

12  
1999

**UFOFOPRA INFORMATION NETWORK  
RESEARCH & INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU  
NEWSLETTER  
SPECIAL CHRISTMAS EDITION**

pmdel@eircom.net

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/ufofopa/>

special edition.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS TO ALL OUR MEMBERS AT HOME AND ABROAD. MAY THIS CHRISTMAS BE ONE OF HAPPINESS AND JOY FOR YOU AND MAY THE NEW CENTURY BRING YOU THE PEACE AND HARMONY. WE HOPE YOU HAVE A WONDERFUL CHRISTMAS AND WE WILL BE BACK IN JANUARY 2000 WITH OUR FIRST PARANORMAL & UFOLOGY NEWSLETTERS OF THE NEW MILLENNIUM.

*Our Christmas special looks at the story behind the Star of Bethlehem and asks: Was it a celestial event, a Supernatural Phenomenon, or a Story made up by Matthew? and to complete our Christmas special Kathy Crinion looks at the mystery of The Star Child.*

## **"THE STAR OF BETHLEHEM"**

**BY ANTHONY F. AVENI.**

*"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King, behold, Wise Men from the East came to Jerusalem, saying, "Where is He who has been born King of the Jews. "For we have long seen His star in the East, and have come to worship Him".*

*No matter how many times Matthew's story is told, the question remains: What exactly was this Star? There has been no shortage of explanations. According to one count, 250 major scholarly articles on the subject were published in the first three-quarters of this century*

## Page2:

alone. Let me run down the short list of nominations: It may simply have been a bright star, a supernova (an old star which, in a gravitational death spasm, blazes forth for a few months before gasping its last breath of nuclear energy), or a recurrent supernova (the same, except that several hundred years generally intervene between spasms).

Some believe it was a constellation, more portentous than a single star, or a bright comet; Haley's has been mentioned. Others say the great luminary was really two comets, a meteor shower, or a fireball ( a colossal meteor visible only in a small part of the world). A few nominated the aurora borealis (northern lights). There are those who contend the star should have been called the Planet of Bethlehem -- Venus hovering over the horizon or transiting the surface of the sun.

Combinations of the of sky phenomena have been suggested, including a conjunction of two or more planets, a planetary conjunction plus a comet, or eclipses of Saturn and Jupiter by the moon. The zodiacal light, a reflection of sunlight off interplanetary particles in the plane of the planet's orbits, has been cited, as have UFOs. A second category of explanation avoids the necessity of scientific accountability by posting a theophany, an aura of light surrounding God, a supernatural radiance. A third category raises the possibility that the star is neither chronological nor literal and that identifying it either naturally or supernaturally serves no purpose, that it is "just a story".

Which of these explanations one opts for depends on who is asking the question -- astronomer, theologian, or historian -- and what constitutes meaning for each in the historical framework in which he or she makes the inquiry. Those who propose explanations subject to natural law come largely from the sciences. They scour planetary tables and ply astronomical software in quest of unusual phenomena that they interpret literally to fit Matthew's descriptive phrases like "long seen", "in the East", and "stand over", weeding out those cosmic events they find inconsistent with scriptural clues.

### Page3:

*Origen, a third-century gnostic, records the first attempt to give such a naturalistic account of the Star of Bethlehem. He wrote in A.D. 248, "We think that the star which appeared in the east...is to be classed with the comets which occasionally occur, or meteors, or jar-shaped stars". Such transient phenomena, difficult if not impossible to anticipate, were thought to have a bad influence on political affairs because they disturbed the order of the heavens. "When beggars die, there are no comets seen; the heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes", said Shakespeare's Calpurnia to Julius Caesar on that fateful morning of the Ides of March. Recently, classicist John Ramsay and physicist Lewis Licht have documented through Chinese written sources that such a portent, almost universally taken to be evil, did appear in the Roman skies during the spring of 44 B.C., the year of Caesar's assassination.*

