

# CRep235

Tue, Jun 02, 2026 9:20PM 2:11:21

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Curious Realm, rebranding, cryptozoology, paranormal, Ken Gerhard, Anne Celine, para investigation, Bigfoot, Mothman, Loch Ness Monster, Sleeping Dog, Jeremy Corbell, UFO documents, peer review, scientific methods., UFOs, declassification, government data, forward-looking infrared, Syria video, MQ-9 Reaper, parallax effect, Tic Tac incident, MK Ultra, Havana syndrome, chemtrails, nanotechnology, religious implications, disclosure, national security.

## SPEAKERS

Speaker 2, Speaker 1, Speaker 4, Speaker 8, Speaker 5, Speaker 7, Speaker 6, Speaker 3

---



Speaker 1 00:00

I'm coming to you from the city of the Weir, exploring topics from the esoteric and unexplored to dimensions unknown, shining a light of truth on the darkest corners of our reality. Welcome to



Speaker 2 00:34

the

S

**Speaker 1 00:35**

Curious Realm, you Well, hello everybody. Hope you're all doing well. Hope you've all had a great week. Welcome to episode 235 our whole new show look been a long time since we launched Curious Realm, and since then we've had like a rebranding of some things. It was hard for me to get rid of the moving Scar Field that has been there since the days of the original Dudes and Beer live streams. When we started doing it, we didn't start doing video until Covid, actually. Once, once the lockdown happened, we, we began doing video every week, because I had the time to produce it, had the time to do it right. It was always one of those, if, if I, if I was to do video from the studio back in the day of Dudes and Beer, it was like three of us sitting around a table, four of us sitting around a table. So it's like, what am I gonna do? Like, put a 360 cam and let people tune in with VR goggles, and they can like look around the table while we drink beer and talk about whatever. But once we started doing it, it became something that I really kind of got into it became the fact of I can't imagine being an audio only show anymore, especially for the information that we share on screen, the data that we put up on screen, the graphs, the documents, all kinds of things. It really is a supplement to the show that goes on, so it was time for a rebrand, time for a redesign of the live show. If you like what we did, let us know. If you don't like what we did, especially let us know. As always, let us know if you don't like what we're putting out there. But our show tonight, I am more than excited for our good friend Mike Turber, will be joining us in the second segment as our pre-record guest, talking about the second tranche of documents that have been released by the Department of War. The videos, most of which, oddly enough, out of like the nine that were released, I want to say like five or six of them were in the new documentary Sleeping Dog that Jeremy Corbell put out before the videos were released and declassified, so we get into that a little bit, and our guest in the first part, I'm very happy to bring them back, both of them are good friends of the show, they've been on numerous times. The first guest is our good friend Ken Gerhard. He is the author of The Essential Guide to Big Foot, as well as so many other books that you can find over at [kengerhard.com](http://kengerhard.com) forward slash store. That's the Essential Guide to Mothman, Essential Guide to Loch Ness Monsters, Big Bird, so many other things, and our guest, in addition to him, is the amazing Anne Celine. Her new book, Signals from the Elephant Cage, which I wrote the forward to, is now out and available on Amazon. Stop on by, you can check that out. You can pick that up over [anselen.com](http://anselen.com) forward slash store, we are talking about the topic of para investigation, and when I say para investigation, folks, it's, it's everything paranormal, and can pardon me, you know, I am very, very staunch on the fact that crypto zoology is different than paranormal, but sadly and horribly it's all wrapped up in what is not normal. So I loathe using the term paranormal with crypto zoology, because I truly see crypto zoology as the as as an on ramp to biology in so many ways,

S

**Speaker 3 04:47**

so thank you for having us on once again, Christopher. It's always good to see you, brother.

S

**Speaker 1 04:51**

Always, man.

S

**Speaker 3 04:52**

Yeah, man, so like in zoology, you know, you have lumpers and split. In terms of, you know, how people classify animals, you have a taxonomic system for classifying animals, and there are some zoologists that will say, well, you know, a puma, a mountain lion is a mountain lion, and then there the splitters will say, well, there's actually 18 subspecies of mountain lions, you know, so I think that's part of it. It's just, you know, some of us are prone to kind of lump a lot of these, you know, mysteries together, because they all kind of strike a similar chord in terms of, you know, our fascination with them, but John Tenney, who I respect as a great paranormal investigator, you know, he would often argue with me and say, "Look, man, it's all cryptozoology is paranormal. It's not normal, that's literally the definition of paranormal, you know, it's not a normal.. so you know there is an argument to be made there, I guess. And then, of course, you know, we were always talking about the three of us in different conversations about, you know, patternicity and how people are just, you know, wanting to connect things sometimes, and so for whatever reason and convenience or just the whim of the moment, but you know people that are prone to patternicity often will try to find meaningful connections between, you know, ghost hunting and UFOs and crypto zoology, and it kind of all gets embedded together. So, but I appreciate what you said. I feel like I'm kind of the last of my kind in many ways, or one of the last, that is, you know, the founders of my field, cryptozoology, were actual zoologists, and they followed a pretty scientific methodology. And in the 80s, I think we had a heyday when we had the International Society of Cryptozoologists, which was, you know, Bernard Heuvelman's president and Roy Mackel vice president, and you had all these guys at Grover Krantz. It was all scientists, and they were all kind of mavericks, you know, because they were willing to accept the ideas that there were undiscovered animals and things. But, of course, through the years, culturally things have kind of changed in terms of how cryptozoology is viewed, and of course the term cryptid is now often used to describe things like skin walkers and aliens and you know black eyed kids and things that that the founding fathers would never accept as yeah no crypto zoology those seem seem to be completely different types of of phenomenon

S

**Speaker 1 07:38**

you know and and that brings up a huge point of the fact of, yeah, I guess, I guess you would talk about technically the taxonomy of these phenomena, and the fact of, yeah, when you're talking rake, pale walkers, even windy, go stuff like that, like those traditionally are not cryptozoologic creatures in that kind of way

S

**Speaker 3 08:04**

to me, they're not, no, like I said, I'm kind of a purist in terms of crypto zoology, but someone else may enter the field, and there are people now in the field who kind of fall more of like the what I describe as the Killian kind of philosophy, which is based on John Keel, he was the first guy, I mean, you could go to Charles Fort, probably before that, and then we all know that Charles Ford, in the early 1900s was trying to find these, these connections between all these different things, but John Keel, based on my research, is the first researcher that tried to connect, for example, Bigfoot to UFOs, he did that in his book, *Strange Creatures from time and space*, which was published in 1970 and then throughout the early 70s there were other researchers like Jerome Clark and others that were basically trying to, you know, they were writing articles in *UFO Review*, *flying saucer review*, and some of those popular UFO mags in the 70s would often feature Bigfoot on the cover, and things like that, so those are the types of ways where you can see kind of a paradigm shift, and you know where people, the newer generations of researchers, kind of are influenced by that, and as they come up, they say, oh, you know, Bigfoot, you know, maybe Bigfoot is from a UFO or interdimensional or whatever, and so I think that's part of how we find ourselves where we are at this point,

S

**Speaker 1 09:24**

absolutely, absolutely, and that kind of bounces us right over to Anne, and Anne's world, which, which is the world of paranormal, not just not just paranormal research, but parapsychology in its true sense, the idea of how does how does psychology play into these things? How do, how do the way that humans observe things to begin with, and the tropes that we have, not just historically in our mind, play into them, but the tropes that are even going on in modern society. One of the one of the big things that we talk about regularly with. With our mutual friend Ryan Edwards is, is the way that numerous of the like a Wendigo is a prime example. The concept of that has drastically changed over the last 10 years since creepy pasta and all that kind of stuff came onto the scene, as opposed to the traditional stories of Wendigo, and what the, what the appearance was, which was once again much more paranormal than cryptozoological in that kind of way. So, it's, it's interesting to see how the tropes of society are playing in on these and moving them in that kind of way.

