



# 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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jan](#) -> RAMS: Re: NASA The Lies

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### RAMS: Re: NASA The Lies

From: "Robert A.M. Stephens" <[sti3818@montana.com](mailto:sti3818@montana.com)>  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 10:47:10 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 16:50:21 -0500  
Subject: RAMS: Re: NASA The Lies

(Darn you Peter Gersten. Okay, here we go. But, I say right now, it will do no good to this man or anyone like him to re-answer these questions because I'll work real hard on these when I need sleep and his answer will be: "xxxx you stephens, you're a xxxx liar." It's what everyone of these people say and I've learned my lesson 2 months ago. Its religion to these folks and what I say is not what they want to hear. I think you are troubled <grin> for putting me through this over and over just because you know I'll try and answer them in my awkward way since I think at times someone is actually serious about it.)

(Note to 'JM': In my mail to you in answer to you tonight, I posted it would do no good to answer any of these because you'll just call me a liar after I work on them for you. I still very much believe this. Peter Gersten thinks there is some good points in this mail of yours so I will counter my assessment and answer these to the best of my ability. At least consider them before you respond with a one liner that I'm lying to you. I think Peter is a part time dentist at times and uses no Novocain nor does he have the vaguest compassion for a fellow lifeform such as me.)

'JM' wrote:

Okay, 'JM', whoever you are, at the request of Peter Gersten, here goes.

>To Mr. Robert A. Stephens:

Good start. No calling me a 'xxxxsucker'. Thank you.

>It seems that you have taken in upon yourself to defend NASA from >Richard Hoagland and his claims.

No. He attacks NASA. I take issue. On balance, this is fair.

>Hoagland is an interesting figure,  
>with some valid arguments about Mars and the Moon,

None. He immutably states a fact. He uses the very source (NASA) as his proof, but this is strange since this is the source that is lying about Mars and everything else. He needs to take his own photos then, instead of using the 'liars' photos. This is a conundrum he has painted himself into.

>and some off-the-wall  
>ridiculous propositions, like Hale-Bopp and the December 7th landing.  
>Your attacks on him focus on his faults(which are many) but forget to

>mention some obvious points.

>1.While Hoagland is the most recognized proponent for the artificiality  
>of structures on Mars, he is not the first or the most scientific. The  
>proponents include:Dr. Erol Torun; Professor Thomas Bearden; Vince  
>DiPietro and Gregory Molenaar; Dr. Mark Carlotto; Dr. James Erjavec

You fail to mention the folks at JPL who first mentioned this when the photos were coming in 1976. I mention no faults. The personal data against Hoagland are from people who requested for me to use their data in my debate on Bell since they have failed to ever get a voice after repeated requests to do so. I have accommodated them as best as possible. They do not want to use their names publicly as they are physically afraid of what Richard C. Hoagland has said to them in the form of threats. I personally don't subscribe to this--which by now should be rather obvious If I was threatened by anyone, any place, I'd go and see the accuser up front and personal and asked where is the beef. Simple.

I still fail to see a face in the latest photos from JPL. I still hold, rationally I believe, that the vote must hold off until we stand on Cydonia with a few backhoes and such and see for ourselves what is there. This is fair since there is 143 million miles between us and Mars and this distance effects what we are able to see for certain with our eyes.

At 6 miles from my home is a 'Face' on the side of the Mission Mountain Range to my east. We all see this everyday. It is not artificial. It looks like a human face in broad daylight at 6 miles distance. It is a rock formation.

It is entirely possible the varved escarpment on Mars at Cydonia is a varved escarpment, based on what we know and what we have to look at for reference on Earth.

>2.Why does NASA, a supposedly open government agency hoard the use of  
>our resources and give exclusive use to its hand-picked friends in the  
>private sector(i.e. "Principal Investigators")?

>The Hubble Telescope, IRAS and all of NASA's other toys are the property  
>of the American taxpayer. When was their ownership signed over to Dan  
>Goldin, Michael Malin and their clique?