*Among modern proponents of natural explanation is the astronomical historian David Hughes. The scenario he opts for is accepted by most contemporary seekers of natural phenomena and is the one that I, too find most convincing. Celestial events figure prominently in the Zoroastrian millennial cosmology that enjoyed a revival during the stable Roman rule of the first Century BC. A forerunner of Christianity, Zoroastrianism predicted a cyclic war between the forces of light and darkness. The end would come with triumph of light, which would be followed by the day of redemption, punishment of the wicked, and the installation of the one true god. Repeated planetary conjunctions were thought to represent the beginning of successive aeons that made up this cyclic world history. Hughes cites a triple conjunction (three close visual passes in a row) of Saturn and Jupiter in the constellation of Pisces in 7 B.C. and places the birth of the historical Jesus around October of that year. The Magi, or magoi, a Middle Eastern tribe skilled in sorcery according to Herodotus, would have been recognised by Matthew as competent astrologers intimately familiar with the sky, who would have been aware that the conjunction was about to take place. A cuneiform text excavated at Sippar, a town north of Babylon known for its school of astrology, records*

Page4:

*calculations and predictions of the event. Familiar with Jewish tradition, the Magi would have known that Jupiter was a lucky star and that Pisces had a strong astrological association with Jews. Fish were the sign of redemption and would later become a well-known symbol for the Saviour, and the sun moves into Pisces between winter and spring, thus contrasting the end of an old cycle with the beginning of a new one. Hughes argues that these circumstances would have given the Wise Men ample cause to make the 550 -mile journey(three or four months) west to honour the new-born king. Moreover , the three close passages of the two planets were spread conveniently over seven months from late May to early December, the first pass perhaps serving as a warning that something momentous was about to happen, the second as a sign to get moving, and the third as an indication that they were nearly there.*

*Other scholars have suggested that after Christians came to believe Christ was the Son of God, they would have looked for a celestial event to connect with his birth - a bit like our relating Comet Hale-Bopp to the death of Princess Diana. Fascinated by a close conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 1603, Johannes Kepler, founding father of modern astronomy, was the first to back-calculate the 7B.C. conjunction.*

*(A Jewish astrologer from Baghdad, Masha-allah, anticipated Kepler's discovery by 900 years). Though he believed the planetary conjunction heralded the coming Christ, Kepler felt the biblical star itself was divine. In the autumn of 1604, one of the greatest supernova of all time blazed forth. Here, Kepler thought, was an explanation for the star, the grandest of all celestial phenomena to announce the birth of the Saviour! With a touch of the unpredictable, its miraculous yet scientifically documentable aspects satisfied across the board. God became both grand artificer and consummate showman, as theologian Kim Paffenroth has said.*

*Natural explanations like Kepler's of ten combine sky events; the triple conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn might have focused the Wise Men's eyes on the west, but perhaps a comet caused them to begin their journey. Another scenario cites comets that blazed forth in 5 B.C. and 12 B.C.*

## Page5:

*The latter has been traced to an appearance of Haley's comet, known to have recurred at 76-year intervals as far back as 240 B.C.; but this is thought by most to be a bit too early to fit biblical history. Christ was likely born between 7 B.C. and A.D. 4, though we cannot be sure. Various historical events sharing the stage with Christ's birth such as Herod's death and Augustus' tax decree, lie along a decade-wide time band. This uncertainty makes it hard to tie Christ's birth to a specific celestial event. For example, a Venus-Jupiter conjunction in 3-2 BC is also compatible with the accepted dates. There seems little room for miracles in today's way of thinking, but the case for a supernatural event beyond all scientific analysis remains plausible at least to some. Can we second-guess the Creator? Why should a believer be tempted to look for a scientific explanation? Had God been so pleased he could have created a heavenly event for any purpose. Ah, but the ruler of the universe is frugal, runs the counterargument. Surely he would rather have made use of the cosmic arrangements he had already fixed in the firmament to deliver his message.*

