

SUBJECT: R. HOAGLAND MESSAGE THREAD RE: MARSFACE
FILE: UFO1732

CompuServe The Issues Forum

Cydonia Reality
S 7 / Mars Mission Issues

Date Range: 02-Sep-89 to 05-Sep-89

#193982
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: ALL
Dt: 02-Sep-89

OK, I have a question for everyone: what would take for YOU to accept Cydonia as artificial?

(Be as specific as you like, and please estimate *when* this is likely to be accomplished, and by what means.)

#193991 reply to #193982
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 03-Sep-89

Richard,

In my book I propose a simple test. The image of half a face is so unusual that it must have only the slightest chance of occurring through natural processes, such as wind erosion. So, just take photos of the other side, hidden in shadows. If that looks like a natural formation, the whole structure will lose its "artificiality". If the unseen half looks like the complementary half of a human face, well, what are the chances of that? It would surely convince me.

NASA SHOULD have reprogrammed Viking to look while they still could. But they didn't, so we must await Mars Observer. --- Tom

#194143 reply to #193991
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 04-Sep-89

Tom (and all those who gave basically the same response),

I'm a bit mystified. We HAVE photos -- marvelous computerized, detailed enhancements now (thanks to Carlotto), of both the original low sun-angle frame, 35A72 (the version that's most well-known, with the right side of the "face" indeed in shadow), AND, high sun-angle frames 70A11 and 70A13, with the shadowed side revealed. It's these frames (with the sun 20 degrees higher) that amply confirm that the exquisite bisymmetry, proportionality, and image structure we see hints of in 35A72 is continued in the so-called "hidden side."

The point is: with the Viking data we (NOT NASA!) have exhaustively analyzed and published now (and will make available to anyone who asks), there IS NO hidden side! This feature's remarkable symmetry (which is about 95% -- erosion could well account for the "missing" 5%) extends even to the detailed *shape* of the "eyebrow ridges" at the structure's "top," left and right. In a Viking low-resolution "morning frame" (753A33 -- with sunlight coming from the right) this "eyebrow" morphology can be matched perfectly to "degraded resolution images" we specifically prepared (at SRI, in 1983) of these identical features on 35A72 -- with sunlight coming from the left, as well as with Carlotto's 3-D views, "lit" at the appropriate angle. And they're a perfect match.

So, what's all this about "needing to see the whole structure." We ARE seeing the whole structure . . . (see examples on our stationery and Newsletter!), and STILL no one is willing to "commit" on the basis of the face *alone*. Com'on, guys, what's the REAL reason? -- Dick

#194182 reply to #194143
Fm: Jim Speiser 72135,424
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Dick:

Now I'm the one that's mystified.

I'm looking at "Unusual Martian Surface Features," 4th ed., pg. 41. I see three

different enlargements of 70A13 on the right side. The first two look like raw data, the third one looks like some kind of computer enhancement - at least, I can't see how they got the "shadow side" information. Looking at the other two, it just isn't there.

If that bottom blow-up is computer-enhanced, I would need to see a treatise on the process used (S.P.I.T.?), and a refereed review of the appropriateness of using such a process.

If that blow-up is "au naturel", its very impressive, but still too ambiguous for me. I see flaws in the bisymmetry right off the bat - the right eye seems lower and closer to the bridge of the "nose" than the left.

I hope your suggestion of an ulterior motive in my hesitance was in jest. If not, your petulance is most unbecoming a man of science. You DID ask what would CONVINCE us it was artificial. I'm very IMPRESSED, but unCONVINCED.

Jim

#194199 reply to #194182
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Jim Speiser 72135,424
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Jim,

Yes, my comment on "what's REALLY going on?" was in jest -- tinged, I guess, with a bit of frustration.

Morphologically, as the geomorphologist in Torun noted, the D&M is far more intriguing to us at this point than "the face" -- as it is a figure NOT influenced by the psychological pitfalls of "humanoid projection" (as "faces" inevitably are, and ALWAYS will be, viewed by "sceptics"). It is deomonstrably there, with its own unique symmetry, specific alignments with the other "unique objects," AND its own resitting precisely astride the *one latitude* which ties all that interconnected geometry into its very location on the planet. Very hard to explain, Jim, *very* hard . . . other

than by deliberate intention.

Which bring me to your question: what would it take to convince me that this is all a natural "fluke" (I'm paraphrasing). Answer: for someone else (actually, a number of "someone elses") to REPEAT all our geodetic and geometric measurements, between all the objects at Cydonia -- and to have EVERY ONE of these independent groups discover we were wrong in all the measurements. Science IS measurement, observation, analysis of data , etc., . . . and, * repeatability*. What this investigation needs now is what any science at this point deserves: simple independent replication.

My frustration is that no one seems willing publically to test our measurements.

They say, instead, "Oh, they'll prove nothing!", or, "Let's wait for better pictures." When, in fact, by any standard of any science that I've ever known, those measurements should now be the basis for any future *scientific* judgements on Cydonia. If they're wrong, then the whole thing is highly suspect. And I would be the first to admit it! But if they're right . . . It's like NASA not agreeing simply to "take the damn pictures in 1993": as long as the "day of reckoning" can be put off . . . we don't have to make "the decision." And the REAL meaning of Cydonia remains in limbo. Frustrating

42

Dt: 05-Sep-89

(Continued from last message)

In answer to your question re "raw images" and "enhancements" of 70A13:

Yes, on page 41 of "Unusual Martian Surface Features," 4th ed., the three righthand images ARE THE SAME. The top one is the full-frame of 70A13; the righthand one is an enlargement of the "face" area in the same frame; and the middle (bottom) image isht out," "something stretched," something amplified," "something made visible above the noise," etc. Here it does NOT mean "something added!"

Dipietro and Molenaar's SPIT algorithm was not, strictly speaking, an

"enhancement technique" at all. It was an "anti-aliasing (sp?) technique"; it merely "smoothed the edges" between pixels (picture elements -- the "dots") making up the computer image. True "enhancement" removes noise, stretches contrast, corrects geometric distortions, etc. It ultimately redistributes what data is available, so the human eye can SEE that data easier (like "false color")! What Carlotto has done, in contrast (another pun . . .) to D&M, is truly apply a range of these state-of-the-art enhancement techniques to these images - - all carefully described in the Applied Optics piece. I KNOW that when you see the new images from the Mars Mission ("new" only in the sense of the techniques applied to these, now, 13-year old data tapes), you'll be amazed at what you see. And realize why Erol and I think continuing arguments about the "symmetry" of our friend here slightly miss the point. -- Dick

#194235 reply to #194200
Fm: Jim Speiser 72135,424
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 06-Sep-89

Dick,

Science is more than numbers and measurements. You have not left any room for interpretation, nor evaluation of your conclusions. Imagine if I were to claim that the mere existence of some 10,000 unexplained UFO reports over 40 yare subject to review, not my interpretation.

Bottom line: What percentage of possibility do you think there is that your measurements are all correct, yet the "monuments" are still naturally formed?

I'll say it again, I'm impressed enough with your work to be willing to DEMAND further research and more openness on the matter from NASA, but only becl'd depend on the results of that series of independent replications, as to my next decisions re "naturalness").

Over the years I've spent on this (six very intensive ones, as of now), as long as we were dealing with "soft" data ("faces," approximate geometric

"alignments," etc.) I carefully maintained the appropriate "open mind" re the ultimate interpretation of Cydonia -- believing that we would indeed need to wait for high-res Mars Observer images, before we clarified the situation.

Then Torun, a geomorphologist, cartographer and geographer with Defense Mapping, began in late 1988 *independently* testing my "relationship model, established in "Monuments" as a "what would constitute 'ultimate proof' for or against the Intelligence Hypothesis" (because he thought my assertion of bilateral symmetry in the D&M "absurd" -- his word!). To his amazement, nay shock -- he found my assertion was correct: the D&M is bilaterally symmetric, and is "aimed" directly at the "face." Further, he extended those initial observations, and discovered that the object possessed extraordinary internal symmetry, mathematical elegance (the front is exactly a third of a circle), and REDUNDANT geometric "constants" difficult to rationalize in any manner other than potentially deliberate. Morphologically, after a broad survey of a lot of other Viking images and geological regimes, and an assessment of realistic processes and "weathering agents" proposed by the Viking geologists for other surface features, he concluded that both mathematically and geomorphologically, Dt: 06-Sep-89

(Cont'd from previous message)

What really got me, however, was not "just" the mathematical elegance Torun found within the D&M. It was the fact that he discovered, completely independently, a *second* example of a curious "coincidence" I included in "Monuments" as a "throw away" on the very back of the book: that the tangent of the (then) approximate lshington, from a total stranger currently working with Defense Mapping, who has found -- not only additional apparent constants "encoded" in the D&M -- but good ol' "e/pi" itself!

Redundancy. A possible (note I still say "possible") signal (see #194254 et al) !

No, Jim, I could maintain a facade, a political "front" on this, and I guess make a lot of people feel easier. Only, I have leveled with everyone all the way along. When it was uncertain, I said so. Now, we have something VERY specific that can easily be tested: *dozen*s of repeats, across the entire "complex," of these two numbers and other specifically related constants -together, alone, inverted, and even multiplied. These multiple redundancies BEG TO BE INVESTIGATED. If they hold up, this "signal" is telling us NOW -- not in three years -- that Cydonia is real. And that should *insure* that we get those vital images! -- Dick

#194208 reply to #194199
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Dick,

I object to your criteria in answer to the question about what would convince you Cydonia was natural. You have surely heard of numerology (the attachment of special significance to certain numbers). And you must know the difference between *a priori* and *ad hoc*.

Consider a randomly-generated set of millions of dots on a large, flat surface. If you specify IN ADVANCE (a priori) some special pattern, such as 24 dots forming a nearly perfect square with 6 dots per side, the chances are very slight that it will occur by chance in a random pattern. So if you find chance.

So if you are searching for a 24-dot square, and find instead two sets of four triangles, each making a perfect square, that is NOT significant, because some improbable things MUST happen purely by chance. Finding a rationale for this pattern after you have found it is *ad hoc* (after the fact), and convinces only those who have not dealt with large random sets before.

I have asked for any *a priori* significance to the measurements you cite, and received unconvincing answers. It is not reasonable for us to accept your

measurements, replicated or not, as proof of anything unless they have *a priori* significance. This is the main stumbling block between us over your whole "measurements" approach to proving artificiality. It is also why I said symmetry in the face WOULD be convincing, because it is *a priori* significant.
--- Tom

#194215 reply to #194208
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Tom, Although I have NOT dealt with large random number bases, I do agree 100% that * some * of these patterns could be, as you put it, * ad hoc *. However, as you yourself have pointed out, the face (even half a face) is * a priori *. Given the fact that a line drawn from the "city center" (which DOES look artificial) to the cliff (which DOES look artificial that not represent * a priori * ? Given the fact that there is an object in the immediate vicinity of the face which DOES LOOK like a pyramid, would that not represent * f a site with similar "objects" are "relationships" be solely considered to be * ad hoc * ? Marty

#194318 reply to #194215
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Marty,
objects? What about lying on the arc of a circle, lying at a perfect right angle, or at an angle of 40.97 degrees, etc, etc. Do you see the problem?

Since you mention objects here on Earth, I agree there is a lot to be intrigued by among the pyramids and other artifacts. But if there is any significance at all to the latitude (40.97 degrees) of the D&M pyramid on Mars, and if there is any Earth connection, then WHY isn't there something significant at that latitude on Earth??? That would be truly "a priori", provided you don't open up the field of "something significant" to include more than major ancient structures of possible ET origin. --- Tom

#194331 reply to #194318
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Tom,

a priori and *ad hoc* are fine when you're dealing with a mathematical puzzle. What we have here, however, is something that "looks" very suspicious. There is simply NO PRECEDENT for calculating odds for the possibility that these may be or may not be ET artifacts. How many advanced civilizations have arisen in the galaxy during the past 4 billion years? How many are "humanoid?" How many engage in monument building? What do they consider important; geometry, art, faces, etc? Until we have answers to those questions, it will simply be impossible to apply any "known formulae" to thousands of atmospheres of pressure in ocean trenches; "advanced life forms" which breathe Hydrogen Sulfide. Almost everything we "knew" about the planets and their moons has been proven wrong. I vividly remember a statement made by a planetary scientist regarding the riverbeds on Mars , "We considered every conceivable liquid, including champagne, before finally deciding that the only possible answer was vast amounts of liquid water." The "impossible" has already happened too many times in the recent past to justify throwing this out just because it is too incredible to be real.

I think there is a temptation to view the two sides in this issue as: THOSE WHO ARE CONVINCED (ARTIFICIAL) * VS * THOSE WHO ARE CONVINCED (NATURAL.) I see it in another context: THOSE WHO WANT TO FIND OUT THE TRUTH * VS * THOSE WHO ARE CONVINCED...and finding out the truth demands further investigation by Mars Observer.

Marty

#194349 reply to #194331

Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Marty,

I completely concur with your thoughts in #194331.

Did I say something which made you think I would not be?
--- Tom

#194401 reply to #194349
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 08-Sep-89

priori* and *ad hoc*
depend on the level of knowledge of the person (persons)
attempting to
"interpret" a message? A quick example AND PLEASE let me know if
I'm off base
here: We (20th century) unearth a large million , in fact, there
is a message) was left as opposed to a message
based on something we understand, should be a yardstick for
determining if
there is actually a message. If there is a "pattern," it should
be certainly
be considered "suggestivur example of the periodic table of the
elements is a good one. But
wouldn't we be disappointed if such a table from ET's with
interplanetary
capability stopped at 106 or sooner (i.e. told us nothing we
didn't already
know). I would then immediately suspect that the gold disk was a
fraud. But if
it does go to higher elements, that's something we can use and
verify.

Of course you are right that ET messages may come in strange
packages,
perhaps intended for us and perhaps not. We already know, from
thinking about
our own attempts at communication, how difficult it is to imagine
what would be
meaningful to ET life. I agree, quite generally, that we
shouldn't ignore
patterns, but should study them.

Nonetheless, patterns of dots, lines, angles, ratios, etc.
are all
suspect, because these very things can, and MUST, arise
naturally. I honestly
do not see a way that a few examples of simple, "special"
patterns, whatever
they are, can argue for the artificiality of Cydonia. Given that
artificiality, then everything about the site becomes
interesting. But just

because the ET architects find e/π angles aesthetically pleasing
does not
imply they are part of a message.

