



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](#) -> [Mar](#) -> **Re: Trent and Rouen Images**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Trent and Rouen Images

From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 23:21:14 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 10:08:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent and Rouen Images

Regarding:

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 26 Feb 1999 17:51:41 EST
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Re: Trent and Rouen Images

Dave wrote:

>>From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
>>Date: Fri, 26 Feb 1999 14:54:27 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 26 Feb 1999 16:09:40 -0500
>>Subject: Trent and Rouen Images

>>My conclusion - it was relatively easy to create a close match
>>and basically requires the dimensions of the Trent image to be
>>slightly 'stretched' lengthways.

>>Given that there seems to be no documented record of where the
>>Rouen photograph originated and as it's almost identical to the
>>Trent image in the first place, I wondered if the 'Rouen
>>photograph' was in fact intended to have been a copy of the
>>'Trent saucer'.

>>If so, perhaps when it had been copied in the 1950s, the
>>'duplicate' wasn't exact, became slightly stretched and some of
>>the precise detail wasn't mirrored in the copying process. This
>>is maybe easier to see in the graphics file.

>Oh, come on! Even stretched, diced, sliced, shredded and
>otherwise manipulated, the Rouen photograph very obviously is
>_not_ a simple copy of the Trent photo in many respects
>(curvature of the rim, relative rim size, tower size, shape and
>detail, clarity of image, graininess, etc.).

Dave,

As we know the 'Rouen' image isn't an exact copy of the 'Trent saucer', that was never a contention.

If it was, there would be little point in undertaking the exercise of considering, as I said, "how much image manipulation was required to make a 'Rouen' photograph from the Trent image".

We shouldn't really call the 'Rouen' image a photograph as there's no evidence it ever originated from a separate source.

That it's conceivably a "simple copy" depends on whether a copy of that 'Trent saucer' image could end up looking like the later 'Rouen' image, apparently first published in 1957, and how easily that could be achieved, intentionally or otherwise.

We should also keep in mind that the 'saucer' depicted on the related Trent photograph needs to be 'blown up' before it matches the 'Rouen' image.

Ideally, one experiment would be to make several duplicates of the Trent 'saucer' image using a range of enlargement, copying and printing equipment available from circa 1950s technology.

How many factors, such as the type of equipment, the operators proficiency, etc. might affect the end result?

Would each enlarged duplicate be an exact copy, or maybe we would in fact discover variances in all of them.

If there was a significant difference in only one of them, then that's sufficient evidence to indicate an inexact, 'simple' copy was possible and could later be published as a similar, yet different, 'photograph'.

A point was, any variances in the 'Rouen' image were perhaps completely unintentional, it may have been a misrepresented, enlarged and cropped image from that 'Trent' photograph.

If an enlarged copy of the 'Trent saucer' would, as you suggest, always be recognisable as such, then why does the "colour contouring" duplicate shown .. see:

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pulsar/rouen.jpg>

begin to look more like the 'Rouen' image?

>Anyway, thanks for the demonstration.

Appreciated you found it of interest.

James.
E-mail: pulsar@compuserve.com

[[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.

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).