*Penetrating the mind of God is no mean task! No wonder scientists find the miracle explanation theologically weak when perfectly natural phenomena occurred that can account for all the historical information. It is humanists who stress the mythic and theologians the miraculous. "A miracle is simply what happens in so far as it meets people who are capable of receiving it, or are prepared to receive it, as a miracle," wrote theologian Martin Buber. When we try to dismantle an omen in search of its underlying causes, Buber argued, we can lose sight of the meaning it was intended to convey to the true believer who experienced the sign. Historians have tried to reconstruct the natural events that gave rise to the story of Moses' parting of the Red Sea. What combination of wind and water, they ask, could have created an unusually low tide in a shallow bay at just the right time to permit the Israelites to escape Pharaoh's pursuit? But, say theologians, the tides of the Gulf of Aqaba are irrelevant to the far more important question of how the children of Israel*

**Page6:**

*interpreted whatever happened. For those who followed the Way, that event became an abiding pillar in the edifice of their coming into being as a people.*

*If the story related by Matthew is "just a story", that does not mean it is devoid of truth and meaning. Following theologian Raymond Brown, Paffenroth explains the famous reference in the gospel as a midrash, a method of arranging truth through story as old the Talmud. Quite distinct from reporting a cosmic happening, natural or otherwise, midrash serves to illustrate a religious teaching. In Paffenroth's view the star narrative is a story that reveals what the writer of Matthew's Gospel felt to be the truth about a man taken to be Christ. Following the style of the times, he simply was not concerned with historical literalism, or at least not as concerned as we are. The narrative of Christ's infancy is really a story about good news of salvation, literally the gospel, and only that. We should not be concerned with reading Matthew's gospel in any other way, lest we do violence to his account.*

*Why seek omens in the stars? Ancients the world over watched the skies diligently and noted the way the stars and planets functioned together like a well-ordered society. Inquiring into the animate wills of celestial bodies helped understand their range of powers, their personalities. While the Advent Star retains a central place in the story, once we try to reach out and touch that star, like the rainbow's end, it vanishes before our eyes. Like searching for unicorns, the quest for the Star of Bethlehem may tell us more about what lies in ourselves rather than in our star.*

***Anthony F.Aveni is the Russell B. Colgate Professor of Anthropology at Colgate University.***

**Source: Internet.**

## STARCHILD.

BY KATHY A. CRINION.

Sixty to seventy years ago an American girl of Mexican heritage, in her late teens or early twenties, was taken by her parents to visit relatives living in a small rural village a hundred miles Southwest of Chihuahua, Mexico. Upon arrival, the girl was told of local taboos which forbade entering any of the area's numerous caves and tunnels. Like most teenagers are wont to do in such a situation, she soon found an excuse to slip away from the village to explore the forbidden places. At the back of a mine tunnel she found a complete human skeleton lying supine (face up) on the ground's surface. Beside it, sticking up out of the ground, was a malformed skeletal hand wrapped around one of the human skeleton's upper arm bones. The girl proceeded to scrape the dirt off a shallow grave to reveal a buried skeleton, also malformed, and smaller than the human one. She did not specify the type or degree of any of the "malformations". The girl recovered both skulls and kept them for the remainder of her life. As her death neared, she passed them on to an American man who maintained possession for five years before passing them on to an American couple who now own and control them. That couple found that both skulls show a staining pattern consistent with the discovery story as told by the now-deceased woman. Only the rear part of the human's (lying on its back) is stained, while all of the malformed skull (the buried one) is stained to varying degrees.

As reported by its discoverer, the Starchild skull is "malformed" in many key ways. In fact, little about it can be compared to a normal human. (See pic) It does possess the same number and kind of cranial bones: a frontal, two sphenoids, two temporals, two parietals, and an occipital. However, none are shaped or positioned as in humans. There are also other similarities, including certain bone extrusions and contours, muscle attachments, and openings for veins and arteries that correspond to humans. Despite these and other recognisable conformities, an overwhelming majority of comparisons show deviation from the human norm. Sometimes those deviations are slight, but most times they are extensive, to a degree that should have produced a foetal "monster" incompatible with life as we know it.