I certainly agree that Cydonia is a remarkable phenomenon,
and should be

#194420 reply to #194415
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Tom, Your comment "an unusual set of natural features" makes
NASA's refusal to
"commit itself" even more suspicious. This also brings to memory
a discussion
I had with one of the planetary Geologists at the USGS. He stated
"this is
nothing more than an example of bizarre geology." Now, if I had
been really
quick on my toes, I would have commented, "well, you're a
geologist aren't you?
Why are you opposed to photographing something that you,
yourself, describe as
'bizarre?'"

If NASA really has a problem lending "credibility" to Hoagland
and the other
researchers, why don't they just agree to takes more pictures
because it
"bizarre geology?"

Marty

#194254 reply to #194208
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 06-Sep-89

Tom,

I believe that part of the problem we are having, on this very
crucial aspect
of our work, lies in semantics: precisely how does one define "a
priori" and
"ad hoc." Let me give an example from the "standard" SETI
community, then pick
up (if the 37 lines permit!) on your own example -- the "million
random
points" (any cousin to George Bush's "thousand points" . . .?).

SETI has been looking for The Signal for precisely thirty years,
now. A LOT of
people, over those years, have debated exactly wavailable
spectrum will look like true "white noise," the *real* signal
will

look exactly like the Galactic background! -- until a proper "decoding algorithm" is applied. [Since we can't be expected to know what that decoding algorithm is, say these guys, the "real" signals will be "from aliens TO aliens" (who already have the code), which we'll merely intercept by accident. And so on.] If you flew through the beam of Voyager 2's telemetry and dage.)

#194255 reply to #194254
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 06-Sep-89

(Cont'd from last message)

I've always been a bit suspicious of these arguments. Trying to "crawl inside the psychology of aliens" to me has always seemed both hopeless . . . and somewhat chauvanistic. The true "signal," I have come to suspect (after you finally find it -- the hard part!), must contain WITHIN ITSELF ITS OWN "A PRIORI" DEFINITION THAT IT IS A SIGNAL. That's the only way it COULD work -- in a Universe of almost infinite possibilities and combinations, where each "unique" reasoning about "a priori" must be based on the individual receiver's experience, awareness, and level of intelligence (or, just as bad, the "sender's" "guesstimates" of same).

What I'm saying is that, to be totally "universal," the "senders" could make NO ASSUMPTIONS regarding "a priori." The "signal" would have to do its own defining. And the only way I could see that it could do that, would be if it was SELF-REFERENTIAL. Like "intelligence" itself.

So, how would this work in practice? You're at your radio telescope, attentively scanning the skies, looking for an intelligent signal that (so our physics say) is going to be far down "in the noise" (simple distance andan "intelligent signal," against all that other "hash?" Must it give you "pi" before you accept it? A prime number? A raster scan of Vanna White?

No. All it has to do is REPEAT something -- anything! "Noise" IS random. It

will not repeat (at least, not within a highly limited "search space" and time).

But a true signal will instantly be recognizable BY ITS SIMPLE REPETITION of "the signal" -- regardless of WHAT that signal "thinks" it's important to communicate. It's the *redundancy* which immediately lifts it "out of the noise of randomness." (And if you're thinking of the "pulsar problem," that's NOT the kind of simple "time repetition" I'm describing. The precise PATTERN must replicate. -- More)

#194257 reply to #194255
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 06-Sep-89

(Continued from last message).

There is a real difference between "a priori" and "arbitrary." If we have "a priori" defined our "size combinations of those SAME FEW DOTS. To insist at that point that "only the square could be significant" would be highly arbitrary. The triangles, by their redundancy, become the "carrier" for "the signal"; the redundant mathematics the "modulation" of that carrier -- the actual information.

What we have found, Tom, is the equivalent of the "highly-redundant triaconstants amid these highly limited combinations (to repeated three sig. figure accuracy), that has us convinced we're "on to something."

I would be the first to "throw away" our possible "first-cut" at a MEANING (what "they" might have intended by this pattern). That there is now an intelligent PATTERN there -- "a message," which has defined itself by its *extreme* redundancy -- I will defend quite strenuously. And I insist that others actually examine what we have discovered and then either replicate or refute the *measurements*, BEFORE they criticize our logic and results -- "a priori." -- Dick

#194261 reply to #194257
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 06-Sep-89

Tom,

The computer "ate" a vital line in my third message. it was supposed to read

". . . I would totally agree that finding the triangle -- while intriguing -- is not particularly significant-(the *exact* ratios of the angles of that triangle, their trig functions, and their radian measure) occurred twice . . three times . . . ten times . . ."

Dick

#194262 reply to #194261
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 06-Sep-89

Tom,

OK, let's try one more time! (Georgia, doesn't the system like capitols for emphasis?) The line is supposed to read

". . . I would totally agree that finding the triangle -- while intriguing -- mes . . . ten times . . ."

Dick

#194319 reply to #194257
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Dick,

If your other compelling measurements and relationships are like TAN (latitude) = e/π , I'll pass when it comes to replication of your calculations, because "a priori" I don't attach any significance to that sort of coincidence.

But perhaps we are reaching the point where I need to know more detail before I can fairly criticize or support your finding that you already have enough evidence to conclude that the Cydonia objects are artificial, other than through the artificial appearance.

I have been through the exercise of finding an amazing conclusion after

lengthy calculations (the breakup of the asteroidal planet); and then having the frustration that others who don't repeat the calculations, but only hear my description about how compelling they are, can never appreciate first hand to what extent they are "air tight" vs. having "loopholes" or subject to interpretation or experimenter bias. So I can empathize with your frustration.

So, what is the single most important single thing you would like someone to replicate, and what raw materials would that someone have to possess to begin? If you make the task better defined and a little less formidable, you may get some volunteers (maybe even me). --- Tom

#194431 reply to #194319
Fm: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Tom: The single most could examine would be the alignments between the "monuments" themselves. This would NOT involve a search for numbers with an abstract significance, but for whole angles such as 60, 90, & 120 deg., and for these and other angles that appear in more than one place. This investigation would not be analogous to the aforementioned sightline intersection point.

- This bisected 120 deg. angle matches the geometry of the "front" of the D&M.
- The City Square to Cliff(lower) to Tholus angle is 85.3 deg., matching the sides of the D&M.
- The Cliff(lower) to Tholus to D&M angle is 90 deg.

These simple alignments, *combined with* the geomorphology of each object, should support the contention that nature may not have been wholly responsible for their existence.

I suggest that you get the original orthographic negs or prints from NSSDC at Goddard and mosaic them. You'll need frames 35A72, 35A73, and 35A74. You might get some hostile comments from the folks at NSSDC, but probably not. After all, who could reasonably object to your wanting to find out for yourself?<grin-- Erol

#194454 reply to #194431
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
Dt: 09-Sep-89

Thanks, Erol. I'll order them Monday. --- Tom

#194463 reply to #194431
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
Dt: 09-Sep-89

Tom,

Erol and I debated a bit re how extensive to make our response to your request.

We decided to begin with the "basics" that Erol has now outlined in his note:

low): the main problem we've had all along is the quality of the data itself. Geometric measurements must be made on

orthographic rectifications of the original images. But JPL only produced

one set of such "rectified images" (at least, that I've ever seen), and . . .

the image quality is lousy!; features are grossly over-exposed, or are

essentially black. So, even recognition of "control points" for accurate

measurement is difficult. For this reason, we've made very large blow-ups, in

several different scales, to assist in reducing simple identification

confusion. And we've constantly crosscompared features between the NASA

"orthos" and our own "Carlotto *rectilinear* enhancements" -- which really pull

all the original imaging data from these tapes, and show features in *exquisite

detail*, but are geometrically useless. You might ask "Why haven't you produced

our own computerized orthographic mosaics?" The answer is: it's extremely

difficult to do that *outside* of NASA.

The geometric corrections must be derived from the latest navigation data

from the Viking spacecraft, which -- when we tried to get it -- we were

informed "that tape has been erased, as we (NASA) had no further need for it."

This was in 1986. So, we've had to live with "doing it by hand." Some way to

do science, eh? BTW: when Mert Davies (at RAND) offered to check our

measurements, he asked US for a set of decent rectilinear prints "because my

JPL copies are so bad." Interesting buraucratic system we've established here,

for "independent testingFm: Eric Haas 73320,2553

To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242

Dt: 07-Sep-89

The CIS message limit is approximately 2000 characters, or 96 lines, whichever comes first.

#194395 reply to #194374
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Eric Haas 73320,2553
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Eric,

Then why does it truncate my messages after only 37 lines (sometimes after 32!)?

I'm setting line length to 80 characters (so it will fit on a normal screen).

Tips? Hints?

Dick

#194423 reply to #194395
Fm: Mark.Y 71340,276
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Richard, each message can be approximately 2700 characters, but CompuServe adds its own overhead, like an extra byte or two between words, so usually one can count on only about 2500 characters, or about 33 lines. CompuServe has truncated my messages with only 31 full lines (79 characters each), and it has allowed 37 lines through when there were many blank and very short lines.

I use TAPCIS on a PC clone, and it warns that I may be exceeding the message length when I get to 30 lines.

#194461 reply to #194395
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 09-Sep-89

If you were to completely fill 25 lines with 80 characters each, you would reach the 2000 character limit, and your message would be truncated.

Since your lines are rarely 80 characters long (due to word wrap) and you leave

I would hardly say that was the *"one latitude"*. 23.78, 26.63, 30.09,

40.42, 49.13, 49.58, 59.91, 63.37 and 65.75, 66.22 all have similar relationships with e , π and trigonometric functions. In fact, 40.42 and 49.58 probably would have served even better, as they are e/π radians from the pole and the equator, respectively.

#194326 reply to #194237
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Eric Haas 73320,2553
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Eric,

I was referring to the **Tan** of $40.87 = e/\pi = 0.865$, as being the significant trig function of that "one latitude." While it is perfectly true that other trig functions, representing this same ratio (0.865), apply equally to some of the other latitudes you mention (which opens up the interesting thought: what's at THOSE latitudes on Mars . . . which we simply haven't had the resources to examine!), Erol and I maintain that there is a "unique significance" to the Tan of 40.87. For one thing, it alone seems to derive the "19.5 degree latitude predictions" (details in the paper) -- which demonstrably contain something "going on" at that latitude (in fact, the "biggest somethings" -- the Hawaiian Caldera, Olympus Mons, the Great Red Spot, and now the Great Dark Spot, Remember too that, every scientific inquiry has started out as a simple catalogue of PATTERNS -- long before the physical reasons for those patterns became "obvious." It becomes a "science" when, from the original pattern and a good theory (or mathematical model) you can PREDICT the next part of the pattern. We did that successfully with Neptune. Which, in any "normal" inquiry should make makentially significant, because that angle is to be found on the D&M pyramid when viewed vertically (as it would be from space). The angle is formed by the west ground-level edge and the edge that points from the apex towards the city square.

While I was impressed by the repeated expression of e/π in many

locations, I was especially intrigued by its expression by three totally different methods: the ratio between angles, the trig. functions of angles, and the aforementioned radian measure. What makes these three methods significant (beyond redundancy) is the fact that they are not dependent upon the system of mathematics used by the observer. Just as our hypothetical architects could not assume what method of analysis would first be applied, they also could not possibly assume that an observer of Cydonia would count in the decimal system (base 10) or use a 360 degree system for denoting angles. The methods by which I believe these numbers are expressed are independent of such assumptions.

(continued in reply)

#194372 reply to #194370
Fm: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
To: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
Dt: 07-Sep-89

Your list of "significant latitudes" would reduce the odds that the appearance of possible architectures on one of them is deliberate, but this requires the additional assumption that these latitudes are equally significant. The latitude of 40.868 deg. affords a good opportunity to look through the aforementioned corner facing the city square AND the upslope terminus of the "flat thing" on the front (towards the face). This representation of both the e/π and $(\sqrt{3})/2$ latitude requires not only that the D&M have a certain latitude, but also a certain shape, size, and orientation. Why not rearguments as to why that particular latitude was better than any of the others.

#194396 reply to #194376
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Eric Haas 73320,2553
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Eric,

I'm sad to note your last statement. It makes it obvious that a serious discussion of what IS (as opposed to what ISN'T) is not possible between us. At

best, you're inferring we're "deluded," and under ANY circumstances would continue our "delusion." At worst, that we're deliberately misrepresenting the data as we've found it. Either "scenario" effectively prevents further serious discussion. Impugning motives (or competence) is NOT a productive aid to discovering the truth -- in any scientific investigation. Independently testing mathematical assertions against the "source data" (in this case, by simply making about half a dozen measurements on the actual NASA orthographic Cydonia imagery -- available from the National Space Science data Center) would be.

Dick

#194430 reply to #194396
Fm: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 08-Sep-89

Eric:

ed Dr. Carlotto to

analyse the fractal geometry of Viking imagery and develop an automated method that would flag landforms that are most unlike the surrounding terrain. Using his method on Cydonia, the face and city give the strongest signal of abnormality. This technique could be used to scan all the Viking (and later Mars Observer) imagery looking for objects to study in detail.

Of course this same technique could be applied to digital imagery of ANY planetary surface to look for unusual landforms that are of purely geological interest.

Erol.

#194458 reply to #194396
Fm: Ralph C. Henderson 72707,3357
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 09-Sep-89

Eric has not accused you of misrepresenting data, but of misrepresenting science. Finding coincidental equalities between trigonometry functions of constants and the latitude of your "city" is not scientific investigation--it's just number-juggling. What's sad to note is the false scientific gloss you're putting on these ideas. ilar physical processes (there may even be a similar process behind the hot spot

that created the Hawaiian chain), but the fact that you found a method that yielded a similar latitude proves nothing. There are plenty of mathematical functions, and an astronomical number of ways to put them together. A little juggling was bound to produce something.

-RCH-

#194462 reply to #194396
Fm: Eric Haas 73320,2553
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 09-Sep-89

I think you may be reading too much into my last statement. I simply think you've fallen victim to the all too common tendency of humans to find meaning in meaningless coincidences. It is true, that at this point, you will find it very difficult (but not impossible) to convince me that there is any meaning to the location of the Cydonia face and other objects. If, however, you were to convince me that the face itself is artificial (at this point, a much easier task), I would be much more willing to entertain ideas about the possible numerical meanings of its location.

#194465 reply to #194462
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Eric Haas 73320,2553
Dt: 09-Sep-89

Eric,

Sorry if I'm a bit touchy on this point, but I'm just slightly tired of endless, redundant criticisms -- which never seem to get beyond the "this is why it CAN'T be real" stage. There is one singular substance of what we thought we'd found. His reaction, like yours, was: "Well, ANY number of points can be connected to give any *ad hoc* "meaning" to a landscape." (Sound slightly familiar . . .?) Anyway, a day went by . . . and then the phone rang. It was the physics guy again. His voice was definitely strained. He said, "You know those relationships you said you'd found? Well,

last night I took out a bunch of old Viking prints I'd been given some random Martian rocks. That's why I know we're "on to something." Science is NOT endless criticism; its doing the damn measurements. They're not hard (well, not THAT hard, see #194431 and my follow -on) Just mind-boggling. -- Dick

#194572 reply to #194465
Fm: Ralph C. Henderson 72707,3357
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 11-Sep-89

Science involves proving that the relationships you've found exist apart from your rationalization of them; you or others must make predictions based on your theories, and see if they pan out.

