

Subject: WINGFIELD Waffles NO More...1/3

From: rschatte@aol.com (RSchatte)

Date: 23 Nov 1995 09:17:36 -0500

Message-ID: <491vq0\$lu8@newsbf02.news.aol.com>

Santilli Film: Should Alien DORA really be Alien HILDA ?

-----  
GW Bulletin 12.

November 22nd 1995

Over the last two months the Santilli alien autopsy saga has rapidly declined into farce. Nevertheless there still seems to be an enormous appetite for it, especially out there in cyberspace: the subject provides an unceasing source of fascination, although few now dare to hope that we are dealing with a real alien, and it seems that what we are left with is simply an overblown whodunnit.

It is now six months since the first public screening of the alien autopsy footage. At the time I bestowed the name "DORA" on the wretched alien: this stands for Dubious Origin Roswell Alien. (It was also appropriate since my erstwhile mother-in-law was called DORA and many had the distinct impression that she was an alien.) Now, however, I believe that the name "HILDA" is more appropriate and, if you will bear with me, I will attempt to explain why.

I have been pressed several times to reveal what I really think

about the footage and whether I consider it genuine or not.

Until now I have avoided that question in the hopes of obtaining access to further footage, inside information and perhaps even contact with the mysterious "cameraman". That was obviously not to be. What I do believe is that the whole production is a scam and most probably one that was conceived in 1993 and carried out during the year 1994. If I am not mistaken there were several people involved in this project which was devised and executed in London. Most likely the footage was shot on video and there never was any "original 16 mm" cine film. I suggest that the US telephone and clock in the "autopsy room" were carefully chosen by the perpetrators to match the supposed 1947 scenario. Likewise, the surgical instruments were selected as the correct sort for that era.

Despite much that has been suggested to the contrary by many people, including medical men, the alien corpse is most likely a special effects dummy.

Reasons for extreme doubt

-----

What reasons are there for thinking that the footage is bogus?

Primarily there is the fact that Mr Santilli has told us things which are demonstrably untrue. He has changed his story again and again and, more recently, he has been caught out (on French TV) in a gross falsehood as regards his original story of how he supposedly obtained the footage. I don't intend to enumerate

all the discrepancies in the story --which is now falling apart at the seams-- but a few instances will illustrate this.

1) We were told that President Truman could be clearly seen in the footage. Quoting Colin Andrews in his newsletter (March 1995), he says: "I asked Santilli what was the most impressive thing he had seen on the film. What had convinced him that it was authentic ? -- 'I had no doubts', he said, 'when I saw President Truman'." No film of Truman has ever been produced and nor will it be.

2) Reg Presley and Philip Mantle were told separately that the footage showed the debris site in the desert, the crashed disk and a crane used to recover it, as well as many military personnel. None of this footage was ever produced.

3) In the same newsletter as (1) above, Santilli is reported as saying that "the prestigious Royal Society in London had agreed to assist with their high-tech. computer enhancement facility". Bob Shell was told that Rank in London had carried out the processing needed to copy the original 16 mm film. Santilli also said that the processing was done in the U.S. Checks indicate that none of these claims are true.

4) On French Television's Jacques Pradel show on the TF-1 network on October 23rd Santilli was confronted with the fact that the early Elvis footage which he claimed he purchased from

the mysterious "cameraman" in Cleveland had in fact been bought  
from one Bill Randle. Randle had helped promote concerts in  
Ohio includ