Instead they seamlessly combined to form a cranial outline hauntingly similar to the "Grey" alien type exemplified on the cover of Whitely Streiber's book "Communion". Indeed, apart from a marked difference in the eye sockets (more about that later), the Starchild skull looks very much as if it might fit inside the Grey alien's head. If it were not so compelling, we also would have assumed it was a deformity and because the Starchild skull shows so much deviation from the human norm, we can confidently expect DNA testing to prove it is one of three things:

1. A pure alien Gray type; 2. A Gray-human hybrid; or 3. A most bizarre human deformity.

## Page8:

Either of the first two would be historic at a level never seen before, while the last would be merely historic. However, even the last outcome would warrant the effort being put into the determination process. History is history, and it is a rare occurrence in anyone's life to get an opportunity to make it.

The rear of the Starchild skull is subtly but clearly convoluted, with no true flattening in any part. Therefore, it is virtually impossible that binding could have been the cause of its unusual shape. Lastly, if a skull is truly bound into some other-than-ordinary shape, the cranial bones will never be able to suture at the top of the head, so that a person thus afflicted will always have "soft spot" on the top of their reshaped cranium. The Starchild skull exhibits a very high degree of overall symmetry, which is difficult to reconcile with the marked asymmetries produced by most cranial pathologies. Also, a CAT scan reveals that all of its cranial sutures were healthy and open at its time of death. The Starchild project, a group of researchers who have set out to determine the truth about the Starchild, have asked over 50 experts to personally examine the skull and tell them what they thought might have caused it to look as it is. Several others have sent unsolicited opinions after viewing the photographs on their website. With predictable consistency they have pronounced the skull as the result of some kind of human "pathology" ( a scientific phrase for "something went wrong"), often combined with the cranial binding discussed above. When they ask what kind of pathology , specifically, they suggest one or another of the genetic disorders as the most likely cause. If they offer reasons why their diagnosis cannot be correct (its symmetry, no synostosis, etc.) they will change to another disorder, or fall back on the safety net provided by congenital deformity. Unlike genetic deformities, which are consistently repeated generation after generation, congenital deformity is a one-time event caused by a sperm-egg disconnecting at conception, or by varying degrees of mutation during gestation. They can be slight or they can be horrific, producing ghastly "monsters" that give neonatologists nightmares. In theory and in practice, congenital deformities are capable of producing virtually anything, which means the Starchild skull can be labelled as congenital and the label will stick. Unless, that is, you know the rules governing the rules congenital deformities at the level the Starchild exhibits. No expert yet consulted has provided a credible, sustainable link to any of the known genetic disorders. Nor have they explained how the Starchild could legitimately be classified as a congenital deformity because its skull shows massive reconfiguration in EIGHT different areas of cranial morphology. In other words, the Starchild should have been DOA several times over, yet it survived until its death. The Starchild skull has most (but not all) of the parts of a normal human skull, all of which are thoroughly reconfigured to somehow produce a living entity never seen (or at least recorded) before. To begin, the overall configuration bears closest comparison to an alien "Gray" type. Grays are entities alleged to have vaguely heart-shaped heads with two high, expanded rear lobes forming the upper arcs of the heart, with a reduced and narrowed lower face area combining with an almost pointed chin to form the bottom of the heart. With that front outline goes a flattened , sloping -inward rear area, and a thin neck positioned forward relative to a human neck. The Starchild skull has all these physical has all of



## Page9:

these physical attributes, plus others that may or may not be part of of Gray morphology, such as no frontal sinuses and an apparent lack of a cerebellum. Specifically, the Starchild's complete lack of frontal sinuses (revealed in a fluoroscopic study) first indicated to us that it might indeed be of alien origin. However, the lack of frontal sinuses is not impossible either in humans or in primates.