The "physics guy" gave up after one day? Haven't you put a lot more time and thought into it than that? Also, your motivation is much better than his was--you believed that there was a real message, while he was sure there wasn't.

Besides, what was it that "didn't work" for him? If he picked another print and tried to find the same numbers you came up with, he had the technique backwards. Aren't most of these relationships found by thinking about what things might be suggested by the numbers? There's a world full of things to draw on, and the human mind is rabid about finding patterns.

I think you'd see the point if you'd ever read one of the "pyramidology" books. One fellow had stumbled onto the notion that changes in the passageways of the Great Pyramid of Giza symbolized the future history of the world, with so many inches of passageway equalling so many years. The author was able to "p(redict including the world wars), but his ability to predict post-publication events was quite poor. He did not fabricate anything; the markings and changes in the passageways were quite real, but his reasoning was only rationalization. It can become quite a trap--the more determined and imaginative a person is, the more relationships they are able to see, meaningful or not.

-RCH-

#194499 reply to #194462
Fm: Stan Tenen 75015,364
To: Eric Haas 73320,2553
Dt: 10-Sep-89

I would like to offer a few quotations that offer informed opinion on the differences (or lack thereof) between ad hoc and a priori, and related issues.

These quotations are sec

"It is the theory which decides what we can observe."

"Even scholars of audacious spirit and fine instinct can be obstructed in the interpretation of facts by philosophical prejudices. The prejudice ... (sic) consists in the faith that facts by themselves can and should yield scientific knowledge without free conceptual construction."

-Albert Einstein

"We ourselves introduce that order and regularity in the appearance which we entitle 'nature.' We could never find them in appearances had we not ourselves, by the nature of our own mind, originally set them there."

"The POSSIBILITY OF EXPERIENCE is, then, that which gives objective reality to all our A PRIORI cognitions."

-Immanuel Kant

(more)

#194500 reply to #194499
Fm: Stan Tenen 75015,364
To: Stan Tenen 75015,364
Dt: 10-Sep-89

(Relevant quotations, continued)

"Quantities like length, duration, mass, force, etc. have no absolute significance; their values will depend on the mesh-system to which they are referred.... (sic) There is no fundamental mesh-system..."

"Mind filters out matter from the meaningless jumble of qualities, as the prism filters out the colours of the rainbow from the chaotic pulsations of white

light."

-Arthur Eddington

I believe that there is only one a priori fundamental indication of consciousness - self-reference. Meaningful redundancy coupled with indications of self-knowledge or self-awareness in the physical record, regardless of the class or type of data, is a unique quality of coherence (within the Cydonia complex) of the D&M pyramid to the face and to and among the other odd and prominent features at Cydonia, the repetition of the same angles between different features, the internal symmetry of the D&M pyramid as shown by sight-lines to the other forms, the exact E-W axis and self-reference would still be sufficient.

I agree that this is not absolute proof. Coincidence is possible and new data must be obtained by a return visit with either much higher resolution imaging, a remote rover, pickup and return of samples, or, of course, a manned visit. However, it is not likely, in my opinion, that the currently available hard data - the angular alignments - will change. We already know these alignments to 3 and 4 or more significant figures and I can't see what adding more significant figures could add.

In spite of the enhancement techniques, I am not convinced that the face is fully symmetrical. But I don't see how that matters. Even if there is only half a face; even if the whole face is nothing but "a trick of light and shadow," that will not change the redundant, symmetrical, and self-referential alignments. For me, the great mystery would be IF the Cydonia complex were ultimately found to be natural, because that would require an explanation of how - short of redundant coincidences - Mars could "know" where its prominent (by Mars' standards ???) features are.

I do find the fractal analysis intriguing, but I don't have enough experience with this tool to have developed a sense of perspective in its use.

One final quotation (reference lost):

"The logic of a theory must stem from an inner coherence, not because external evidence makes it the most logical over other theories." - Albert Einstein

I hope this helps to season the discussion.

Stan

o #194501
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Stan Tenen 75015,364
Dt: 10-Sep-89

Stan, I must disagree with your assertion that should the "face" turn out to be natural, Cydonia would still be interesting! It certainly would not be of any further interest to me. The "face" IS THE CENTERPIECE OF CYDONIA. It is the whole reason this issue reply to #194508
Fm: Stan Tenen 75015,364
To: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
Dt: 10-Sep-89

I meant, if it turns out that the face is natural, but that the complex is not, after we have examined new data, then that would be the greater mystery. While it is true that the presence of what looks like a face started this investigation, and while it is very unlikely, given the context of the alignments of the other forms, that the face is natural, I still find the alignments themselves - from the data we have - a much more compelling indication of conscious intent than the face itself.

I am not attempting to dismiss the face. It is just that given the low resolution of the face, I find the high resolution of the alignments, by comparison, more likely not to change with new data.

For example, it appears to me that the landforms at Cydonia were artificially modified, but were initially chosen from the natural landforms available. The forms are very large and would have been very expensive to make if they were all entirely artificial. Even the face may/might have been adapted from a conveniently placed and formed natural feature which might not have been

sufficiently symmetrical to start with for it to have been shaped into a completely symmetrical face. It is not even obvious to me that the face ought to be symmetrical. Real faces are not entirely symmetrical and artistic lly carries information, not the symmetrical and redundant carrier itself. I believe that the presence of static symmetry may not be as strong an indication of consciousness as slight asymmetry. Moslem geometric patterns always include a defect or an asymmetrical component because, among other reasons, perfect order is considered to be the province of God and not appropriate for man's view of reality which is always "defective". The face may be more than a weathered rock and still not be symmetrical. (more)

#194525 reply to #194524
Fm: Stan Tenen 75015,364
To: Stan Tenen 75015,364
Dt: 10-Sep-89

A closer look at Cydonia will improve the precision of our view of the face significantly, but it is not likely to improve our knowledge of the alignments between the forms to any significant degree.

I am prepared to find that the face is not entirely symmetrical even after we find that the Cydonia complex is actually artificial. As for absolute proof: It would be beyond doubt an artificial complex if we were to find a map, chart, or illustration of the complex or the face inscribed/written/drawn on the face or on another object at Cydonia. That would be the ultimate proof of conscious design based on my a priori requirement of self-reference - even if the face were completely asymmetrill NOT "go away." While it is true that the existing imagery reveals it is not "perfectly" symmetric (neither, in fact, is any "face"; just look in the mirror!), the small differences we see (and they are small) are easily explainable in terms of selective erosion. The prevailing winds at Cydonia -- as charted by the published global meteorological models developed from the Viking surface observations, uncomplicated by any "oceans" -reveal a long (millenia-long) pattern of

seasonal-dependence of compassdirection. In other words, the right side (as you look at it) should b

Additional factors are: the "photometric function" of the surface. Light in both existing high-res images is falling across the curved "cheek" on the right at a significant angle, on a surface which strongly absorbs at low incident lighting angles (because it is composed of myriad little dust particles, each of casting a shadow on the next particle, at low angles). This can explain the rest of the *apparent* differences between the right and left side.

But, most important to me, is the simple fact that the "Face" is an INTEGRAL part of the geometry and specific relationships we've found on the Cydonia landscape. One line -- the line that precisely bisects the 120 degree front angle of the D&M Pyramid -- crosses the "face" at three critical points: the lower left "corner," the "teardrop" (just below the left "eye"), and at the upper "forehead" where the "face" literally ends. These *three* points (on that ONE line) in turn provide specific, redundant, angular relationships with three other objects. No, Marty, the "face" will not disappear -- leaving just the mathematical relationships (like the Cheshire Cat <grin>). The *two* are inextricably linked. -- Dick

#194204 reply to #194143
Fm: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Dick,
I haven't the slightest inclination to backd by this very important point.

How can I get copies of your 11x14 pictures and enhancements, as described in your second paragraph to Michael. And how can I get SOURCE information about times and spacecraft location when these frames were taken, so I can be absolutely certain there is no mistake about this? It is too easy for a print to get reversed, and too important a matter to tolerate any chance of human error. --- Tom

#194207 reply to #194204
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Tom Van Flandern/DC 71107,2320
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Tom, I am sure that Richard will also reply to your message, but I thought an opinion from someone who has the enhanced enlargements may also be in order. There are only two ** known ** photographs of the face. One was taken at low sun angle (10 degrees) and the other was taken at high sun angle (30 degrees). In both photographs the right side is in shadow. Even in the low sun angle photo, it is possible to see what appears to be a "right edge" of the face. The high angle "stretch-contrast" Carlotto enhancement (which also distorts the image) clearly shows **some symmetry** with the left side. It does not show the visual detail of the left side, this (right) side not being "filled-in" with data. Still, it ** tends ** to confirm rather than to ** disprove ** the "artificial hypothesis," at least in my mind.

Obviously what we need are more AND BETTER photographs!!! Marty frames, including made-to-order enlargements from those frames, are indeed available from the Mars Mission (see message to Darrell Green re "Mars Mission Order Form," # 194206). As to source information on the initial imaging parameters (frame number, spacecraft distance from Mars, lighting azimuth, lighting angle to zenith, etc.), all these data are on the "data blocks" that accompany each e IS a "second frame" with lighting at almost 30 degrees to the surface, which TOTALLY reveals the so-called "shadowed side." And under Carlotto's algorithms, it's a beaut!

I am aware of (and possess) at least one lower resolution, "morning shot" of the "face" (frame 753A33). As it was taken about five times higher than the two previous frames, its resolution is about 5 times lower. But, as I noted earlier, it's facinating for the detail it reveals regarding the left "eyebrow" region of the "face" at opposite lighting -- particularly when compared to both a "deliberately-degraded 35A72," and to Carlotto's 3-D computerized "face"

model, the latter "lit" from the same "morning" angle. All three images show IDENTICAL DETAIL in this "eyebrow" region -- which is pretty impressive, considering that three different data sources being compared. I prepared an illustrated comparison of this effect years ago, but it "strayed." I'll try to find it -- or recreate it, if you're interested. -- Dick

#193997 reply to #193982
Fm: Jim Speiser 72135,424
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 03-Sep-89

OK, Richard:

I am looking for total bisymmetry in the "face." I've heard that Carlotto has shown some rudimentary bisymmetry through some sort of computer enhancement, but I have yet to see it. I would also like to see an objective skeptical treatment of Carlotto's work in this area. As with any anomalistic claim, I tend to wait for the skeptics' answer; if it is specious, or smacks of a priori rejection, I am inclined to sympathise more with the claimant. This is how I came to become an advocate of serious UFO research.

Now that I've answered y.Y 71340,276
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 03-Sep-89

Richard, I am 60% persuaded that the Face and Pyramids are probably artificial.

I have read Monuments of Mars and it left me tphotographs and ranging data.

#194049 reply to #193982
Fm: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 03-Sep-89

Richard, This may sound like a simple answer but I think Mars Observer really will decide "once and for all." We have, for example, a photograph of only one side of the face. The "face" IS the centerpiece of Cydonia. If the "hidden side" (even at Viking level resolution) shows nothing, I think this whole issue will be settled. No copouts like "The Martians only built half a face." If,

on the other hand, the hidden side shows the same symmetry and detail as the sunlit side, "just let someone suggest that we don't investigate or take higher resolution photographs!!!!!!"

This brings up another point: As you stated in your book, NASA "secretly" took another photo of the face 35 days after the first photo. It will probably never be known whether this was the result of "normal mapping" or if there was a conscious decision to do so. If they actually "made the decision," then it would be safe to assume that they also took a "third" photograph of the hidden side. If "that side" showed NOTHING, they could have used it to "disprove" all of this "nonsense" (their choice of words, not mine.)

Note: beginning of this paragraph: I didn't mean they secretly took the second photo, only that they never mentioned to the preDt: 03-Sep-89

Dick,

The Cydonia observations/measurements/predictions are extremely interesting and clearly warrant further examination by Observer, etc. My attention, however, keeps being drawn back to another region on Mars referred to as Utopia, an area which is far away from Cydonia but in a similar latitude. DiPietro, Molenaar and Brandenburg, in their book "Unusual Mars Surface Features" (4th edition) point out two "faces" in the region. One of the faces looks remarkably similar to the Cydonia face, with its "characteristic" hair (helmet?). It is shown with comparisons to the Cydonia face on page 102 (Fig. 63) of their book. I would think it would be possible to do some kind of computerized comparisons between the two faces. If indeed similarities proved to be significantly "beyond chance", that would be supporting evidence for artificiality.

There are other intriguing features in Utopia, which you point out in your book "Monuments" (Fig 22) --a "Runway" complex, etc. One particular feature that caught my eye but was not specifically referred to is something that looks like a complete "humanoid body". This is just inside the right edge of Fig. 22 in your book. The "head" is about one third the distance from the top of the

figure and has the "characteristic" appearance of the Cydonia face (most distinguishable feature is the "hair".). A "right arm" is stretched out portions resemble that of a human. When I pointed this out to my wife, she immediately saw still another "face" within the torso. I'm curious if you or anyone else has noticed the additional significant information gathered there, especially if certain mathematical relationships (similar to Cydonia?) could be found. In any case, shouldn't there be some encouragement for Observer to look city. Although I haven't even spoken to any "geology experts" about this, I feel they would explain this by some kind of local faulting.

I think what had made Cydonia the center of attention is that here we have five or six "bizarre looking" objects...all of which are very "DIFFERENT" from each other. That makes them much harder to explain through weathering or geology than the other "interesting" areas.

Marty Arant

PS Yes, I do see a "face." It "looks" interesting, but I don't think it has anywhere near the symmetry or "relief" that the face in Cydonia has.

#194101 reply to #194088
From: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
To: Martin Arant <s7> 71270,1311
Dt: 03-Sep-89

Ok. Some questions which have probably already been answered, but I'm { forgetful.

1) Who is the publisher of "Monuments"?

2) How can I obtain higher resolution photos (as opposed to halftones or whatever you see in magazines and, I suppose, the book) of the region in question?

#194144 reply to #194101
From: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
Dt: 04-Sep-89

Mike,

In answer to your questions: 1) "Monuments" is published by North Atlantic Books, Berkeley, CA. Its' available in Waldonbooks (even accessible here on CIS, I believe), B. Dalton, Crown, and a lot of major independents, anywhere in t that way, it's signed, and the on-going research gets a percentage of the cover price).