S

**Speaker 4 10:40**

Yeah, no, it's interesting, because I mean, I think that at least right now in my current knowledge and belief system, we humans love to be afraid, we get that adrenaline rush, that's why we have horror movies, that's why we have thrill rides, that's, you know, all that kind of stuff.

S

**Speaker 2 11:01**

Yep.

S

Speaker 4 11:02

And putting that aside, though, I think that we also have things epigenetically in our history that I mean, because if you went back, do you remember how far back it was, that book that of yours, where I mean, we wouldn't even recognize our, you know, our

S

Speaker 3 11:22

current English language?

S

Speaker 4 11:23

No, the extinction book.

S

Speaker 3 11:26

Oh gosh, extinct animals.

S

Speaker 4 11:30

Yeah, like it was. It wasn't long ago that if we could time travel, then we wouldn't even recognize a lot of the plant - there's plants, animals, and everything, and and just how we functioned there, you know, and then when we got into the, you know, the tribes, the villages, and it became us, and then everything out there was to be feared, and so all these things get passed down, so we're kind of connecting to two different things, I think you know, epigenetically the monsters of our past, and also parts of ourselves, but also just that thrill, and that that rush of adrenaline, and everything. And so, of course, we're going to turn Sasquatch into a monster, you know. Of course, we're going to make something look a little scarier as time goes on, or you know, create the creepy pastas, because what's some, you know, a favorite past time around a campfire?

S

Speaker 3 12:27

Yeah, telling scary stories.

S

Speaker 4 12:29

Yeah, exactly. So,

S

Speaker 1 12:31

and I

S

Speaker 3 12:32

gotta.. I'm sorry, just go ahead. Another one saw an article on the news this morning that a recent, I guess, just a very recent survey of what people want to see at the movies, and it was horror. Yeah, that was like the number one that people want to be scared. So I was, yeah, that's true. Well, victory stories,

S

Speaker 1 12:50

yeah. Not just that, it's also it's also the fact of we, we want something familiar, we want something that leans on our culture, on our history, all kinds of things, and we've talked about that before, Ken. Whenever I've had you on, and we've discussed topics like Dog Man, and things like that, where, when you get into the locations where these sightings of things like that are, it's very interesting to see that they have cultural ties to stories like that, you know, be they Germanic or French, Greek cultures, things like that, where lycanthropy, that kind of stuff was regularly talked about in their histories, that kind of thing. So the idea of that being a part of the identification of something, and something that we just tend to automatically go to, almost as a comfort blanket, so to speak.

S

Speaker 4 13:52

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 13:54

absolutely. But I think you know, as we talk about fear and being afraid, I mean, there's that old saying about, or was it Lovecraft, that was talking about, you know, there's nothing scarier than the unknown, you know, the true unknown. If we don't have the answers that we don't understand, and that's kind of what the common thread that runs through all of these mysteries is, that there's that element of fear because we don't understand exactly what any of these phenomenon represent,

S

Speaker 4 14:24

but also to your point as well, we know we've created this knowledge around like the werewolf, we know how the werewolf functions, we know how well, I mean, we don't know, but that's what we've created a schema around it, like an association, and then you know, same with Bigfoot. I mean, but you have the people that are in the different camps that are like, I'm happy in this belief system with Sasquatch. This is what feels known and right, which then kind of goes into, of course, when we offer up different opinions. And as we are researchers and stuff, if we, what's like, contest a belief system,

S

Speaker 3 15:06

yeah, challenge it, challenge

S

Speaker 4 15:07

it, it can really create a crumbling of a person, which is really, really hard, and I think that's one of the, you know, talking about one of the things that's so hard with investigations, and in our field, it's offering up new insights without, you know, having that, creating that, I guess it would be dissonance, right? Because you may, you know, so

S

Speaker 1 15:34

well, offering insights without creating a confrontational atmosphere,

S

Speaker 2 15:39

yeah,

S

Speaker 1 15:41

that's the most HR way to say it, quite literally, and I mean, like, I had it happen, I was just telling, and Godspeed to all you travelers on your way back from contact in the desert right now, that that is a hardcore show, like it ends Monday night, like crazy stuff. So, like, there are people travel, yeah, like they have sessions all the way through Monday. It's crazy. And I was just speaking with one of my friends from Contact in the Desert this morning, talking with her, and I was sharing a story about my Lyft driver, EDC Electric Daisy Carnival, was going on during my show in Vegas, so it took a long time to get from the airport to the dispensary to my hotel, so I had about 40 minutes, and I'm talking with this Lyft driver the whole time, and we immediately just, he brings up the have you seen the disclosure files, this was when the first batch of files had just come out, and I was like, oh, absolutely, and we got into it, and then we got into the death of David Wilcock and his suicide, and, and where that came from, and where that sourced from, and that's when he was confronted, because he, he began the conversation of cosmic disclosure and Corey Goode, and all kinds of things, and when I revealed to him that no, no, Corey Goode said that all of that was fiction, that he wrote it, that it's his concept, that he's busy suing Gaia Network for continuing the show without him, and that anybody else who said that they had these experiences was delusional. I could literally see his, his,

S

Speaker 4 17:33

yeah,

S

Speaker 1 17:34

columns of understanding of what he thought to be real begin to crack and crumble, like in front of my eyes, where, like, he had, he never knew this information, and suddenly he was confronted with something that, like, he spent the last decade deep diving into these concepts and into these people, and, and following every rabbit hole that they dig, only to find out that it's all based on fiction, you know, and that's that's that's rough, that's rough, and yeah, that's something as investigators that we have to be careful of, you know, we have to be careful how we approach these conversations with experiencers, and at the same time we have to be open-minded, even as scientists, to the fact of the extraordinary, to the fact of the strange and weird and unexplained, you know, it's it's a weird didactic that we kind of have to live in and court, right? No,

S

Speaker 4 18:36

it definitely is, and it's one of those things where this is a perfect example of why you know we have to be so careful, and why we really need to be, you know, I think have more heart and and intelligence in regards to like making sure that we know that our actions people really look to us, you know, for these things, and then a whole world will be created in somebody's life based on things that we do, and I don't think that you know, or that we present, or whatever, and I, and I wish that more people really took that to heart, so yeah, now

S

Speaker 1 19:22

when it, when it comes, especially to to that science versus belief point, and I don't like that I bring it up all the time in my presentations that I give, I have a whole whole slide of a scientist fighting somebody, like in a boxing ring, but, but quite literally, it is, it is the fact of, and so many people on both sides, both the side of science and the side of woo, do not like hearing from the other at all. Yeah, like I know, I know a good three or four researchers here in Texas. Who will utterly and immediately dismiss anything science says, like the first thing out the gate is they're lying straight out, and it's hard to get through that facade. It's hard to, it's hard to find some kind of common ground to approach things with, at that point, you know, because, because it is one of those, you've, you've decided not to listen to new data,

S

Speaker 4 20:32

right. Well, and it also shows kind of where their mental status is, and it could be an indicator of some unhealed trauma, or you know, different things, and again, How do you, how do we approach that? I wish that there was, like, a course, like when we get into these things, and we want to be speakers, and we want to, you know, I know that there's not, and that's wishful thinking, but you know, I mean, like, I recently learned, so if I want to conduct certain types of what they were like surveys, right?

