

20 February 2009

By: Tudor Vieru, Science Editor



The first picture shows the alleged monster idly swimming. Notice its size as opposed to that of the trees. Handout via LiveScience

Two Pictures Show the 100-Foot 'Borneo Monster'

Questions as to their authenticity arise

Two photographs have been recently released from unknown sources in Borneo, depicting the weirdest of occurrences - a 100 foot-long snake-like creature cruising in the waters of the Baleh river. Natives are understandably scared of that, as they believe that the alleged monster is the mythical Nabau creature, a dragon-like serpent that has the ability to change its shape whenever it pleases. Western observers are, however, reluctant to accept the pictures as genuine, saying that there are serious clues in them that give away the fact that they are most likely fake.

Allegedly, one of the photos, taken from a helicopter, is said to be the work of a member of the flood surveillance team. But his or her name has not come out, and the date on which the image was taken also remains a secret. This further helps to amplify critics as to the accuracy of these snapshots. Another reproach is that there only appear to be two photographs of the beast, even though those in the helicopter could have taken numerous ones from the safety of the air.

In the first picture, the alleged animal is seen swimming idly in the middle of the river, but its position is just perfect for the photo. Plus, it should, according to estimates, be 100 foot (33 meter)-long, but the relative size of the trees near it seems to contradict that. You can form an opinion for yourself while looking at the image and searching for discrepancies between how water is displaced by the monster, as well as its relative size.

In the second picture, it clearly appears in all its splendor, photographed from the side. Again, notice the fact that the ratio between its size and that of the trees seems to change drastically between the two snapshots. In the first one, it looked like it was thicker than a few trees bound together. In the second, it only appears to be an over-sized snake. Also, its length seems to be smaller. Again, its position is just wonderful for the shot, which allegedly has been taken in a "remote" village.

No one can dispute the fact that the locals really buy into this story. But scientists have a tougher time in doing so, as they always require a little something called proof. And the question arises "Why are there only two pictures of the creature, when most certainly those wielding the cameras would have been most excited to capture even more?"