2) The highest resolution photos are also available (as actual hard-copy 11 X 14 prints of 35A72, 70A11, and 70A13), with individual 11 X 14 enlargements of the key features (high atical "overlays."

Does that help? -- Dick

P.S. There's also, just out (Sept 1), an "updated audio 'docu-drama' of the book" (NOT just someone reading "Monuments!") -- with illustrations, mosaics and a map included in the "bookpac" containing the cassette. Also called "The Monuments of Mars," and available like the book.

#194193 reply to #194144
Fm: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Yes, but how can one get the photos you describe?

#194203 reply to #194193
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Mike,

To order the 11 X 14 enhanced full-frame images, and detailed enlargements of the Cydonia objects (or any of the other items discussed in previous messages -like "Monuments," the new audio-version of same, the Mars Mission Newsletter, the NASA-Goddard video, etc.), simply send a U.S Mail note requesting a list of what's available to: The Mars Mission, P.O. Box 981, Wytheville, VA 24382. You'll get a free issue of the "Mars Mission News" and an enclosed order form

by return mail, detailing everything we have -- with illustrations. If you have a PC (and you must, or you wouldn't be reading this <grin>!), simply call the Mars Mission BBS (703) 228-7822, and enter "Files." Follow the "prompts" from there to get to "RESOURCES" -- the file-name under which a detailed printout of what we have available is entered. There is also an order form filed there, which when printed out, filled out, and mailed to us (with check), will get you anything we have.

Hope this helps.

Dick

#194201 reply to #194144
Fm: Darrell Green 72406,1736
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Dick, if I wanted to purchase a copy of "Monuments" directly from The Mars Mission, how much money should be sent? :dg

#194206 reply to #194201
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: Darrell Green 72406,1736
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Darrell,

Please see message #194203: my response to Mike on a similar question. Also, I've copied the Mars Mission BBS "Order Form" below. Detailed descriptions of these items are available by calling (703) 228-7822, and following the "prompts" to "DESCRIBE" (in "RESOURCES"). -- Dick

***** MARS MISSION ORDER FORM *****

	Price each	Shipping &handling	Total each	Number ordered
Subtotal				
BOOK-Monuments of Mars	\$14.95	\$3.00	\$17.95	_____
\$_____				
5.00	1.00	6.00	\$_____	
T-SHIRT(Size____Color_____)	10.95	2.00	12.95	_____
\$_____				

PHOTOGRAPHS (As marked) 16.95 3.00 19.95 _____
\$ _____
Face & Profile _____ Pyramid _____
Fort & Oblique _____ Mosaic _____ Total of Order
\$ _____
Virginia Residents add 4.5% Tax
\$ _____
Total Enclosed
\$ _____

PAYMENT IS BY: MoneyOrder__ Check__ SHIP TO: CHARGE TO MY:
Mastercard _____
Visa _____ NAME: _____ Card

ADDRESS: _____
Expires: ____/____/____ Bank No. _____
CITY: _____
Signature _____ STATE: _____ ZIP
CODE: _____
Order Date ____/____/____ PHONE
NUMBER: (____) _____

Please place my name on your mailing list to receive future releases: _____
Sale of above items helps to support THE MARS MISSION, a non-profit educational & scientific research group. THANK YOU for your order. Allow 3 weeks delivery.
Mail this form to: THE MARS MISSION, P.O. BOX 981, WYTHEVILLE, VA 24382

#194228 reply to #194206
Fm: Darrell Green 72406,1736
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Thanks, Dick! And if I order the book direct from The Mars Mission I get a signed copy, right?

Appreciate the info. :dg

#194105 reply to #194088
perimposes the "torso" of the "whole-body figure", which has a much more symmetrical Cydonia-like face.
That face is about a quarter the size of the other face and is slightly above the latter. Let me know if you can see it.

Bert

#194114 reply to #194105

Fm: Erol O. Torun 73207,landforms, and is oriented exactly East-West.

Speaking of "faces", I think that there has been too much attention over the years given to the search for representations of the human form on Mars. The face in Cydonia is the only one that I feel has a chance of being real; the others don't even come close. But while the face in Cydonia appears real, it is NOT the most anomalous landform present from the viewpoint of geomorphology. There are objects in Cydonia whose location, shape, and orientation more strongly suggest intelligent design. These objects include the "cliff" - a straight ~2km long ridge located ON the ejecta apron of ancient pedestal crater, the "Tholus" - a hemispherical structure with a flat ledge around its periphery, the straight walled "city", and most anomalous of them all, the D&M pyramid - with its five sides and bilateral symmetry oriented toward the face. I began my own investigations into the possibility of ruins on Mars not after seeing the face, but as a result of seeing the D&M pyramid, a structure that geologically should not exist on Mars (or any of the inner planets).

#194232 reply to #194114
Fm: Bert 71450,3504
To: Erol O. Torun 73207,2331
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Erol,

I have not seen "The Face on Mars" by Pozos. Can you give me some information such as the publisher, etc. and any suggestions on how I might obtain a copy?
Thanks.

Bert

#194240 reply to #194232
Fm: James Duke 75340,377
To: Bert 71450,3504
Dt: 06-Sep-89

Dear Bert: The formal title is "The Face on Mars: Evidence for a Lost Civilization?" by Randol of cost and current address of the publisher; it's probably the same but sometimes publishers move.

#194250 reply to #194240
Fm: Bert 71450,3504
To: James Duke 75340,377
Dt: 06-Sep-89

James,

Thanks for the book info. I'll see if I can find a copy.

Bert
-Sep-89

Bert. Now that you mention it I see both the larger face as well as the smaller one (with the body.) It seems as though the "body" is pointing to something to the left of the picture. The "legs" seem slightly misaligned though. As for the larger face, it.... well....sorta looks like.... <gulp!>... Richard Nixon.

#194129 reply to #194127
Fm: Bert 71450,3504
To: Sysop Ted Markley 76012,3361
Dt: 04-Sep-89

Ted,

You're right the larger face does look sort of like Nixon. I thought it looked familiar but I couldn't place it <grin>. Actually, the image looks almost TOO real to be real (Ha!), but what's underneath it (the full figure) is quite intiguing. Do you think the small face (the one above "Nixon") looks like the Cydonia face? It would be interesting to see a "blowup" of it.

Bert

#194100 reply to #193982
Fm: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 03-Sep-89

Little manufactured things sprinkled around the surface, or buried beneath the surface features.

#194145 reply to #194100
Fm: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
To: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
Dt: 04-Sep-89

Mike,

Ok, my question back to you: how would you RECOGNIZE "little manufactured things" . . . if you can't recognize BIG manufactured things (like the D&M, the "Fort," etc.)? In otherplease don't respond "because it will *look* manufactured."). -- Dick

#194194 reply to #194145
Fm: michael houdeshell 70003,4667
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Guess I was shooting from the hip. How about a similarity of objects across several scales? Little faces just like the one on the surface. Now =that= would show consciousness to me.

#194179 reply to #193982
Fm: James Duke 75340,377
To: Richard Hoagland 72470,242
Dt: 05-Sep-89

Dear Richard: I have seen the Carlotto photos and frankly they impress me as giving the clearest indication as of now that the face is most likely an artificial construct which in turn would lead to probable artificial construction of the pyramids and other objects of Cydonia. The only other feature is the negative made of one of the Viking photos shown on p. 43 in "The Face on Mars" by Dr. Pozos. However I would prefer to have IMAX photos which show the Face and the surrounding area in incredible detail enough to make the skeptics and myself scream, "OH, MY GOD!" But I must admit that Carlotto's work has certainly lessened my modest skepticism even more.

* THE U.F.O. BBS - <http://www.ufobbs.com/ufo> *

SUBJECT: COMPUSERVE CON WITH RICHARD HOAGLAND
FILE: UFO1734

[The following is a transcript of Sunday, May 7, 1989 on-line CompuServe Conference sponsored by the National Issues and People Forum with author Richard Hoagland. His most recent book, "The Monuments of Mars," explores a surface

anomaly photographed by NASA's Mars Viking Mission resembling a human face.]

User ID	Nod	Name
72470,250	NRL	daniel burton
71340,276	SOR	Mark.Y
76012,3361	MRT	Ted
76340,3357	BTM	Michelle Smith
76703,266	DUK	Georgia
71270,1311	LAK	MARTIN ARANT
76416,733	QFM	Ed Tarantelli
76702,330	CWV	Dick
72537,2312	PRI	Paul Carr
74656,2333	LCA	Paul J. Burke/CA
71435,1203	NWH	Howard
72135,424	PNX	Jim S.
73500,625	CGK	John
72406,1736	HLV	Darrell Green
70511,17	CRZ	Mike
74270,3360	BOI	Don Ecker
71450,3504	ANN	Bert
72560,341	RIV	Mike Sugarman/Celes
72427,1316	ENC	Ron Page
76703,674	DUK	Chuck Lynd
76247,447	DTB	steve rivera
72470,242	HVN	EROL TORUN
75015,364	SFM	Stan Tenen
72210,1213	DEM	mcorbin
76703,303	WVA	Dick DeLoach

% Conference has begun

(Georgia) Welcome to all! Tonight we welcome Richard Hoagland. During the question-and-answer period, when it is your turn to speak, please keep line length to around 60 columns. Keep questions short so that all participants have an opportunity to ask their questions. When you have finished formulating your question, end with GA so that our guest will know when to begin. First, Ted Markley, my assistant in charge of Paranormal issues will introduce the guest, then ask some questions to start things moving. After that we will take questions as long as possible. GA Ted.

(Ted) Tonight we are fortunate to have as our special guest Richard Hoagland, author of "The Monuments of Mars" and founder of the Mars Project and the newly formed Mars Mission. Dick's long list of impressive credentials can found in the Convention Center lobby as well as in the Issues Forum. Before we open the floor

to questions I will conduct a brief interview with Dick which will cover some of the more frequently asked question. Welcome, Dick! GA

(Dick) Thanks, Ted. It's nice to be here. Ah, where ever "here" is.

(Ted) While many here tonight have read your book, others only know of the "Face" on the Martian surface through tabloids such as the "National Enquirer." I know that this Martian surface feature is getting the serious attention of noted members of the scientific community. Can you comment on the caliber of the team on the Mars Project. GA

(Dick) Well, Ted, the list is constantly growing. We have some whom have been involved almost from the beginning -like Dr. Mark Carlotto, of the Analytic Science Corporation, in Reading Mass. But, then we have "new blood" that comes to us out of the blue, like Erol Torun of Defense Mapping who read my book last okfall, was _determined_ to prove me wrong -- and wound up discovering some extraordinary stuff. So it just keeps growing.GA

{
(Ted) Dick, you recently started the Mars Mission as spin off of the Mars Project. Can you explain the charter and purpose of the Mars Mission? GA

(Dick) When it became clear last Fall that we were really on to something, when the numbers started really coming together I realized that the biggest hurdle to getting verification was going to be the _political_ process. So, if the Project was the originator of the research, the Mars Mission is the "home" of what I like to think of as the necessary "democratization" of the data to get the _political_ system up to speed for verification. In other words, we need to put the pressure on NASA to TAKE NEW PICTURES. And that means Congress and people who want to know if this is real.ga

(Ted) Is there a way that interested people (even though they may not be highly technical) can keep abreast of new development in both the Mars Project and the Mars Mission? ----- Dick got knocked off. Please stand by. For those of you who just joined us, Dick Hoagland was knocked off and should be back on shortly. ga

(Dick H.) Sorry, guys I seem to have slipped into a warp. This ship takes a little getting used to. One can't be "all thumbs".ga

(Ted) I'll repeat my last question. Is there a way that interested people (even though they may not be highly technical) can keep abreast of new development in both the Mars Project and the Mars Mission? GA

(Dick H.) Let's try again. Yes, there is. One can write to us at the Mars Mission: P.O. Box 981, Wytheville, VA 24382. Or, one can subscribe to the Mars Mission Newsletter (at the same P.O. Box). Or, one can actually log-on to our new (very new -- grin) Mars Mission Board, which we hope to get up and running in a week or two. There are so many new developments -- on both the research front and the political front that we've decided to try the "electronic way" and see if it works. I should add that Marty Arant is the guy who really impelled us to try this, so if it DOESN'T work blame him!.ga

(Ted) One last ? before I open the floor. What can the average person do to help get us back to Mars and get more data on the "Face"? GA

(Dick H.) (Sorry for the delay -- we have cats) The main thing is that we need new images of Cydonia, ASAP, And NASA has steadfastly refused to take them!!! That simply doesn't make sense. What makes this science, as opposed to that "other stuff" is that THIS IS TESTABLE. It's that simple. The fact that NASA doesn't WANT to subject this data to the only fair appraisal at this point, is very suspicious. Which is why we were extremely gratified that we've found such an excellent reception on Capitol Hill including an invitation to meet with the Chairman (himself!) of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology a couple of weeks ago. His attention to this problem is probably going to do more in the long run to get us the answers we need (and deserve) than any other single development on the political front in the last 13 years. And, to keep that side of the system "honest" public interest (citizen support for the simple idea of LOOKING) is ESSENTIAL. This, Congressman Robert A. Roe should get some

mail from anyone who wants to let him know that they support HIS
interest in
this vital inquiry. His address is:

The Honorable Robert A. Roe
Chairman, House Committee on Space, Science and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Rayburn Building -- Rm 2243
Washington, D.C.

Ted, you asked.ga

(Ted) I'll now open the floor to ? GA

(Dick H.) Sounds good.ga

(Georgia) type /que to get in line.

% Moderator recognizes queue #1
Paul J. Burke/CA <10>

(Paul J. Burke/CA) Mr. Hoagland, I feel you are mining the depths
of scientific
ignorance, with this phony issue. It is the nadir of
anthropocentric chauvanism
to believe some advanced civilization could detect the existence
of man on this
planet and do nothing more than carve out a mountain that MIGHT
be seen, by some
tree dwelling mammal. How could THEY see so far ahead? GA.

(Dick H.) This goes to the heart of many issues, Paul I
personally believe it is
us who are acting slightly anthropocentric. We have an "image,"
a "model" for
how "ET" is "supposed" to behave. If the "signal" we get doesn't
fit that
"image," we -- NASA -- rejects it. So, which is more
anthropocentric? To pursue
data where it leads. Or to say, "the data doesn't exist?"ga

(Paul J. Burke/CA) Aren't the Mars imagers dead? How can NASA
take any more
photos?

