



# 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: [HoustonSky@aol.com](mailto:HoustonSky@aol.com)  
Date: Sun, 22 Dec 1996 14:02:15 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 22 Dec 1996 17:17:16 -0500  
Subject: Re: Genesis and Provenance

HI Theresa,

Never one to keep my mouth shut, I'm going to butt in again.

> <<It's what Bob may contribute as evidence which has to deemed credible or  
> otherwise.>>

> How do you determine if the evidence is credible? What Bob says about  
> the Kodak testing is in conflict with what another well known researcher says.

Check the "evidence" yourself. Or you can rely on someone you trust.

> On December 4th, the SIGHTINGS show aired a new segment about the  
Autopsy  
> Footage. This segment featured testimony from Kent Jeffrey, Dan McGovern and  
> Joe Longo.

> Kent Jeffrey stated in the broadcast:

> "Kodak has been standing by since July 1995, waiting for the film. If  
> they were given only one or two frames, they could adequately analyze this  
> film, and determine one way or another whether it is genuine 1945 film."  
> ----snip----

> Note: I don't know why Kent said 1945, but he did. -T.

> Bob Shell says Kodak wants or needs a couple of feet of film and would  
> prefer to have a whole reel. These two statements are in conflict with each  
> other. Is Kodak giving differing information to different people? Or are  
> one or both of these two researchers misleading the public?

Below I will include an excerpt from Kent's SCAM article. It contains the same quote essentially. That article's date was March 1, 1996. Why is this news now?

A better question to ask would be who has the most to gain by misleading anyone?

Figure that one out and it might help you to understand who is could be misleading who.

As for Kodak giving different statements one could speculate that one "hears" the answer they want to hear. It would probably be best for you to contact Kodak yourself and see what they tell you.

Here's an except from Kent Jeffrey's article "Santilli's Controversial Autopsy Movie":

Eastman Kodak in Rochester, New York, has been standing by since July 1995 with an open offer to authenticate the film's date of manufacture. I confirmed this fact in a recent telephone conversation with Tony Amato, the Kodak motion-picture product specialist who would oversee the authentication process. Amato told me that Kodak has received repeated promises during the last six months from Santilli through an intermediary in the United States that film meeting the required criteria was "on its way."

According to Tony Amato, while the short-term loan of a complete reel of film would be desirable, Kodak would be willing to work with as little as two or three frames. ..."

[end excerpt].

With the exception of the 1945 statement (I haven't seen the program, so I don't know what this about) how does what Jeffrey said on "Sightings" differ from the article, published last March?

Seems to me that these are not new claims by Jeffrey. Why are you now just raising this point? It was in April that Santilli said he would not work with Kodak. One could speculate that Santilli's announcement of distrust of Kodak in April was a direct result of Jeffrey's article. Perhaps Kodak finally made it so easy for him to provide the film that he decided that he needed a new excuse. I'm not saying that is what happened but the timing is interesting.

Although Jeffrey's article was not footnoted much to the chagrin of Michael Hesemann, whom you congratulated on his article in Nexus, the Jeffrey article does quote Amato. He should not be hard to find. Check it out yourself. Phil Klass checked with Kodak (a spokesperson by the name of Jim Blamphin, if I remember correctly) and he was told the same thing. This was reported in one of Skeptics UFO Newsletter (probably April or May).

And then there is the email that James and others have seen from Tony Amato at Kodak... how many times does Kodak have to say something before they can be taken serious? Or do we just keep making excuse for Poor Ray?

> <<I've asked him to clarify exactly what he's implying and if he's seriously  
> suggesting, as it appears he is, that it's all part of some conspiracy.>>

> I've never cared much for conspiracy theories. They are always too  
> convenient. But I have to say that I have seen some strange things related  
> on with this story that I don't know how else to explain.

But a conspiracy theory is just what Ray needs at the moment. Looks like some are going to provide him with one.

Rebecca

Search for other documents to/from: [houstonky](mailto:houstonky)

---

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

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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