



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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Apr](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Seeing is not believing

From: **BOB SHELL** <76750.2717@CompuServe.COM>
Date: 15 Apr 97 11:29:15 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Apr 1997 11:48:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Seeing is not believing

>Date: Wed, 9 Apr 1997 22:39:40 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Sean <Tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Seeing is not believing

>It has been said in the past that "seeing is Believing" it certainly
>looks in this case that "seeing is not believing!".

>There has been an awful lot of dissent over the AA film and a lot of
>conjecture. Who actually knows ALL the facts? Santilli? I'm pretty sure
>even he does'nt know all the facts. I say this for several reasons.
>Permit me if I may but here are some thoughts that I have had on this
>subject.

Certainly Sean. Nice to see someone really doing some thinking
about all this.

>1) It has been said several times about the camera man getting the
>"right shots" and "positioning" etc. Could it not be possible that the
>chap in question was young and unpracticed in this art?

No one has claimed, to my knowledge, that this man did a really good
job of the filming. According to his story, he was in a state of
near shock while filming this. Remember, this was a dead "freak"
as the military called them, a creature of unknown origin and
which had turned out to be a bio-hazard. I suspect that even
the best cameramen would be so nervous and freaked out (literally!)
that they might not do their best. Also, the fact that this
creature even existed was a serious blow to "Jack" whose
religion is one of the fundamentalist sects. He still refuses
to even consider the idea that these "freaks" were space aliens.

>2)What was the procedure in 1947 for alien autopsy's? I'm fairly certain
>that "we" have one now, but back in '47? I'm sure that there was none.
>so why do we pass comment about what should or should-not have been done
>in the "theatre" of dissection.

Good point!

>3)It has been said, by several people, that if the alien bodies are S/FX
>dummies then they are extremely good ones. If I remember correctly a
>certain S/fx (his name escapes me) said that he would employ on the spot
>the man (or woman) who could do this kind of stuff, (remember the blood
>co-agulation etc) but back in '47 it would have been totally impossible
>to do this kind of stuff.

Yes, if these are special effects dummies, the person/persons who
made them are nothing short of genius.

>4) That brings me to another point, who has actually identified the film

>as from '47 stock other than one of Santilli's people? According to this
>board none. But according to the video that I have seen of the AA it has
>been verified by two top film people. One being Kodak themselves.

Yes and no. Kodak initially verified the film as absolutely from 1947, but this was a mistake caused by misinformation in the chart they use to identify film age from edge codes. The problem is that the film I have examined is copy film, not camera original. It does have the proper chemical composition and edge code for 1947, but without examination of some of the actual camera original film, all testing is really inconclusive.

>5)It has also been said that there are six other reels of film "out
>there" as yet unreleased or un-recoverable, what is on those reels of
>film? It has been hinted at that Truman himself was on one of those
>reels and that a fragment with him on footage clearly visible, now that
>I would LIKE to see.

Whether the actual number is six I do not know. The roll which has been claimed to show Truman is stuck together, and has not yet been unstuck.

>6)The alien corpse, S/fx dummy aside, there was a number of these
>"bodies" not one, so surely if they where "fake" then only one would
>have been made as the cost of making just one is bound to have been
>exorbitant. also on this vein

There are at least two different bodies. Maybe three, but the one shown in the tent footage is not seen clearly enough to be certain whether it is different. Yes, making the two bodies would have cost a substantial amount of money, and it makes no sense to make two bodies and film two procedures when only one of them has commercial potential. The first autopsy, the one not released, consisted in large part of a detailed "gynecology" exam which could not be shown on television anywhere in the world, and thus is worthless from an exploitation point of view. To me this argues heavily against it being a special effects creation.

>7) It has also been said that the "greys" of the AA film are not your
>typical "grey" well the only thing I can say to this have you ever
>thought about your typical human/homo sapien? surely if we were to be
>seen by another race of beings how would you say that we are all the
>same when you have African blacks and Chinese, and European whites etc?

The creatures shown in the film are not grays. In life they were said to be pink, and turning grayish after death. Just as human corpses do.

>Finally.
>If this film is the genuine article (which I would dearly like it to be)
>then it would be the "Holy Grail" that we have all been looking for.
> Is it possible that certain "agents of the government" connived a
>devious way for it to be "released" to create dissent in the ranks? I
>mean since the release of this film there has been a raging argument
>over it ever since.

Many believe that the film is real and is an intentional release by the US Govt or by some group within the Govt. Yes, your scenario is possible. Hand us the proof, but do it in such a way that the bulk of the UFO community discounts it and discards it.

>I am a passenger on this spaceship, Earth

>Sean Jones>

Yes, Sean, so am I. And it is likely that so are these little creatures who crashed and died in the NM desert in 1947.

Bob Shell

Search for other documents to/from: [76750.2717](#) | [tedric](#)

[[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](#).