



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: James Easton <100626.2242@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 23 Dec 1996 12:06:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 25 Dec 1996 00:04:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Genesis and Provenance

Regarding...

>Date: 21 Dec 96 14:18:42 EST
>From: Theresa <70571.1735@CompuServe.COM>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Genesis and Provenance

Theresa Carlson wrote:

<Yes, I've seen transcripts of interviews with Tony Amato at Kodak.>

> In the interview does Tony Amato say that they are willing to do the tests on only one or two frames or give any other requirements on the amount?<

Theresa,

Yes, the following extract from a response to Bob Shell might help clarify this issue for anyone who's interested:

Bob,

In your statement, which Philip Mantle has now circulated, you suggest that Kodak have not "acted in good faith".

Are you sure this is really supported by the evidence?

During September 1995, Tony Amato was asked if he could clarify what requirements Kodak had specified for testing any film. He replied:

"We don't have a requirement. All we need is a few inches of film. Mr. Shell has three frames of the film of the empty room. We can authenticate those frames, but only those frames. It was Mr. Shell that has suggested to provide an entire roll therefore the roll would be authenticated".

He also commented:

"Well, we haven't got any film yet to take a look at. We have been told that we will have some film and we have been waiting months now.

...Mr Shell has left me a message saying that he does have three frames to send me. But I have not seen them.

...Yes. We have to do a destruct test. But we only need two inches of film to do that.

...My position now is: we set up the test once we have the film in hand. I can't go spending peoples time on a wish".

In the January 1996, Skeptics UFO Newsletter (SUN), we heard that:

When we informed Blamphin* that Shell had earlier told SUN that a Kodak movie film specialist in Rochester, named Tony Amato, had agreed to test the Santilli film without charge if Shell would provide a two-inch long sample from the autopsy film [SUN #35/Sept. 1995], Blamphin said he would talk to Amato to confirm such an offer. Several days later, Blamphin confirmed Amato's offer.

Shell told SUN during our Sept. 7 interview that Santilli had agreed to provide the two-inch strip of autopsy film. But when SUN next talked with Shell, on Oct. 6, he reported that Santilli's financial partner, a German named Volker Spielberg -- who, reportedly, had stored all of the original autopsy film in a Swiss vault -- had flatly refused to provide the two-inch strip that Kodak needed. Shell explained that because Spielberg had put up the money to acquire the film, he "owned it" [SUN #36, Nov. 1995].

*A spokesperson for Kodak's public affairs office.

The problem at this point appears to have been the refusal, or inability, to provide a corroborative film sample. No fault of Kodak's.

During October 1995, you explained the current position on the sample frames you had:

Kodak has refused to do anything with this film. They want to see a strip at least 50 frames in length so they can do some sprocket spacing measurements.

Spacing of sprocket holes was changed around 1960 when new equipment was installed, and Kodak can easily determine whether the film was made before or after this equipment change if given a long enough strip.

Kodak also needs to see a strip which is intact from edge to edge, since this is an important measurement to determine film shrinkage. Film shrinks as it ages.

Kodak also wants to perform chemical tests on a piece of film which can be firmly established to be from the same film on which the alien appears. There is no hard evidence that the film Bob Kiviatic and I have is from this, only strong circumstantial evidence. That's not good enough.
[End]

Would you agree there was no dispute with Kodak's intentions at this point?

In your latest statement you comment:

"I spent a lot of time working with Ray and got Volker to agree to supply such a strip for them. At this point they said they needed 16 feet, at which point I got disgusted with them and gave up on them".

It was my understanding that the only reference to "16 feet of film" was by Peter Milson, at Hemel Hempstead and had no bearing on Tony Amato or your arrangements with him.

That aside, the statement that Ray/Volker had actually agreed to supply a strip of at least 50 frames in length, is central to your claim that Kodak's requirements had been met.

However, on 8 December 1995, you mentioned that, "I have forwarded a detailed description of Kodak's requirements to Volker Spielberg via Merlin, and have received a response that he is not willing to provide what they are asking at this time. He has indicated that he may soon be willing to provide "about half" of the 50 frame strip with the creature on it that Kodak wants".

So, at this point, there was in fact a refusal to supply the 50 frame strip, and at best, you might some day have access to about half of what Kodak apparently now required. Then again, you might not.

But the problems still all lie with the absence of any corroborative film.

When were you subsequently told that the full 50 frame strip was definitely to be made available? Or was this perhaps just another indication from Ray that some day things might change.

I'm trying to square this with Ray's comments from the 24 March 1996 conference, that there was no way Kodak were going to be asked to test any film in the first place.

I'm also trying to square it with Ray's comments to Philip Mantle, at the end of 1995:

Q: Why hasn't a segment of film showing the 'creature' on it been released for analysis.

A: Plenty of film has been released with a variety of images including images of the autopsy room. Giving away film with the creature would be a last resort as the frames are far too valuable. I think it is also unnecessary as it is part of the same material already released.
[End]

Doesn't this confirm that there was in fact never any intention, or perhaps the ability, to provide a meaningful film sample to you?

>>*The absence of any corroborative film is hardly your fault. But at what point was the decision taken not to involve Kodak in any theoretical testing - it must have been sometime before the 24 March conference?*

Was this Ray's decision, your recommendation, or a mutual agreement?<<

>*None of the above. It was a statement supposedly made by Ray which I knew nothing about until after the fact.*<

The statement was made by Ray during the CompuServe conference and I believe there's still a transcript in the library.

Again, if you didn't know it had been decided that Kodak would specifically be precluded from any potential testing, it does all suggest that Ray was telling you personally what he maybe thought you wanted to hear, but he knew this would never materialise.

As you acknowledge, Ray is capable of doing so, although not necessarily intending to be deceitful.

On the question of film verification, Ray mentioned something puzzling during that conference:

Ray Santilli: Yes there are further plans with regard to the verification of the film and this will hopefully be done at the time of the cameramans interview.

Q: Can you give us more details about the verification of the film you plan to do.

Ray Santilli: Sorry I cannot right now apart from saying that the matter is in hand and with an independent.

It did perhaps indicate a change of attitude, but I wonder....

Could this simply have been a reference to the independent testing of Philip Mantle's non-corroborative sample, which Professor Malanga was to undertake?

We haven't heard of any other candidates since March of this year and Professor Malanga's testing does seem to have taken place around the same time as the "interview".

It seems a reasonable assumption that's what it referred to and basically, there endeth the film "testing".
[End]

In essence, I don't believe the evidence supports Bob's premise that Kodak have placed obstacles in his way.

I do believe it's apparent that there was never any intention, or the

ability, to provide a meaningful film sample to Bob Shell and that was always the only obstacle.

I'll copy this mail to Philip Mantle and perhaps Philip can comment on the possibility that the independent verification mentioned by Ray Santilli, was the work to be undertaken by Professor Malanga.

James.
Internet; pulsar@compuserve.com

Search for other documents to/from: [100626.2242](#) | [70571.1735](#) | [pulsar](#)

[[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](#).