



## 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: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!

From: Brian Cuthbertson <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
Date: Sun, 30 Aug 1998 17:57:48 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 31 Aug 1998 10:30:11 -0800  
Subject: Re: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!

> From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
> To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
> Subject: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!  
> Date: Sat, 29 Aug 1998 06:57:32 +0100

> Re:

> <http://www.ufomind.com/misc/1998/aug/d26-001.shtml>  
> <http://www.ufomind.com/misc/1998/aug/d27-001.shtml>

> I have been reading this Edgar Fouche stuff. Alien Crapture more  
> like!

Since Ed Fouche isn't on the Updates email list, and since I just happened to know his email address, I forwarded him Tim Matthews's posting critiquing his book Alien Rapture and his talk at the Laughlin UFO Congress.

Ed responded within an hour or two answering Tim's comments. I've appended his response below. I'm taking no sides in this; I just figure critical reviews deserve a hearing from BOTH sides.

I've edited Ed's response only as as required to conform to the line length requirementss for postings to Updates. For those of you unfamiliar with the book Alien Rapture, see web site <http://fouchemedia.com>

Here's the note Ed prepended on his response to me regarding Tim's review:

-----

From: Ed Fouche <[fouche@connecti.com](mailto:fouche@connecti.com)>  
To: "'Brian Cuthbertson'" <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
Subject: From Ed Fouche/ Please feel free to pass on  
Date: Sun, 30 Aug 1998 16:47:58 -0500

Dear Brian:

Thanks for the input. I expect no less from some people. This is why the UFOlogy group never gets anywhere. Everyone attacks everybody else. I have not said one negative thing about other researchers or writers in this field. Everyone is entitled to his or her opinion.

But some try to promote their own ideas and book by putting

down others. Sort of like an insecure bully in school don't you think. The bottom line to his rebuttal is his bottom line:

>"FIND OUT ABOUT THE BOOK THEY FAILED TO BAN! "UFO REVELATION -  
> THE SECRET TECHNOLOGY EXPOSED!" BY TIM MATTHEWS OUT VERY EARLY  
> 1999. IT'S GONNA KICK ASS!"

I really don't care what he thinks. I wrote the truth as I knew it, and indeed I did not do research for this book and had only read Project Blue Book many years before. I did not want to copy anyone else's opinion. The presentation I gave at Laughlin, the UFO Congress, has very little to do with the book. However, I will take two minutes and answer a couple of his points. Please feel free to forward this to anyone who is interested, including the Ass Kicking Tim.

Sincerely  
Ed Fouche

-----

And here is Ed's response to Tim Matthews:

>Date: Sun, 30 Aug 1998 11:19:27 -0400  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!

>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Alien Rupture - the truth breaks out. Challenge!  
>Date: Sat, 29 Aug 1998 06:57:32 +0100

>I have been reading this Edgar Fouche stuff. Alien Crapture more  
>like!

Of course he hasn't read the book, that would take too much energy.

>It is utter nonsense as I show below with just a few quick  
>examples. The first thing to say is that most of the correct  
>technical details - there are always a few in disinformation or  
>science fiction - could have been gleaned from any half-decent  
>textbook on military affairs or through the most casual perusal  
>of a book or article by Bill Sweetman.

Perhaps, but when have you had the details of the operations at Groom, especially the goggles that visitors wear. Ask a few USAF Test Pilots, and SR-71 pilots who flew into or out of Groom. Why hasn't anyone before me mentioned the details that are in Alien Rapture? Because not one of these so called insiders were inside.

>My view is simply this. The whole thing has to make sense and  
>basic concepts must be presented correctly in order for the  
>account to be credible.

This was a simple presentation put together with my own personal slides. No doctoral thesis was intended. Just an overview of what I know.

>1 - The other semi-anonymous characters referred to by EF have  
>conveniently died or are not available for comment. Rule 1 of BS  
>is to ensure that sources cannot be checked.

