



## Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is **OPEN**

*Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!*

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Sep](#) -> Re: 'Rods'? - In Answer to all

### UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: 'Rods'? - In Answer to all

From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>  
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 1997 12:44:35 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 Sep 1997 01:29:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Rods'? - In Answer to all

> From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>, on 9/18/97 4:30 AM:  
> From: rjke@webtv.net (Jose and Karen Escamilla)  
> Date: Wed, 17 Sep 1997 21:21:26 -0600  
> To: updates@globalserve.net  
> Subject: Re: 'Rods'? - In Answer to all

> Mark mentions that the shadow across the torso of the cave rod "could  
> be" duplicated with a time exposure, and he gives an example about a  
> ball using this technique; but the cave rod was shot in real time video  
> as the base jumper took his dive.

> This was a one shot deal. Not allowing for any time lapse photography as  
> Mark so carelessly suggests. Nice try, but Mark be more realistic in  
> your insights.

Jose, you are missing my point. The question was how an object  
blurred in a frame by motion could show a cast shadow on itself.  
I explained it the way I did so that anyone could attempt to  
reproduce it.

However, it is essential to remember that EVERY image, video or photo  
is a "time exposure", and depending on the speed and proximity of the  
object involved, one can experience the same effects in a 1/10000  
of a second exposure as in a 3 second exposure.

And some of the information posted here indicates that 1/10000 of a sec  
in a video camera does not have the same stopping power as in a camera  
with an actual shutter.

> Bruce Maccabee, Dr. Jack Kasher and Jim Dilettoso have seen the cave  
> footage and I finally got topographical maps, latitude/longitude  
> information on the cave, which will be forwarded to Bruce, Jack and Jim,  
> so that thy can use this data in finding out how big, fast and far away  
> this thing was from the base jumper and the camera.

> Bruce says that once he gathers this information & data about the time  
> of day and time that this event was taped, he will be able to determine  
> the probable size and speed of this Rod object from the cave. This will  
> certainly rule the insect theory.

As always, I have a hard time seeing how you can know  
the results of this analysis before you perform it.

I appreciate your confidence in your methods, but it is more  
scientific to be skeptical prior to measurement and analysis.  
At least to say "this analysis will cast some light on the  
insect theory, etc." would be a safer statement.

I am not sure how lat/long data is going to tell anyone how far the object was from the camera. The only reliable method for determining this is parallax and triangulation.

> Mark and others feel that we're not being scientific enough to warrant  
> ourselves as serious investigators. If science is based on closed minded  
> opinions before the fact, then I suggest the annals of scientific  
> investigation be re-written. Unless you are out in the field with us,  
> documenting and adding your knowledge to this investigation, then I  
> doubt that anyone should take your commentary as a serious scientific  
> analysis of the Rods phenomena.

Why do personalities have to be brought in to this? Can't your data stand up to technical criticism? Do you think that people in the conventional sciences don't get their experiments questioned? Do you think that measurement errors and artifacts aren't issues in conventional science?

Why would I bother with the critique if I didn't take your data seriously?

Have a look at some books on, for instance, electron microscopy. There you will see that even experienced scientists have used flawed techniques and reported structures in cells which did not actually exist, but which were artifacts of the preservation method used, or the method of exposure. Their errors were discovered and discussed by other scientists, some of whom did experiments, and others of whom did mathematical modeling. Those scientists whose work was criticised didn't spend their time complaining, they tried experiments to disprove the contentions of the critics, and if those experiments failed to do so, they accepted it and moved on.

To the extent you do this, I applaud you.

And, I also think that you should realize that one does not have to be "out in the field" to be able to offer a critique of your methods or your interpretations. I am surprised, considering your statement, that you bother to send data to Maccabee, who I suspect is not out there with you either.

> Mark; join us on the expedition if you really want to exercise your  
> intellectual knowledge while applying it out in the field.

Thanks for the invitation, but I'm afraid a long journey is not in the budget of money or time at the moment.

---

On a related note, we often on this list come down to this discussion of what will improve the scientific standing of UFO studies.

To my mind, the continuing debate on "rods" is exactly the sort of thing which does that.

In science, an observation is raised and a hypothesis is made. Someone else raises a counter-hypothesis. Tests are performed, and perhaps they are not conclusive, so another hypothesis is raised, and tests are performed.

Jose's hypothesis is (correct me if I'm wrong):

Rods are large, high-speed objects some distance from the camera. The blurring is an effect of their intrinsic speed, and, possibly, some sort of field surrounding them.

My hypothesis is:

Rods are insects or other objects, either self-powered or blown by the wind, whose proximity to the camera and size causes a blurring effect because of angular movement during the exposure.

I believe the mathematics and statistics I have presented have shown that "rods" can be explained in this manner. The angular size of rods is not inconsistent with insect sized

objects at some proximity to the camera, and the speed at which the rods move is not inconsistent with the apparent angular speed or the calculated distance and size of the object, or the known speeds of insects.

However, the most important test comes with a verifiable triangulation of a rod. I look forward to seeing the results.

In any event, in science, the scientist takes a risk in making a hypothesis: a risk that the hypothesis will be proven wrong. Jose takes that risk and so do I. However, both of us must be willing to accept it if we are proven wrong, or we leave the domain of science and head into the foggier domain of "faith".

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of the Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.geocities.com/~mcashman>  
[http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The Temporal Doorway Storefront](http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The_Temporal_Doorway_Storefront)  
Original digital art, writing and UFO research  
mcashman@ix.netcom.com  
-----

Search for other documents to/from: [mcashman](#) | [rjke](#)

---

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

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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