S

Speaker 3 21:09

Yeah, gathering data,

S

Speaker 4 21:12

right? So when I'm in college and I get to that point where I can then start doing surveys, it has to be vetted in a way that it protects the general public, because there are things that you can ask people that will re-traumatize them, and they, I mean, it's a whole legal thing, and this is like that's just a questionnaire, yeah. So, yeah, I mean, what are you, know,

S

**Speaker 1 21:41**

it's it, yeah, it is the fact of you, you have to, you have to phrase things very carefully, no, no different than any therapist, or or something like that, there's a reason why those, those kind of atmospheres are are built around that kind of question for me, you know, and even to the point of science, like scientifically, that's why most, most things, scientific surveys, things like that, are written dispassionately. The purpose is, is to remove that from it as much as possible,

S

**Speaker 5 22:19**

you know. So,

S

**Speaker 3 22:21**

yeah, well, I mean, one of the big themes this past weekend in Kentucky, and we talked about it when I got back, is you know, you can't argue against beliefs. No, I mean, there's there's no argument there between belief and science. So, you know, the idea of trying to convert someone or open someone's mind, I mean, I guess that sounds kind of negative. Now I'm hearing myself say it out loud, but you know, if we look at the history, I mean, centuries ago, if they, you know, if there was someone that took a kind of a scientific attitude, you know, you know, the stars are not gods floating around up there, then you're a heretic, right? At that point, you know, it was basically religion, and you know, in the West, it was, of course, the Roman Catholic Church for centuries, or you know, whatever religion around the world. And then, you know, in the beginning, at the end of the 18th century, beginning of the 19th century, when you started to have, like, the birth of paleontology, and you know, people were beginning to accept that, yes, these bones being found in the ground were not gods or giants from a past civilization, they were animals that lived in the past, or whatever, and then, of course, Darwinism, and all that kind of stuff, and even, even at that time, in the mid 19th century, there were a lot, there was a lot of soul searching that went on with academics and scientists who are still maybe from a Christian or Catholic background, and still kind of, we're struggling with that, you know, science versus spirituality, religion, and how those could coexist, right? So I think, as science has kind of, you know, certainly gotten a much more of a foothold in our society, in terms of being able to, for you know, most people to accept or understand that there are explanations to things that we often, for in the past, considered to be miraculous and magical, and so forth, but no, there's actually scientific explanation as to why this, you know, the whatever, an eclipse, or, you know, what have you, but, and I'm sure I'm not going to make any, I guess I won't ostracize anyone on your show, but I don't make,

S

**Speaker 1 24:26**

I don't make a lot of friends sometimes too. Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 24:29

but I mean, what percentage of the world would you know, Christopher? You know, worldwide, how many people, what percentage of the population of the world is still pretty religious or spiritual? Oh, would you say 90% say

S

Speaker 1 24:41

close to 85 to 90% worldwide out there, and that's beyond Christian major religions

S

Speaker 3 24:47

around the world. You know, you certainly have most people are still pretty religious and spiritual, and it's up to the individual in terms of deciding how science or if science can be. Incorporated into their reality, you know, and coexist with their religion or their sexual beliefs. Well,

S

Speaker 1 25:07

and you know that is quite literally one of the.. and this is why I love having the two of you all together, because, because frequently we are having adjunct conversations whenever I have both of you on, and that is that is that connection that that weird weirding connection between science and the paranormal, and I will bring up an image that I bring up in every single one of my talks to preface this, because you just brought it up, Ken, and that's quantum entanglement. This is actively the image, this isn't like a representation of people. The image that I have up right now is basically a yin yang. For you listeners out there who aren't on video, it is. It isn't like, hey, squint and lean to the left, and it's a yin yang, like it is precisely a yin yang, and this isn't like the graphic representation of two entangled photons, this is an actual electro scanned image from the microscope of two entangled photons. This is what cultures have been in religions older than Christianity have been talking about for millennia, so the day that that picture won the Nobel Peace Prize for science and for physics, the whole conversation changed. The whole conversation changed suddenly. You, you had quantum physicist, and the whole idea of, you know, holographic reality being so much more the conversation, the idea of strange powers like psi, remote viewing, that kind of stuff, the lab work into that suddenly took a spotlight, because, yeah, we find out that that ninth grade science concept of us all being 90% empty space and even being entangled with a Sasquatch right now, beyond seeing one person, you are entangled with a Sasquatch right now. All right, it goes deeper,

S

Speaker 6 27:19

it goes deeper, you know,

S

**Speaker 1 27:24**

it's that's the actual science of it, so it's it's really wild to think about once again, where, where this discussion should even stop, should it stop, because once again, we, we know that these connections are out there. We know that things are entangled in strange ways. We know that there are species discovered every year, literally on the order of 1000s of them, most of them insects and bugs, deep sea creatures, all kinds of things like that, but 1000s every year, remnant animals found, so the idea of a Sasquatch being out there, you know, I'm one of those that's like, feel free to find me a full skeleton of a bear out in the woods, I'll wait,

S

**Speaker 2 28:14**

yeah,

S

**Speaker 1 28:15**

you know, feel free to find me a full carcass of a deer, even then you rarely find that you find bits and pieces, something like that. So, what scientifically.. let's, let's start switching this conversation now. As far as these topics go, can what do you think? Because we've, we've had the conversation on the show before, I think it will take a whole lot more than a picture. I think it's going to take a whole lot more than a video, but what we do get, whenever, like, and I'll bring up the example of the rare ocelot, and I believe it was the Philippines, all in the last year that they have gotten video of from video traps, things like that, that they have thought was extinct for generations, that they have found is back, and it's, it's through that kind of technology, it's through this kind of work that they, they weren't even searching for that, they were doing work on other things and came across that, but what that does is allow now for good science to happen on something that people thought was extinct. I'm sure there was more than one researcher who was like, "We should be looking for these, because people are still saying that they're out there, and if they're out there, they're, they're more than endangered, and we need to take care of them, you know. Same thing with the thylacine stuff like that, so what do you,

S

Speaker 3 29:45

that's a good, good example of where there'd be perhaps a delineation between, you know, different aspects of, you know, the unexplained that we investigate, so in my field, yes, in order, you know, when we say. Need to, for them to accept it, you know, we're basically talking about the scientific establishment, right? Because we would want, for example, Sasquatch to be identified as a species and classified and accepted, and then it's in textbooks and things. Yeah, so you know, we do, we do require empirical science, requires empirical evidence for that, so no amount of trace, physical trace evidence, like footprints or films, eyewitness testimony. It doesn't matter how great a circumstantial case you can put together for the existence of something like Sasquatch, but ultimately zoology and anthropology, and all the fields that would, that would make that decision, they would need something physical, so even a tooth or a DNA, which is where I think it's actually headed. I think that's going to be the most sensible way to prove it. DNA, a tooth, a body, a bone, but you know, regarding other aspects of the paranormal, things like psychic phenomenon, and you know, extraterrestrials and things like that, I guess. Extraterrestrials, you could also potentially have some kind of physical evidence. Yeah, yeah, but let's talk about the parapsychology, and like kind of the thing that Anne's writing about in her new book, which, yeah, you know, what is it going to take to prove something like that to science, because you're certainly dealing with more of a right, I mean, am I kind of onto a,

S

Speaker 4 31:25

yeah, well,

S

Speaker 3 31:26

an idea here, or

S

Speaker 4 31:27

remember the morning of the parasite, and I was like, oh, because I was wondering about the microbiology, and wondering about the, you know, projection of like synchronicities, and all that kind of stuff, and if we could somehow figure out how it looks on a micro level to see how far, yeah, wow, you know, like

S

Speaker 3 31:53

micro, as opposed to macro, you know, breaking things down to you to the cellular, molecular level, but yes, I mean, I know that universities have had, you know, parapsychology, you know, this was probably more in the 70s, I don't know how much, and you guys have talked about remote viewing and government programs that actually tried to explore some of these, but in terms of, you know, proving it, and that's another thing I've noticed about many of our friends in the ghost hunting field, there are some researchers out there that are trying to collect audio recordings and get film of phenomenon, stuff like that, but it seems like a lot of people in the paranormal field, the ghost hunting field, seem to be in it more for kind of the experience and the personal validation, or the connection to the spirit world,

S

Speaker 1 32:38

sure,

S

Speaker 3 32:38

and kind of, you know, forming a bridge between the spiritual world and the physical world, but many of our friends tell us, you know, they go on these expedition investigations, and it's like something happened, and it's like everybody experienced it, and there's a kind of a shared experience. Yeah,

S

Speaker 4 32:55

well, and it's hard to, because we have no idea if we're actually the ones that are doing it and projecting it, yeah, we, there's there's no way to tell what it is, but we automatically, or they automatically project it outwards that it was a whatever fits that moment, demon child, you know, somebody's grandma, you know, whatever

