

fran ridge <franridge42@gmail.com>

Science and the ETH

1 message

fran ridge <franridge42@gmail.com> To: The-Lunascan-Project@googlegroups.com Sat, Feb 23, 2019 at 10:40 AM

My friend and colleague, Mike Swords, recently took the time to write a nice paper, I think entitled, "Is the Idea of Extraterrestrial Visitations a Reasonable One?" I just had to put it up on the NICAP site and I intend to do the same with it and my meager response on the Lunascan Project site.

http://www.nicap.org/eth/swords/

I wish I had the time to do a nice paper on the subject as well. My experience with the Lunascan Project and scientists would make a good companion piece to go with Mike's treatise on the ETH.

The latest example is really the best. Paul Davies heads the data analysis team of the very successful LRO mission at NASA and wrote papers before and during the mission about the search for alien artifacts and the the importance of looking for them. If I hadn't had the idea all during my tenure since 1996 and the search with Lunascan, I'm sure after reading the papers he had published I would have pulled out all the remaining stops. But he was definitely beating the same drum. And then in June of 2016 I almost fell out of my chair while looking at LRO images of Paracelsus C on the lunar far side. I made numerous web pages, we conducted our own analysis, then Mark Carlotto joined me and Ananda Sirisena to produce our analysis both in printed version and a YouTube video. I then submitted our findings to John Keller who was the actual head of LRO, whom I had befriended and was supportive on other ideas such as the mystery of the Blair Cuspids and the RIPTILA Mission. I later sent these reports to Davies because apparently Keller wasn't sharing our results with him. All we wanted was for LRO to tell us what we were seeing. A natural explanation for such an unbelievable observation or the same type of excitement we at the Lunascan Project shared about what might not be an active alien base but evidence of an ancient alien structure, complete with ramped up lunar regolith to reinforce a section of an old rocket stage, actually two of them! And impacted meteors in the reinforcement indicating that thousands of years had passed. I was sure they would at least want to use this to get public support for an unmanned lander. But nothing happened. No response. No explanation. But I say nothing happened. Something actually DID happen. My friend Keller has since ceased all contact with me. And if you zoom in on the lunar far side and know right where to look, the image with its well-lit, well-defined structures has been replaced with a different image, one from a different angle at a different time and it looks NOTHING like what we found. We were aware of all the images of the location and knew there were such shots, but we always use the best angles for all searches, just like NASA or anybody else would. But for some reason, when we were investigating the Blair

Cuspids years ago LRO went in and actually took more close-ups. And we were able to explain the cuspids as shadows cast by boulders down deep inclines. It was something LRO liked. But Paracelsus C was different.

It isn't over. But what Mike said is true. There is a thin line that suddenly changes possibilities into probabilites and the scientific world doesn't always adjust very well.