

Date: Fri, Sep 8, 1995 1:20 PM PDT  
From: Steve 1957  
Subj: Roswell Comments (INTERCEPTS NET NEWS)

Here are some reposted comments on the Roswell Autopsy film found on America On-Line

Subj: The scene... 95-08-30 21:51:35 EDT  
From: DepDirMJ12

(unknown)> I don't think a 40's era wall clock would have batteries or a plug; there'd be wires to connect it to the building's main wiring. If this is a hoax, I'm betting this is one detail of the set they overlooked...>>>

Inall>> I've seen those types of clocks before and they are plug-in...The plug wire is coiled behind the clock and the clock is attached to the wall right over a wall outlet. The outlet has been installed specifically high for a clock.-- no wire is exposed and the clock is plugged into the outlet.

Well, after I went back and reviewed the tape (FF, 6th time thru...) I found that the clock has been hung at eye level, plugged into an outlet at about \_knee\_-level.

This, in and of itself, would not necessarily be unusual (although one would \_expect\_ a lab room in 1947 to have a high clock outlet). It's the fact that the clock is hung very low in a room that seems to have no ceiling.

Now, to \_this\_ "believer," the apparent lack of a ceiling in this apparently small room (of which we only see \_less\_ than 1/2 of the total wall surface area) means that this is either the \_strangest\_-shaped room in any military facility in the world...  
...or it's a sound stage.

(And does anyone know what the "DANGER..." sign next to the phone says?...)

Subj: Fake or Real? 95-08-31 21:16:27 EDT  
From: Sandy995

This being my second post on this I'll be uping mine to five centsa from three...

First there are two angles of approach that need taken.

A. It is REAL and needs examined from that aspect. What can be learned if this premise is accepted. This assumes who hearted that its real and no discussion against that would be used. IE: No visible bones. What does that mean about the phisiology. An incorrect post would be "Its fake stupid, why bother" A correct post would be "It tells us about their home world gravity....."

B. Its FAKE and needs examined from that direction. That's where you go after things like... The radiation suits were model xxx from 1952 so that shows it was the wrong time period. A incorrect post would be is that its real why are you guys so negative.

The reason I bring this up is if everyone would put in the subject area a "R" for real or a "F" for fake then the subject and post we could dispense with this continued back and forth debate over whether one believes or not. That way we can get on with solid looking at the video and seeing what can be learned both pro and con. Your posting a "F" or "R" would not mean you believe or disbelieve only that your post is for showing how its a fake or what can be learned if its real.

Why do this?

So that we can get a large body of facts, evidence, myths, ideas, concepts out for everyone to look at and understand. Then we ask OMNI to have an open forum debate on the topic using the posts knowledge as a base to work from.

Personally, I find countless messages that say nothing other than "Its obviously fake or Its obviously real.. " not very helpfull since this issue is one that needs examined like a crime scene, not a debate on an issue like politics or religion.

Thanks for reading my long winded message. Please be aware that my sentence structure and syntax was done while " on line" so please take the message as a whole and not as individual phrases and sentences. Thanks again to everyone. This folder continues to produce some excellent conversation....

Sandy995

Subj: Technical observations, cont'd 95-08-30 03:21:07 EDT  
From: KWOrca

So, based on my own OR experience, all of the points listed in the previous post point to a possibly genuine event. The lack of a surgical light and the relatively even lighting in the room might be explained away by the procedure having been hastily carried out somewhere other than a proper pathology lab. Often when filming surgical procedures myself, I would bring a powerful "fill" light into the operating room to help reduce the contrast between brightly lit surgical sites and the surrounding room. And, having been in the military once, I can also easily envision some poor enlisted boob with a security clearance and a cameraman's rating being roused out of bed to record the event, stepping into this very weird situation with a lot of nervous brass and playing it safe by setting up a bright light off-camera (probably bounced off the ceiling of this white room), setting his camera to a medium lens and praying for a clear exposure.

Now for the parts that didn't work for me.

Aside from the fact that the film I saw would be virtually useless for any real scientific study--and I would have expected the doctors to be pointing out specific anatomical structures at every stage of the dissection, rather than holding up an occasional mass of indistinguishable tissue once in a while--the procedure seemed to have been done with undue haste for something so momentous. Also, I find it somewhat suspicious that only two doctors were involved. After all, this would have been a major scientific event that everybody would have wanted in on.

More importantly, I would also have expected the dissection of an alien being to have been accompanied by laborious and meticulous gathering and labeling of tissue and fluid samples at every step of the way, though only a few such tissue samples--and no fluids--were actually shown being taken, and these were dumped rather casually into open trays--which again raises the contamination factor. Just not the way it's done.

Most suspicious of all to me was the removal of the dark coverings over both eyes, but not the eyes themselves. Beyond the fact that it seemed to be a showy move and completely out of context with the rest of the procedure, I think that any good pathologist would want to remove those remarkable orbs (or at least one of them) intact for careful preservation and later study, as opposed to hacking off the outer layers (effortlessly, I noted) on the spot and dropping them into a pan. Seems unlikely to me.