These 'characters', are personal friends whom I have known 20 to 30 years. Three very important people have met them and can verify their existence. I'm sorry two of my dear friends died before you could try and ridicule them in order to promote your KICK ASS book. This is a little petty, even for someone trying to promote their KICK ASS book.

>OK - perhaps somebody might want to talk about something but  
>given the very definite compartmentation resulting from US  
>security and classification procedures there is NO WAY that any  
>of these people would be able to present so much of the picture

>about any classified project.

That's what they said about Woodard and Bernstein. I claim no special investigative powers. Just contacts within the DoD and special programs who trust me enough to talk to me.

>2 - It is simply not credible under any circumstances for EF to >claim that he was given permission to come out with this >information. Anyone breaking security protocols and being >discovered faces loss of clearance, loss of job and most likely >- imprisonment. Even if a problem arose with a particular worker >he/she may temporarily lose their clearance.

Bingo, the obvious! That is why the book had to be written as fiction. No person writing about their secret experiences in the government is writing NON FICTION. If they were, the hammer would fall quickly.

>3 - From EFs account;  
>"It was an unmanned reconnaissance vehicle which took off from a >B-52 bomber" etc. etc.

For your information, there are B-52s at Groom which are currently used to drop special programs aircraft. You don't have to R&D and FOT&E a new host aircraft. The B-52 is perfectly adequate for the job.

>I think he got this idea from the very public D-21 drone which >reached Mach 3 plus in the 1960s. No alien technology there I'm afraid!  
>'Slide 53';  
>Story about SR-71 encountering a UFO. No evidence at all to back this up.  
>An SR-71 encountering such problems - said to include serious pilot >problems both in the air and upon landing - would not have made it.  
>Never said serious problems upon landing. Read some books about >operations and you'll see why. "SR-71 revealed" by Graham (Motorbooks).  
>A good starting point... No technical details about SR-71 operation >are mentioned and that's because Fouche doesn't know any.

The SR-71 is old technology, what would you like to know about it. I'm current, even of NASA using them for research. The bringing them back, cutting the funds, etc. They are now dismantling, and have been for a couple of months this program in Lancaster CA. Why do you think the Air Force has fought this. They don't need it. It was replaced.

>SR-71 pilots hitting the bottle; absolute crap. The pilots would >have been booted out of the Squadron immediately.

You were obviously never in the military. Drinking is a way of life; to cope, to self medicate. The US Military has the highest functioning alcoholic rate except for Law Enforcement. Just because you drink a lot at night, doesn't mean you can't function during the day.

>'Slide 55';  
>"A laboratory named DARC" sounds like sci-fi and totally >unnecessary. Again, the template appears to be DARPA - Advanced >Research Projects Agency. Again, what is 'super-secret'? Top >Secret ensures solid secrecy! There is no 'Above Top >Secret'.....

NOPE. DARC does exist. Someday, soon I expect, everyone will know this. Again, wrong. There are clearances above Top Secret. Having had an SBI, EBI, and SPBI, I know. Not to mention SCIs.

>"One operational TR3B is now stationed in Scotland, another in >Diego Garcia". Nonsense. Having spent a great deal of time >looking in RAF Macrahanish there is evidence to suggest previous >operations and maybe the very occasional landing of something >hush-hush - but nothing more. The facilities at DTEO West Freugh >are impressive and undoubtedly stuff has flown out of there but >no TR3B.

And how would he know. Ever been through all the hangers, every day. Conjecture on his part.

>There is NO EVIDENCE of a TR3B and EF is obviously unaware that  
>TR means Tactical Reconnaissance. He also shows a complete lack  
>of understanding of the Tier drones designations.

In the presentation and in Alien Rapture I use this term. You missed it. Sorry, but you were in too much of a hurry to promote your ASS KICK book. I also mention the TEIR program.

>Slides 57, 58, 59.  
>Something has been recorded off the US West Coast approaching  
>Groom Lake at Mach 4. The SR-71 was almost certainly not  
>responsible and is not 'still breaking world speed records'.

