

The Starchild Project – Keeping the Record Straight

Andrew Johnson - ad.johnson@ntlworld.com23 May 2017

Update 10 Sep 2017 - See Towards BottomFurther Updates - Sep/Oct 2017 - See Bottom For those people who don't know about the so-called Starchild Skull, please watch this 17 minute fact-packed video. [youtube:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BAAnbJneB4mk] I first learned about the so-called Starchild Skull in about 2003 and less than a year later, I met and befriended Lloyd Pye and helped him transfer some 35mm slides into a Powerpoint file. Over the next 9 years, we met many times and he came to stay at my house at least twice, when I organised talks for him in Nottingham (2009) and Derby (2012). Amazingly, he also attended at least 3 of my talks – in London (2005), Gravesend, UK (2012) and the same Derby event in 2012. In 2004, he visited me with Amy, whom he was later to marry, after they moved back to the USA in 2005. Once again, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of having to document deeply troubling developments in a field of research. I will examine and unpick deeply troubling attempts to introduce doubt about the Starchild Skull and Lloyd Pye himself. If you don't want to read all of the text below, simply spend about 2 hours listening to these next 2 recordings. A comparison should clearly highlight the main problems which I attempt to analyse in detail below. Melanie Young - The Starchild Skull - 2014 Border Zone UFO Conference – 40:53[youtube:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=asheW-G-s9A] Melanie Young, RN - 1/2 - The Starchild: DNA Testing and the Story Behind the Story – 62:15[youtube:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vY6hsoc1K5U] Are the 2 presentations by the same person? Read on, if you wish. Lloyd Pye – My Friend Lloyd was a great friend with whom I was in regular contact and I was extremely upset to hear of his death from Lymphoma Cancer in Dec 2013. I still think of him daily. Lloyd was always generous with his time and his attention and, privately, he was also generous with his praise and gratitude for whatever assistance I and others gave him. In 2003, I knew that what he was doing was very important and we shared the common goal of revealing important truths and knowledge, of the type that many people didn't want to hear or understand. The last time I saw Lloyd was on 18 Sept 2013, when he showed me the Starchild Braincasts. At that time, he told me more about a new development with the Starchild project. Lloyd explained that some months previously, he had gone to see a business man, based in Tampa Florida, called Matthew Brownstein. Matthew was going to try and help Lloyd to develop skills for raising funds for the research into the Skull, as Lloyd felt he had not been very successful at this. Mr Brownstein himself became acutely interested in the skull and started to do his own research. At this time, Lloyd and others were attempting to raise further funds for ongoing DNA testing and analysis which, for the previous 3 years or so, had been undertaken on a voluntary basis by an anonymous geneticist in the USA. The geneticist had the permission of the company he was working for to do this research, but the company, too, wanted to remain anonymous at that time. At our last meeting, in Sept 2013, Lloyd explained to me that Matthew Brownstein, following his own research, proposed that they form an agreement and a company as a vehicle for furthering the goals of the Starchild Project. Although Lloyd didn't go into minute detail about the agreement, he did tell me of the formation of an agreement between himself, Amy (his ex-wife), Ray and Melanie Young and Matthew Brownstein. The reasons I am explaining this will become clear below. I find this whole article difficult to write because I have to write about 2 people whom I thought would share the same goals as Lloyd and myself – to talk about evidence and reveal truths. However, the statements documented below essentially prove they now want to insert doubt and/or attempt to discredit years of research for which many sacrifices were made. The So-called “Veritas” Show Some readers will know of a subscription-based podcast/internet radio talk show called The Veritas Show which has been “on the web” since 2009, with all shows hosted by Mel Fabregas. He set up the show following his discovery of the Milton Torres UFO-shutdown case and his wish to interview Torres. As a previous guest on the programme myself (in 2010 and 2016), I did consider contacting Mel Fabregas before posting this article, but decided against doing so, due to the extreme nature of the statements which I have documented below. I suppose I will just have to resign myself to the possibility that Mel Fabregas will post an hour-long tirade against me, as Henrik Palmgren of Red Ice radio chose to do in 2013, when I posted a similar critique of his failure to point out errors in statements guests were making about 911 evidence. Or, maybe Mel Fabregas will “do the right thing” and include an update on his website, pointing out the errors and false statements made in the interview which I am analysing here. I had a high regard for Mel Fabregas, not only because of his support for Dr Judy Wood's research and the fact that he has interviewed her several times, but also because he was a friendly chap who seemed to be trying to “do the right thing”. He had featured a number of interesting guests on his programme. Perhaps things began to change for Mel Fabregas around the time he began to entertain the idea of a flat earth. To anyone who can observe reality for themselves and do some basic calculations, hosting a programme like this is little different to hosting a programme about the theory that 2+2 might actually be equal to 5. Something has definitely changed for Mr Fabregas - I found this May 2017 interview to be deeply upsetting and troubling. “Veritas” and The Starchild: DNA Testing and the Story Behind the Story On 19 May 2017, I received a Veritas email update announcing the interview with Starchild Skull Owner Melanie young. The description seemed to have some slight errors, so I was already slightly troubled. That is, it said Testing has revealed that both skulls were from individuals who had Native American DNA, but from different tribes. This was information that I remembered being correct in 2003, but later testing revealed a rather more complex situation. Why didn't Melanie Young, owner of the skull, know this? I knew that there had been some disagreements within the Starchild Project since 2016, because I had seen the creation of Melanie Young's own “Starchild” website – which was rather peculiar. I had also briefly corresponded with Amy Vickers – another key member of the Starchild Project Team - about the situation. During the “Veritas” show, the troubling picture became clearer. I spent quite some time carefully listening to the interview and transcribed parts of it (timings given below are approximate). This was an uncomfortable process, knowing what I know about Lloyd Pye and the Starchild Skull Evidence. (I have recently started to give talks about the Skull, because I had copies of most of the