It is an extremely rare condition, but does not alone indicate the

Starchild might be alien, especially since a maxillary sinus is apparent in a detached piece of maxilla (upper jaw and palate) that the woman who discovered the Starchild skull stated that it is an integral part of it. That detached piece of maxilla has a stain pattern similar to the Starchild, so it's possible to accept the discoverer's assertion that they were once connected. Initially, belief was that the Starchild skull was

indeed that of a child (hence its name) because the detached piece of maxilla has two visible teeth still embedded in it: a right rear bicuspid adjacent to a right rear molar. By their small size and the small size of the maxilla itself, both appear, at first glance to be primary (baby) teeth. In addition, a fluroscope exam indicated two teeth impacted above them, apparently waiting to emerge, while visual inspection showed an incisor apparently moving into the first of the empty front holes. To the dentists, who were initially consulted, three front teeth missing (usually lost at five or six) and a replacement on its way, indicated a child in its fifth or sixth year, assuming that it aged as humans normally age and that the teeth had been lost naturally (there is no sign of bone breaking away in in any of the three empty holes).

Now with more information to go on, and the picture is far less clear. It turns out that the piece of maxilla seems to be entirely without the space where another bicuspid should go. Also, the extant bicuspid has three fair-sized roots, two outer and one inner, when only one outer and one inner is normal. Lastly, both teeth show much more than usual wear on the crown areas, and both show clear signs of crazing, which is cracking and fissuring of their enamel. Crazing is not likely to have occurred in 5-6 years old baby teeth, no matter how coarse or gritty the child's diet might be. Significant crown erosion is not likely, either. What might the above mean? One possibility is that the missing front teeth could have been secondary teeth removed after recovery of the skull, with the incisor that seems to be moving not moving down at all, merely holding a place like the two impacted molars. This could mean the visible pair are primary teeth in the last stage before replacement by the impacted molars. This could move the Starchild's age to around 10 or 12 years old, when primary molars are typically lost. This is barely more plausible, accounting for the wear on the crowns and the crazing, because both normally require decades of hard use. Unfortunately, the discoverer left no word at all about the status of the missing front teeth, and she is now deceased it's not possible to follow this line of inquiry any further by the project group!! Another less likely possibility is that the visible teeth might be secondary (permanent) teeth in an extraordinarily small mouth (not unlike what a Gray might have), and the impacted teeth are not from a second but a THIRD set waiting to come down. With a complete lack of frontal sinuses, three sets of teeth are extremely rare

## Page10:

but not unheard of in humans or in primates, so it remains a possibility. Therefore, it could be that the Starchild did not age the way we do, and its primary teeth lasted much longer than the dozen years human primary molars and bicuspid usually last. Indeed, the Starchild could have been a fully grown adult utilising what appears to us now to be primary teeth but which were in fact secondary. Something else that complicates ageing the Starchild is the extensive degree of high-quality suturing (combining of bone plates) found all over its skull, especially along the border between the left parietal (upper left crown) and the upper left part of the occipital (rear of the head). There, it had many of what are called "islands", which are small but separate pieces of bone that fill in the gaps that sometimes appear when the sutures are growing rapidly and pulling apart too fast for the edges to fill in properly. Those islands have caused several experts to question our description of the Starchild as being about 5 years old. They feel its suturing indicates no less than late teen and / or early adult, and perhaps even more adult than that. Taken all together, the new information about maxilla and the persistent doubting that the Starchild is in fact a "child", has caused us to rethink our position, which was based largely on what are called the "Star Being Legends" of South America. Those legends state that Star Beings regularly come down to Earth from the heavens to impregnate certain women --usually barren- in isolated rural villages. The impregnation is done artificially because the Star Beings described are consistently Grays. The resulting hybrids, called "Starchildren", are bestowed on women as a great "gift from the gods", and are to be raised by the entire village until they reach the age of five, six, seven or even eight, when they are taken away by the Star Beings and removed to whatever place and/or purpose they have been created for. Furthermore, the positions in which the two skeletons were reportedly found, with the same human lying on the ground and the smaller misshapen one buried in a shallow grave beside it, one hand sticking up out of the dirt so it could be wrapped around the upper arm of the human, indicated that maybe a murder-suicide had taken place, with the human killing and burying the small one, then lying down beside it and committing suicide in some way. This led to further conclusion that the human might have been a Starchild's mother who, for whatever sane or insane reason, was determined that her child would not be taken away to meet its fate, one she might have viewed as worse than death. So she killed it --again, sanely or insanely-- and then took her own life for failing to fulfil the "sacred duty" entrusted to her by "the gods". The same dentists who initially examined the Starchild also examined the human and calculated that the extreme wear shown on all its tooth crowns (they are worn almost totally flat) indicated an age no less than in the late twenties, probably pushing toward thirty. They based their guess on the knowledge we provided that the skull was ancient and came from northern Mexico, where the diet would have consisted on corn smashed and ground to a pulp on grinding stones, which would have added highly abrasive grit to the mix. Not being knowledgeable about the wear caused by such a diet (extremely foreign to their experience), they guessed it would take approximately twenty-five years of such a diet to cause such extensive wear. Knowledge of wear patterns on dental enamel or a high-grit diet would not cause such