I do not understand this question. Dan Goldin is the Administrator of NASA. Malin is a free agent contractor as myself. NASA went and took pictures of Cydonia as requested. The results are at JPL. Where is the beef? I pay very hefty taxes too since I am self employed. All NASA workers including Goldin pay taxes also. So does Malin. This statement you've made escapes me.

>3.Why does NASA no longer carry LIVE broadcasts from the Shuttle?

Because they are the smallest government agency and they do not have the funding to carry all feeds from Whitesands transponder and the other on orbit relay feeds. The USAF has also raised the fees for this service to use their hardware and NASA could not get congressional budgeting for it on a regular basis. To you and other serious people who rely on this service for keeping in touch with on orbit activities this is a rotten loss. Within NASA, they have a fund tank for folks to contribute to the public interface since so many NASA employees have families that want the live feed. They rely on mission tapes now, most of the time.

This feed was also how mission crew families were able to watch their loved ones on orbit. Now, they get either the tapes or still photos.

If you want it back, write congress since they are the funders.

>4.Why does NASA only release a trickle of images from Hubble, IRAS and  
>MGS when these instruments are in almost constant use by NASA?

Hubble is in use 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, all year long and is never ever down unless for repairs or new plugins. Actual usage by NASA and its centers is on a sign up basis. This means for 36 hours the University of Hawaii may have look time reserved. Next, maybe the University of Tokyo. Then, NASA's

Goddard may have 4 hours reserved, then some other private venture. NASA's actual on air usage of HST is about 10-15% of the time at most. The waiting sign up list is long. Anyone can reserve air time on Hubble. A list is available for requesting reserved time.

What others do, which is 85% of the users of the device, is up to them regarding photos. NASA elects to post all photos from HST publicly. However, this is a small percentage of the returned images that could be offered for viewing.

>5. Why was NASA obsessed with the constellation Orion (as correctly pointed out by Hoagland), and why did the original Apollo logo carry a prominent image of Orion?

Hoagland pointed out nothing. This statement that he did is a oxymoron in and of itself. Think about this statement. If it was there for all to see, it was then posted there for all to see. Period. Be logical.

The forerunner of NASA, NACA, 1958, designated Greek symbols for space flight because this made more sense than naming or referring to mission and other flight off Earth by names of flowers, or plants, or bridges. There was no metaphysical tie in to symbolism in this. Few know that if you talk to visual astronomers, which are few in number, they do not go by constellations for stellar reference but by star locator mapping and celestial dynamics.

>6. Why do many scientists believe that NASA is withholding images of Mars?

I don't know. I watched them come in by vector from here on my other Mac set up for such via link (not the photos, but the digital numeric vector) and they all came in as sent by number. It would have been impossible to 'delete' something coming in all at the same time from space selectively. I wanted to see how many photos were coming and I could not get resolution time to JPLs database to see the pictures as they came in for resolve since I have nothing to do with JPL work wise, but the numbers of those that got developed and the vector signatures for numbers of photos gelled to the number. No bombs or errors or missing photos.

>Florida Today, October 10, 1998  
>Scientist Says New Mars Photos Being Withheld

> Speaking at the Space Coast UFO Conference at the Hilton Hotel in  
>Cocoa Beach, Florida on  
>Friday, October 9, 1998, Vincent DiPietro, who worked for NASA's  
>Marshall Spaceflight Center for 23 years, claimed recent photographs  
>taken by the Mars Global Surveyor were being withheld from the  
>scientific community. DiPietro, a scientist who was first to evaluate  
>photos of the surface of Mars taken by the Viking landers in 1976, cited  
>a September Space News report on the growing number of planetary  
>scientists disgruntled over the slow release of photographic data from  
>the Mars Global Surveyor and "suggested that new images were being  
>consciously  
>withheld.

This is a fabrication. There is a 6 month waiting for selective review of all photos by the prime contractor. This is for all government contracts made with the public. Malin or whomever is the prime contractor has exclusive rights to make any financial gain from any data so garnered. On the art side, I have every right, even though NASA owns the original oil, to get any proceeds from the exposure of my paintings in any fashion I deem plausible and useful to my benefit. This is not uncommon---its the way it is done. The prime contractor can release the photos the second they are developed or the last second of the 6 month grace period. This isn't a NASA rule. This is all government in all agencies.