slides Lloyd Pye used in his talks. I had these copies because I helped Lloyd on several occasions and hosted talks by him, as mentioned above.) The interview runs for just over 2 hours, but the 2nd hour is only available to subscribers (which is kind of ironic, as you will read, below). A friend kindly donated a 3-month Veritas subscription to me, which enabled me to listen to the 2nd hour. In my analysis below, I will be “jumping around” a little, across the 2 hours, in order to point out some problems/errors I found. If you’re going to accuse me of cherry-picking statements etc, you’re going to have to listen to the whole thing, aren’t you? Melanie Young, Who’s She? As mentioned above, Melanie Young owns the Starchild Skull - she had met with Lloyd Pye in 1999 and handed over the unusual skull to him, because of his expertise in hominoids. Young confirms this account in the first hour. She also states she is a UFO/Abduction experiencer – even to the point of stating she has had “hybrid alien children.” She herself acknowledges that because of this, some people do question her sanity (but I, personally, do not judge her on this issue – as there are others who have described very similar and deeply troubling experiences). You can listen to the first hour of the interview here: <http://ia801505.us.archive.org/10/items/VS170518MyoungA2b/VS-170518-myoung-a2b.mp3> Link Young and Fabregas discuss the story of the Skull and at 1:58 into the interview Mel Fabregas says: “I didn’t know [about] your name!” The way that Mel Fabregas said this was odd to me - as if he was trying to say that Lloyd Pye had tried to keep Melanie’s identity a secret. This seemed to be confirmed by the discussion which took place at about 28:23. MY: He had no life but fringe science [MY talks about her business and family life]MY: I stayed out of the way. MF: You did to the point I didn’t know who you were!MY: Most people don’t know who I am and most people don’t know that I own it and even the people involved in the project attempted to take the ownership away from me. Before dealing with this remark, I will make one comment on what she said after the above: So it’s been interesting since Lloyd’s passing on trying to get me out there for people to understand the story behind the story and to get the correct information because the correct information isn’t out there. Except for since I came on the scene about a year ago. Lloyd did not tell the truth. This is a direct attack on Lloyd Pye’s reputation and is clearly meant to insert doubt. Listeners can make up their own minds as to whether they think that Mel Fabregas, champion of Veritas, challenges these statements in any way – or comes up with any of the points of rebuttal to what Melanie Young says. There are some points that Young makes that Mr Fabregas should have known were wrong/untrue/misleading. Please read on. [EDIT: 25 May 2017 - I noted that Melanie said "I came on the scene about a year ago". She was giving public talks in 2014 and 2015 - she didn't just start doing this in 2016. However, 2016 is when Chase Kloetzke came on the scene. Is this a "different Melanie" talking, then, do you think?]

