



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](#) - [Forteana](#) - [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: Mexico City Fake [was: Lindemann & Rense Tidy]

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Mexico City Fake [was: Lindemann & Rense Tidy]

From: bruce maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 1998 23:04:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 06 Jul 1998 10:18:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Mexico City Fake [was: Lindemann & Rense Tidy]

>Date: Sun, 5 Jul 1998 02:44:24 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Lindemann & Rense Tidy Up>

<snip>

>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?

<snip>

Dear John,

I understand your comments about curvature of field and also other optical aberrations. They cannot explain this noted effect in the video. The field aberrations are ":field depondent", that is, how much aberration depends upon where you are looking within the field of view. As you are aware, typically the aberration is greatest at the edge of the field of view. Anyway, such aberrations are "static"... they occur at the same magnitude at a particular field location each time you look at that field location (which is an angle away from the optic axis). The blurring I am talking about is dynamic, varying frame by frame in the video even though the change in position of the UFO or building image doesn't change much in the field of view..

>>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.

Thanks for your comments regarding the social issue.

>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.>

Actually there is a more important effect which is what first
caught Sainio's attention: the rather strong partial correlation
between the "hand vibration" motion of the UFO and the vibration
of the buildings frame by frame. Here I am talking about motion
from frame 'to frame rather than relative image smear on a single
frame, The camera is always moving around by some amount due to
random hand vibration. The UFO also moves with respect to the
building background. Under these conditions one might expect an
occasional "perfect pan" in which the UFO image seems to stand
still in the field of view as the building images move. In this
video that sort of thing happens a lot.... and at a high rate
(frame by frame). Sainio discovered a considerable correlation
between the frame-by-frame motion of the camera itself (as
determined by building image motion) and the motion of the UFO
image. He discovered this as he was making a stabilized image
video in which the building images stand still. Under these
circumstances the UFO and the DATE STAMP on the video (which is
at a fixed place in the field of view) both move. Sainio noted a
considerable correlation between the vertical motions of the
date stamp and of the UFO. There are further details on this that
really require a paper...which Sainio might write (he has made
his correlation graph available to Walt Andrus and to the
Elders).
This correlation is a bit "too much" to expect for merely random
correlations between the UFO motion generally to the right and

the hand motion of the camera.
There is on point where one can see this effect by looking hard without sophisticated software analysis. This is as the UFO passes over the second wind sock. The UFO image makes a several frame "jump" up and down... and this is correlated with the date stamp motion, meaning that the camera moved down and up a noticeable amount while the UFO stayed at a single place in the field.
Such an effect is consistent with the use of a software program to analyze the background video (which is of a real scene), remove the image motion, calculate locations for the UFO image to generate a uniform UFO motion against the background, and then reintroduce the hand motion. If the program does not do perfect image stabilization the residue of "incomplete stabilization" will show up as a correlation between the motion of the camera (as indicated by the motion of the date stamp as seen against the background) and the motion of the UFO.

>>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.

Don't know if jeff takes time for list correspondence. I'll mention it.

>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

You're welcome. Yes, I did put in time!
And, while we're at it, heads up on Phoenix.

Thanks to cooperation from some witnesses...who don't believe the flare hypothesis, I have been able to demonstrate that at least some (and perhaps all) of the major light displays (non-moving or very slowly moving orange colored very bright lights) are probably flares. The triangulations that I have been able to carry out for events on January 14, 1998, which didn't make a big splash in the national media the way the March 13, 1997 (at 10 PM sightings did), place the lights 60 to 80 miles from the witnesses.... right over the Barry Goldwater Test Range. The March 13 video situation at 10 PM seems similar. THE March 13, 1997 moviong V shape remains unexplained. I am also investigating a case of 1995 sighting with possible missing time. I am writing a paper on the Phoenix light arrays. Won't be done for a while thought. I will not be reporting on the 1995 case until I and the witnesses are convinced we have "figured out" what really happened.

[[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](#).