S

Speaker 1 33:19

it is, I literally have a rote phrase that I use on the show that I've used with both of you, that I use with numerous guests, that I use when I speak, and it goes like this. I believe that there is a large hominid being roaming the woods of North America and beyond known as Sasquatch, but I also believe that there is something else that is willing to use the tropes of our mind and our want of experience as a point of ingress to this dimension. Yeah, that could be that could be your CE five experience of human-initiated alien contact, that could be your experience at a Ouija board during or or a seance, or your experience of asking questions to a spirit as you walk through a house, that could be you're sitting up against a tree and going, please, God, let tonight be the night that I see the big hairy one, you know, all of those are literally you opening the window for the vampire, the now the question comes to bear, is the experience the actual experience, or have you charged the environment, which, which is why I say, like, if you're going out on a paranormal investigation, if you're going out somewhere that you regularly squatch and you think is an area of high activity. Don't go digging rabbit holes, don't go watching videos all night, don't go letting it rent. Get your rote checklist of gear ready, get it ready. We got the, we got the gear, we got the map, we got gas in the car, we got snacks and water. Cool, put it away and don't think about it till. You leave till you go till you get there, because the more you think about it quantumly, the more you are affecting

S

Speaker 2 35:08

it.

S

Speaker 1 35:09

You know, the more it's that whole idea of the more you think about, did I leave the iron on? Does it actually turn the iron on and burn your apartment down eventually, because you thought about it so much, you know, that that's that's kind of the point, and yeah, you know, even even to hear you can scientifically say that, like, you, you may be adversely affecting the outcome of your experiment in that kind of way, I even put it into the fact of at the very least, what you're doing by doing that is polishing the filter through which you're going to be looking at your data. Absolutely,

S

**Speaker 3 35:53**

I just, you know, I was just having a conversation with someone, a colleague of mine who investigates Bigfoot, much like I do, and in active areas is constantly encountering these, you know, ghost lights and different light phenomenon and orbs and things like that, and it's a recurring thing, and I don't doubt he's documented it in film and different things. I've been investigating Sasquatch for decades in active areas all over North America. I've never seen an orb or a weird light or anything like that. So, it's almost like he's somehow, or each of us are in a different reality of our research, you know. And I'm not.. I don't know if he's projecting that, but as you said, somehow stimulating or affecting the environment or inviting a type of energetic thing, yeah, you know, basically allows that to happen in his when he's out there, sure, just a wet blanket and all that stuff goes away.

S

**Speaker 1 36:55**

Well, you know, it's it's interesting that you bring that up, because that's exactly the point, is that, that you know, and it's, I think it's more than I wouldn't say wet blanket, you, you, I wear my, I wear my skeptic ass like friggin Superman, dude, like it is always under my clothes, ready to go, but proudly so, because my job as a skeptic, your job as a scientist also is to always be looking for the data that sways your decision, always be looking for the data that changes your formed hypothesis or your tested hypothesis that makes you go, ooh, well, that's interesting, you know, because I'm not there to poo poo people's experiences or data that they've collected, I'm there to encourage people to please let's start looking at it dispassionately as data, because that when you bring it to a scientist, finally the day you finally do, the second you say I have some evidence for you to look at, buddy. There's a whole different realm of questions that start like immediately, because you've said I have evidence that's total, that's a totally different realm of questions to a scientist than I have some anomalous data that I'd like you to look at. Yeah,

S

**Speaker 1 38:20**

if you come at them with anomalous data, the mind is open in a totally different way than I have evidence. If you have evidence, my job is now to disprove your evidence,

S

**Speaker 2 38:30**

right? Yeah, like

S

Speaker 1 38:31

literally, that's my job as a scientist, is to challenge your evidence and make you prove your hypothesis. Now,

S

Speaker 3 38:38

yeah,

S

Speaker 1 38:39

you know, so it's, it's funky trying to get people to understand that, and, and to dispassionately disconnect themselves from that experience that they've had, and to understand that even, even if what's found in their audio, or their video, or their photograph is quantifiable, that it doesn't remove the moment of experience in question.

S

Speaker 3 39:05

Absolutely, well stated.

S

Speaker 1 39:08

Thank you. Thank you. But what can people begin to do, those that are those that are out there right now, even those that are investigating to confirm their own belief, can what can they do to gather good data? What can they do to begin to begin going down that path of getting, getting good data when they go out in the field that is usable by, by somebody.

S

Speaker 3 39:38

Well, I'd like to, you know, kind of go backwards. Sure, which is, would you know, I think the most important thing that you just touched on is, is a system of peer review. So, what I've found in my experience is that many researchers in this field, or paranormal field, tend to be very insular. In terms of, you know, it's their, it's their evidence, it's their data, and you know, they're reluctant oftentimes to let other people kind of objectively challenge it, and that that doesn't happen in the paranormal field. People want to protect their evidence, it that has a value to them, you know, it kind of reaffirms why they're in the field, or whatever, or that they're capable of collecting good, good evidence, or good data. For example, I had a colleague who I really respect in the field of cryptozoology, he thought he had some good evidence of a Sasquatch, and he turned it over to a very respected researcher, but didn't give him any information or background at all. He just said, look at this, you know, basically there was no, there was no tendency to want to influence, or, you know, you know, plant a seed of idea of what you know, it was just, you know, objectively, yeah. Tell me what you think of this, yeah. And just doing it like that is really, you know, unfortunately, I think very lacking in our field. I think people are, you know, even if someone's going to share some evidence with a colleague in the field, they're probably going to tell a back story and why they think this is, you know, you know, so you're already kind of tainting the, the evidence and trying to win favor from, from up here. So, yeah. Anyways, I know that kind of dodged your, no, no, no, you did not.

S

Speaker 1 41:32

You did not. Peer peer

S

Speaker 3 41:33

review is the really the lacking element, I think, in our field, and if we can't do it amongst ourselves, then certainly it's going to be much harder to go to the next level and to go to the academic community and try to present it to a legit PhD or scientist who's really going to challenge you in ways that rapier it your

S

Speaker 3 41:53

colleague in the field might not so

S

Speaker 1 41:56

well and that's just it you know there there is that a that want of shared support in that kind of way, that want of confirmation of what, what you've spent good time in the field gathering, but yes, I firmly confirm, confer with you here in the fact that, and concur with you that we need more independent data like that, we need more peer review, honest peer review, and that's that's the thing, finding a ride or die, finding somebody whose opinion you value, who isn't just a stroking your ego or b trying to give you the want of experience, the confirmation of experience in that kind of way, someone that you're willing to allow to challenge your statements and beliefs is massively important, massively, because, yeah, most of it, and I understand, believe me, like I have a researcher, researcher who comes on my show who hadn't been on my show in almost two years, because she came on and probably about six seven months after somebody started doing tours on her work, yeah, yeah, 00 credit given to the person that discovered this thing, nothing, nothing, so it's it's hard because you do good hard field research, you do that kind of deep digging library research. You would like to at least be notated by people when they go out and do tours, and and base a whole day of tour on your work. You know, it'd be kind of cool. So I understand the want to be insular and the want to protect your squatching spot, you know, the even the, even I suppose, the want to protect their identities, because they don't like their pictures taken, Ken, but, but these, it can be hard with that data to to allow somebody to have experience, because it can be tough when somebody comes up when you've already read circled it, then that is actively part of the problem, because go ahead, please.

S

Speaker 4 44:22

If I may,

S

Speaker 1 44:23

no, no.

S

Speaker 4 44:23

I also think that it's something that should be done when people have their data and stuff like that, when you know whatever they've gathered, if they've already come to a conclusion, which most people sit there and go, "Oh, look what I found, I found this, and this is what it is, I think that everybody that has done that, when they do that, they need to then ask themselves, why do I want it to be this?