The theme of Melanie Young being marginalised was revisited in the 2nd hour when she said, regarding Matthew Brownstein: He thought he was going to take up the torch but there was no way I was not going to be in the forefront again – you were not going to push me to the back of the pack. The overriding impression I got is that Melanie Young was trying to say that the other members of the Starchild Project team (including Lloyd Pye) had tried to minimise and downplay her role and take away attention from her. What was really galling is that I knew Lloyd Pye had never done this and, when given the time, he had always clearly stated that Ray and Melanie Young were the owners of the skull. He said this at least in 2007 (3 mins 50 into this interview with the Paracast), 2008 (10 mins in) and 2009 – at the Nottingham Presentation I organised and recorded – note the photo on the screen (approx 9 mins 42 in). Interested people can find many many more examples of Lloyd Pye’s interviews where he mentions her name. For Mel Fabregas not to know her name in relation to the skull must mean that he hadn’t listened to the story of the skull very closely, or he had a poor memory or he was deliberately misleading people over this issue. Similarly, the Starchild Project Website also showed (at least by 2009), who the owners of the skull were – here are links from the Internet Archive. Even the current Website makes this clear, though there isn’t a photograph of the owners. Going back to Melanie Young’s abduction experiences, at 25:00 in hour one, she stated: When I found Lloyd he was very clear that he did not want me talking about my abduction experiences. He did not want me doing anything with abductions and... related to the Starchild. To him it was like a battlefield. Though Lloyd Pye may have said this to Melanie in 1999, or thereabouts, Lloyd had clearly changed his mind on this sort of issue 4 years later – when he was openly discussing a possible connection between the Skull and Alien Abduction experiences at some of his lectures. He was still discussing these issues in 2009. (As we shall see later, he was less inclined to include this material in his lectures from 2010 onwards.) Intervention Theory In parallel with furthering the research goals of the Starchild Project, Lloyd Pye had discussed other aspects of his research which seem to indicate that an off-world influence has been at work in the development of homo sapiens. This “Intervention Theory”, for example, is discussed in his ebook. I bring this up, because in hour 1, at 26:58, Young states: MY: I just felt that comfortable with him. I did not know what his agenda was going to be. And his agenda all along has been to prove that aliens have interfered with our growth on this planet that we have been genetically manipulated. That’s what he wanted to prove with the skulls.MF - Isn’t that contaminating some of the research with your own - I don’t want to say pre-conceived notions... Isn’t that providing some of your biases?MY - Yes, so correct. This was a peculiar comment – suggesting that Lloyd wanted to use the Starchild Skull to “prove himself correct” about Intervention theory. Whilst this may even have been true at one time, it was still a peculiar comment – because it came from a woman who stated she had hybrid children! (That is, someone who had been on the receiving end of alien intervention.) Fabregas seems to “join in” with this criticism of Pye, which is also inappropriate, as we shall see. In reality, it appears Lloyd was more interested in gathering evidence about the Starchild Skull than proving his intervention theory was true. Again, if Melanie Young had personally experienced “interference” by aliens, wouldn’t she, too, want to see her experiences validated by additional evidence? As was saw above, Lloyd did talk about alien hybrid children – at least until 2009, but then, in 2010, more DNA evidence was given to him. Following this, Lloyd clearly stated that it looked as if the Starchild Skull was not a hybrid. In his lectures, he describes how new DNA evidence changed his conclusions about the “hybrid” scenario. Both Melanie Young and Mel Fabregas entirely failed to mention this (another reason for me writing this article.) “Don’t Speak Ill of the Dead” – They’re Just After Money...? This is one of those phrases that, when it is uttered, you can guess that the person making this

