



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

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1996](#) -> [Dec](#) -> Re: Genesis and Provenance

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Genesis and Provenance

From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 1996 13:20:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 15 Dec 1996 13:13:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Genesis and Provenance

> From: Theresa <70571.1735@CompuServe.COM>
> Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Genesis and Provenance

>
> >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.

Are you perhaps confusing sales and advertising with the real world???

> 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.

We have three parts to this:

- 1) The film stock (and if there is any),
- 2) The content of the film,
- 3) Those who made the film.

Dating the film stock does authenticate the film stock. If the footage was shot in 1987 I would still like to know who did it but only after a very long and very enjoyable period during which we peel the flesh off the bones of those who have been promoting this as anything but a hoax...<grin>

> 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.

What you have isn't proof. It doesn't matter if Santilli and a cast of hundreds or even thousands it. Until we know if there is film stock, and until we know the date of that film stock, we don't know anything.

> > 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?

You have to answer that question for yourself.

> >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.

Did you forget about the scene showing a guy in military uniform on the other side of the 'window?'

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

Just noise, hot air, unless it can be verified.

> 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.

I don't understand why you would be more interested in unverified chit-chat from an unsubstantiated source about an unverified film, but to each his or her own...

> > 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.

Okay...<grin>

--

Thanks, take care.
John.

```
([[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]])
[
[ sjpowell@access.digex.net ]
[
([[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]])
```

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

[[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](#).