(Dick H.) I don't see any connection. The material "ruins" are
still there.
When Mars Observer gets there in 1993, all we want is the Cydonia
Region
REIMAGED. The objects (there is FAR more than the "face") will
still certainly
be there.ga

(Ted) Next

(Paul J. Burke/CA) I would agree to a 'side trip' on the next
Mars mission,

(Dick H.) It's not even that complicated. Mars Observer will be in a POLAR ORBIT. It will inevitably fly over EVERY SQUARE INCH OF MARS every 35 or 36 days. So, all NASA has to agree to is to take the images at the designated time. And they won't!ga

% Moderator recognizes queue #2
Bert <17>

(Ted) GA Bert

(Bert) Dick, do you know if the Soviets have an interest in Cydonia and do you have any information relating to the AP release (a month or so back) indicating the Soviets had observed something very strange on the surface of Mars? GA

(Dick H.) I put several items relating to the past research history of this into the Library earlier today (Ted, can tell you guys how to get them out!) I can tell you this (as background to some of that material, which relates to past dealings we've had with the Soviets on this issue. Last January, one of our team -- Dr. Brian O'Leary a former scientist-astronaut went personally to Moscow with the pictures. His mission: to try to get Sagdeev and others to take new images with the Phobos spacecraft. They all sat there, looking at the Carlotto enhancements and were VERY interested, according to O'leary. That was over a year ago. Late last year, in December, just before the NASA briefing we did I got a letter from a Soviet scientist whom we've been in direct contact with for about a year. He's a specialist in "problems of extraterrestrial contact". His Ph.D. is in this particular subject, in fact! Anyway, HE said the new data was SO interesting, he was going to Sagdeev (then head of the unmanned Phobos Mission) to try to get new images of Cydonia from Phobos 2. That was last December I, of course, immediately shot back a reply telling him HOW the images might be taken (inclination of orbit to the equator, etc.) So far -- this is MAY -- nothing. But the Soviet's HAVE announced some pretty peculiar things around their Phobos mission including a Radio Moscow Report that Marty Arant heard first-hand which had Orthodox Russian priests going into the Moscow Phobos

Control Center to "see the Phobos images of Mars and to talk about the creation.
You figure it out.ga.

(Ted) As Dick mentioned, there will be several files in LIB 10 of the ISSUES forum tomorrow. Dick was furiously uploading document today and I have not processed them all yet....

(Dick H.) "Furiously" is right.ga

(Ted) We will have only one ? each until all have had at least one chance. GA
NEXT

% Moderator recognizes queue #3
DON <16>

(#DON) Ok Thanks Ted. Richard, I have just a simple question. I am presuming that the majority of your work is concerned with the photos that were taken in the early 70's, and are mostly concerned with the "face" and what you perceive as structures my question is this. How many independent computer photo enhancements have been performed by independent facilities, other than the Carlotto work and if this is so important why is there so much "infighting" among the various people working on this, such as John Brandenberg's Cydonia Features, and Vince Di Pietro and Greg Molenaar. Why is there no co-operation?
ga

(Dick H.) I guess every time in the history of human affairs one comes up against a problem that is really interesting very "human" problem will inevitably raise their head. This is true, whether you work at the NSC, at NASA, for the Civil Rights movement, or anything. The fact of the matter is we all, all of us who have been involved with this firmly are committed to one goal now: new images ASAP. That's got to be priority number uno. The rest of it -- which says a lot about different emphasis on different aspects of the research is far less important than that point.ga

(DON) Ok, so how many independent research efforts have there been that confirms your theory? Or is there only one? ga

(Dick H.) Good question. In "Monuments" I go into great detail on three investigations. Each of these did some imaging. The first, of course, was NASA! Surprised? It as NASA which first "found" this object, and put it on the public record. It was only after that, that others namely DiPietro and Molenarr, at Goddard, in 1979 did their "thing" -- found the SECOND, corroborating frames taken of Cydonia at a higher sun-angle which has given us such great data to actually work with. They did enhancements, published and nothing much happened for EIGHT YEARS. Then, in 1983 I got the images, looked at them and realized that I was seeing not only a "face" but other things which didn't belong there. That's when the third IMAGING investigation began -- at SRI. Their Prime system did some excellent work, using digital copies of the NASA Viking tapes. That's when we turned to a FOURTH source, for "independent data" on the imaging: Mark Carlotto. Carlotto, I must say, has put the most time and effort into extracting every bit of data from these tapes. And he's brought not only new techniques to the imaging. He's also "attacked" the problem with new ideas -- such as the "fractal analysis" he's not done and submitted to the journals. And every time we use a new technique we turn up DATA not noise. That, I believe, is trying to tell us something.ga

% Moderator recognizes queue #4
Stan Tenen <8>

(Stan Tenen) hi, Richard, this is Stan of meru. (I don't think I can squeeze in punctuation). I have several questions; first, i think that you are focusing on the wrong data; brilliant as Carlotto's analysis is, the best data , in my opinion is Toruns. the alignments that he shows among the various strange objects at Cydonia is very hard to explain for example: 1 the edges of the d&m pyramid are very fuzzy in the enhanced photos. I am not convinced by the photos what is extraordinary is that the alignments of the d&m with the bulls eye and the face and the cliff and the tholus are exactly redefine the fuzzy edges of the d & m so it is not necessary to see it clearly - the alignments sharply

define the edges. Also, it is not hard to find very interesting alignments for example; the cliff subtends the same angle from both the tip of the d & m and from the city center bulls eye. That means that the edges of the cliff, which are very well defined and the tip of the d & m and the bulls eye must lie on the same circle. By the way, what features has John Brandenburg found - I have not heard of his data before. Also, you mentioned base 3 and 3609 on the phone earlier my calculations show 360 base 10 to equal 111100 base 3. 364 base 10 equals 111111 base 3, much more elegant. What say you. ga

(Dick H.) I don't know quite where to begin, Stan. Let me say, first, that you have confused some of the work just a bit. When I got into this, back in 1983, it was precisely because I thought I saw the potential for some remarkable relationships between some intriguing objects at Cydonia. I put these ideas into a VERY primitive numerical "model" in "Monuments" I called it the "relationship model" and felt that if we were going to ever know at EXISTING image resolution what we were dealing with it would only be through discovery of some very precise, provocative, and repeating numerical RELATIONSHIPS between these objects. Little did I know that that day would arrive much sooner than I thought when I finished the book Erol, in the Fall of last year, in measuring. ONE of the most fascinating "structures" near the "face": the so-called "D&M Pyramid" discovered an extraordinary set of VERY SPECIFIC relationships INTERNAL to this object. I, in turn, in remeasuring all the previous alignments, had noted in the book between the objects that you cited -- the Face, the "City", the "Cliff" and the "Tholus" (all objects which are much easier to talk about if you have images and maps before you!) Anyway, in remeasuring those previously noted alignments, I discovered to my immense surprise -- and satisfaction! -- that Torun's precise numerical angles (and derived numerical constants which we shall define in a moment) SHOWED UP -- not once . . . or twice . . . but perhaps HALF A DOZEN TIMES (I've lost exact count, at this point). The point is this:

you're right. To me, the REALLY exciting stuff is NOT that something "looks like a face" or "looks like a Pyramid". It's that Erol and I have discovered between us something like two or three dozen REPEATING numerical relationships and these have given us the SAME set of repeating mathematical constants -- like "e" and "pi" -- again . . . and again . . . and again. And these constants have now yielded a prediction as to the very siting latitude of these objects on the planets's surface --. Anyway, you're right. THAT's the "ball to keep one's eye upon! And, tonight, we're fortunate that Erol is here, to tell us specifically what he's discovered recently.ga

(Georgia) Ted is next.

(Ted) Dick, I think we passed too quickly over a couple of innuendoes that Don raised relative to "Infighting" and lack of co-operation among members of the Mars Project. Is it true that this has been occurring? GA

(Dick H.) I'd be less than candid if I didn't say, "yes." But so what? Politics are everywhere. The point is not who agrees with you, or who decides that "this" area is more important than "that." The point in science is "Can you test your hypothesis?" Personality conflicts, hidden agendas, fear of being too bold (or too timid) have no real place in such a process. That's why those of us who think we need a bold, politically aggressive strategy to get back to Mars for the crucial data that we need now have formed the Mars Mission. That doesn't

(Ted) GA Dick

(Ted) Dick has been knocked off again.

(Dick H.) Gone into the ether, again. But, I'm back!

% Moderator recognizes queue #5
steve rivera <22>

(Ted) TO get into QUE type "/que" GA Dick

(Dick H.) Now, what was I saying? Oh, yes . . . the point is not the politics of "personality," but the objective of getting real information on a problem of first-rate importance. If the criteria for an important problem be that there

are no "politics," then that would eliminate ALL of human activity. Next.ga

(Ted) GA Steve

(steve rivera) SORRY I MISSED THE FIRST FIFTEEN MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE
BESIDES THE "ISSUES" FORUM, WHERE CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION (AND PERHAPS
PHOTOS) SUCH AS BBS NUMBERS, ADDRESSES, ETC DTB GA

(Ted) Steve, there will be a transcript of this CO in the ISSUES Lib 10 soon.
Dick answered that question earlier. If you don't find what you need there send
me EMAIL. NEXT

% Moderator recognizes queue #6
Jim S. <12>

(Dick H.) I should add our Mars BBS number, however, which I forgot earlier
(703)228-7822.ga

(Jim S.) I should preface by saying the face looks enough like a face to me to
merit serious inquiry, however. As you know, this issue lives or dies on
scientific diligence. In your white paper, you refer to the Viking images as the
"first hard evidence" of the existence of ETI. Was this just a semantical slip
(did you mean "possible indication") or do you really consider your findings
"hard evidence"? If so, isn't it possible that NASA's motivation (or lack
thereof) stems from simple mistrust of your methodology and/or scientific
objectivity? GA

(Dick H.) Excellent question. I used the term "hard" because for all of NASA's
30 years of SETI. They've only had THEORY. The evidence in the images -- no
matter how you consider the pros or cons of looking at it -- is hard evidence.
It must be addressed. It has not been except by this group OUTSIDE of NASA. I
have entered in LIB 10 what I think as some of the reasons for this. You may
agree or disagree. But the point is this. In science, when a theory
("Hypothesis" is a better term, here) is "on the table," the scientific process
DEMANDS that it be tested. It hasn't been. The only one's who can TEST it at
this point on Mars (which is the only test that will really convince everyone)

are the NASA folks who control the spacecraft, the launch facilities, the imaging systems the tracking network, etc.etc.etc. And that's put a severe "dent" in the process.ga

(Ted) Next

% Moderator recognizes queue #7
Bert <17>

(Ted) Bert Passes, Next

% Moderator recognizes queue #8
mcorbin <9>

(mcorbin) Dick, I hope that this is not redundant as I was unable to get on at 6:30 due to network problems, but despite official NASA denial of interest in this aspect of the Martian surface are there any indications of interest on their part unofficially? I seem to get the indication that they do indeed have an interest in this phenomenon, but they are not public about it.ga

(Dick H.) If they don't have a "official"interest now, they might have shortly. Tomorrow morning, according to a phone conversation we had with the chief aid to Congressman Roe last Friday the Congressman is sending an _official_ letter to NASA, asking precisely that question "WHAT (NASA) HAVE YOU DONE ABOUT THIS DATA?" Now it's become a bit uncomfortable in the last 48 hours or so to lie to Congress. I think we're going to find out some interesting things in the next few days.ga

(Ted) Ok Next

% Moderator recognizes queue #9
DON <16>

(DON) Richard, I assume you are familiar with William "Bill" Moore and the work that he, Stan Friedman and Jamie Shandera have done with the MJ-12 material. As you may or may not know, ParaNet was the first informational system to "break" this story, at ParaNet and here on CIS. I understand that Moore was attempting to get in contact with you. Would you care to elaborate on this, and does it have anything to do with your attempt to get Congress involved with the Mars

material and his same attempt in reference with the MJ-12 material? ga

(Dick H.) First, the investigation into the Viking images has no DIRECT connection with any UFO material, investigations, etc. I want to say that, so that what I say next is very clear. Both, however, have at their root, a POLITICAL problem. If NASA HAS done work on these images (in the theory that we're not the only "smart" guys in town) then the ONLY way to find that out is through the political process -- if it works. The UFO guys have had the same problem. So, on the surface there is a similarity. The DIFFERENCE is this: we can test the Mars data in the very near future BY SIMPLY GETTING NEW IMAGES OF MARS. There is no easy way to TEST the UFO hypothesis; the "data" doesn't "stand still". Now, I'm impressed that the CHAIRMAN of the most powerful committee, in terms of science, in the Congress invited us in HIMSELF -- no "staff" etc. We had what Henry Kissinger would have called a "frank and open discussion" of many issues. His reaction was (and I'm paraphrasing here, of course): "Look, NASA's taken a _political_ position why are you here . . . for a _political_ solution." But, that solution is going to need the attention of Americans who want to know what's there, if these political expressions of interest are going to be followed through.ga

(Georgia) We are not quite finished but the format is about to change there are still 3 questions and after I end the formal session, each of you 3 send a ? and Ted will moderate there is a more manageable number here now. I want to thank Richard!!! APPLAUSE!!

% The conference has ended
Thank you for attending

(Jim S.) ?

(Ted) Let start the new que, who are waiting in the wings? ga

(DON) !!

(MARTIN ARANT) ?

(mcorbin) !

(Stan Tenen) ?

(Ted) GA Jim

(Jim S.) Thanks Ted, and yes, applause Dick. Is it just coincidence that your Mars Mission is headquartered in a well-known UFO flap area? More to the point, is Danny Gordon in any way connected with your group? GA

(Dick H.) Well, everyone I know, at one time or another has asked me that in the last year! I can assure you that UFO's are NOT why I'm here. But I have met Danny Gordon on a number of occasions. And he strikes me as a serious reporter, trying to fathom an unfathomable story.ga

(Ted) Don is next ga

(DON) Richard, lets get back to Moore. I believe you did not address the question about Moore? Is he connected with you with the Mars material, or was this coincidence? ga

(Dick H.) Don, I have also met Bill Moore -- at a couple of conferences in LA, I believe. (So, I don't know where the idea came from that "he's trying to get in touch with me; he already has!") Anyway, I know all about his work, and can assure you that it has no direct or indirect connection with our own. Let me add this, however. If this data we've been exploring on Mars is as robust as it has now become to some of us, then it raises the obvious question: if someone could find this solar system once (the operative "visitor to Mars" model that I favor). Then why couldn't someone AGAIN. Especially, if the "face" is trying to tell us of some "link" with events beyond this planet. I think we should all keep an open mind on that point.ga

(Ted) Martin is next Don you are in line after Stan ga Martin

(#MARTIN ARANT) on my interesting conversation with JPL ted, am I on? OK. Dick, Great conference! I was #11 and was going to make a statement on my interesting conversation with the "gentleman" at JPL. Anyway, is Erol Torom on line? I am interested in what else he has discovered. ga

(Dick H.) Erol, do you want to get a word in here?ga

(Ted) Ga Erol

(Bert) ?