statement is going to go against their own advice/statement. In hour 1, at 29:35 this peculiar exchange takes place: MF: There's a saying that goes like this "Don't speak ill of the dead."..... A lot of researchers and me were invited to a private meeting in Pennsylvania... MY: ... with Paul... MF: Yes, I also saw a presentation at UFO congress in 2011 or 2012 and please people don't criticise me for what I am about to say... but I couldn't stay there for the entire time... because at one point I felt it was almost like an infomercial trying to collect thousands and thousands of dollars. Every other sentence had to do with "donate to this" and I understand if you need to conduct a DNA test and you don't have the funds and you go out there and try to get them. But the amount of money being requested was enormous and I don't know about you, but how much does a DNA test cost? This was also extremely peculiar – not just because they were talking about a closed meeting of researchers and were clearly being cagey about the details, but also because Mel Fabregas had already been told, in some detail, about the cost of the DNA tests in his own interview with Matthew Brownstein, conducted shortly after Lloyd's tragic death. What exactly is the problem Mr Fabregas is trying to solve here? The "money theme" is returned to several times in this interview, but the way the costs have been incurred or changed over the years is never properly discussed with accurate detail. For a more detailed summary, refer to the already referenced interview with Matthew Brownstein, or the one given on Red Ice Radio by Amy Vickers (whom Melanie Young attacks at several points in the interview. I will leave the listener to make up their own minds about these remarks, once they find them. I would strongly argue that it is Amy's name that is the least well-known by those who are familiar with the Starchild Skull.) Money and Ownership of the Skull Mel Fabregas further criticises Lloyd and the Project's fundraising efforts at about 30:50 in Hour 1, stating: Why do you need 100's of thousands of dollars to continue an operation where some of the titles that I saw including one – who I interviewed a few years ago I am not gonna name the names folks you can google it within our website - he is the last person who came on board. Chief operating officer – things along those lines. Why do you need all this corporate board of director in such a fashion that in order to keep that operation going it almost looks like the muscular dystrophy association collecting funds every year. Again, why won't he even mention Matthew Brownstein's name? Melanie Young does! What is the objective here? Later, Fabregas has to acknowledge, that Melanie Young was involved in the formation of a company. In the 2nd hour, they discuss the formation of the Starchild Project Company/agreement. At 2:55 in another peculiar exchange, they say: MF: Do you now regret having given Lloyd the Starchild Skull? MY: No, the only thing I regret is signing any legal papers with the other members of the team. MF: Oh you did sign some legal papers? MY: Yes, towards the end of Lloyd's life, after he was diagnosed with Lymphoma – or right before – within the last 6 months. When Matthew Brownstein came into the picture that's when they decided we needed to have a business in order to get funders to get investors so that's when they took it to a lawyer he drew up paperwork on the operating agreement OK so they developed 2 companies. One I totally understood and it was about funding the research. The 2nd one was explained to me that it was making sure everyone knew I was the owner but I was giving them sole permission to do the research. MF: Oh my goodness so you were basically relinquishing your rights MY: I didn't understand that I was relinquishing my rights but what really happened was I relinquished ownership. MF: Which was worse? MY: Which was worse. And again this was stuff that was pretty much forced down my neck because it had to be done and they had a time table and I was not given enough time to take it to a lawyer I trusted or I knew. The idea of Melanie Young being forced into an agreement and given a time limit seems ridiculous. In any case, this agreement has now been dissolved! A little later in this discussion, Mel Fabregas again collaborates in trying to paint the original team members in a bad light: MF: Even without those legal documents, they were in possession of the skull for many years, correct? MY: For 3 years. MF: So possession is 9/10 of the law so if they were in possession of that skull, and you didn't have any you didn't have any legal documentation stating it was yours, how could you prove that it was yours and I am surprised you got it back. I am glad My understanding of this situation, from knowing Lloyd personally is this. When Lloyd was lecturing originally, and also taking the skull around to various experts, he was in possession of the original skull. At some point, however, he realised this wasn't a good idea – as it became clear it was very unusual and needed to be kept safe. At this point, an expensive replica was made by a company "Bones Clones" and that is what he carried around with him. So, I assume from this, that the real skulls were returned to Melanie Young in about 2002 (as in 1999 + 3 years). So, Mel Fabregas appears to be conspiring with Young to promote the idea that Young did not have possession of the skull for "many years" when in actuality, she had possession of it all the time. If you listen closely, you will hear discussion of the skull's teeth, which were used for DNA testing. Hence, I am highly sceptical of Young's story of picking the Skull's up from Matthew Brownstein in Tampa (and no specific dates are given). The "I am surprised you got it back" statement from Fabregas can only be meant to cast the original project members in a bad light, suggesting they would try to keep possession of the skull against Young's wishes. This is clearly a ridiculous suggestion, when it seems Young had the skulls all the time! At around 6:50, Mel Fabregas says: Are you sure you have the real one? That is, he suggests, Melanie might not have been given the real one back. Again, Fabregas shows a lack of knowledge here – because the real skulls have had segments of bone cut out of them for the testing – the replicas do not have these cuts. It would be totally clear if Young was given a "replica skull." However, Young then says: MY: Oh the other one I have too. I know I have the real one because the copy has been destroyed. Wow – why destroy a copy? I have my own copy here and it wasn't cheap! Young then talks about having a museum quality cast made – but for what purpose, when she already had a good quality copy? [EDIT: 25 May 2017 - I think she (or someone) probably destroyed the first copy - this was the best one and, I understand, it was made BEFORE portions of bone were removed for DNA testing - and I think the first "Bones Clones" copy was used to make the Brain Casts.] The theme of money and ownership is returned to several times during the interview, with both of them trying to give the impression that Melanie Young was "taken for a ride" by disingenuous people. This is extremely upsetting. Why on earth would Melanie Young be associated with such people for over 15 years, without any such statements from her? Perhaps we will find part of the answer to this question later. Age of the Skull At several points in the interview, Young makes comments about the age of the skull at death. For example at about 41:07 in hour 1, she states: All of the experts say it's 5 years old the only ones that say it's more than that is Lloyd and

