



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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Re: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 1998 02:44:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 05 Jul 1998 08:45:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up

>Date: Sat, 4 Jul 1998 10:47:24 -0400
>From: bruce maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>From: Joe Murgia <Ufojoel@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 3 Jul 1998 00:39:52 EDT
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up

>>>Date: Thu, 02 Jul 1998 23:54:17 -0400
>>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up

>>ebk wrote:

>>>It seems that he ran into Jeff Sainio at the MUFON Symposium in
>>>Colorado this past weekend. The reclusive Mr Sainio called up the
>>>Mexico City footage of the 'Craft' going behind a large building,
>>>on his computer and told Michael that he was absolutely in no
>>>doubt that the footage was a hoax.

>>Lindemann also said that Jaime (sp?) Maussan is willing to
>>consider this but Maussan can't get by the credibility of the
>>teenage girl Cassandra who claims she saw the craft and her
>>Father didn't believe her and called her a liar. He allegedly
>>believed her when J.M. came calling. The Father tells same
>>story. Supposedly Cassandra didn't watch the show where Maussan
>>debuted the video. Of course, this is impossible to prove.>

>>There were also other witnesses including a young boy. Are they
>>all lieing? What a sad world if they are. And what a terrific
>>bunch of liars because I saw the interviews and these people
>>seemed credible. Some were professional people from the area of
>>where the sighting or hoax took place if that's what
>>it is.

>>How reliable is Sainio? Who is he?

>>Joe in Tampa

=====

Bruce wrote:

>Sainio is one of the best photo/video analysts in the
>"business." He began studying the video at my request and the

>results of our initial joint work on it were published in the
>MUJON Journal several months ago. He as spent MANY hours on this
>video, as I can attest, as have I.

Jeff is a very thorough guy. He did an analysis on some photos I took a few years ago. If he goes over everything the way he did my pix then 'thorough' is one good way to describe him.

>One of the things to check in in video movie or even a still
>photo is the comparison between the smearing of images due to
>camera motion. The UFO image smear should be the same as the
>background image smear. Careful edge analysis shows that the UFO
>image is smeared very little or not at all at the same time (in
>the same frames) where the building image smear is sizeable. In
>neither case is the smear very great because the camera was
>evidently operating with a rather fast shutter time (1/250 sec
>or so). This is why the differential smearing was not noticed in
>the initial analyses.

>Any acceptance of the video as real would have to include a
>logical explanation for this differential smear (I can't think
>of one!). Since the cameraman is still, so far as I know,
>unknown, the camera, etc. cannot be checked.

Bruce, I've been an avid amateur astronomer for 26 years. I have constructed telescopes over the years and learned a 'little something' about optics. Let me ask you a question, could field curvature (aberration) caused by the optics themselves account for the difference in the amount of 'smearing' of the objects in the field of view?

I'm transplanting knowledge of telescope optics onto videocam optics so my question may not even apply. I will bow to your expertise. But, if camera optics can suffer from the same types of aberrations that the mirrors and lenses in telescopes do, then differences _may be_ accounted for in this way. In telescopes using mirrors the shorter the focal length the more curved the surface of the mirror and therefore the further away from the center the image is the more distorted it is. (Curvature of field)

Telescopes using lenses or combinations of lenses and mirrors (such as schmidt cassegrain or maksutov systems) are always corrected for curvature of field. The 'amount' of correction is what distinguishes 'quality' optics from mass produced junk. I would imagine that the same applies to videocams. If this guy was using a 'cheapy' videocam with poorly manufactured or uncorrected lenses would that account for the differences you are finding? I'm curious.