Also, I am suspicious of the white suits and gloves worn by the pathology team in the film. While I might concede that it might have been decided to wear some sort of radiation suits for the procedure, it's the gloves that bother me most. Surgeons today wear skintight white latex disposable gloves--just like the ones we saw in the film. Surgeons up until the late 1950s or early 60s wore brown reusable gloves that would have been pulled up over the sleeves of the surgical gowns, and probably over any gloves that might be attached to the suits, if we assume that the main concern was for possible biological contamination and not radiation exposure. Not that any amount of gloving would have been all that effective, since upon cutting into this alien corpse the pathologists-- breathing room air, as indicated by the lack of any breathing apparatus or filters on their suits--would have placed them at high risk for airborne contaminants, especially since the alleged corpse appears bloated and could have been expected to spew billions of microbes into the room when its (probably) gas-filled belly was opened.

Even in 1947 medics knew about such things and, particularly in the military, I suspect, they would have been highly concerned, if not terrified, about the possibility of biological contamination.

So, as much as I'd like to be convinced that this footage is the genuine article, I find it at best enigmatic. Yet another bizarre

oddity in the growing archive of Ufology. Too bad, because it really caught my interest.

Subj: Is there a path in the house? 95-09-05 11:07:48 EDT  
From: Indy M

I've been much more concerned with football lately and had not even heard that this film existed until I saw a commercial from the local CBS affiliate (channel 11 in Dallas) saying that they would be showing the video and analyzing it. I missed it, so all I know comes from reading the posts in this folder over the past few days. My dad is a pathologist, so I have seen several autopsies, and even assisted once or twice. I would be interested to hear some opinions from pathologists and/or coroners about whether or not it "looks" real.

Also, what surface was the autopsy conducted on? (Should have been a stainless steel flat table, with irrigation and troughs for directing blood away from the body.) Was there bright overhead light? (Lighting from the side won't do.) Were any tissue samples taken for gross or microscopic analysis, or did they just slice it open and poke around inside the chest cavity? Was there a scale for weighing organs? Did they measure the body thoroughly before cutting? Was there any blood? (If the body had been dead for several hours, most of the blood should have pooled in the back, so any incision in the chest should not have produced blood.) Did they examine the back of the body before cutting into it? What kind of cut was made? (Y-cut or just straight up-and-down?) If there was a sternum, did they remove it? etc etc etc.

Seems like a good line of questioning to me. You can fake lots of things, but pathologists and coroners (even government ones) always follow the same set of procedures when conducting an autopsy, even one on a dead alien. A preponderance of deviations from this points to a fake.

Subj: Re:YOU had a different version, 95-08-31 01:23:17 EDT  
From: ChaSBU

The creature on the table is NOT a grey. Greys are pretty indestructible so I would think this is another species of space alien. This creature had six toes and fingers instead of the four of the greys. There were ears whereas Greys just have numbs for ears. It also appeared that there was a functional mouth and I am sure it had a human like digestive tract and you could almost see the area where it eliminated. The mouth was also more human-like, whereas the mouth of the greys are very tiny and non-functional as there is a membrane a few inches into the oral cavity. This probably IS an alien creature but a grey it is not!

Subj: Re:Setting the Record straight 95-09-04 01:56:51 EDT  
From: MMASTALER

The autopsy was performed by Dr. Leonard H. Stringfield.  
The name of the person who gave out that copy of the movie I don't have in files but he used to work to DELTA DIVISION( DELTA is the designation for the specific branch of NRO (NRO - NATIONAL RECON ORGANIZATION - based in Fort Carson AFB, Colorado.) >>>>

Subj: Re:RE:autopsy 95-08-30 00:31:12 EDT  
From: Gorgo1

Also did you happen to see them WEIGH any of the organs as they were being removed. A basic and important step they missed. MTV style camera movement. An "anonymous" cameraman. A terrific prop and a batch of 1967 film. Santilli will make much more than he needed to recoup his production costs on this one. BTW, they talked to the wrong FX guy. Should have talked to Tom Savini.

Subj: Effects POV 2 cents... 95-08-30 16:40:08 EDT  
From: DaveK511

I and many of my friends have built "fake" creatures for years. I have worked for Stan Winston as well as Rick Baker( don't let the "Jurassic Park" hype fool you, Rick is still the best ) over the years.