Amy. But all of the experts say it's a 5 year old child. This statement is false in both parts. The evidence regarding whether the skull was that of an adult or a child is inconclusive. This is clearly stated on Starchild Project.com website in Dr Ted Robinson's report: 17. A detached upper right maxilla contains two molars [recent note: one has been lost to testing]. Tooth wear on the molars indicates maturity was reached, yet another set of teeth are present in the maxilla and appear ready to take the place of those mature teeth when and if they are lost or are no longer useful. The question of age at death remains open. Various experts are named on this page and so Young's statement about "all the experts" is false. Why is she, as owner of the skull, contradicting what was on the project website for years? Why is Mel Fabregas not familiar with this? DNA Evidence/Update At several points in the interview, there is discussion of DNA evidence – but some of the statements are vague and/or incorrect. The 2nd set of DNA tests were done in 2003 by a company called Trace Genetics (which was later absorbed into another company). Lloyd discussed all of this in his lectures. Young also tries to present the impression that the Starchild Project have hidden data and reports. A couple of statements Young made stand out at 7:57 in hour 2 she states, weirdly: MY: I never saw a report from Trace. All you ever saw in reality when you went to see one of Lloyd's presentations were screenshots or photoshopped pictures - MF: Right This statement is also false, as we shall see, and the remarks immediately following are also made to paint Lloyd Pye and Amy Vickers in a bad light. (Fabregas again conspires in making these remarks.) In hour 2, Young makes further remarks about the 2003 Trace Genetics Report. At 9:21 she states So when we started this new independent investigation with Chase, all of a sudden, the 2003 report from Trace Genetics shows up on the website. On the project website. Even though for the last year, I had been begging Amy for reports. She would never give them to me. She would always say "they're in the book or they're online" This is a lie. I found a copy of the Trace Genetics report in the Internet Archive dated June 2004! I cannot believe that Melanie Young was either not given a copy or did not know it had been posted. Here is the link explicitly - <http://web.archive.org/web/20040603092133/http://starchildproject.com:80/SCSreport.PDF> Why can't Mel Fabregas verify the claims of his guests? "Verify" and "Veritas" – you can see the connection, right? Young states that she has recently, through a person called Chase Kloetzke, initiated more DNA testing and that the Young's website currently contains results in a report dated 28 March 2017, which states on Page 6: The results for the nuclear DNA feasibility test were positive. There is sufficient nuclear DNA detected for future testing opportunities. As stated by Melanie Young in the interview, the mtDNA results agree with those carried out 14 years ago and since the original 2003 tests, nuDNA (nuclear DNA) was recovered in further tests, as Lloyd described in his presentations between 2010 and 2013. Hence, the March 2017 report appears to contain no new information. In the interview, Melanie Young implies that further results were due in April or May 2016 (by my estimation). Mel Fabregas states near the end of hour 2 of the interview that he would record an additional short conversation about the results, if they became available. No discussion was included and neither is anything newer than 28 Mar 2017 posted on Melanie Young's Website, that I was able to find. At other points in the interview, both Young and Fabregas question why it's taken so long for DNA tests to be done and a figure of 20 years (elapsed time) is mentioned by Fabregas (at about the 23 minute mark of hour 2) – disregarding the earlier discussion of the Trace Genetics 2003 test – which is covered in depth in Lloyd's lectures, as already stated. Young makes further remarks around the 24:20 mark (Fabregas assists) which appear to be an attempt to discredit the (anonymous) geneticist that has been doing the research for free since 2010. MY: People found Lloyd on line and offered to help and the scientist found Lloyd and said that he could do the testing for free in his spare time at the lab he was working for so we went that route and he found weird stuff but nothing he could substantiate and he would not put his name on it. So when Lloyd passed and I started really looking into it because no one else was doing anything. I tried to pick up the torch. I started looking into this guy he's not a geneticist – he's a virologist used to work for the CDC – probably really good in his field – but he had no clue how to do human genome – nor did the lab he was working for. We wasted time because he was willing to do it for free. MF: Yeah but do what if he doesn't know what he's doing. MY: That's my thought. It's odd how this guy who "doesn't know what he is doing" was able to supply Lloyd Pye with detailed screenshots – from the NIH database – that show the DNA sequence matches (or lack thereof). Neither Fabregas nor Young discuss the FoxP2 gene, which was discussed in some detail in Fabregas' interview with Matthew Brownstein in Dec 2013. As an example, a question Fabregas could have posed would be, "What about the FoxP2 gene that Matthew Brownstein and I discussed in 2013?" This may, perhaps, have elicited a more appropriate response from Young. However, it seems that character assassination was the "order of the day" here. Discrediting the Original Investigation It appears one of the objectives of this interview is to discredit the original investigation. It is so hard to believe that this would be the case, as the person being interviewed is the very same one that "kicked off" the whole "quest" back in 1999. However, at the end of hour 1 of the interview, Young makes the following staggering statement: You go to the Starchild Project.com all of their information is old and not true. I don't like to speak ill of anybody but their website has changed so much since chase and I started the new investigation that they basically are mirroring what we're finding. So what you have seen in the past is no longer on that website – they've changed it completely. But they definitely are misleading on their website. Chase Kloetzke and mine are totally scientific in nature – mine's a little bit more story telling and that's www.starchildmelanieyoung.com Now, it is quite easy for anyone to compare the 2 websites and it should, very quickly, become clear that there is a lot of information on www.starchildproject.com and not very much at all on the www.starchildmelanieyoung.com site (so the "mirroring" claim is also bogus). Being slightly facetious, and taking Young's statement literally, that all information on the Starchild Project website is "old and not true," doesn't that mean that she is not really the owner of the skull and has, in fact, never been associated with the skull? (She did say all of the information is "not true".) So here again, we have a ridiculous statement – she never really states which specific information is untrue and cannot be true. Her sweeping statement if taken literally, discredits her own story/account. Also, the statement about the www.starchildproject.com website having been changed since the "new investigation" is misleading. A video of Chase Kloetzke discussing the new "investigation" was posted on 6 May 2016. To assess what changes took place on the Starchild Project's website between, say Jan 2016 and the present time, you can access a version of the website from Jan 2016 in the internet archive.

