

Date: Thu, Sep 7, 1995 10:21 AM PDT
From: Steve 1957
Subj: Re: Alien Autopsy Comments

I again watched the "autopsy" film frame by frame.

I too am a doubting thomas.

There are some things about the film that shouts "hoax."

1. An almost 50 yr old film on flammable nitrate stock film stored in a cardboard box in foggy old England still in pristine condition?

Nitrate based film stock needs to be kept in a cool dry place (preferably frozen) or it will be attacked by film eating fungi, and deteriorate faster than a dead alien in the Roswell summer sun, but this film looks like it was shot yesterday.

The Kodak rep. dated it from 1947 or 1967. A smart hoaxer could obtain some old unexposed 16 mm film stock and either shoot the film on it or have an optical printer, print the footage on the old stock. Not as implausible as it may seem. A local tv station used to shoot 16 mm film until video became available. When I was a kid fooling around with movie gear I once talked a TV station out of their old 16 mm film stock that they had sitting for years in their freezer. Some of it was over twenty years old, yet when I shot and processed it, it looked brand new.

Also : one could print the film on 35mm motion picture stock (including bogus film markings of the day) and then cut (split) the film to 16mm size, including adding sprocket holes. Professional film makers have used the technique in the past when 16mm film became scarce.

2. As for the body. Did anyone notice that the organs seemed to be just lying inside the body like cookies in a cookie jar? All the organs including the brain, almost fall out of their respective body cavities with little cutting needed.

As for the opening of the head, notice how it seems that one surgeon seems to be holding the face on.

The only time I saw any connective tissue being cut, was when the "surgeons" removed the "crystal" (or alien gallstone?).

To me this looked like an heavy handed attempt to prove to the viewer that this was some sort of out-of-this -world organ and not of human origin. To obvious for my part.

3. Although it sounds ghoulish a well funded hoaxer could obtain a real body, attach a fake alien face, hands and feet to make the cuts bleed in a realistic fashion.

We see them cutting, but we never see them open the body with the alien organs in place (No, I have not seen the original footage, but those who have say that they cut to the body already open. This is convenient for the purpose of inserting bogus alien organs, cow lips, crystals, burnt meatloaf etc.

Some things I didn't see which I expected to were:
Ribs (not even the barbecued kind)

Removal of the eyes. (that would mean digging into the bogus head)

Dissection of the extra digits, toes. (wonder why?)

Opening of the mouth and inspection . (wonder why?)

The "alien" turned over and dissected through the back.

In fact, if this was a real alien being , by the time it was autopsied there wouldn't be much left on the table. We would want to learn everything about its structure and would dissect it down to its bones (if it has any).

Some other things that bothered me:

How come we were only allowed to see two walls? Could it be an open movie set? Great care is made not to show them.

Lighting: Everything was flatly lit to show no reflections, especially on the windowed booth that the other observing surgeon was inside. Shouldn't there be a hanging operation room lamp?

As for the guy inside the booth: why was he wearing a mask and why wasn't he wearing a radiation suit?

And how come we see no door to the booth? It is very small, not like an observation booth but more looks like a windowed closet built on a cramped set.

Also we never see a door to the room or the observation booth, do we?

The phone cord (not the curly one) can be seen in several instances dangling like it is not installed and just a prop hung on the wall.

The warning sign: Looks too modern and printed on plastic .

The pen used to jot down notes doesn't look like the standard ball point pen from the 1940s. Looks like a blue 29 cent BIC, not available in 1947 . The notes (although they can't be read) look broad and bold like those made by a felt tipped pen. Also the surgeon holds down the paper with a bloody gloved hand while he writes down notes. Would a real pathologist do this? Didn't they have clip boards in 1947?

The pan that organs are being placed into looks like an antique, too antique. The bottom is dented and rusty.

The dangling pathologist's microphone looks like the one on Dave Letterman's desk or from a forties radio station. Would they use a broadcast microphone to record notes?

All in all I'm not convinced.

In my humble opinion it is a carefully yet flawed product of a hoaxer.

If so a more interesting question remains.

Who did it and why?

-Steve