S

Speaker 1 44:50

Yeah,

S

Speaker 4 44:50

because when you ask yourself that, you know, why do I want it to be this, and then you start reflecting on yourself and then. Your biases and your background, you can kind of see patterns, and then you know, at that point you can kind of look at it a little bit more objectively, if you can look at yourself that way, and be like, okay, so maybe I'm projecting this on here, and you know, and then lean into curiosity to be like, I want to see what somebody else thinks that doesn't have my background and my bias and everything like that, but again, I feel like it's wishful thinking. I don't know how many people are actually willing to do that in our field, so it's,

S

Speaker 1 45:35

it's hard. It's hard. Yeah, and once again, it's hard to trust people to begin with, it's hard to trust people with experience, much less trust them with data, and once again, I think it begins with the researcher to begin to see things as nothing more than data, and it's literally the fact that once you start considering it as data, then then you rapidly start considering things like, well, there's no way I could be picking something up every single night.

S

Speaker 4 46:08

Yeah,

S

Speaker 1 46:09

like I can be gathering a lot of data, but the fact that I'm gathering evidence every single night would be, would be very, very slim in that kind of way. And the example I give is, there was a gentleman in my UFO groups who used to post three, four times a week from right up around where you guys lived in San Antonio, like, oh, there they are again. It's like, dude, if you're posting videos the same time, same time window, three, four times a week I'm wondering why you're not selling tickets.

S

Speaker 4 46:44

Yeah,

S

Speaker 1 46:46

why? Why are.. why are we posting videos online? Why don't you have ticket sales at your front lawn? You know, why don't we have a food truck set up? Because, because if it's that dependable. Hey, the Marfa lights are weird, they're strange, they're still unexplained. There's an observation deck, go hang out and watch them, you know.

S

Speaker 2 47:08

Yeah,

S

Speaker 1 47:08

so, so, and you have to wonder about those things, you have to be willing to question those things. I bipolarly, and in a good way, scientifically say, please, more red circles, because I think we, as scientists, we as people examining things as data, a need to be willing to court everything that's just science, you've got to be willing to take it into the data set and call it out, but at the same token, the experimenter, the person bringing the data, has to be able to accept what the explanation is and understand the fact that they have bipartisanly done two things to science: a, you have now expanded the realm of known quantitative in investigating these things, whether it be a drone, whether it, whether it be a picture of a black bear from the side, what have you. We now have more known quantitatives, and what they look like. So, in theory, we're narrowing down the, we're whittling down every time we explain what's in a red circle and and widening the scope of of what the unexplained might be in hyper, I'll

S

Speaker 3 48:29

give you a couple of examples that are that are strangely related in terms of the origin of the data, but I had a researcher last year that sent me some photographs of weird footprints that no one could identify, and pretty quickly figured out that they were alligator footprints, but they were near a body of water, but they were in a slightly unexpected place somewhere, somewhere up north, where you would think, oh, there's no alligators around here, but if you go back and do the research on that particular area, then you'll find out that, yeah, every once in a while an alligator shows up in this area. It's weird, it shouldn't be here necessarily, it's not supposed to be here, but that particular researcher was not really wanting to hear none of that particular explanation, it was. That's not what.. no, you know.

S

Speaker 1 49:24

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 49:25

Anyways, that's fine.

S

Speaker 1 49:26

Nope.

S

Speaker 3 49:27

I got contacted from another group, actually a pretty well-known UFO research group that had a recording of a strange sound that was recorded while a UFO was being seen in the area near a lake, and this was again kind of somewhat up in the north, and I concluded that the sounds, which were very scary and deep and growling, were actually again an alligator, and I said, "That's that's an app, you know, an alligator grumbling there. Yeah, they're at a lake at night, and they're, you know, they did film something, but they thought. Why are we hearing a weird growing sound? So, but they actually did accept, you know, they're like, 'Wow, you know, we didn't know alligators could be around here. And I was like, 'Yeah, actually, there is apparently like a wildlife, you know, right down the road, and they had some alligators there, and so it was just two different responses for basically the same, you know, the second group, to their credit, were like, okay, that's weird. Well, we still have this UFO video, so we'll, we'll kind of focus on that, but, but the other researcher, you know, is just, you know, he had his shields up and he didn't want to accept,

S

Speaker 1 50:36

yeah, yeah, and I saw one in, in my group, I literally posted it. I took a screenshot and sent it to a meme group that me and my brother and buddy from high school belong to, because the only thing I posted in the actual Bigfoot group was, "It's Big Foot's house now, you should move, and you may have seen the picture over the last couple few weeks, but it was, it was a picture of like a two three car garage door with scat all over the door, and then this person was like a person in one of my research groups has been gifting for a long time on their property, this and that, and, and you know, this is this has been the result, and like, the immediate, the immediate thought is, you know, oh, I've been gifted back, you know, and that, that just blows my mind, I guess. Maybe, as, as a kid, who, you know, I'm not gonna say I was a punk kid, but I definitely did a couple punkly things in my time, Ken, you know, you were at one point a young 16 year old male with nothing at all to do on a Friday night, guaranteed some poop landed somewhere it probably shouldn't have at some point during those outings, you know, like that's that's just what kids do, but but the fact of amongst a group of researchers that instead of, well, did you contact the HOA? You know, like, none of that immediately. It's wow, wow, that's incredible. You know, that is the first place that's gone to, is that you have been gifted back by Bigfoot. Like, like I said, my only response was clearly it's Big Foot's house now. You need to move, you know? Like, he has definitely marked his territory.

S

Speaker 3 52:30

He's returning the used food,

S

Speaker 1 52:32

that's it exactly. He did not like the bananas, but, but that's just it, and that's it's it's hard because there is good research being done out there. There is good work being done out there, even amongst those communities. There are some people I think doing things at least somewhat properly in the way that they're doing it, Ken, and the problem comes to bear in all of this, whether it's PSI community, UFO, paranormal, cryptid, how do we how do we unmuddy waters, and how do we get once again science to be willing to accept an outreached arm of data, and how do we prepare our communities to prepare data and start looking at things as data. We'll start with you, Anne.

S

Speaker 4 53:27

Oh, me. Well, I mean, I think I'm getting to the point where I'm kind of gonna be the dead horse here, you know. It all to me it goes back to psychology. We have to really start looking at ourselves and why we're doing what we're doing, what we want to get out of what we're doing, because if we have that self realization in regards to, you know, are you in this because you want to better the community, because you're wanting to help heal people, you want to, you know, find answers, or are you doing it because you want the money and the fan and the authority, or whatever. Nothing else, in my opinion, will get fixed or help, or whatever, without fixing that first, psychology comes first, I think, in regards to all of that, because then once we unmuddy the waters within our own selves, then we can come more clean into the community, and we're not.. it's kind of like the whole, you know, when you get into a relationship and you have old wounds and they say you don't want to bleed old wounds on new people, same thing with our community and the research that we do, so that's, I mean, that's my opinion on it, that's where it begins.

S

Speaker 3 54:51

Okay. Oh, that's great. I think, in order to get the scientific community to look at, you know, or take any of this seriously, I think we just really need to get our act together collectively as a field, and you know, adapt more scientific methods, like peer review, like, you know, heavy, heavy documentation, and provenance of, you know, evidence, and, you know, and just presented, you know, objectively, instead of seemingly having some kind of desire or agenda, yeah, behind it. It has to be presented in a very, you know, we're in there, basically it's their home field, you know, we're the visiting team, so we want to go in there and present evidence and get, and there are scientists, I mean, I, you know, we lost, of course, you know, sadly, Dr. Jeff Meldrum, last September, before him, there were guys in my field, like, you know, PhDs like Dr. Gilbert Krantz, and who women's before him. Currently, there's Darby Orcutt at North Carolina State, who's doing Bigfoot DNA testing at the university. Dr. Haskell Hart, who we know down there, who said, you know, a retired PhD, you know, it's about, you know, kind of bridging those connections with actual scientists, you know, and then you know they obviously know people, you know, so but it's all about presenting it in their, in a language that they'll understand, and

S

Speaker 1 56:16

exactly, exactly,

S

Speaker 3 56:17

we can get there.