## Page11:

extensive flattening of the cusps until at least the 40th year and more likely closer to the 45th year. Furthermore, a handful of experts have now cast serious doubts on whether or not the skull is that of a female, which was the initial assessment of other experts because of its relatively small size and certain gracile (fine, slender) features. Others feel that the mastoid process (the triangular bone extending downward from behind the ear hole) slants straight down too much to be that of a female. Female mastoids are attached to a significantly lighter neck muscle than males, so they tend to curve inward somewhat, a curve seen clearly in the Starchild's smaller mastoid bone. Unfortunately, the Starchild's potential young age and much smaller neck (more about that later) does not allow the otherwise logical inference that it was a female.

The human skull might well represent a male about 45 years old at the time of death. And rather than being a child of about five, the Starchild skull could be that of a late teen or even a seasoned adult. However, this does not explain the original scenario to explain how the bodies were found. It still appears the human buried the Starchild and then committed suicide. Whether that followed a murder or natural death is now open to question, but in the absence of any other evidence, the best explanation for how they were found still seems to be that the Starchild expired first, and that it was buried by the human in the shallow grave with its misshapen hand sticking up, and the human deliberately dying along side of it. Whether it was a young female mother or a middle-aged male caretaker the human seemed to care a very great deal about the Starchild to help it enough to join it on its journey into eternity.

Another interesting fact is that the Starchild had a wall-to-wall brain. Also, in anthropology a brain gain of 200 cc in any prehuman fossil entitles it to be classified as a new species. Homo Habilis to Homo Erectus is 200 cc; Homo Erectus to Homo Archaic is 200 cc; Homo Archaic to Neanderthal is 200 cc. So at a minimum, perhaps the Starchild represents a rare, possibly extinct hominid species. Normal human eye sockets have a conical shape recessed about 2 inches (5 cm) into the skull. The Starchild's sockets have a scalloped shape (like an upside down teardrop) only about 1 inch (2-3 cm) deep. The outer edges of human sockets, called "orbits", have a vaguely rectangular shape and are rounded along the brows. The Starchild's orbits are separated by a nose width of normal dimension (though not of normal shape, having no "dip" from midbrow to bridge), and the brows have a clearly definable edge. Also, in a normal human socket the optic nerves and optic fissures are found at the inner rear quadrant of the cone. In the Starchild the optic nerves and fissures are moved down and away to the inner bottom. In anatomical terms such differences in depth and shape are enormous. Though they appear to be quite smooth, the inner surfaces of the Starchild's eye sockets possess incredibly subtle shifts of terrain that are exactly the same in both. This astonishing symmetry virtually removes the possibility that they could have gained their unusual shape by deformity. Furthermore, ophthalmologists have assured us that if those sockets contained eyeballs as we know them, they would have to be positioned low in the sockets, opposite the middle of the nose rather than at the top of it. There is also a strong possibility the Starchild had significantly less eyeball mobility than normal humans enjoy, and it is a virtual certainty that its