>The story is that the cameraman would not come forward because he >was working illegally in Mexico City and would be sent back to >Venezuela (or perhaps arrested and put in jail) if discovered. >You should note that sizeable amounts of good old American \$\$\$ >were thrown around in order to UPN to buy the rights to use that >video in "Danger in Our Skies." The cameraman could have >demanded a pretty penny for convincing proof that his video was >real.... I expect he could have made a lot of money and gone >back to Venezuela as rich man, had he played his cards right. In >other words, if this were a real video it would have been more >lucrative for the person to admit to having taken it (thereby >getting paid tens of thousands of \$\$\$) than to maintain >anonymity and continue working for whatever company in Mexico >City. (Unless, of course, he works for "Juan Valdez" and the >people who have all those "funny" farms in Columbia.)

Your logic is plausible. But you also need to take into consideration cultural influences. (Latinos are notoriously family oriented,) and many Latino households are three generation affairs. In my culture if one person screws up really bad the whole family is tarred with the same brush. -Everyone- is (socially) shamed by it. A good comparison is the culture of the American deep South. If you screw somebody today, - his- great grandchildren will hate -your- great grandchildren. Hatfields and McCoys, shit sticks, that kind of thing. His -stated concerns- about going public and how that may impact on his family and career may be completely legitimate, honest, and a reflection of deep cultural influences that demand that 'family' (first and foremost) and personal reputation are -always- a major consideration. Ask any Latino on the list!

You may be right and a 'faker' is simply trying to hide, but it's also important to give people both sides of the story when making implications of intentional fraud publicly. Maybe the guy meant what he said and he -really- doesn't want to expose himself/his kin to public ridicule or humiliation. Or, jeopardize his bread and butter gig! It (may not) necessarily be a case of not taking advantage of commercial/marketing opportunities because he has something to hide as you imply above. Not fair Bruce!

In his original letter to Maussan he clearly stated that he didn't want his family involved, or bothered by this. He went on to say to Maussan that he was sure, (because Jaime had been a public figure for so long,) that Jaime would surely understand why he wished to remain anonymous. All legit concerns and -to be respected- if he so wishes.

BTW Bruce, 'Juan Valdez' grows _coffee_ not "funny stuff!" <G> If you saw Peter Jennings' TV special/report, "The Money Tree" you'd know that more Americans grow their own "funny stuff" at home (for fun and profit) nowadays than is grown/imported from old Mehico. You're thinking of the sixties man! <VBG>

>Without a "first person account" of the video, the video will
>always be "wounded." Inasmuch as internal evidence seems to
>show signs of fake, at the very least it cannot be accepted as
>proof of the visual sightings.

Does the difference in 'smears' mean that the UFO was a "dropped in" image? If so, does it show any of the other signs of superimposed image work? ie; traps/seams, differences in pixel size, lighting, color value, texture, etc.?

It just seems to me that if it was a fake, (superimposed or dropped in from somewhere else) there would be -more- than just one indicator. If the object wasn't a part of the original scene then -evidence of tampering- would go further than a difference in edge smear correct? You're the 'expert' Bruce, you tell me man. I'm just trying to get it all straight in my head before I dismiss it as a hoax myself based on what you are sharing with us.

How strong is this difference in 'edge smear' in terms of indicating/proving a sure hoax? Could optical aberrations in the lens train account for it? The object did spend most of its time off to one side. Field curvature at the edges could account for certain 'visual' differences. (Lengthening/ foreshortening of image elements) Again, I don't know if this applies to videocam lenses so I'm just shooting in the dark.

>How, then, does it related to the visual sightings?

>The bottom line is that we don' know how to relate the video to
>the sightings, and we may never know if the videographer
>doesn't come forward.

Agreed. Let's hope this guy does come forward. If it's real, it's an important document and piece of evidence. Would it be possible to get Jeff involved in this thread? I'd like to hear from him too on this. I'm sure he'd give us all an earful about this video and I'm all ears! <VBG> Send him a copy of this e-mail and we'll all hope he responds. I have been following this one very closely from day one and I'd like to see it through to a final conclusion if such a thing is possible.

Thanx Bruce, for the info and all the work that I know you put into this video yourself.

Till I hear from you,

John Velez

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](#).