



# 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

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Aug](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City

From: **Asgeir Waehre Skavhaug** <[KONAWS@statoil.com](mailto:KONAWS@statoil.com)>  
Date: Fri, 28 Aug 1998 13:54:16 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 30 Aug 1998 09:25:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Comments on Maccabee's Analysis; Mexico City

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

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

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](http://www.jse.com/ufo_reports/Sturrock/toc.html) (See Appendix 2 here.)

[ [Next 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](#).