## Page12:

eyes would have "bulged out" to some degree relative to normal human eyes. [Alien abductees and contactees often state that the eyes of Grays are large black teardrop shapes that wrap horizontally across the middle of their faces. If those large orbs are indeed their visual mechanisms, it would argue against the Starchild's eyes being related to them. However, it could also be that those dark "wraparounds" are protective lenses or lenses that allow them to see at night (when most encounters occur). Since many other abductees and contactees claim to see Gray type aliens with eyes (usually large and bulging), we have to assume their natural visual mechanism functions at least somewhat similarly to humans]. Switching from eyes to ears, the Starchild's ear canals are clearly visible on both sides of its skull. They seem normal in shape and size and angle of entry, but a CAT scan revealed that they are slightly larger and have somewhat more depth than normal human inner ears. There is no way to know if an external ear was present or what it may have looked like. It is also fair to mention that even though the Starchild seems to have teeth, abductees and contactees rarely see teeth in the mouths of Grays. Of course, this might be due to the fact that they seldom open their mouths, because apparently they are able to communicate telepathically.

The foramen magnum is the hole at the base of the skull where the spinal column connects with the brain. In normal humans the foramen is positioned slightly rear of centre to balance the hollow-filled front face against the brain-filled occipital (lower rear) area. The extensive reconfiguration of the Starchild's skull has somehow caused its foramen magnum to be shifted to a central point directly under the cranium, which provides much better balance between its rear brain area, and its face and forebrain, which are both filled to capacity. Inside the foramen magnum along the centre of the inner wall of the occipital is a raised ridge of bone called the "internal occipital protuberance". It extends from the inner area of the inion (called the "external occipital protuberance") down to the edge of the foramen's opening, a distance of about two inches. This inner ridge of bone is flanked by two sets of lower flanges that sweep away from it with quarter-inch spacing. This lattice of levitated bone helps hold the cerebellum securely in place. (The cerebellum is the lower rear part of the brain which functions as the co-ordinating centre for muscular movement). The Starchild completely lacks any sign of an inner occipital protuberance, meaning it might also lack a cerebellum as we know it. If that is true, the Starchild may well have had a brain very unlike a human brain, which supports the argument that it might have been an alien or an alien-human hybrid. Typical human neck muscle attachments begin at the inion, the bump in the middle of the occipital bone, and sweep out in a semi-circle that reaches to the mastoid bones just behind the ears and converges at the foramen magnum. The distance from any part of the semicircle to the foramen opening averages a little over 2 inches (5 to 6 cm). In the Starchild's skull a shallow arc of muscle attachments extends about one inch (2-3 cm) from the foramen hole, while the inion has disappeared and been replaced by a slight depression in the occipital bone. Such a drastic reduction in muscle attachment area means the Starchild's neck must have been from 1/2 to 1/3 that of a normal human. Not surprisingly, such thin necks are consistently described as hallmarks of Grays and Gray-human hybrids. In humans,

### Page13:

the area for chewing muscle attachments is the entire side of the head, from just behind the eye orbits up to the line where the skull stops being vertical and begins arcing over to become the crown, all the way back and down to and above and behind the ears. It is quite an extensive area. The Starchild, on the other hand, has an area for chewing muscle attachments that is every bit as reduced as the attachment area for its neck muscles, about 1/2 to 1/3 that of a human, as already mentioned above. And though they are called "chewing" muscles, they also connect and hold the lower jaw (mandible) to the skull. Based on such a greatly reduced attachment area, the mandible size these muscles could have secured would be equally reduced, and such a reduced lower face area is also a hallmark of Grays and their hybrids.