Comparing that to the current version, one can indeed see that the layout/style has been re-vamped, but the information is the same and I would argue that the newer version is clearer and shows a lot of information directly on the homepage (for example, the “Starchild For Dummies” video is the first thing you see now.) “Maybe It’s Hydrocephalic After All...” Early on in the investigation, it was deduced this skull was not that of a hydrocephalic. This explanation is the one sceptics and debunkers immediately “go to”. Lloyd Pye, and others (including myself) have gone to some lengths to show that hydrocephaly cannot explain the skull’s shape and form. Indeed, Melanie Young herself, in a 2009 interview with Bill Burns (Blackboard) and others in the “UFO Hunters Team” was asked about Hydrocephaly and confirmed the skull could not have been from a hydrocephaly victim: MY: If it were a hydrocephalic, this would be bulged out (pointing) but only one side would be bulged out, or the back would be bulged. It wouldn’t be symmetrical like that is.”BB: So a hydrocephalic skull is asymmetricalMY: asymmetrical...BB: This skull is symmetrical...MY: ...is completely symmetricalMY: If that were hydrocephalic, the bones would not be connected. The would be no skull So, then, what possessed Melanie Young to say, at 20:26 in hour 2 of the Mel Fabregas interview: MY: I am not ruling out Hydrocephaly any more – I was at the beginning – because I bought into Lloyd – but I am not gonna rule that out – now that I’ve looked at it and ye know.... {mp3remote}http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/Melanie%20Young%20-%20Starchild%20Skull%20Hydrocephaly.mp3{mp3remote} Again here, we see her implying that Lloyd Pye persuaded her. However, she had previously implied or even stated that it was her knowledge of human anatomy – and deformities in infants – which had shown her the form of the skull was not the result of hydrocephaly. Shortly after this incredible statement, Young discusses Dr Aaron Judkins (an archaeologist who lead a dig for evidence of Noah’s Ark) and states: Aaron Judkins is the only one to go on record claiming it’s not hydrocephaly This statement is also untrue. Point 8 in Dr Ted Robinson’s report on the Starchild Project website: 8. Dr. Bachynsky noted that there is no evidence of erosion of the inner table of the skull. Such erosion would be consistent with a diagnosis of hydrocephaly, so this condition can safely be ruled out as a cause of the abnormalities expressed. Hydrocephaly also causes a widening of the sutures, again not expressed here. There was consensus agreement to both of these observations by other experts conversant with these features. Why is Melanie Young making these false claims? Is it me “seeing things” where there is really nothing unusual? Chase Kloetzke – The New “Investigator” Several times in the interview, Melanie Young mentions Chase Kloetzke who, as indicated above, has allegedly “taken on” the investigation. In the interview, we learn very little about Kloetzke – certainly, none of her expertise is discussed in any detail, neither are details of why Melanie Young appears to have put so much trust in this person. Kloetzke has a website, where she gives information about her background (and a lot of photos of herself.) Her “bio page” states: Chase earned her Master Trainer, Master Instructor title while employed with the Department of Defense. Armed with a Bio-mechanical Engineer accreditation, she was responsible for designing specialized programs and the supervision of complete success regarding Force Readiness, unique mission responsibilities and Elite Force Protection. This information seems rather vague to me – is there anything which indicates she has a good knowledge of human anatomy, osteology, genetics or other related fields? So, Melanie Young criticised a geneticist (or virologist) working, gratis, in a lab intermittently for several years – and was supplying real data, but she is uncritical of some person that has recently come on the scene, has disclosed connections to the US military and lacks any obvious credentials to help with the investigation of the Starchild Skull? Is it me? Conclusion In this analysis, I have tried here to be dispassionate, but it is difficult here, due the involvement of my late friend Lloyd Pye and because I know about the evidence being discussed. As with 911 evidence, I have spoken about it publicly, many times and the same sort of attacks have been made on the evidence and the “messengers”. In Nov 2015, I wrote to Melanie Young enclosing a link to a booklet (36 MB download) I had produced to accompany the talk(s) I was giving about the Skull. This booklet was basically a total rip-off of the information either produced by Lloyd Pye or posted on the Starchild Project Website. If you work through this booklet, and through the 2017 Fabregas/Young interview, it should serve to further illustrate how bizarre the whole interview was. Melanie Young did actually write back to me on 05 Nov 2015 saying: Thank you for your support. you have done a great job on your pamphlet. It is very well written. I know I couldn’t done a better [job] myself. I appreciate anything you could do to help me pick up were Lloyd left off. I owe it to him for everything he has done for me. So, from reviewing this, as I just have, it appears that something happened to Melanie Young after Nov 2015, because her comments in the Mel Fabregas interview don’t seem to tally at all with the Nov. 2015 email, above. To provide further evidence that something serious has happened to her, I found an audio of Melanie Young’s presentation at the 25 Jan 2014, Border UFO conference, in Texas. Here, she is in complete agreement with all the research on the Starchild Project Website and reports on it 100% accurately. She also has trouble describing what happened to Lloyd Pye and her overall demeanour makes her sound like a different person – speaking in a clear and concise manner. This is also the case with her presentation on 21 April 2015 at the Ozark UFO conference, where we can here her accurately discussing the DNA evidence. I ask the question then, what has caused Melanie Young, in April or May 2017 to lie about Lloyd Pye and smear or attempt to smear other members of the Starchild Project team? Why did Mel Fabregas assist in this process – when he had previously interviewed Matthew Brownstein and had previously met Lloyd Pye. He did not challenge anything Melanie Young said and did not bring up any of the points I have made in this article. From the discussion, analysis and checking that I have written about above, I conclude here that the Fabregas/Young interview served one or more of the following purposes: · It was an attempt to discredit the previous investigation work.· Wind the clock back 18 years, by re-presenting the disproved theory that the Starchild Skull is that of a hydrocephalic child.· Introduce doubt about the reputation of Lloyd Pye and/or attack him.· Introduce doubt about the reputation of other Starchild Project team members. · Focus on funding/money issues, and imply the project was/is all a money-grabbing scam (ironically, some of this discussion is in an interview recording which sits behind a “pay-wall”) Based on previous analysis of similar issues, I will now switch to some speculation. The skull is now in the possession of Chase Kloetzke, who will either not publish any results which go beyond what was known by 2012, or she will publish results which attempt to contradict or discredit the research done up to that point. The video of Kloetzke, posted on Melanie Young’s