S

**Speaker 1 56:18**

Well, and that's just it, that's that's what what I try and get across to the communities is that much like we, even within the communities, have to learn each other's nomenclature, you know, whether, whether you're talking scientific Bigfoot, whoo, Bigfoot, there's different nomenclature that both sides use, and if you want to have a conversation, you both have to be aware of that nomenclature, and how to use it, and when to use it, and it's no different than science. They are looking for, like I said, the difference between data and evidence to a scientist immediately changes the realm of questions that begin, you know, and where the conversation starts. So learning those things, and even even the fact of I've brought it up with you before, Ken. If you want to get into crypto zoology, if you're into Bigfoot things like that, get into their environment, get in, get into being a wildlife preservationist, get, get into find your local colleges, biology department, things like that, that are doing studies on wildlife, that kind of stuff. If you're out with five or six trail cams, give them the footage, just bring it to them, tell them what you're doing, but tell them, hey, I've got this area of property that I've got covered with eight or nine trail cams. I would love to bring you just the raw data, things like that, because if they're out doing bear counts, deer counts, stuff like that, like you're now giving them good data that you can then later be like, hey, you know, amongst all that stuff I gave you, I ran into, like, a weird 20 seconds on this Thursday. Would you mind looking at that for me? And at that point, their attitude is totally different. You've been pumping them full of good data that they can use, that they don't have to get a grant to have five trail cams out in an area to count bears or deer, whatever, you know, so like you're saying, can building those bridges, making those handshakes, really just like proper cryptozoology, or even proper science, thinking outside of the box in that kind of way, and trying to break down those walls that both sides have built up equally, I think,

S

**Speaker 2 58:42**

yeah,

S

**Speaker 1 58:43**

so I want to thank you, thank you, I want, I want to thank you guys always for coming on, for being a part of the show. It's always a great conversation. It's even more fun having both of you on at the same time,

S

**Speaker 4 58:55**

honor, truly.

**S** Speaker 3 58:56  
Yes, thank you for having us,

**S** Speaker 1 58:58  
always, always. Before we let you go and let everybody know where they can go to find all your work, where they can go to find your new book.

**S** Speaker 2 59:07  
Yeah,

**S** Speaker 1 59:08  
and pretty much,

**S** Speaker 4 59:10  
and celine.com a wonderful my website, you can find everything there. All my latest blog posts are there, all of my social media links are there. You can message me there, or you can message me on Facebook. I am just under Ancille, and yeah,

**S** Speaker 3 59:28  
from go ahead for me. My website is Ken gerhard.com and you can certainly find links to my books on Amazon, and also my crypto zoology course, and also, if you go to Exploring Crypto Zoology on Patreon, you'll have access to my critically acclaimed cryptozoology course, as well as my Patreon exclusive podcast, Crypted Legacy, and other exclusive I. Crypto zoology related content,

S

Speaker 1 1:00:01

and I can attest, I went through the first series of courses. Absolutely phenomenal, well put together, Ken. I really think it's something that you should, you should try and write it as, as a curriculum for elective biology classes. I think it would be hugely awesome to have out there in the actual world. So, anyway, thanks so much, guys. I truly appreciate it, as always. I'll be in touch with links, all that kind of good stuff. You guys take care.

S

Speaker 4 1:00:32

Awesome. Thank you. Good night, everyone,

S

Speaker 3 1:00:35

for listening in. All right,

S

**Speaker 1 1:00:36**

man. Um, always a great conversation with both of those guys, and we, we as investigators, we as people who are into these topics, have to take these things into consideration. We have to take the curation of our communities into consideration. That is something that I have advocated since the beginning of this program, is that there there are numerous people out there in all of these communities, even in the events world, in these communities that, as Anne said, horribly and parasitically come into these communities, use the belief systems, use the use the things going on and the topics going on inside of them as a means of not only division within the communities, but also as a means to profit from them and their belief systems, things like that. So, when we come back from this commercial break, we will be joined by our good friend Mike Turber. We will be talking about the Pursue documents, the second tranche of files that has been released by the US government, the videos, the photos, the documents themselves, what they mean, what they're about, and what this, what this disclosure moment truly means we'll be getting into that with our good friend Mike Turbo from Five by Five News right after this. The key to good science is good research. At the heart of good research is a good data set, but the field observation and encounter log from Curious Research, you can easily keep track of your investigative information all in one place, making it easier to review cases and readily see comparisons and contrasts between them, whether out in the woods squatching in a back room, gathering EVPs, or using high-tech gear to track UFO UAP activity. This easy to carry, pocket sized scientific data log is the perfect companion for any field researcher. You can find your copy of the Curious Research Field Observation and Encounter log@amazon.com or visit the official Curious Realm store at Curious realm.com forward slash store to reserve your copy for yourself, your family, or a mine that you want to open. That website again is Curious realm.com forward slash store. Well, hello everybody, and welcome back from that quick commercial break. Thank you so much for staying with us. Also, thank you so much to our sponsors, especially True Hemp Science. If you're a user of CBD products like I am, stop on by trumscience.com today. Christopher Lynch and True Hemp Science uses five yearic process, where every part of the hemp plant is used, every part that's seeds, stems, buds, roots, leaves - every part is used, combusted, and reused, and that process followed time and time again until nothing remains. But an amazing Spidery product, complete with terpene profiles and all. Stop on by, check them out. Their website is truehimscience.com The code that you want to use is Curious Seven, that will get you 7% off your entire cart of \$50 or more, as well as free edibles on your way out the door. I have been using True Science for years for my travel anxiety, and I am here to tell you, folks, it is absolutely amazing. The terpene profiles alone are phenomenal. I have never found other CBD products on the market. It's normally just like glycerin and general CBD oil. These guys are absolutely awesome. Stop on by, check them out. True, him. Science.com is the website that you want to go to. Curious seven again is the code that you want to use to save 7% and get free edibles on the way out the door. Our guest in this segment is our amazing friend Michael Turber. He is the founder of Five by Five News. We will be talking tonight about the Pursue files, there has been the second series of files dumped. Folks, feel free to stop on by Curious research.org forward slash research forward slash pursue, and I have made a nice easy document there that has hyperlinks that go to all of the videos, all of the photos, things like that. That is a downloadable document.

S

Speaker 1 1:05:46

There is a description of the video there, what the video name is, where it was taken, the date, all that kind of stuff. And there is just a massive, I would love to say massive trove of documents. Mike Turber, I would love to say that there is a massive trove of videos and photos that's been put out. Curious Realm has more documents. The Black Ball has, like, good God, you want to talk about drove, you know. So, welcome back to the show, brother. Welcome back.

S

Speaker 7 1:06:27

I appreciate that. Thank you for having me. It's always a pleasure to be on your show, and I just absolutely enjoy every time I do it,

S

Speaker 1 1:06:35

you know. Once again, it's.. it's one of those. we were talking pre-record, and like I've been saying almost the shows I have guested on, like I have been saying on this show since, since the first government panel that we had, you and I had Earl Gray on to talk about that. These things are not for us, these panels going on, folks, are not for us. These disclosure files going on that have been released. You can go to war.gov forward slash UFO to find all of the photos, videos, documents, things like that. These things are not for us. They are not for the UFO UAP community in that kind of way, but most of these things I want to say, out of the nine that were just released in this second tranche of files, out of nine, like five of them were in Jeremy Corbell's documentary that just released Sleeping Dog, before they were declassified and added to this, you know,

S

Speaker 7 1:07:49

that leads to a lot of questions.

S

Speaker 1 1:07:52

Well, it's also the fact of once again, a lot of these videos have been out in the community already, they've been out there and in people's hands and in researchers' hands, and

S

Speaker 7 1:08:06

yeah, they've already seen the effects of what might happen, so you know, making it's kind of like, keep in mind when they, when they take that gimbal and go fast video came out, it took a while for the Pentagon to even acknowledge that those videos were real. Yep, so this is kind of that all over again. It's, you know, you've got the videos that Corbell gets his hands on, or people bring to Corbell, and then in some ways the government's somewhat possibly obligated to go ahead and release them, because they're already out there. We might as well, you know what difference does it make anymore, yeah, kind of thing, but and there's there's a lot of other questions that come along with it, but you know it's very similar to what happened kind of before, different happenstance, you know, as far as the people and the outcome, but similar, similar process nonetheless, even as different agency and stuff, but yeah, it's interesting.