(Ted) Maybe Erol will speak later

(Dick H.) Let me answer Marty's question in another way. Marty called JPL some weeks ago and got some very interesting responses to this investigation. Particularly the idea that if we "keep this up, we're going to destroy the planetary program, if not at least Mars Observer!" I kid you not... Anyway, last week, a reporter for the Wall St. Journal called up JPL and, asked to speak to the Project Scientist for Mars Observer. I think his name is Alby, or something. Anyway, Alby told the Wall St. Journal guy that "he didn't have any objection to taking a few pictures of Cydonia if asked. Point: this represents a 180 degree reversal of field for NASA. And, I said in a note to the Journal reporter: "Perhaps it's because there have been some calls from the guys on the Hill in the last few days"ga

(Ted) Ok Mike wanna continue? ga

(mcorbin) Yield to Bert. Th-.,.HX6l. Good night.

{

(Ted) Stan is next GA STAN

(Stan Tenen) im still curious about 360 degrees and base 3 as far as I can see
360 base10 = 111100 base3 is this correct?ga

(Ted) This seems to be a rather involve question to answer in this format. Stan, earlier Dick gave an address where he can be reached. Could this question be dealt with in that way? ga

(Stan Tenen) yes

(EROL TORUN) ?

(Dick H.) perhaps I can answer Stan, without boring everyone else I come back to "how will we know it's real." That is THE question everyone would agree (I hope!) I also feel that something said earlier this evening is right on track: we tend to get mesmerized by the images -- what "looks" familiar -- a "Face," etc. And we lose sight of the science -- the epistemology -- that must underpin any "decision" on "reality." I believe, in answer to another question, that we

may have "crossed the Rubicon" on this one. The math is the key.
How many "big"
questions in science are decided by things we CANNOT see --
quarks black-hole
models .. AIDS viruses? If we have to recognize something in
these images,
before we accept the "reality" of this, then we're rejecting at
least two
hundred years of science! So, we come back to the numbers. Erol
discovered a
specific set of numbers in one object, after trying to DISPROVE
my contention
that this object was important. I extended those specific numbers
to the whole
Complex and found THE SAME quantities, expressed repeatedly to
ONE PART IN A
THOUSAND!!! The probability that these serial discoveries are
chance is
calculable by the same mathematics used to calculate the odds of
TWO engines
failing on a 737 in England and the results say we are NOT
dealing with chance:
it HAS to be Design to we believe the numbers . . .? Read the
papers on the
Mars BBS -- (703) 228-7822 -- in a week or so. ga

(Ted) Erol Torun is up. Go Ahead Erol GA

(EROL TORUN) Am I getting through to you?

(Ted) Yes. Just a reminder to those new to our CO. We operate
under formal
rules. If you want to ask a question or make a comment type a
"?" or a "!" and
I will take down your name and put you in queue. I'll let you
know when it is
your turn. GA Erol (GA means Go Ahead and talk) GA

(EROL TORUN) Great conference, dick. I agree with Dick's opinion
that the final
test of the reality of what we are looking at will be based on
the presence of
regular geometry. To briefly summarize my work, I have found the
three things
that one would look for in ANY remotely sensed imagery that might
contain ruins
these are :

- 1 - Inconsistency with the local geology ..
- 2 - The presence of regular geometry that is suggestive
of intelligent intervention
- 3 - Meaningful context

Dick was the first to emphasize the importance of context i.e. a
face or
pyramid in isolation would make little sense GA

(steve rivera) ?

(Dick H.) Sorry, I missed a bit when something knocked me off line.ga

(Stan Tenen) bye and be well all

(Ted) Don is up GA

(DON) Thanks Ted. Richard, Mars is all well and good, and it is possible that something has in fact occurred there. Until such time as more photos are taken, or a manned mission happens, we will not know. My question is this. Since the first manned flights in the 60's, there have been many reports by our astronauts of sightings of UFOs while in orbit, or while on the moon. Also, many unexplained sightings of something on the moon have filtered back. In the mid 70's George Leonard wrote an excellent book titled "Somebody Else is on the Moon". Have you read this. Or are you familiar with this as well as other works about unusual occurrences that have been reported on the Moon? What is your opinion that even know, something could be occurring? ga

(Dick H.) First thing's first. My point (and Erol's) is simply this: we now have enough repeatable, numerical data, to be able to make a very high probability statement regarding the "reality" or "non-reality" of the Cydonia Complex -- if we use the SAME RULES we routinely apply to other areas of science. To most people, I realize, they'll have to "see" something they recognize; but that's not "science," that's emotional response. So, let's keep in mind the work that we have covered

(Ted) Dick, are you there? ga

(DON) Ted, he got bumped.

(Ted) Dick got dumped. Welcome back Dick.

(Dick H.) Sorry, Don. Now, to the last part of your question

[Don left the conference at this point]

(Ted) Bert is next GA BERT

(Dick H.) Oh

(Bert) Go ahead and finish your thought Dick.ga

(Ted) Ga Dick

(Dick H.) I was going to answer Don's question...But. since he's left, let's move on.ga

(Ted) GA BERT

(Bert) With regard to the AP article mentioning that the Soviets had seen something like a "15 mile strip" and a "spindle" shaped formation, have you or any of your group attempted to contact them about what this might have been? ga

(Dick H.) Let's take a few interesting things in order. The Soviets have "known" about these objects since AT LEAST 1984 -- when they published a provocative piece in Soviet Life Mag titled "Pyramids on Mars?" Now, O'Leary took them the enhanced photos in Jan, '88. They had at least a year and a half to plan how to take new images. Now, we have strange stories coming out of Radio Moscow Stories of "strange, spindle-shaped objects and linear features that seem rectilinear". If you put all of this together, you just MIGHT come up with the idea that they have indeed taken some new images . . . and they are "leaking" news to the West -just like they've done before. Look at the details of the "spindle story": They claim it could be the "shadow of a spacecraft on the surface". If their resolution is THAT good (do the calculation) then they have to have seen something interesting at Cydonia! ga

(mcorbin) !

(Ted) Mike C is up GA Mike

(mcorbin) I have three small questions/statements to make. First, does the US have any frames of the areas that have been taken by the Soviets? Also, I would to offer ParaNet's assistance to you in the efforts of getting information to the public. We are prepared to be of service to you in any way that we possibly can. And, finally, how near to the complex is this area that the Soviets are interested in?

(Dick H.) To your first question, yes the Soviets have brought some Phobos images to Washington NASA HQ but I haven't seen them. They did show O'Leary some

Phobos (the moon) photos in Tokyo. And he brought those back to Phoenix. We were discussing them on the phone the other afternoon when he called trying to get an idea of the resolution of the cameras (Something like the physicists who've been trying to duplicate the cold fusion lab set-ups from wire photos!) Anyway, we don't know (because they haven't released coordinates) where the Soviet "spindle" is located. So, does that answer your question?.ga

(EROL TORUN) ?

(Ted) GA Erol

(mcorbin) Yes, one thing more on this. What is the resolution on the Soviet's camera. Do you know?

(Dick H.) For obvious reasons, we've been trying to get very specific info on this. But it's been hard. We've tried published specs. We've tried "inside sources" who are working with the Soviets (like Merton Davies, at RAND) and, we've tried to estimate it, based on the photos they gave O'Leary last week. It all says that IF they wanted to really take new images of Cydonia they could probably AT LEAST equal Viking and, if they put the spacecraft in an orbit designed to get new pics specifically they could do better than Viking by maybe a factor of 2 or 3 But we don't know!!!ga

(EROL TORUN) ?

(Ted) ga EROL

(EROL TORUN) Dick, was the AP story more specific as to what the Soviets meant by a "spindle shaped object" ? I'm thinking of the Viking photograph in Monuments that shows a bizarre "bow-tie" shaped object in close proximity to a straight line with an East-West orientation perhaps the Soviets have reimaged these objects GA

(Dick H.) Shades of the Runway. I simply don't know, Erol. However, all our speculating is not going to get real data. What we have done -- and you were in the meeting in Roe's office when he asked -- is to submit a specific "wish list"

to the Chairman of items that will move this Investigation along.
And a DIRECT
CALL to the Soviets, asking to see any images they DID secure of
Cydonia, is on
that list and will be in the LIB 10, t'morrow, right Ted? ga

(Ted) Should be there if all goes well. Any other ? GA

(Ted) Ok, I want to thank Richard Hoagland for a VERY interesting
and
informative evening. I hope that Dick will be back to join us
soon (and
hopefully will be in the National Issues Forum) to join our
discussions. Thank
you Dick. GA

(mcorbin) Thank you Dick.

(Dick H.) I'd like to thank everyone who turned out, Ted, it's
been a real
experience. Never had to type so fast in MY LIFE!ga

(Bert) Many thanks Dick, also thanks to Erol.

(Mark.Y) Thank you for typing with us! Much appreciated!

(Mike) Ditto

(EROL TORUN) Thanks and good night to all

(mcorbin) Thanks Erol.

(Ted) Yes, thanks to EROL also. Let you fingers do the walking
thru the data
bases! Nite all! ga

(mcorbin) Night Ted. Night Bert.

(Mark.Y) Night, all!

(EROL TORUN) ditto

(Bert) Night all.

(Mike) "Nite

(Dick H.) Why does this sound (look?) like the Waltons? G'night
one and all.ga

* THE U.F.O. BBS - <http://www.ufobbs.com/ufo> *

SUBJECT: WHITEPAPER BY RICHARD HOAGLAND
FILE: UFO1735

Context and Implications of the Discovery of Extraterrestrial Life:

A Whitepaper

by Richard C. Hoagland
(C) 1989

Introduction

One of the things I have tried to understand, as my research and that of others has revealed ever more suggestive data, supportive of the phenomenal idea that these objects in the Viking images could in fact be artifacts, is the curious "historically anomalous" position of the agency which took the pictures in the first place: NASA.

Despite "a billion dollars plus" spent by Viking in the Search for Life on Mars, NASA has refused throughout these ensuing thirteen years to even once reexamine its original "political" position on these images -- that the objects they contain are merely "tricks of light and shadow" -- despite now published and peer-reviewed good science to the contrary. This reaction, increasingly at odds with both outside scientific assessments of our work and rising public calls for swift resolution of this question, has resulted in this paper -- a serious attempt to place NASA's curious "non-reaction" in some historical context and perspective.

The Ancient Roots of Our Obsession with 'ETs'

Scholars who have studied the history of our involvement with the idea of "extraterrestrials" have been more or less amazed to discover the ancient roots of what has been generally perceived, until these studies, as a minor and relatively recent "pop" cultural reaction to the Space Age -- you know, "Star Trek", "Close Encounters of the Third Kind", "ET", etc. Dr. Michael Crowe, Professor of the History and Philosophy of Science, at the University of Notre Dame, has published the most current (1986) in-

depth treatment of the subject: "The Extraterrestrial Life Debate
1750-
1900: The Idea of A Plurality of Worlds from Kant to Lowell."
Crowe's own
words summarize best what he and others have discovered:

"The question of extraterrestrial life, rather than having
arisen in
the twentieth century, has been debated almost from the beginning
of
recorded history. Between the fifth-century B.C. flowering of
Greek
civilization and 1917, more than 140 books and thousands of
essays,
reviews, and other writings had been devoted to discussing
whether or not
other inhabited worlds exist in the universe . . . the majority
of educated
persons since around 1700 have accepted the idea of
extraterrestrial life
and in numerous instances have formulated their philosophical and
religious
positions in relation to it."

Notwithstanding Crowe's all-too-familiar Western
Civilization
chauvanism -- that all human intellectual thought began in
Classical Greece
-- he is pointed in the right direction; it is amply demonstrable
that we
are heir to several thousand years of intense preoccupation with
ETs prior
to the Greeks -- such as Sumer's fascinating "Oannes Myth," and
their
attribution of their entire civilization and culture to
visitation and
specific instruction by a representative of an advanced
extraterrestrial
society, in about the 4th Millennium B.C. (the full "Oannes
Legend" is
carefully cited in detail in ^BMonuments^B). The ancient
documents and
cosmologies that Crowe then cites as evidence for Grecean origins
of human
ET curiosity -- such as Epicurus' "Letter to Herodotus" --
actually reflect
an already very old tradition, which the Greeks (along with all
their other
supposed cultural "inventions" -- according to Stanley Kramer,
noted
"Sumerologist" at the University of Pennsylvania) simply passed
along to us
from Sumer, several millenia before.

The 'Extraterrestrial' Roots of 'The Enlightenment'

Crowe's recounting of the involvement of more recent historical figures in the great Extraterrestrial Life Debate is more original -- from the written works of fundamental religious revolutionaries, such as John Wesley (founder of the Methodist Church), to extraterrestrial musings of that "great man" of pre-Einsteinian physics, Sir Isaac Newton, to discovery of detailed conversations carried on around the subject by such geopolitical giants as Napoleon -- and amply confirm that even theoretical interest in ideas of other worlds has had a remarkable effect in shaping human thought -- and thus the current world. Rather than merely making the claim that "the discovery of extraterrestrials would powerfully influence human ideas," the historical record reveals direct evidence that the extremely ancient, widespread belief in extraterrestrial life has repeatedly and directly affected life on Earth -- beginning with Sumer 6000 years ago. Furthermore, its captivating hold on leading philosophers and intellectuals of what has since been termed "The Enlightenment" (c. 1700-1800) -- from Descartes to Kant -- reveals the fascinating, and heretofore unappreciated, extent to which the quest "for extraterrestrials" actually created the context for the rise of modern science.

Which makes all the more inexplicable NASA's adamant refusal to either take a second scientific look at the anomalies on its own Viking photographs -- the first demonstrable hard evidence favoring the existence of extraterrestrials in the millennial-long history of this Debate -- or to take new and better pictures of Cydonia, when the unmanned Mars Observer mission returns to Mars, in 1993.

Why -- against the historical backdrop of documented, overwhelming interest in the idea of "a plurality of worlds" -- this apparent paradox?

The Search for Extraterrestrials as Inspiration
for Major Astronomical Discoveries

One of the most revealing new insights regarding the history of questions relating to extraterrestrial intelligence, is the extent to which the science of the times followed prevailing religious doctrines on the subject -- contrary to our general understanding of how science has supposedly developed.