>Images are radioed to Earth and downloaded by Malin Space Systems, Inc.  
>of San Diego,  
>California, NASA's contractor. DiPietro criticized MGS camera operator  
>Michael Malin, whose (NASA) contract gives him a six-month proprietary  
>embargo on the images. He and other scientists reported Malin had taken  
>numerous photos of the so-called Face on Mars, other than the single one

>released by NASA in April, that appeared to reflect natural terrain  
>rather than artificial features. "This leads me to believe that we are  
>not getting all the facts from Malin Enterprises," DiPietro said.

See above. By law, Malin can do whatever he wishes. Within that  
6 month period.

>7. Why does a private company get a 6-month exclusive "review period" for  
>images taken by a half-billion dollar satellite belonging to the  
>American people?

Congress set and passed this law.

>What possible commercial or other value does Malin  
>gain in those six months?

I don't know. Ask him. He is a very profound and solid man. I  
trust him implicitly. He has worked very hard on this project  
and I do admire him greatly.

>Does he get to make his own line of Martian  
>t-shirts or breakfast cereal? Science is supposed to be an open process  
>where all people can participate. Scientists in various disciplines  
>should have immediate access to these images.

Then bring this up to Congress. I agree.

>8. Why does NASA orchestrate an unscientific and blatant attack on the  
>Cydonia researchers?

They do not ever. They postulate over and over. Think this  
through. Are you referencing Hoagland's Space Program photos of  
Cydonia, or NASA's. Since I'm nearly certain it is NASA's  
photos, since I don't think Hoagland has a space program  
personally, then they have taken the stand it is a geo-physical  
structure until proven otherwise. I agree. This is as fair as if  
someone categorically stated "it is NOT a face." I think we have  
to hold off until we get there.

Is this remotely fair in your mind. If there was no NASA photos,  
we wouldn't even have this discussion. Isn't that at least to be  
considered?

>Why does NASA, to this day, maintain the ridiculous argument that the  
>Face is a trick of light and shadow?

Because at 6 miles away the rock formation the Mission Range is  
a trick of shape, light, and shadow. If this anomaly occurs  
here, and it does millions of times on this planet, it stands to  
reason it occurs elsewhere. But I'm talking a religion here. I  
have no further explanation but what I offer and since you and  
the rest are the real experts, somehow at 143,000,000 miles you  
can do what I cannot. See a face in the latest photos. I see a  
varved eroded escarpment in very sharp relief with water effect  
and wind and erosion. It shows a heavily encroached area by wind  
and storms in the 22 years since we were there before.

I have studied Cydonia under pretty well founded conditions and  
I do not find NASA's assessment ridiculous at all.

>Dr. Stanley McDaniel has tracked  
>NASA's peculiar and unscientific behavior in regards to Cydonia and  
>makes several important points. First, Dr. Sagan did a propaganda piece  
>in Parade magazine, which showed a deliberately distorted version of the  
>Face "which had been processed using false color in such a manner as to  
>diminish the resemblance to a face. This doctored image was then used to  
>refute the reality of the facial appearance by claiming it was an image  
>in which the face disappears."

I would use the doctored photos on Richard Hoagland website of  
the latest photos of Cydonia to see if there is a artificiality  
to it. My art side says no. Even when I have played with it on  
Richard's site. In the 1976 photo it looks just like a face,  
with the photo grainy, strong obtuse lighting, and the high  
altitude photo resolution. Close up, the hillock looks more for  
what it is.