S

Speaker 1 1:09:03

Well, and you know, once again, it's it's the idea of these videos, these files, these photos that are, and even audio clips that are being released are for the people who question why the government is looking into it. They're there for the people who question why the government is spending hundreds of 1000s and millions of dollars. Yeah, and

S

Speaker 7 1:09:32

they have to justify all that.

S

Speaker 1 1:09:33

Well, yeah, yeah, and what this does is show the fact of, oh no, we've spent billions, and over the last like 50 something years, 60 years, and well, we're doing that for good reason,

S

Speaker 7 1:09:49

yeah, and some of some of that reason we hope that at some point in time a true actual bona fide non nothing bur. Disclosure actually happens, and we get something for our money, so to speak, you know? Right now, I think everybody, you know, we get all excited when we hear that there's going to be a release, and, and I think sometimes there, you know, there's a certain select group of people that tend to over hype the the release that's coming, and then you know it comes out, and you know people get disappointed in that, but we still get to see new information that we didn't have before, and anytime that happens, that's a good thing, and in this case, you know, we get to see a little bit more, it's you know, there's no real earth shattering video, or anything that truly jumps out, except for a couple where you know people are explaining what we're seeing, but when you put the math to it, it's kind of like go fast, is it's not exactly as we were originally told, or is something that's a lot more prosaic, and, and it's frustrating, because everybody wants, we want the information that comes out to be, you know, something extraterrestrial, or something, you know, yeah, you know, inter-terrestrial, or all the above, but at the same time, we want it to be true, we want it to be truthful, we don't want a bunch of fluff thrown out there, and I think in some cases some people are considering some of this fluff, some people are considering it and step in the right direction. At least we're getting something, we're getting more people turning heads and looking into the subject, and the more heads that look at this, the more eyes that are on this, the more information that we should be able to get out, either internally or externally.

S

Speaker 1 1:11:44

Oh, no, no, absolutely, absolutely. And you know, it's kind of like whenever we had you on to talk about the drone flaps that were going on, Mike, and people like, oh my god, there's so many drones, and it's like, oh my god, it's the exact same number of drones,

S

Speaker 7 1:12:01

more people are looking, but

S

Speaker 1 1:12:03

now you're looking for drones, is what it

S

Speaker 7 1:12:08

is. Yeah, and there's no regular,

S

Speaker 1 1:12:12

yeah, yeah, you know, and it's, it's one of those, like, oh my god, there's so many more sightings, it's like, in, in average, there's, there's just about the same number of sightings as there have been every year,

S

Speaker 7 1:12:25

and you would think naturally, as time progresses, and more and more people get their hands on drones and various other types of consumer and even military aircraft, that we would see an uptick based on the population, the number of cameras, and our phones, and so forth, and you would see that, but it's, it's honestly, it's been holding at about the same percentage. It's just we are now, we have a very, a very good group of guys who are able to push some of this stuff out to the mainstream media that's getting some eyes on it, you know, you know, we may have some differences here and there about how they do it, or some of the,

S

Speaker 1 1:13:08

yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:13:08

you know, material that they choose to use at the same time, it does put more eyes on the subject, which is never a bad thing, never a bad thing,

S

Speaker 1 1:13:16

yeah, and I have said that about, and I just had the opportunity sadly to go see Lou Elizondo in Dallas, and my wife, I love her. I had completely forgotten that I had purchased tickets to go see Jerry Seinfeld with her for Christmas.

S

Speaker 8 1:13:38

She had issues,

S

Speaker 1 1:13:40

and like, like, my buddy Daniel Allen Jones texted me. He was like, "Hey, you know, I've been asked to help promote the Lou Elizondo event in Dallas, you know, for his, for his new, for his new book. Would you like to come? You know, and I was like, "Heck yeah, like absolutely. And I went to go put it on the calendar, man, and I was like, my God, I'm a horrible husband. You remember that ticket you bought for your wife for Christmas to go see Jerry Seinfeld?

S

Speaker 7 1:14:17

Oh boy,

S

Speaker 1 1:14:18

so I had to call up and tell my buddy, like, dude, I'm so sorry. And, as a newly engaged man, I was like, caveat, be careful, pay attention to such things,

S

Speaker 2 1:14:32

and try

S

Speaker 1 1:14:32

to remember what you have his tickets for with your loved one, you know. Oh, yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:14:37

you gotta, you gotta do that, you gotta take care of the sandwich verse,

S

Speaker 1 1:14:40

but in all reality, it was.. it was one of those.. I wanted to go see Lou. I wanted to, you know, invite him on the show. He's invited, numerous people are invited. Mike and I'd have questions. I'd have some real questions, but I got a couple

**S** Speaker 8 1:14:56  
series.

**S** Speaker 1 1:14:56  
All in all, it's the fact of without people like. Am without people like Jeremy Corbell, without people, as much as I hate to say it, like to the Stars Academy and stuff like that, we would not be having a lot of the conversations that we are having now.

**S** Speaker 7 1:15:13  
That is very true. That is very true. And this year, as it progresses, there's the very thing that Lou Elizondo and TTSA brought to the brought to the playing ground, so to speak, was those three videos.

**S** Speaker 1 1:15:30  
Yeah,

**S** Speaker 7 1:15:30  
they typed the gimbal and go fast, and those three videos are pretty much what's kicked off this current wave of UFO conversation, and we would not be having this if it wasn't for that december 16, 2017 a date that will live in infamy. That's right, that this all, this all got laid out in New York Times, put out the information to the Stars Academy was essentially born, and we had a crew of people that were on board, you know, some Chris Mellon to live Elizondo and Semin, and all the way down the list of some very high-profile people that were on board.

**S** Speaker 1 1:16:09  
How put off all kinds of good folks? How

S

**Speaker 7 1:16:11**

put off, of course, ramp, you know, the thing was run by Tom DeLonge, who's the lead singer to Blink 182 and very soon after that the conversation started, and you know, I had, you know, my conversations, you know, was Tom DeLonge and Lou, and so forth, and you know, everybody's got that, that moment that they, you know, that they decided to, you know, look at these objects and go, wow, that, that's that, that's got me thinking something totally different, because it's a different way that it was presented. It was in the New York Times. It wasn't in the Enquirer this time. Yeah, yeah, it was not some obscure, you know, you know, middle of Montana TV station doing this. This, this is, this is the New York Times, and it just doesn't really get more reputable than that, and the rest is history. We are having this conversation, otherwise we would not be having this conversation if that never occurred.

S

**Speaker 1 1:17:12**

Yeah, absolutely, man. And quite literally, when you're talking about the articles by people like Leslie Keen that really kicked all this off. Black budget, black money, or black money, black projects, and dark skies, or something like that. I can't remember. I can't remember what the title was, but it was it was Leslie Keen and her writing partner, and Lou Elizano that really brought that to the table, and even, even whenever you consider some of the things that have happened since then, Mike, from from that article to the article that came out, where the community was all a kerfuffle, because you know it came out that the CIA and other alphabet agencies have used stories from within the community as cover for their black budget projects for years and years, because, hey, why have a psyop officer when there's a whole group of believers out there writing the psyop for you? You know, exactly, like, why even employ one?

S

**Speaker 7 1:18:17**

Yeah, it's not necessary. They saved, they saved a ton of money, and basically, we, you know, we are various people were doing the job for them, and a much better job, probably, than they could have done themselves, because, you know, let's just face it, they're not, they're probably not going to dabble into this area for any length of time. Well, that's a good thing, quite frankly.