site (referenced above), shows no images of the skull, gives no new information and gives no real clue as to what precise expertise Kloetzke has to further the analyse and investigate the skull. Perhaps the overall intent was to encourage those who have worked so hard to reveal the truth about the skull to “give up and walk away.” Didn’t quite work, did it...?

Update 25 May 2017

This is the death knell - a full-on debunking article to trash all the original research - my prediction made in the last paragraph was correct.

Update 10 Sep 2017

Mel Fabregas responded thus (my response below):

From: Mel Fabregas [mailto:mel@manticore.com]

Sent: 04 September 2017 02:44

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Your open letter... Andrew, I thought we were friends. If you had a problem with me, whatever it might have been, I would have expected you to come to me directly for clarification. That is what true men do. Not hide behind an open letter, which would have been more appropriate for someone you've never interacted with before. That is not the case here. Obviously, you and I have a different style in how we deal with differences of opinion. Your trigger-happy attitude toward criticizing those who have a different approach will lead you to burning more bridges. Not everyone shares every single one of your opinions. Even though you claim to follow the scientific method, your approach in considering the opinion of others seems to have become very dogmatic and overzealous. Not everything you discuss is incontrovertibly true. There are other perspectives to be considered and explored, and just because you don't agree with them, does not mean there is a hidden agenda. Sincerely, Mell made 1 typo in my response.... From: Andrew Johnson

[mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 04 September 2017 08:58

To: 'Mel Fabregas' <mel@manticore.com>

Subject: RE: Your open letter... Hello, It isn't an open letter I wrote. It's an article documenting what you and Melanie Young said or implied about my deceased friend – who has no chance to respond to the lies you told about him, between you. I was so shocked, I couldn't write to you. I note in your letter you offer to [should read "no"] corrections to my article – which is what I would expect as it is all true. You talk about “burning bridges” – if that stops me being connected to “islands of lies”, then burn they will. I am sorry to know you have chosen this path. I will only know you are “OK” again when you post my article, in full, on your website along with an apology – not to me – but to Lloyd Pye his family, and Amy. You might also acknowledge the problem of how disinformation works – when guests are allowed to lie and not be challenged – because hosts have paying customers to “please”. Andrew Johnson I should have added that I can't be held responsible for Veritas' lack of ability to research the history of the Starchild Skull and establish "who said what and when." To let lies be spoken is one thing, to encourage them to be spoken is another. The "Veritas" YouTube channel has also posted a video more recently: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-v0p72_vKU Hopefully this posting will help people to make decisions about where they place their support. Melanie Young Correspondence – Sept 2017 On 21 Sept, Melanie Young wrote to me saying Andrew I wish you would have an honest dialogue with me instead of chastising me publicly. I have no problem having an open debate with you but not allowing me address your attacks is just not fair to Lloyd or the starchild. I posted on your sight Check the evidence and received an email stated that it was posted. But I can't find it. I may not understand how your site works. I thought we had a good relationship. I'm sorry that changed. You still have my utmost respect. I wish you the best. Respectfully, Melanie You can have a look at the rest of the correspondence by clicking here. I offered to post her comments on the website, although she offered no corrections to the article above and no explanations for her actions. She did "beg me for help" but did not explain what help she wanted or what help she thought I could give. Did she want me to help her pronounce that the skull was that of a human child? (She confirmed the Starchild Skull is still in her possession.) Now that Melanie Young herself has become a debunker, it is the best possible outcome for the secret-keepers. Also, another irony can be observed – Melanie Young talks at some length about her “alien hybrid children” (that she's never met). Yet the skull she possesses, examined and tested by many different experts and never shown to be entirely human, is not, according to her, unusual at all. i.e. her alien children are real, but there's no proof of aliens... Is it any wonder research in this field does not progress...? 2017 Nuclear DNA Tests Also in Sept 2017. Quote" Chase Kloetzke was interviewed by Martin Willis for the UFOPodcast programme. (Archived here.)