Countless quotes from the technical papers of legendary scientific figures of the 18th Century -- the heyday of the Enlightenment -- ranging from men like Immanuel Kant (and his Nebular Hypothesis -- how solar systems form) to Sir William Herschel (and his theories of star distribution and formation in the Milky Way) make clear that their revolutionary insights and discoveries were impelled by something other than pure "science." Their theories, which have led directly to our present understanding of the Universe were, it turns out, inspired in significant measure by a search for extraterrestrials! -- by a fundamental acceptance and pursuit of something termed "the doctrine of the Plurality of worlds." This basically religious inclination was spurred by a deep theological conviction, pervasive of the times, in "the principle of Plenitude" -- the assumption that a truly Infinite God could not help but create an infinitude of other, habitable worlds . . . if not Inhabitants themselves.

The Rise of Modern Science --
and the Rejection of 'the Plurality of Worlds'

Only increasingly sophisticated telescopes, and other instruments of astronomical research (which eventually enabled acquisition of real information on the stark uninhabitability of the other planets in this solar system) finally produced the sharp divergence of scientific thinking -- beginning with the question of extraterrestrials -- from this curious religious heritage. This break thus marked the true beginnings of "rationalist science" -- and an increasing intellectual embarrassment by

later scientists, over the religiously-based cosmologies which originally gave birth to the idea of "a plurality of worlds." At its height, it was a sweeping theological assumption that populated even the surface of the sun with "beings whose organs are adopted to the peculiar circumstances of that vast globe" (according to one memorable quote from Herschel).

NASA's Intellectual Timidity Based on Fear of Intellectual Embarrassment?

It is easy to see, in this brief overview, one element of NASA's obvious discomfort with reawakening ideas relating to even a formerly inhabited planet in the solar system. Much of current science seems to operate by "fear of intellectual embarrassment"; with a history like this, it's no wonder that the idea of a plurality of worlds seems more appropriate, in the eyes of some of NASA's scientists, to the Book of Common Prayer than to the pages of the scientific journal ICARUS!

But this is not the whole sad story, of "extraterrestrials and modern science."

The Scientific Death-Knell to 'the Plurality of Worlds'

By the beginnings of the twentieth century, all scientific expectation of actually verifying the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence essentially had died -- with the singular "anomaly" of a continuing intellectual flirtation with a place called "Mars."

With this one, agonizing exception -- which almost singlehandedly destroyed modern astronomy and modern planetary science, according to Carl Sagan -- that should have been the end of it, no more "God given Plurality of Worlds"; the new scientific evidence in hand simply made life-bearing planets -- except for Earth (or "earth-like" worlds, like Mars . . .) -- impossible.

The rapidly ascending theory of planetary formation, in the early

decades of this century, was now focusing on planets as "random by-products of near stellar collisions" -- events calculated as so rare, that in the entire several-billion-year history of the Milky Way Galaxy itself, there had been literally only one near-collision, with the resultant freak creation of the sun's nine planets!

Thus, by virtue of the immense distances separating stars, sheer statistics argued implacably against more than "one or two" collisions in the entire history of time and space. Meaning, that in all the Galaxy -- if not the Universe -- we were quite alone . . .

The Scientific Resurrection of the Nebular Hypothesis --
the Modern Basis for a Real 'Plurality of Worlds'

The scientific process, if it's properly pursued, has a way of quietly continuing, leading to continuing developments in fundamental theory, new observations which throw out old ideas, etc. Within a few more decades, by the middle of this century -- the 1950's -- from the confident, premature pronouncement that Earth was undoubtedly the only inhabited planet (with, of course, the possible exception of Mars . . .) in the entire Galaxy, several fundamental astronomical breakthroughs came about -- and with these, came a return to a Galaxy potentially filled with stars as central suns, orbited by countless other worlds . . .

In 1959, as the Space Age itself was just dawning, two astronomers proposed a radical approach to actually establishing contact with all the new potential beings on all those new potential worlds far beyond the solar system -- they proposed that technology might enable "ET to phone home" -- or at least, try "to ring up good ol' Earth."

The modern, scientific "SETI Paradigm" -- the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence -- was born.

The Politics of SETI --
Even Recognizing ET Artifacts as Opposed to ET Signals

Morrison and Cocconi, the two astronomers just cited, proposed using microwave radio equipment -- technology developed for the fledgling science of radio astronomy after World War II -- in a bold program of interstellar listening for signals. The SETI Paradigm that they created by announcing this proposal was simply this: that, because of the vastness of the interstellar night and the immense difficulty of even approaching a reasonable fraction of the speed of light with any spaceship technology known to human science (especially in the 1950's!), any truly intelligent entities seeking conversation with other intelligent entities, separated by the almost inconceivable interstellar distances, would inevitably turn to radio transmissions . . . and "phone" their messages at the speed of light between the stars.

That was thirty years ago . . . and the idea that it will always be easier and more economical to send radio transmissions than to send a fleet of spaceships, like the ancient theological obsession with "a plurality of worlds," has now become the new, unquestioned wisdom of the age-old Search . . .

All opposing scientific concepts -- such as the very real technological possibility that spaceships someday might be good enough to do the job (to a truly advanced race of interstellar beings) -- quietly were banished. If it isn't a radio signal, whispering in from somewhere deep in interstellar space, no one currently looking for ETs is even interested . . .

And therein lies the second cause of NASA's rejection of our Intelligence Hypothesis: there simply can't be artifacts on near-by planets!

Not only are they all demonstrably lifeless (after all, not even a microbe lurks beneath the Martian sands, according to Viking's trusty life experiments) -- so there's no one "home" to build such artifacts -- all possibilities for visits from beyond the solar system have been effectively

ruled out -- by the basic "theology" of the SETI Paradigm itself:
to travel
is engineeringly too difficult . . . and too expensive!

The 'Ultimate' Reason for NASA's Apparent Fear of
the Intelligence Hypothesis: It's on the Wrong Planet!

And, if "they" -- interstellar beings with a spendthrift
propensity
for wandering around the Galaxy in spaceships -- by some miracle
had
visited the solar system, "they" certainly wouldn't have wasted
great
amounts of time and energy building silly "pyramids" and "faces"
on the
surface of a dead and cratered Mars! Shades of those fantasies
about
canals . . .

Because . . . when all else is said and done . . . that's
the ultimate
reason NASA, by their own admission, hasn't bothered to
scientifically
examine one frame of Viking's Cydonia photography: the planet
Viking
photographed--

The planet Mars itself.

The ultimate reason NASA hasn't taken seriously our
Intelligence
Hypothesis is simply this: Mars is scientifically bad news!

No other single planet in the solar system, or in the
history of the
pursuit of the plurality of worlds, has been more abused or
ridiculed than
Mars. With the scientific excesses and downright vicious
namecalling of
the last century, over the "reality" or "non-reality" of
Martians, still
ringing in their ears, planetary scientists -- not a generally
courageous
lot -- are loath to reopen anything even remotely resembling the
"circus"
that surrounded Schiaparelli's Canals . . . Lowell's "valiant
canal-
constructing Martians". . . or Orson Welles' Invasion . . .

Or, in the words of Sagan:

"It became so bitter and seemed to many scientists so
profitless, that
it led to a general exodus from planetary to stellar astronomy .
. . the

present shortage of planetary astronomers can be largely attributed [to this]."

Conclusion

If Sagan's assessment is correct, the present treatment of the entire issue of the "Face" by NASA and its small cadre of planetary scientists (led, it must be noted, by Carl Sagan) -- who vividly recall the sad and bitter scientific history of Mars and its "canals" too well -- is driven by a fervant fear that history will once again repeat itself -- only this time, in addition to intellectual embarrassment, the stakes are now perceived as cataclysmic: potentially, a disastrous loss of funding from the Congress, and with that -- as NASA is the only game in town which pays for "looking at the planets" -- the imminent destruction of the very profession of "planetary scientist" itself!

Or, as one planetary researcher put it to me candidly: "If you keep this up, you will destroy the planetary program!"

Which, of course, is a revealing personal statement -- regarding the nature of true scientific curiosity versus the desire for security . . . pursued merely in the name of "science."

Ultimately, now that "good science" (as acknowledged by many reputable researchers, in a variety of fields) has been done outside of NASA with regard to Viking's Cydonia photography, the disposition and implication of what's on those images lies, not with "science" or with fearful men and women pretending to be scientists . . . but with people.

The meaning of potential artifacts on Mars is almost incalculable -- and must lie somewhere nearer that millenia-old quest for answers to what Albertus Magnus termed "one of the most wonderous and noble questions in all Nature," than to NASA's 13-year timid and myopic "non-response." So, how do we find out?

The problem ultimately is not with most scientists not really being "scientists," or with an agency called "NASA" worrying more about survival than with scientific Truth . . . but with our own individual response to "Do we really want to know . . .?"

Because the wonder of this data is: we can.

* THE U.F.O. BBS - <http://www.ufobbs.com/ufo> *

SUBJECT: MARS FACE AUTHOR WRITES PRAVDA, 12/89
FILE: UFO1736

=====

FILE ORIGINATES FROM: <<UFONET I>>
UPLOADED BY: Tom Mickus
DATE OF UPLOAD: DEC/27/1989

=====

HOAGLAND.LET [***] Marsface author writes Pravda -DEC/89

=====

NOTE: The file is reproduced verbatim, except for use of "(sic)".
Words fully capitalized represent use of boldface in letter.
Accompanying "attachments" referred to in the following letter, are not reproduced here.

=====

Richard C. Hoagland

Old Gate Farm
Rt 4 Box 168
Wytheville, VA 24382
(703) 228-5524

December 1, 1989

Olga Dmitrieva
% Komsomolskaya Pravda
Street 24
6th Floor
Moscow, USSR

Dear Olga,

It was great to talk with you again the other morning (even though the only time I could finally get a circuit between the United States and Moscow was about 4:30 _AM_ -- when my body kept insisting it was still "night!"). From the sound of your voice and our brief conversation, including our exchange last Spring at Peggy Carters', I know if we lived closer -- at least on the same continent -- we'd have many things to talk about -- especially now, in view of what is taking place around the world.

Attached is my "Op-Ed piece" on our Mars Investigation -- and what I now believe is the "fingerprint" of its dramatic, real-world impact on the current history taking place before our eyes. I look forward eagerly to your reaction.

I've thought a lot about what you were trying to describe that night so many months ago, when you were telling us about the new, important role for journalism in your country; it reminded me of the feelings that I had, when I got my first major journalistic opportunity "to make a difference." At the somewhat "tender" age of twenty-three, I was suddenly, "miraculously," invited to join CBS News about twenty years ago (see attached biographical sketch) -- "to help them go to the Moon." [The actual invitation was to become a science advisor, during the Apollo lunar missions, to Walter Cronkite (can you believe?). At the time, Walter was known as "the most trusted man in America," and indication of the esteem in which he was held, both by the public and his journalistic colleagues].

The almost indescribable feelings that I had on that remarkable occasion -- when I realized that my (at the time, _very_ meager!) science journalistic skills were actually being sought by an almost legendary world news organization, if not by its very dean of journalism (!), to contribute even in a tiny way towards an unprecedented moment in the history of all Humanity, the First Lunar Landing -- I've thought, many times since our first meeting, must have been very similar to the feelings you attempted to describe that night in North Carolina, involving your own role these days in Moscow: being witness to -- if not an active participant in -- History.

If I remember correctly, you said something like "we [journalists] now feel like soldiers 'on the front lines.' We feel a great, almost historic responsibility to may 'peristroyka' work!"

Because of the historic "moment" you are now experiencing, Olga -- participating in the extraordinary rebirth of an entire nation, literally grappling with the Future (as opposed to "just" reporting it) -- I believe that you can share some of my own vicarious excitement, as I watch from half-way around the world, and wonder. . . is it _possible_ that, behind ALL the extraordinary, revolutionary changes we are seeing. . . what we have discovered on the Viking photographs is partially responsible. . . ?!

ANCIENT RUINS LYING ON A NEARBY PLANET, RUINS WHICH WILL CHANGE THE COURSE OF HISTORY FOR EACH OF US. . . IF THEY AREN'T DOING SO ALREADY?

When we first discussed the possibility of my writing something for you regarding our research, I certainly could not have stated these ideas with such apparent certainty. But, over the course of the summer, several major breakthroughs have occurred -- on both the scientific front, and on the "politics of verification." These have remarkably

verified our "intelligence hypothesis," and crystallized my thoughts

-- and the result is the "editorial" you have before you.

The dramatic political developments -- which have included a total reversal of "policy" with regard to the "Cydonia artifacts"

by NASA, and in less than 6 months (correspondence attached to this

letter) -- occurred, after 13 years of dismissing the possibility as

"nonsense," almost as rapidly as the revolutionary changes your government is now undergoing after 70 years, prompting me to ask:

what's really going on here?

In particular, when you and I first met, I had just returned from Washington (April 19), and a face-to-face meeting with Congress-

man Robert A. Roe, head of the most powerful science committee in the

U.S. Congress. As you can see from the attached correspondence (just

follow the dates), after our meeting Roe asked me for a memo of re-

commendations. . . then he took a long time (over 6 months) doing

"something". . . followed by a sudden flurry of announcements to the

media and various constituents, affirming (directly opposite NASA's

previous "position") that "NASA does plan to take new images of the

'Monuments of Mars'. . ." The very day the article in the WALL STREET

JOURNAL, announcing this development, appeared, was the same day

that Chairman Roe did an interview for radio (I have the tape) in

which he bluntly said, "I've seen the [Viking] pictures. . . and they

[the objects] don't appear natural. It would be stupid not to look!"

This from the Chairman of a major Congressional Committee in the U.S. Government!

As if this weren't enough, as I said, we also had a major scientific breakthrough this summer in the Cydonia research: we believe we've now actually decoded the first part of a mathematical message represented by the exquisite, redundant geometry we had

previously discovered at Cydonia. How do we know? Because the mathematics predict certain geophysical events, at specific latitudes on other planets in the solar system, and the Sun. . . and

when we look at the geodetic maps of these celestial bodies --
the
phenomena are there!

As I said many times in MONUMENTS: "Science is nothing, if
it's
not prediction."

In mid-August we published a technical paper on these
dramatic
findings -- including a series of very specific geophysical
pre-
dictions regarding what our Voyager unmanned spacecraft would
find at
Neptune (before it got to Neptune!). Because of the short
lead-time,
we published electronically in a world-wide computer-information
system
called "Compuserv" (the managers of Compuserv have specifically
told
me, incidentally, that they will give you free access from
Moscow, if
you want to communicate "live" with our on-going Mars Mission
Issues
conversation, where we are actively discussing the major issues
that I
raise in my "guest editorial." Or, you can simply access a vast
range
of information. We can discuss details of that fascinating
possibility
later, if you're interested).

