



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1996](#) -> [Dec](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Genesis and Provenance

From: **Theresa** <70571.1735@CompuServe.COM>
Date: 11 Dec 96 11:25:03 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 12 Dec 1996 03:27:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Genesis and Provenance

<<Date: Wed, 11 Dec 1996 07:32:12 -0500
From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>
To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Genesis and Provenance
References: <2.2.32.19961211070336.00b5ad20@globalserve.net>>>

To John Powell,

<<That's an incredibly silly premise.

Dating the film merely dates the film, nothing more. In no way does it prove ownership. Santilli has already claimed ownership and has the copyright, and he's not a US citizen. If the US gov't wanted the film they'd have two options:>>

Silly or not, it seems to have worked. If you saw my message to James Easton, I mention the videos of the footage been or being sold by other vendors on that premise even without the US Govt. claiming it.

You are correct, dating the film does nothing else. It does not "authenticate" the footage. If the footage was shot in 1987 we still don't know who was involved in making it. Not all people are interested in finding out who did it. I just happen to be one that is.

That person that is claiming to be the cameraman is involved now. Whether he is actually the cameraman that shot the footage or not, he is still involved. I think the fact that there is an actual person claiming this, besides Santilli is significant. I don't think Santilli could have done this whole thing by himself, and now there is more proof that he didn't.

<<Sorry, but this is just a convenient dodge to allow Santilli to continue to market his hoax.>>

And he should continue. Particularly if he is able to market it even though people think its a fake! No one is being forced to look at the footage or to purchase it so what harm is being done? If the networks paid good money and got good ratings they are not likely to complain. Few others spent any money on it. Any money that went to Santilli, that is. It's a good hoax, well thought out, well prepared, and not so cheaply done, not your usual 'saucer dangling from a string'.

<<If your alleged cameraman turns out to be a cameraman from the 40s that's wonderful but it tells us nothing about the Santilli footage. There would also still be no connection between the cameraman and the Santilli footage. We would still need to date the film to know it is from that era.>>

Dating alone will prove nothing other than that deformed human bodies or special effects existed in whatever year it turns out to be. There is nothing in the footage to show that the military or any government agency was involved.

The person claiming to be cameraman can tell us who was involved and what is on the table.

So yes, I think more information can be gained from the "cameraman" than from dating the film. At least the information that I am interested in. I know that all people aren't interested in knowing the who and the what of it, and I wouldn't expect them to.

<<Logic would tell us that the quickest and easiest choice for us is the one that requires the least time and work. The lowest time/work option for Ray is to get the film dated. The lowest time/work option for us is to get the film dated.>>

The time and work doesn't bother me. It's a hobby.

<<Now, finally, please state why you think _any other_ choice makes more sense, and please do so by refuting the simple logic stated above.>>

I would chose the one that would give me the the most answers. Dating the film would only answer one question. Many people have stated that would be enough for them. But I want to know more.

Regards,

Theresa Carlson

Search for other documents to/from: [70571.1735](#) | [sjpowell](#) | [2.2.32.19961211070336.00b5ad20](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).