Listening from 40 minutes, it appeared she was doing “a muddle up” – jumping between accounts of Steven Greer's Atacama Alien and Starchild. Greer's “Sirius” film does not really say it's alien or human – it leaves it in doubt). There is some interesting and useful dialogue with Dr Gary Nolan on this page. He strongly implies the Atacama creature is indeed human. He mentions meeting Lloyd Pye too (this meeting happened in Sept 2012). Nolan plays down the Starchild Skull's physical and bone anomalies, however. Kloetzke's interview briefly mentioned that a new Nuclear DNA test had been done by a Lab in 2017 which “proved” the DNA was human. Closer inspection reveals that this is not quite true. Here is what the report actually says, on pages 3-4. The combination of replication, procedures in place for laboratory sterilization and elimination of Paleo-DNA Laboratory DNA profiles suggest the results are authentic and not contamination. However, no modern comparison samples were submitted with this batch from the archaeologists or any other individual who may have handled the sample and potentially contaminated it. Therefore, we cannot guarantee that these profiles are authentic and not a previous handler. Kloetzke also reported that the sample was given to the lab “blind” and so they did not use any special recovery techniques. This article in Nature implies that ancient DNA is at least 400 years old (Lloyd Pye said that Ancient DNA was anything older than 50 years). The Starchild's DNA, according to repeated Carbon 14 dating tests was 900 years old. Hence, it is highly likely that recovery techniques used in the latest test, didn't actually recover the Starchild's Nuclear DNA – they recovered other DNA. The test sounds quite similar to the

Bold Lab test done in 1999 where they claimed to have proved the skull was from a human male child. The report is brief and contains no images, for example. I wrote to the lab to ask how much DNA was recovered – they kindly wrote back to me thus: The 23 markers attempted in the report make up a very small percentage of the genome. I can't be certain of the percentage. They are commonly used in human identification and paternal ancestry. Our recovery techniques are the same with all of our samples no matter the age. The goal of DNA extraction is to maximize how much DNA you can get from a sample. Age plays a part but the level of preservation of a sample plays an even larger part. So, as Lloyd Pye said repeatedly, to prove the case fully, a full genome would need to be recovered – and it seems the previous (anonymous) geneticist might have been able to do this if funds have been available. Kloetzke did not make it clear that only a tiny percentage of the DNA had been recovered. A number of incorrect or false statements were made in the Chase Kloetzke interview, for example at around 49:20, the host states the Starchild skull was “elongated” (it was not). Kloetzke nods and smiles and does not correct the host. At about 51:03, Kloetzke states that Lloyd was given fake evidence by experts. However, she does not name the experts nor does she describe the “fake evidence”. She also references the data/report on the FoxP2 gene which was revealed in 2012 and she describes these (51:55) as “not real science lab graphs – they're photoshop graphs.” (My understanding is that the FoxP2 results these were screenshots emailed to Lloyd by the geneticist.) Kloetzke then proceeds to cast doubt on the anonymous geneticist's credentials and even describes him as a “foreign national!” At 53:00, referring to the Fox P2 gene research she says “geneticists don't even talk like that.” This is essentially a flat out lie, as can be found here: [FOXP2 gene forkhead box P2](#) The FOXP2 gene provides instructions for making a protein called forkhead box P2. This protein is a transcription factor, which means that it controls the activity of other genes. It attaches (binds) to the DNA of these genes through a region known as a forkhead domain. Researchers suspect that the forkhead box P2 protein may regulate hundreds of genes, although only some of its targets have been identified. The forkhead box P2 protein is active in several tissues, including the brain, both before and after birth. Studies suggest that it plays important roles in brain development, including the growth of nerve cells (neurons) and the transmission of signals between them. It is also involved in synaptic plasticity, which is the ability of connections between neurons (synapses) to change and adapt to experience over time. Synaptic plasticity is necessary for learning and memory. The forkhead box P2 protein appears to be essential for the normal development of speech and language. Researchers are working to identify the genes regulated by forkhead box P2 that are critical for learning these skills. This is exactly as Lloyd Pye described in his lectures and presentations. So, whom should we believe? It seems sensible to point out here, that as Kloetzke is attempting to debunk this evidence, it is very likely that it is exactly the sort of evidence Lloyd Pye said it was – that this skull was from a being that was not even remotely human. In order to try and make sure an audience had chance to get a more accurate picture, I wrote to the Podcast UFO website – which is referenced in the Kloetzke Interview. Here is the message I sent. Dear Sir/Madam I notice you recently had Chase Kloetzke on your programme talking about the Starchild Skull. I know quite a bit about the background to the skull and the lies that have been told about it. I have documented this thoroughly in an article I posted in March 2017. I would like the opportunity to clear up a few misconceptions about the matter and therefore would like to offer myself as a future guest on your programme. I can also advise you of other important UFO related evidence which few people will talk about. Thanks for your time. Andrew Johnson <http://www.checktheevidence.com/> The response I got back from Martin Willis was as follows. Hi Andrew, I am all set and want to move on to other topics. Thank you, Martin