>Second, Dr. Michael Malin posts an article on the web that seeks to  
>disprove the existence of "teeth" in the Face, as shown by Dr. Mark  
>Carlotto. Malin, like Sagan before him, concocts distorted images in an  
>attempt to discredit the artificiality of the Face. "No matter how the

>article is interpreted, there is a very strong appearance of  
>impropriety." Malin also refused to respond to McDaniel's queries about  
>his hack job, and why he makes no reference to the work of Dr. Carlotta  
>directly, but merely to an unnamed "tabloid".  
>Third, when it comes to image analysis of Cydonia, NASA puts in the  
>least effort possible:

>"Neither NASA nor JPL have ever conducted a serious study of the  
>Cydonian objects. NASA refuses to acknowledge the work done by  
>independent researchers. Apparently many NASA personnel are not aware of  
>the work that has been done. Now we find an NSSDC[NASA Space Science  
>Data Center] scientist using low-end personal computer software and bad  
>contrast control to provide a crude enhancement of the Cydonian Face in  
>an article that is supposed to be informative to the public."

I am confused by this above. I use a PPC Mac with a link to a  
high end SGI box to get my CAD and other high end resolutions. I  
know that Malin uses even better hardware firmware. I don't know  
how to answer this charge by you.

>Science is supposed to follow the evidence, not make pre-judgements or  
>offer biased and tampered evidence, which is exactly what Sagan and  
>Malin have done. So, my question to you, Mr. Stephens, is how can we  
>trust NASA at all based on those who represent it and their deceitful  
>and misleading actions?

Since this is your conviction without more concrete proof by you  
I would say if it vexes you so badly and you're so convinced of  
this deceitful act, I'd go to work for this agency and find out  
for sure. I did. I have. I say you are in error. Too, I have  
stayed out of civil service and will never work this element so  
I can be free to do what I want. (Like when I would not have  
anything to do with the agency after STS-51L for nearly 2 years)

>9.Your own views on UFO's and NASA are contradictory. On the one hand,  
>you say that NASA and the military have reams of records of UFO's  
>entering and leaving Earth's atmosphere, of strange objects buzzing  
>military installations.

You are in error. I only pointed out the DoD data that we are  
basically forbidden to see. NASA, to my best judgment, after  
nearly 20 years of intimate involvement, has no data of intruder  
vehicles. If they did, the NRO or OIA would take this data away  
from NASA and they have in the past during test flights of STS.

>On the other hand, you claim that NASA is  
>honest and truthful to the public.

NASA lied during and after STS-51L. I will never forgive them  
for this. I do not know them to lie since then or now. Ever.

>If NASA is honest, then why hasn't  
>Goldin gotten in front of the press and shown any of this evidence?

What evidence?

>This should be front page news all over the world.

What news?

>Where are the videos  
>of the objects, the testimonials of astronauts, military people, the  
>Fence data that you claim to have seen? Why does NASA seek to censor  
>all information and only occasionally throws a bone to the public?

I do not understand any of these rapid fire questions above.  
Fence is NORAD, not NASA. What are you referencing?

>10.Why does NASA distort and suppress IRAS data? Why does NASA stay  
>well away from the 1983 discovery of another planet in our solar system?  
>Washington Post  
>Mystery Heavenly Body Discovered, a front page story  
>31-Dec-1983

>A heavenly body possibly as large as the giant planet Jupiter and  
>possibly so close to Earth that it would be part of this solar system  
>has been found in the direction of the constellation Orion by an  
>orbiting telescope aboard the U.S. infrared astronomical satellite. So  
>mysterious is the object that astronomers do not know if it is a planet,  
>a giant comet, a nearby "protostar" that never got hot enough to become  
>a star, a distant galaxy so young that it is still in the process of

>forming its first stars or a galaxy so shrouded in dust that none of the  
>light cast by its stars ever gets through. "All I can tell you is that  
>we don't know what it is," Dr. Gerry Neugebauer, IRAS chief scientist  
>for California's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and director of the Palomar  
>Observatory for the California Institute of Technology said in an  
>interview.

>The most fascinating explanation of this mystery body, which is so cold  
>it casts no light and has never been seen by optical telescopes on Earth  
>or in space, is that it is a giant gaseous planet, as large as Jupiter  
>and as close to Earth as 50 billion miles. While that may seem like a  
>great distance in earthbound terms, it is a stone's throw in  
>cosmological terms, so close in fact that it would be the nearest  
>heavenly body to Earth beyond the outermost planet Pluto. "If it is  
>really that close, it would be a part of our solar system," said Dr.  
>James Houck of Cornell University's Center for Radio Physics and Space  
>Research and a member of the IRAS science team. "If it is that close, I  
>don't know how the world's planetary scientists would even begin to  
>classify it."

