

Explorers Web has given us the chance to make a final review about the polemic we had sustained with Mr. Borge Ousland and Mr. Thomas Ulrich some time ago, specially after they arise new elements to consider.

We had sent to Explorers Web a long, full and detailed argumentation about those issues. For the benefit of the audience, we are not going to repeat here all of them in the same extension.

They are:

**A) ABOUT THE SOUTHERN PATAGONIAN ICEFIELD (SPI from now)**

Scientific, mountaineering and cultural evidence had showed long before the SPI is between Jorge Montt and Balmaceda. At least 16 expeditions, involving some times world class climbers, had tried to cross it as it. The opinion we are defending is not ours, it's the natural agreement existing in the mountaineering world.

This argument is already enough to deny Mr. Ousland's and Mr. Ulrich's achievement, at least, as they presented it at the begining of this polemic.

**B) ABOUT WHERE THE SPI ENDS**

The main formal reason to explain the early exit of Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich in the SPI is they had a satelital picture where they "see" a mountain barrier, thus "*... there is no reasonable exit between our exit at Tyndall and the rock band*".

It's true that satelital picture give the impression of cliffs, mountains and big obstacles, but that idea doesn't match with the truth.

First, we sent another picture which permit to see the area under a different perspective. It's just a visual exercise to see if there is rock obstacle (or not) to stop any expedition.

Second, WE WERE THERE, and all the features we found where snow corridors and little nunataks; no barrier.

Third, there was another expedition who crossed there (Hémon 1983) and they never commented anything about a "rock band". They just pass it.

**C) ABOUT OUR OPINIONS IN THE PAST**

It's true the reference cited by Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich, but that opinion was wrong.

The main reason of that misunderstanding was because we only could analize the facts several weeks after our return with the help of new material we didn't have in the trip. With them we realise we had missed a couple of right pass because we were in a foggy day.

After that episody, we ALWAYS had repeated the SPI finish in Balmaceda Glacier. There are many examples about this in reports, letters and forums.

The decision of Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich to leave in Pingo Glaciar wasn't taken because they were informed about that report. In fact, they didn't know about it.

Just for the record, Mr. Fica was arguing about the polemics existed in those days between two possible exits: in Balmaceda Glacier or Canal de las Montañas which was the real discussion about the end of the SPI. In any case that opinion was used to justify an exit in Pingo.

#### **D. ABOUT MR. OUSLAND AND MR. ULRICH ATTITUDE**

The correct attitude should have been to continue walking to the south after Pingo, to see the interruption, to photograph it and, then, to manifest opinions. In that position, it's more credible to say "here, we believed, the SPI finish".

But, Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich didn't reach that section. They just use a radical exit several kilometers far from that point.

The "warmer planet" theory doesn't apply in this case (smelt of the snow and the surge of a "barrier"), because they were travelling in the edge of the spring, close to the end of the winter, when there a lot more snow.

#### **E. ABOUT OUR EXPEDITION**

All the details about our expedition are publics. We never had hidden we left the ice to take the cache or we had to threw sleds and unnecessary equipment in the borthern rib of the Reichert Fault (by security reasons).

To say we twist the truth is a unhappy way to obtain redemption.

The first week of May there will be a book about our expedition. There anybody can find all the facts we had repeated through the time.

#### **F. ABOUT OUR CACHE.**

Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich's numbers are wrong.

Our cache was 370 kgs. in 9 barrils plus 4 sleds. We took to the high camp 300 kgs., mainly food.

The afirmation our expedition sounds more like two independent crossing is ridiculous. From what quantity of kilos a chache split a travesy in two separate sections?

Our cache didn't make easy our trip. We put it to go down fast (and safer) in the northern rib of the Reichert Fault and, because it wasn't placed in our way, it involved waste time to take it.

#### **G. ABOUT DEFINITIONS**

We support Explorers Web definition of unsupported, not because it's convenient to us, but it's a better way to make fair our game.

**H. ABOUT MR. BESSER'S OPINIONS**

It's not right to translate "gringos patudos" as "stupid foreigners". The exact meaning of "patudos" is somebody who want something and solicite it without deserve it.

Maybe Mr. Besser is wrong, but his attitude had been sculped because similars experiences in the past.

After this episode, do you think he is going to give free information to any other superstar expedition?

**I. FINALLY, ONE QUESTION**

To now, the central discussion had been the european expedition. Despite this focus, to this point we had answered all the questions about our expedition: caches, ideas, equipment, garbage, etc.

Now, in our benefit, we would like to receive more information about how Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich passed Reichert Fault.

We are not saying here anything and we are not taking any premature conclusion. We are just soliciting more information about this part of the travessy. A couple of key pictures, a map and a description would be enough.

Thank you.

Let's be fair. We can say Mr. Ousland and Mr. Ulrich's expedition was a superb one, but with wrong statements. If they insist to defend unaccurated achievements, the only goal they are going to obtain is to contaminate their fine activity.

Yours,

Rodrigo Fica  
Pablo Besser  
04/03/2004, Chile