

INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS
MT SAN ANTONIO, CA

DATE: June 12, 2026
TO: The Herald, Church of Alienism
FROM: Howard Stonecipher, Director
SUBJECT: Atlantic Deep-Ocean Sonographic Expedition

PROSPECTIVE HERALD SUBMISSION

The Public Story and the Account Beneath It

Submitted for consideration by The Herald.

The public version of the event is straightforward. A civilian researcher associated with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution participated in a year-long expedition into some of the deepest waters of the Atlantic. During routine checkouts and exercises of sonographic equipment, the team recorded a return from an object or structure that could not be reconciled easily with the local seafloor.

That account is substantially true and substantially incomplete.

The Institute became aware of the expedition through fragments of correspondence collected from several people who were not communicating with us. Those fragments were initially too inconsistent to support a useful conclusion. Later access to restricted material allowed us to reconstruct a second chronology. The civilian expedition had not merely encountered an unusual sonar return. It had repeatedly observed a geometrically regular feature at depth, after which a separate vessel arrived and assumed control of the survey area.

The later observations were made from a submerged platform using underwater optical systems in conditions that ordinarily permit very little detail. This distinction matters. The reported clarity applies only to the optics available from the submerged observing platform and should not be interpreted as evidence that the feature was plainly visible from the surface, from aircraft, or through ordinary seawater at comparable distance.

Even under those conditions, the descriptions are incomplete. Personnel reported edges that appeared too regular for exposed geology, a surface that returned light differently from the surrounding bottom, and an apparent vertical extent that could not be established because the feature continued beyond the useful viewing geometry. No reliable image available to us shows the whole object.

The restricted account contains no persuasive evidence that the feature was a conventional vessel, wreck, drilling structure, or known seabed installation. It also contains no persuasive evidence that it was extraterrestrial. The most defensible statement is that multiple sensing modes appear to have encountered something regular enough to attract immediate outside interest and important enough that the original civilian team was no longer permitted to characterize it freely.

Alienist doctrine contains repeated warnings against confusing concealment with absence. The deep ocean is a particularly effective teacher of that distinction. It hides ordinary things perfectly well without requiring any Veil at all.

Our interest therefore remains cautious. If the structure is artificial, its age and purpose matter. If it is geological, the regularity matters. If the original teams misinterpreted a combination of terrain, sonar processing, and poor visibility, that matters as well. What is most difficult to explain is not the first observation, but the rapid narrowing of who was permitted to continue observing afterward.

The Institute has not attempted to revisit the site. For now, the public story should be treated as accurate in the way many useful cover stories are accurate: it describes what happened before the interesting part began.

Respectfully,
Howard Stonecipher
Director
Institute for Environmental Systems Analysis