>The mystery body was seen twice by the infrared satellite as it scanned  
>the northern sky from last January to November, when the satellite ran  
>out of the supercold helium that allowed its telescope to see the  
>coldest bodies in the heavens. The second observation took place six  
>months after the first and suggested the mystery body had not moved from  
>its spot in the sky near the western edge of the constellation Orion in  
>that time. "This suggests it's not a comet because a comet would not be  
>as large as the one we've observed and a comet would probably have  
>moved," Houck said. "A planet may have moved if it were as close as 50  
>billion miles but it could still be a more distant planet and not have  
>moved in six months time.

>Whatever it is, Houck said, the mystery body is so cold its temperature  
>is no more than 40 degrees above "absolute" zero, which is 459 degrees  
>Fahrenheit below zero. The telescope aboard IRAS is cooled so low and is  
>so sensitive it can "see" objects in the heavens that are only 20  
>degrees above absolute zero. When IRAS scientists first saw the mystery  
>body and calculated that it could be as close as 50 billion miles, there  
>was some speculation that it might be moving toward Earth. "It's not  
>incoming mail," Cal Tech's Neugebauer said. "I want to douse that idea  
>with as much cold water as I can."

I have no data on this at all. But I would definitely get ahold  
of the HST team and find any data you can on this. This is  
compelling and I've heard reference to this before. However,  
NASA would be the first to talk about this sort of thing, not  
hide it. This would be a scientific windfall. Since everything I  
say is a lie and this whole thing is a waste of both of our  
time, then, why not yourself begin an adult dialog with the HST  
team and find out about this. Do a research project on the  
topic. Then, report online your findings.

If it is a galaxy, it is at least 2 million LY from us. If it's a  
proto planet, at these temps, which is a puzzle to me for data  
as far as celestial mechanics go since there is no reasonable  
way for it to be this cold, it remains a mystery, if true. At 50  
billion miles (over 500 AU) and with a mass that of Jupiter it  
is beyond the fringe of the outer solar gravitational influence.

Go find out. If you don't start right off with HST as Hoagland  
would, they will love to answer this as best they can.

>Why do various NASA satellites go "out of service" at very convenient  
>times and then suddenly get "fixed" months later?

I don't agree with this assessment by you. Generally the  
perception is in reverse of fact. Meaning, like NEAR, it  
glitches at the last firing before coming close to EROS. This  
isn't some trick, it is a failure because the craft fired the  
RCS for the first time after long dormancy and then failed. The  
failure is because it fired, not because of location. If logic  
is not part of the issue, then "gee, look there, that craft got  
to where it was suppose to be, fired its engine for entry, and  
screwed up. Damn, NASA's always doin' that."

No. It failed because it fired, not because of where it was.

>In short, Mr. Stephens, Hoagland is a flawed character whose data should  
>certainly be taken with several grains of salt. NASA, however, has done  
>far worse in misleading and lying to the public and denying them their  
>right to knowledge.

You are a liar with this statement. Sorry. I was there--still am for 20 years.

>Knowledge which was paid for by them

It was paid for by you and me and Hoagland and all Americans.

>and should by

>all rights be available to all Americans. You, Mr. Stephens, could do a  
>far better service to us by telling what NASA really knows and thinks  
>than on hounding Richard Hoagland.

I disagree with this last statement. I have told what I know. There is a hell of a lot more. Its good stuff. I have a tougher hide. If NASA got this above they'd trash it for the same reason I told you in the first mail.

Hope this wasn't too much of a waste of time for you.

Okay, Peter, best I can do.

sincerely,

Robert A.M. Stephens  
NASA Documentation Program  
Stillwater Mills  
Contractor-Aerospace  
406-745-3818  
[sti3818@montana.com](mailto:sti3818@montana.com)  
<http://198.116.116.10/gallery/arts/samples.html>

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous 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](#).