Here are just some thoughts that occur to a "creature" person IMHO:

1. The body looked real good. If it is a fake it was very expensive. If it was fabricated, it was most likely made in England within the last 4-5 years.
2. The skin being pulled back was especially impressive. The comment by the pathologist that the internal organs were "not human" is a valid one. On a film I worked on years ago "Day of the Dead", we had zombie autopsy sequences as well as general disembowlings. The internal organs for this were purchased from a slaughter house and were "not human". So the comment of organs not appearing "human" does not mean alien.
3. The issue of the black lenses over the eyes is most interesting. The fact that it is the SAME SIZE as the opening in the eyelids infers several explanations:
  - a. A genuine "alien" eye filter of unknown composition and usage.
  - b. A last minute decision on the part of the creators, which is why it is just a cutout the size of the opening and does not go under the eyelid.
  - c. If it was fake, why not copy the way that current SFX lenses are done. These are large affairs that cover the lens as well as the sclera (the white of the eye) and fit under the eyelid. An explanation could be that some skin materials, such as silicone, sometimes tear easily, which could make this kind of lens an iffy

proposition.

4. Several effects people have commented that they felt that they were watching some sort of "organic" not necessarily an "alien" autopsy. A feeling I have to echo.

5. The fact that the film only shows 3 of the 4 walls in the room make me think of a movie set. Or perhaps that was where he had some sort of fill light.

6. If it is fake, the props person gets an "A".

7. The fact that the bodies joints were not moved very much says:

a. The body had stiffened -or-

b. A cost savings measure. Bodies that don't have to bend realistically cost much less to fabricate.

8. The cuts made in the body were very convincing, from an FX standpoint. The subdermal fluids were very convincing. These can be a very difficult thing to chase on set, nearly every substance we use dries out under the lights.

9. The fact that the body does not follow the "Abduction" or "Roswell" descriptions to a tee makes me scratch my head. Is it truly another organic entity or a clever art direction decision to throw the "now thats wierd" element into it.

As you can see, nothing I saw from an effects standpoint, screamed "FAKE" or "REAL". This film is wonderfully ambiguous. A note to OMNI posters. What you saw on t.v. was a "show". Another respected FX person was asked to view the film at the same time that Stan Winston was. His comments were filmed, but were not as positive as Stans. He thought that he was seeing a fabrication because just as you were about to see something good, like some skin being pulled back, someone would wipe frame with their body or there would be a rollout of the film in the camera. Guess who's comments you were not allowed to hear.

As for now I'm sitting on the fence.

Subj: Re:RE:autopsy 95-08-29 23:55:27 EDT  
From: Nova 799

Although, I had also hoped for more, I was let down also. It would be nice to know if fox edited out the more fake parts, or if there are more real looking parts to the film, without seeing the unedited version of the original film its hard to pass extreme opinions as Fox made hundreds of edits to the original film which was intercut with interviews. k they should of let it run in longer clips How long was the entire film? Who's idea was it to put a digital crotch cover on the alien body, afraid of alien porn. was the genitalia so real it couldnt be shown on TV. And here is a list of (other) problems with the film I

noticed.....

1. showed hands and feet, but why doctors were so gentle with the hands and feet is beyond me, after all its dead. It would be nice to see joints move, even a leg joint?...Harder to fake finger and feet joints
2. The Black lenses came off too easy and were removed in one pc.with no ripping.
- 3 .You do not remove organs without carefully documenting where they came from, I saw none of this, or was this the fifth Alien AUTOPSIE, so they already knew.
4. There were no shots of mouth parts, no teeth. no tongue, palet.or nasal areas.
5. why were their no pushes made on stomach, or anywhere on the body, no gentle stretching, pulling., even lifting of eye area, lid, ears, didnt want to mess the makeup on prop?
6. Take note... if you were going to fake this, you could not pull this off without a much higher budget! ... skin cut pulled it open and reveal the internal organs without edits in there, notice where the edits are: they are all very conveyintly placed. in stages. if it was real all of the above could be done without edits. This is a most important point.  
Again I do not know what Fox did to raw footage. just making some points.

Subj: Re:RE:autopsy  
From: JamesOberg

95-08-31 10:31:31 EDT

Nova 799 says <<6. Take note... if you were going to fake this, you could not pull this off without a much higher budget! ... skin cut pulled it open and reveal the internal organs without edits in there, notice where the edits are: they are all very conveyintly placed. in stages. if it was real all of the above could be done without edits. This is a most important point.>>

I completely concur. I'd heard on this loop, and verified with friends of mine in SFX, that cutting fake skin LOOKS fake, it bunches and rupplies. The scalpel here just left a dark line with NO skin parting ("We used chocolate syrup for blood in the B&W days", I was told), then the scene comes back AFTER the skin has parted. I watched ALL the cuts as carefully as I could and saw NO skin parting, not even the slightest, due to the first "incision". That's the way a SFX team would have done it.

Also the 1947 date on the film, this was suspicious to many of my friends who told me that a 1944 or 1945 date would have been much more authentic-looking because of all the stocks from the war that would necessarily have been in line to be used up first. They told me that new film wouldn't likely show up in field depots the same year of manufacture. But that can be checked out -- if anyone else thinks it seems significant. Comments?

It's not proof, nor are arguments over what people "Should or would" have done. This is fascinating.