The Ministry of Defense in England has admitted radar tracking of vehicles from Mach 8 up to the limits of the radar's capabilities. Read Nick Redfern's really kick ass book, he's a pro and didn't have to attack anyone to get recognition for his research.

>SR-75; a model kit aircraft from testors. More fiction.

Wouldn't be the first time a model came out that was true. Look at the B-2 model.

>'Hypersonic speeds start at approximately Mach 5'.  
>Well Mach 5.4 actually where the air stagnates in front of the  
>air vehicle but again a total lack of technical detail from a  
>supposed knowledgeable insider....

Yes it is. Mach 5.4, rounded off, is Mach 5. Besides, depending on which text book you read, the figure goes from mach 5 to mach 5.6 It also depends on the vehicle's design.

>4 - Author's Note; "The MJ-12 documents presented in the book  
>were copyrighted also". Obviously fake documents (sorry Stanton)  
>copyrighted? I do wish we knew who they belonged to!

The documents were copyrighted in 1993 and 1994 with inserts, to prove this information was out before the Autopsy film and Corso's and other's claims.

>Mention of the alien autopsy and Corso. Well we all know what a  
>load of bull Corso came out with - lots of factual errors.  
>Autopsy film? In tatters thanks to UK researchers.

I agree, the film was a fake. But it was made by the government in Lancaster Texas for that purpose. The best lie is the one closest to the truth. Courtesy of PSY OPS.

>Slide 69; "TR3B Operational Version".  
>>Reducing the mass of a nuclear generator by 89%? I don't think  
>so.

Never said the mass of the nuclear generator was reduced alone. Every thing within the Magnetic Field Disruptor accelerator is reduced.

>"With the vehicle mass reduced by 89% the craft can travel at  
>mach 9 vertically or horizontally. My sources say the  
>performance is limited only by the stresses that the human  
>pilots can endure. Which is a lot, really, considering along  
>with the 89% reduction in mass, the G forces are also reduced by  
>89%."  
>Utter nonsense. Mass and g forces have no relationship to each  
>other. Regardless of so-called 'mass' the pilot would suffer the  
>g turns. As to travelling vertically 'at mach 9' with a pilot.  
>Forget about it!

Obviously. But if gravity is warped around the MFD accelerator then the G forces would be reduced.

>At mach 9 and travelling in a straight line g forces would be no  
>problem as such. Only when performing turns or evasive maneuvers  
>- fairly impossible at Mach 9 but no matter - would g forces  
>operate.  
>"The crew of the TR3B should be able to comfortably take up to  
>40Gs".

By reducing the G forces by 89 percent. Then the 40 G forces would be reduced to approximately 4 Gs.

>Are we really expected to take this seriously? Read any basic  
>aviation text; +/- 9g maybe, even 10g. get to between 12-18 g  
>and you're talking UAVs.....

You sound like a nuclear physicist from the 50s debating  
advanced programs of which you know nothing of. In 1935 how few  
people really knew what the A Bomb would do if explodes. Even  
Opinhiemer wasn't sure.

>The reason that classified projects have concentrated upon  
>active camouflage is precisely because a plane at high speeds  
>might not be able to out-maneuver the new range of  
>near/hypersonic AA missiles - obviously g turns rule out evasive  
>action at such high speeds.....

---and to reduce the reflected radar image. If you can't see  
it, you can't shoot it. The ASPJ Program at ITT is an example.  
If you see what I mean.

>Slide 73;  
>"In the upper atmosphere with hydrogen propulsion and in orbit  
>with hydrogen/oxygen propulsion".

Wrong. Hydrogen won't burn by itself up there - No Sir! Yes, but  
when mixed with Oxygen it will.>

>Slide 74;  
>He uses a computer graphic of the supposed TR3B despite claiming  
>to have access to the real thing??

You bet!

>Slide 75;  
>>!THE CLINCHER!

The thrilla in Manila again.

>"From the evolution of exotic materials, advanced avionics and  
>newer propulsion engines the stealth aircraft were born".  
>This proves the guy is talking BS. Stealth has NOTHING TO DO  
>with avionics and engines.

