



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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Aug](#) -> Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City

From: Bruce Maccabe <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 28 Aug 1998 21:25:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 29 Aug 1998 20:49:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City

>From: Asgeir Waehre Skavhaug <KONAWS@statoil.com>
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Date: Fri, 28 Aug 1998 13:54:16 +0100
>Subject: Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City Disc

>>Date: Wed, 26 Aug 1998 12:22:39 -0400
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>Subject: Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City Disc

>>>Date: Tue, 25 Aug 1998 19:26:20 -0400
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City Disc
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>>I must comment on this message since evidence has been in the
>>>video which suggests a video hoax. Some of that evidence is
>>>directly illustrated in the attached GIF image of four frames
>>>from the video. In two of the frames, one above the other, on
>>>the right side there are building images which are sharp. In two

><snip>

>Hi List,

>Quick question on the videographic "evidence" and the resultant
>"investigation" of such. Blurring as in Soft focus is being
>maintained as camera shift from being handheld I take it? I
>concede that this is all too possible however, is it also not?

><snip>

>Are the procedures for analysis of photographic evidence more or
>less "standardised"?

>Could they be similar to the procedures mentioned, e.g., in
>this report:

>- http://www.jse.com/ufo_reports/Sturrock/toc.html

>(See Appendix 2 here.)

I am not certain what you are asking.

There are "standard" tests applied to UFO photos to demonstrate

self-consistency within the photo/video. Which tests are used depend upon the nature of the imagery. For a hand held camera that is supposedly videotaping objects at great distance (more than a hundred feet) one would expect similar amounts of smear of real scenery (e.g., buildings) and UFO images.

Any difference in the amount of smear requires a careful explanation (e.g., accurate panning with the camera can leave a building image smeared while a moving UFO image is unsmeared). The Mexico City video does not pass this test.

(Note; the oft maligned Ed Walters photos from Gulf Breeze _did_ pass the test!)

[[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](#).