



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Oct](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: One Picture is Worth a Thousand Words

From: BOB SHELL <76750.2717@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 4 Oct 1997 10:08:44 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 04 Oct 1997 10:55:36 -0400
Subject: Re: One Picture is Worth a Thousand Words

>From: rfsignal@sprynet.com [Cathy Johnson]
>Date: Fri, 3 Oct 1997 20:14:13 -0700
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: One Picture is Worth a Thousand Words
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

> Can I ask how a poleroid camera be made to double expose any
>of its film? And, another point I'd like to ask concerning the hood
>reflections. If there was nothing else besides the tree line being
>reflected on the hood, wouldn't it be logical to assume that the
>object was further away than the treeline, and much larger in size to
>be visible in the picture at all? I don't know for sure, but I
>thought I would ask.

Although most modern Polaroid cameras are designed to prevent double exposures, if you know what you are doing you can rig any of them to do it. It's not necessarily simple, but could be done. If you didn't know how but had the money, there are technicians who specialize in modifying cameras in a wide variety of ways. So, in theory, the Polaroid photos Ed took could be double exposures.

On the point of the reflection, I think Bruce has given a detailed explanation of that point, so I will await the posting of his argument.

The problem with photographic evidence, particularly still photos, is that ANY photo could be faked. But just because something could be, that doesn't mean that it is.

I've been studying some photos taken in Mexico by Carlos Diaz, and I have to say that they are pretty damned convincing. Could they have been faked? Of course. Were they? How can anyone other than the photographer know?

Bob

Search for other documents to/from: [76750.2717](#) | [rfsignal](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.

To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).