You couldn't be further from the truth. Active stealth coating  
Is electro chemical active and works with the Stealth ECM suite.  
The electronics counter measures controls the active stealth  
coating. It's not like a mood ring Matt.

>Look at the F-117A. The low RCS was achieved through an  
>understanding of Ufimtsev's mathematics relating to the  
>reduction of an aircraft's radar cross section. The ONLY thing  
>of concern was to build a low RCS aircraft in order to  
>(initially) avoid Soviet SA-6 missile batteries and then to act  
>perhaps as a 'silver bullet'.

This was not the only concern. Trying to fly a non aerodynamic  
vehicle was achieved with computers to control the awkward  
flight dynamics.

>Hence the 'Hopeless Diamond'. Faceting is not mentioned re;  
>stealth and neither is any other technical detail - which  
>suggest that he doesn't know any. I'm no expert but I know more  
>than he does!

Perhaps. But, I never claimed to be a know it all.

>In terms of both the F-117A and B-2 the engines and avionics are  
>not the big issue. The F-117A now has a new avionics suite but  
>this has nothing' to do with stealth.

As I explained. WRONG again.

>Stealth is not a new idea and many aviation writers note the  
>very strong possibility that the Horten Brothers flying wing  
>aircraft (late 1930s and early 1940s to 1945) with their  
>composite materials would have had a very low RCS. The testing  
>of captured aircraft such as this by the USAF and US Navy  
>through the later 1940s proved this.

The first time they used Chaff dispensers that was a form of

stealth. To block enemy radar tracking.

>In fact original ideas of low observability are as old as  
>aircraft...

Yes, the color of an aircraft provides a modicum of camouflage

>EVEN by reading a basic book on stealth Fouche should have known  
>this. He is obviously making most of it up as he goes along.  
>Sorry - you've been rumbled. I hope the advanced was a big one!

Didn't have to make up any of this stuff. It's all real Tim

>5 - No information on the US Navy even though they have been  
>involved in more black aircraft programmes than the USAF and CIA  
>put together. Last time I looked US Navy classified R+D amounted  
>to some \$8 billion - more than the USAF. I'll check on that but  
>the point is that I have an official intel' doc (Sign) admitting  
>that the US Navy had an experimental a/c mistakenly reported as  
>a UFO. It used jet engines.

WRONG AGAIN, the USAF has the biggest Black Budget.

>The Navy had operational saucers too and more information on  
>this is due to emerge in print very soon!

Yes, from your KICK ASS book, I presume. The AVRO saucers were  
funded by the NRO (Navy) in case you didn't know. Read Dr. Paul  
Hill's book, Unconventional Flying Objects. He was a NASA UFO  
investigator for 30 years. He only got his book out because his  
daughter took the manuscript to a publisher after his death.

>Well folks this is just a brief comment upon second reading of  
>the talk supposedly given by Fouche at the Laughlin UFO  
>Conference just recently. I could call Fouche a liar but I think  
>he's just on the bandwagon.....the real classified Projects  
>people must really love him.....

>I challenge him and any of his supporters to debate these issues  
>either live in front of an audience or on a talk radio show.

I have, and I will continue to do so. This was not much of a  
debate though.

>Know what? They'll lose.

To the Great KICK ASS debater. Have a good day.

>Tim Matthews - standing up for common sense and factual analysis!

Common sense says you read someone's book before taking shots.  
It's called research.

>FIND OUT ABOUT THE BOOK THEY FAILED TO BAN! "UFO REVELATION -  
\* THE SECRET TECHNOLOGY EXPOSED!"

You can get arrested for exposing yourself, TIM.

\* BY TIM MATTHEWS OUT VERY EARLY  
>1999. IT'S GONNA KICK ASS!

In all sincerity. Tim has a right to his opinion. But, I  
obviously disagree. When I have time I will respond in kind to  
others. But I have a company to run. So I don't have time to  
cruise the Internet and send out mass mailings to promote my  
book like others. Please forgive the misspellings as I did not  
take time to check them.

Ed Fouche

**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](#).