The Project group have found so many strong correlation's between the Starchild and alien Gray types. They have also found a fascinating new piece of evidence that may prove to be the strongest correlation of all. A few weeks ago they were given a series of photographs taken in 1975 at the temple complex of Cholula, Mexico (80 miles S.E. of Mexico City). Since this evidence is so new, they have not yet been able to verify what they have been told, so I'm just stating what was alleged to them to be true in 1975. ("The Cholula complex was for centuries the centre of religious pilgrimage throughout Mexico.

Today we do not know what the attraction was, but it must have been compelling. At any rate, on the site, rose what ultimately became the largest single temple in Mesoamerica, covering 45 acres. It had not been well excavated or restored because the Spaniards built a large chapel on top of it, which locals wish it to remain as it is. However, several smaller temples surrounding the main one have been excavated and restored, with one standing apart from the others. It is to be considered to be of Aztec design (circa 1200 A.D.), and is dedicated to two beings the locals claim were "gods" who actually lived among them at some time in the distant past (estimates range from 300 A.D. to 900 A.D.). According to the legend surrounding them, these two "gods" --a male and a female-- had been brought to Earth by other gods and left behind to teach the natives what they would need to know to create the great culture and society they eventually built. These gods stayed with the natives for an extended period (unspecified), teaching them math, science, astronomy, and many other subjects. Then, instead of being retrieved by their own kind and returned home, another group of "gods" different from the Cholula gods appeared on the scene. There was a conflict between them and the two Cholula gods were killed. Devastated at their loss, the local natives buried their dead gods near the main pyramid that had already been built. Eventually the Aztec-inspired temple was constructed over the burial spot, which became a place of worship. That worship lasted several centuries, into modern times, when someone decided to exhume the bodies and put them on display in a small glass box placed against the temple. The one photo we have of that box reveals the skulls and various body bones of two beings, one smaller and the other (perhaps male or female). Both skulls have upper heads astonishingly like the Starchild, and they also have upper and lower jaws intact! Unfortunately, the bones in the back of the eye sockets have been knocked out to a degree that makes it difficult to compare them

# "STARCHILD" SKULL PICS



*(Pic 1) :  
Close up of  
starchild skull*



**(Pic 2) :**  
**Comparrison to human skulls**

**Page14:**

with the eye sockets of the Starchild. But from what is visible under a magnifying lens, both skulls' temple areas look to have the same great reduction of chewing muscles. Also, the backs of their heads are reported to have been "flat", but the degree of flattening was not remembered clearly by the people who took the photograph and sent it (and the others of the temple complex) to us. We should say no more about this until we can visit Cholula for ourselves, or until others can verify or refute what we have been told".)

If the Cholula "gods" can be physiologically linked to the Starchild in any way, then all three might well be the vanguard of an entirely new species of hominid, which does not necessarily mean they are hominid-like humans. Indeed, they could be aliens, alien-human hybrids, or even "gods".

In conclusion, if the Starchild does prove to be a deformed human, it will be the most bizarre physical anomaly since the Elephant Man. This means that either way the results come in, the Starchild Project will have made history. It will just be a matter of how much history.

**Source: The Starchild Project via the Internet, (people wanting to donate to, or help them with their research can do so by logging on to their website).**

**copyright (C) IUFOFRA 1999.**

**NEWSLETTER COMPILED AND EDITED BY ANNE GRIFFIN. COVER DESIGN AND LAYOUT:  
BY PAT DELANEY.**

**COPYRIGHT(C)IUFOFRA INFORMATION NETWORK-ALL RIGHTS RESERVED 1999. PHOTOCOPYING OF THIS NEWSLETTER, OR ANY UNAUTHORISED USE IN ANY FORM, WILL RESULT IN LEGAL ACTION.**



**HAPPY CHRISTMAS & A BRIGHT NEW YEAR 2000 TO ALL OUR MEMBERS !**