S

**Speaker 1 1:18:39**

Thank, thankfully, thanks to things like in Q-Tel and programs like Prism and the arms into into platforms like, you know, Facebook, and ending Q-Tel giving money to the first round of that, in Q-Tel giving you the money the first round of Twitter, all kinds of things that, yeah, these, these technologies that we're actively using to share these stories are just funneling straight into them.

S

**Speaker 7 1:19:08**

I mean, Wi-Fi, you know, Bluetooth, and all of these technologies were basically invented. The internet itself was invented because of Arpanet in the beginning at Arpa Arpanet, and what have you, and it was a military slash university thing, and here we are, but the bigger part of the picture, I guess, is that as this conversation moves forward, as we start talking about these things, we start to see a certain pattern develop, and ain't you know me, because of my previous employer, those patterns that develop sometimes go the right direction, sometimes go the wrong direction, and sometimes we have to do a course correction. It's just like, you know, you're sending a, you send a satellite or probe to a planet, and you've got a course correct. As it goes along, if you start deviating, and that I think what we're having now, and what's going to, you know, we, because you can see in the arguments that go on in Twitter or X and various other platforms, that this is a very contentious subject when it comes down to it, as far as you know, certain aspects of the videos we're being told certain things that are the videos are, and so forth, and then you have, you know, the one side of the fence versus the other side of the fence, and and that's the area that I get that I end up being thrown into quite often, and it's an area I truly enjoy, because I do, I do like helping people. I do like identifying what things are, and what have you, and, and, and moving things right along, so we can get to the meat of the matter, because you know, if they're, if they're here, and you know, we've got people testifying in Congress, they're swearing under oath, we've got this stuff going into the national record, and at some point in time, if this, if all of the things that we are being told through the hearings, or what have you, are true, then our government truly does have a lot of explaining to do, but then in the other, in the spectrum, you also have a large group of people who say that this open door into government is bringing in a lot of people that may or may not have direct information, and what have you, and they're feeding into it, and that feeding frenzy might be stirring up a whole harness nest that might, you know, might come out here at some point in time. Yeah, but either way, either way, in the interim, we know what's going on. We know there's something going on that we don't know, that the government does know, and we want to know, and we want that information to be revealed, and everything declassified. And when they do it, we want everything. We don't want, like you were saying earlier, before we came on about all the redactions and various other things that prevent us from surely knowing what we're looking at. If we got a blob on the screen, that's great, but we need all the other data that comes along with it, so we can help figure out what these things are.

S

**Speaker 1 1:22:11**

Yeah, yeah. No, precisely. And I've got the first image from this second dump on screen right now, where you can see that it's a, it's, it's an image where all of the data on the side of the image that's taken with the forward looking infrared camera on whether it's a gun pod or on an air airplane or whether it's a forward looking infrared on a Reaper, what have you, that's all the data that you would be looking at, that shows elevation, distance to object, speed of the object, speed of speed of the platform, tracking the object,

S

Speaker 7 1:22:50

and what's odd about this, this, especially this particular image, is we have this video with the data shown on the video, so why they didn't do it in the release doesn't make a whole lot of sense, because I use the data inside this particular video that you just showed to determine the object's distance, its speed, elevation, and things like that, and basically where exactly it was on the earth, because it actually gives a, there's a grid system that the military uses that are 100 mile blocks, and they have numbers. I'm trying to remember them off the top of my head, the number on this thing was like c7 32 or something like that, and these, these blocks are gridded out over over a map, so to speak, and there are 100 miles in length, and anywhere when you're in the map, it'll give you the exact, your exact location based on where you are inside that 100 mile block, like a little bit different than latitude and longitude, but you can transpose this even in Google Earth right into a map system, so that video there is, I believe, the Syria video. If I'm not mistaken, I could be, but I think pretty, I'm pretty sure that's the Syria video, and in that video that object is moving, or the camera is aiming to the north, so that means the camera is south of that object, and it's an MQ nine reaper that's taken the imagery, and here we are looking at it at imagery that is not the original imagery, because the original imagery would be much sharper than this, and it appears as though I think on some of this imagery that the image was taken by a camera aimed at a monitor getting that video. What's odd to me is if someone was taking a video of a video and then the government releases video and it's the same video,

S

Speaker 1 1:24:58

yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:24:59

yeah. Then that in and of itself is a problem, so the release that I've looked at has all the data on it, shows me the location of the reaper, gives me the location of now, if you look at the crosshair on that image, that crosshair, when it's basically not on the object itself is it's a person trying to get more of a manual lock on this thing, and the crosshair will basically give you the distance to the ground behind the object, so a lot of people have seen this, have seen the data, and and the data that they're looking at, they're misunderstanding how it's represented on the screen, but the measurements, which we don't see here, would would actually show the distance to the ground behind it, so the object is obviously in between the ground behind it and the reaper, and as the reaper moves, much like in the Go Fast video, you have that parallax effect, and you're back to the same scenario that you had with Go Fast, where the objects not really moving that fast,

S

Speaker 2 1:26:05

but in

S

Speaker 7 1:26:05

the video, when it moves, when it moves in that northerly direction, there is a point where it darts off or appears to dart off to the right, and that part of the videos is the the the part that everyone pretty much looks at and and questions what is actually happening there. There's a lot of debate about what is occurring in that video.

S

Speaker 1 1:26:28

Yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:26:28

especially over on X, and you know, every people have their opinions about things, and then you have your, your, your analysis of it, and after careful analysis, you know, there's there's people that tell us that that object is doing one of the five observables where it's showing instant acceleration, and I would argue that, based on what I'm saying, it's a very similar situation that we have with Tic Tac, where Tic Tac appeared to dart off to the left, but they happen to correspond exactly at the time of a zoom change, so we're looking at almost a similar scenario here, which creates that nothing burger atmosphere, but at the same time some people don't hear this information, some people are not getting the the skeptic side of what, what we might be looking at, and that you know everyone's feeding into it, which is, which is natural, and over time, you know, you gotta, you gotta roll it back a little bit and say, hey, this is, this is, remember that video a few years ago, this is what it actually was, and, and, and we, but we keep moving forward, because that holy grail is out there, and it will happen, and we're gonna, you know, I hope, I hope it's sooner than later, because I want to see it.

S

Speaker 1 1:27:47

Well, then we actually

S

Speaker 7 1:27:48

had that.

S

Speaker 1 1:27:50

Yeah, you know, for me, as you know, well, Mike, it's it's data, data, data, data, data rules the day, and whenever you get pictures, period, that have next to no data, like the one I've got up on screen now. The second still image that they put out, where it's.. it looks like kind of like three and a half objects or something like that. I mean, to me it more looks like something is submerged and there are three things on top of it. Yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:28:20

it's hard to tell enemy looking at this image, the objects are not not submerged, and they're in the reason for it is the the blurriness. I had this in, you take a got what's called a Gaussian blur, yeah, and you kind of reverse the blur, so to speak, to sharpen it, and then you unsharp in it again, and then you put a mask on it, and you feather it. You do all these things you do in Photoshop, and then see what you have left at the end of the day. And if you compare, say, the wave crest in the background, there are some of the waves with the objects, you'll find that there's a, there's a quite a bit of difference, and if you look below one of them, it almost appears that you can see the shadow of it,

S

Speaker 1 1:29:05

yeah,

S

Speaker 7 1:29:05

yeah, the bottom one, and then the one that's jutting out to the front there a little bit, but then you don't see it on the top one, so it kind of makes you wonder, okay, so we kind of see what may be a shadow under the second one, and then that leads me to believe that it's probably not a shadow, it's just like the object in front and a little bit below that appearing shadow, it's just another dark patch on this thing, you know. So these are the things we look at, and and we start, we don't really rule anything out, we just lower the chances that it's a shadow, or lower the chances that it's above the water, or below the water, or you know, go back and forth, it's a percentage thing. Well, and at the end of the day, you know, you hopefully have the answer of what it is, because most people ask them, what are these things, not necessarily, you know, is it real, and. Not, it's real, because we're looking at it, and the military says it's real. So, now we need to determine, okay, what