Anyway, two weeks after we had published our "message
paper,"
Voyager flew by Neptune. . . and observed exactly what our
"Cydonia
equations" had predicted -- based on a set of mathematical
geophysical
principles discovered where there should be nothing capable of
giving
any valid predictions for events taking place on a planet in the
distant
outer solar system!

The only logical conclusion you can come to from these data,
is
that we indeed have successfully decoded a specific "message"
intended
by someone -- whomever "built" Cydonia -- to lead whomever would
discover "the Cydonia artifacts" to these specific geophysical
phenomena. Why? Because they are clues to how planets really
"work"
-- including our own Earth. And finding that out is essential
to
preserving any planet, if not possibly much more (we're
working on
additional possibilities right now).

So you put these remarkable developments together, and you wind up asking: "Are we the only smart guys on this planet, to have finally figured it out -- if only the beginning?!"

And the answer is: "Of course not."

Your next question might be: "If these facts were also known to members of the Government, particularly, since one key member -- a Chairman of a major Congressional Committee -- has now publicly admitted "they don't appear natural. . .") -- HOW WOULD THE GOV-ERNMENT BE ACTING?"

And, if you had, in fact (as I report in the editorial), briefed high-level members of both governments -- the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. -- and one of them subsequently had a brilliantly-equipped, working spacecraft actually in orbit around Mars for several months . . . before it mysteriously "quit," your next logical question would have to be:

DID THAT SPACECRAFT ACTUALLY FIND SOMETHING. . . SOMETHING WHICH COMPLETELY VERIFIES OUR VIKING INFORMATION, IF NOT RADICALLY EXTENDS IT. . . ?

But then you'd have to ask: "If that were true, if Mr. Gorbachev is truly holding absolute proof (from Phobos 2) of the most phenomenal discovery in history -- HOW WOULD HE BE ACTING?"

My conclusions -- if not some of the significant evidence which has led to these conclusions (the computer-enhanced Viking photographs, along with my official documents and letters) -- you now have before you my "editorial."

* * *

Olga, after a lot of soul-searching and weighing of our evidence, I think the confirmation that the Human Race Is Not Alone -- as Mr. Reagan repeatedly has provided us the clues (see "editorial") -- is the only thing "big enough" to have suddenly, almost overnight,

forced the radical events we have been witnessing. And I think pro-
viding the crucial, hard evidence of that New Reality, to a series of
major leaders at the top of key governments (including now, the Pope!)
-- both within and without the so-called "Communist world" -- is the
reason Mr. Gorbachev remains so confident that the major "restructuring"
he's planning for your country -- if not the world -- is actually going
to succeed.

Because, if I am right, this discovery represents an extraordinary New Beginning for Humanity. And Mr. Gorbachev, more now than
any other leader (since Ronald Reagan's Presidency ended), seems to
realize the power of that concept for creating needed Change. Just
compare television images of him and Mr. Bush. . .

Olga, I know this sounds bizarre. It would have appeared that
way to me, if anyone had seriously proposed this even a few months ago.
But the Mars data is inviolable, and the terrestrial clues are there --
including a series of truly curious events I didn't detail in the
editorial, for simple lack of space. These events include:

* * *

A September meeting, against the backdrop of developments sweeping out of Moscow and across all Eastern Europe, between ex-CIA
and ex-KGB agents, held in the United States -- ostensibly, to discuss
"possible interagency cooperation on international terrorism." One
key participant -- Mr. William Colby, former Director of the CIA --
as he was being interviewed on the ABC network program, NIGHTLINE,
along with Lt. General Fjodor Sherbak, former First Deputy Director
of the KGB, suddenly introduced into the conversation (for a total of
five occasions in the last four years) former President Reagan's
curious scenario. Colby:

"President Reagan said to Mr. Gorbachev one time, that if hostile MARTIANS [sic] landed on the Earth, we would be together against them. . . (emphasis added)."

* * *

In the context of what we have discovered on the Viking images,
and against Roe's own comments that "they don't appear natural,"
isn't
that just a little _too_ coincidental. . . ? What REALLY was
occurring
at that meeting? And remember, Mr. Gorbachev used to be the
equivalent
of Deputy Director of the KGB. . .

Or, take the following, truly bizarre sequence of events:

* * *

Within days of this strange repetition of Reagan's curious
"alien threat" -- and from a former head of the U.S.
intelligence
community no less -- came a bizarre, real-life "extraterrestrial
invasion story," appearing on the official TASS wires. The
"report"
originated out of Voronezh, a city of about 800,000 people south
of
Moscow. The correspondent, writing from Voronezh, seriously
des-
cribed a "landing" in a city park by a "glowing alien vehicle";
a
"stroll around the park" by its giant humanoid inhabitants; and
even the temporary "disappearance" of one of the severely
frightened
witnesses through the action of some kind of "ray of light,"
wielded
by the "aliens." The witnesses consisted of both children and
adults,
reportedly including one high-ranking police official from the
city,
Lt. Sergei A. Matveyev.

In early October, President Gorbachev visited East Germany,
to celebrate the 40th Anniversary of the German Democratic
Republic.
He then returned to Moscow, amid reports that Eric Honecker had
issued live ammunition and crackdown orders, against increasing
demonstrations for democracy across East Germany.

Then, suddenly, the preceding official TASS report, on an
"alien invasion of a Soviet City," appeared on official Soviet
television, in the official Party newspaper, SOVIETSKAYA
KULTURA,
and throughout the West -- including in THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE
WASHINGTON POST, and on our evening network television. . .

THE SAME DAY -- OCTOBER 9 -- THAT ERIC HONECKER WAS SUDDENLY
REPLACED BY EGAN KRENZ, AS HEAD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE
GDR.

Then, a few days after returning from his own quick trip to

Moscow, Egon Krenz, after instituting additional sweeping changes in the entire GDR government and Party structure, announced dramatically that the Berlin Wall "is obsolete" -- and three million East Germans flocked to West Berlin across one deliriously happy weekend, as we all watched in disbelief. . .

Mr. Reagan's "human family," at least in Eastern Europe, was taking shape with staggering rapidity and, eerily, precisely as Mr. Reagan had himself, repeatedly, "predicted" -- this time, literally against the backdrop of an officially-reported "alien invasion" of the Soviet Union. . .

What the hell was REALLY going on. . . a "public reminder" -- to a new, unenthusiastic Bush Administration in the West, and to a resisting Party structure in the GDR -- "to get with the Reagan-Gorbachev program" . . . or else Gorbachev would prematurely reveal the evidence (from Phobos 2) of REAL aliens (which is the last thing this American government wants)?

Is that why Bush (and Baker) are so obviously unenthusiastic about the upcoming Malta meetings? Because now, it's clearly "Gorby's game?" I (and a lot of other Western observers, who have remarked about it repeatedly in all our media the past few weeks) have seen men going to their own hangings -- who've looked happier!

* * *

Olga, as hard as this evidence, and as fantastic as my interpretation of the effects it is creating, might seem -- are the "real" events any less fantastic? And do the "it's all driven by the desperate Soviet economics" explanations really "fit?"

If it weren't for our now indisputable imaging and mathematical evidence, and the repeated statements of a former President of the United States (not to mention Chairman Roe's own statements and actions on behalf of our findings), I would say "yes." But the contrary

evidence is there, and almost overwhelming; something of this magnitude
-- unprecedented in all human history, therefore, CALLING FOR AN UN-
PRECEDENTED HUMAN RESPONSE -- _must_ be behind the staggering events
that are occurring. It is the only thing which could be
"bigger" than
"history as usual," creating a need for unprecedented actions.

If this analysis is true, the _real_ facts and decisions that
are being made are being hidden from us. These _must_ be made public,
I believe -- and publicly debated. Otherwise -- as I end the editorial
-- "glasnost" and "self-determination" are merely hollow phrases, being
parroted by leaders who are _all_ treating us like children -- which
has been precisely the problem for too much of human history!

I'll bet you didn't expect this, when you invited me to do a piece for you on our research! But, ask yourself: if the Viking evidence we have painstakingly assembled (some of which you now possess) is truly what we think, what would we be seeing as its effect upon the world -- given, that the leadership decided NOT to
tell us. . . yet. . . until we were somehow properly "prepared" to
handle it?! And what would that "preparation" look like?

You now know what I believe.

* * *

As I was finishing the final draft of what I have submitted, I realized that what we had originally discussed -- a presentation
of our "ET evidence," followed by a discussion of how it will affect
"the average Soviet citizen" -- was just not possible within a single
editorial; events have progressed too far and too rapidly: if this
hypothesis is accurate, both the "average Soviet citizen" and the
"average American citizen" are being deeply affected
_at_this_very_
moment, as are the "average citizens" of the GDR, Czechoslovakia,
Hungary, Poland, etc. -- if not the rest of humanity on Earth. These
effects are not going to occur in some hypothetical and distant
"future"; they are happening _right_now_ -- only , without the proper
background information, no one knows how to interpret these events.

Therefore, a good deal of the piece contains the crucial "background."

But, Olga, I still feel that readers need a further amplification of the immense consequences flowing from this now rapidly-advancing, unprecedented situation.

For instance, that one extraordinary, almost immediate effect -- with staggering, immediate consequences for everyone on Earth -- has been the visible, rapid retreat of the likelihood of nuclear annihilation. Even our Defense Secretary, Richard Cheney (sic), has turned (in less than two weeks,) from a vigilant "hawk," who was then giving speeches arguing that we "could not rest our national security on the future of one man, Mr. Gorbachev," into someone now aggressively promoting the need for about 180 billion dollars worth of U.S. defense cuts -- over the next three years -- regardless of whether President Gorbachev is still around! Clearly, Cheney feels there has been some kind of fundamental change in the Soviet Union. . . or in the larger situation embracing both the super-powers on this planet.

The immediate economic effect of this new attitude is also making itself felt, not only in the United States but also in your country: a so-called "peace-dividend," the monies that here-tofore have been lavished on these huge, super-expensive arms-stockpiles and high-tech weapons systems -- an almost uncountable number of conventional weapons, nuclear warheads, intercontinental missiles, planes, bombers, battleships, etc. -- is being rapidly "earmarked" for diversion into "productive," peaceful industries; I understand there are, even now, former rocket factories in the U.S.S.R. which have already been "converted" -- and are, in part, making bicycles!

Olga, because of the necessity of providing proper background to this whole extraordinary sequence of developments, I was only able -- in a line! -- to touch upon this immediate economic "dividend" of finding out the Human Race Is Not Alone. But there is more -- much more.

So, here is my additional proposal:

If you like what I have given you, and decide to run it, I would like to expand upon the "effects" of these developments in a "Part II." Since the economic impact of what is taking place is of crucial importance to both of our respective cultures, the process of "conversion" of 40 years of weapons industries to productive output should be of major interest to your readers -- particularly, if it is directly coupled (as it will be) to the exploration of what we've found on Mars.

For years, we have been discussing in the United States -- both inside and outside of NASA -- the potentially awesome terrestrial economic effects of establishing "space industries" in orbit, to exploit the unique resources and environments of outer space. But with massive weapons budgets and other constraints upon our federal budget, there have been no "extra" monies to pay for such developments. Your country, with its "MIR" space station and its various "materials experiments" conducted during the long "stay-time" in zero-gravity by cosmonauts in orbit, has developed far more experiences than we have in exploring the kinds of materials that one can uniquely make in orbit -- then send down to Earth. But even your space program has been limited in applying this developing technology, by the massive resources that have been going to the military, and by one other real constraint -- the current, prohibitively expensive necessity of taking all materials, to be processed, into space from Earth. The costs of lifting those resources into space for processing, with present, primitive rockets, is simply "killing."

All that dramatically can change -- if we pursue its exploration properly -- because of what we have discovered at Cydonia.

What I would like to cover in "Part II" is the stunning economic prospects for mining the Martian moons for these critical resources, and the resulting industrial renaissance these abundant,

unique materials could stimulate on Earth -- with all the resulting economic "fall-out" of new industries, new jobs, new markets, and new consumer goods. Many economic studies, carried out both in the United States and in the Soviet Union, indicate that with current space technology (such as our space shuttle) IT IS CHEAPER TO GO TO THE MARTIAN MOONS AND RETURN, THAN TO SEND MEN AND WOMEN OT THE SURFACE OF OUR OWN MOON! (One of our own MARS MISSION associates, Dr. Brian O'Leary, mentioned in the editorial, is an extensively published pioneer in many of these studies.)

The fact that the Soviet Phobos mission was directed at intensive study of the composition of the _moons_ of Mars, before its enigmatic "failure," is demonstration of the Soviet perception of eventual economic importance of these objects. _If_ we have indeed discovered a former extraterrestrial civilization once resident within the Martian system, the political and social impetus to exploring fully its potential -- if adequately publicized -- could easily create an economic renaissance which could dramatically affect the economies of both our countries -- particularly, if we _jointly_ agree to explore the Martian "ruins," and similarly, to _jointly_ develop the technologies to exploit the moons of Mars.

The result could be a swift, almost painless, economic transition -- for those major industries in both our countries which currently employ millions of workers in the production of weapons of destruction -- rockets, warheads, advanced electronic avionics, and all the other high-tech gadgetry used in making war. These same skills and technologies, employed through such a "Mars conversion program," could usher in a literal New Age for everyone on Earth.

But of course, if I am right, the greatest benefit of all will be in the dramatic new perspective that these discoveries will give to every person living on this planet. There is almost a "spiritual dimension" to discovering this truth -- that Humanity is NOT alone before the Universe. This, I believe, is why those Orthodox Russian priests were invited into the Phobos 2 Control Center. . . and why Mr. Gorbachev met with Pope John-Paul this morning just prior to

his first face-to-face meeting with the current American President;
invoking the spiritual leaders on this planet in helping us to "break the news" will be _essential_ to successful "preparation" of the planet for the truth.

Well, that's it for now. I eagerly look forward to hearing from you regarding all of this. I know it's a LOT to take in all at once. But, just look at your television screen this weekend.
. .
Does any other explanation really fit?

Enjoy. . .

P.S. I had another thought. If you agree that this should now be publicly debated -- and in both our countries -- I would suggest you might propose to the American television network news program, NIGHTLINE, that they do a _joint_ program on this information with your television program, in Moscow. You could contact Terry Irving, the NIGHTLINE producer Ted Koppel assigned some months ago to research our story; we've met with Irving in Washington at the ABC News Bureau for several hours, now, and have provided him with all the images and analyses -- including now a copy of my "editorial".

===== END OF FILE
=====

* THE U.F.O. BBS - <http://www.ufobbs.com/ufo> *
