



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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Apr](#) -> Re: Seeing is not believing

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Seeing is not believing

From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 17 Apr 1997 21:07:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Apr 1997 00:08:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Seeing is not believing

Regarding...

>Date: 16 Apr 97 10:01:14 EDT
>From: BOB SHELL <76750.2717@CompuServe.COM>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Seeing is not believing

Bob suggested:

>Ok, lets pick some nits.

>When Ray first saw the film in Florida, he says he phoned Kodak while
>he had the film in his hands, talked to them about edge codes, and
>was told that the film was absolutely from 1947. That's why he agreed
>to buy it.

Bob,

You may recall the following point, but most subscribers are unlikely to be aware of it.

At the Q & A session during the BUFORA conference on 19 August 1995, Ray was asked, "Did you ring Kodak at the time to verify this film?".

He answered, "Well, no, not to verify it, but to ask them what I need to look for and I also called Philip Mantle and I said to Philip at the time, can you please tell me what Roswell is all about and my agreement with Philip at that time was that he would educate me on the subject and point us in the right direction".

He didn't call Philip, as such, at all.

At the time of the BUFORA conference, Ray was still claiming that the Cleveland visit, when the film was allegedly offered, had taken place in the summer of 1993 and shortly before he first met Philip.

It's now of course known and acknowledged that the Cleveland trip actually took place a year earlier, in July of 1992.

It was during the summer of 1993, after Carl Nagaitis, Philip and Ray had already discussed some UFO related video projects, that Ray announced he had some film connected with the Roswell case.

So, not only was the claim to have phoned, "Philip at the time", untrue, Ray didn't in fact have any urgency to clarify what this unknown Roswell film might relate to and whether it was likely to be genuine.

Even a full year after supposedly having phoned Kodak, he was discussing other UFO related video projects with no apparent interest in finding out what this film he had not only "agreed to buy", but "paid a deposit on", was all about.

As you're also likely to know, in discussions with Ray, I detailed this and asked if he could explain the anomaly, but there was no explanation offered.

Have either Michael, Philip or yourself asked Ray if he might explain this seemingly significant anomaly?

Is this perhaps a similar situation to the bogus "Rank in London processed the film" claim, the "IRT" having apparently some reluctance to trouble Ray with, it seems, any of the evidence indicating that the video might be, perish the thought, a somewhat more recent production than 1947?

No-one's compelled to, but all that evidence won't just "go away" and failing to address it does tend to make the IRT's case look more of a promotion than an investigation.

As an aside, in one of the earliest interviews with Ray, published in the May-June 1995 issue of the French magazine "Phenomena", he claimed, "This particular cameraman is an ordinary person, he is now in his early eighties. He's been in the same house for the last 50 years".

If he's lived in Florida for 50 years, I'm not sure how we equate that with Ray's subsequent claim that the Elvis Presley "Cleveland" film he bought from the same cameraman, in Cleveland, had been, "shot by a local freelance cameraman".

>Later, in a letter on Kodak stationary, an official of Kodak Denmark >stated that the film was definitely from 1947.

This being the sample they had seen, not "the film".

As Rebecca points out, the sample was meaningless, with no images from the video.

>The problem, as I have been told by Kodak personnel, is in the chart >used to identify film...

We know what apparently happened in this specific incident. In December, 1995, I posted the following to the CompuServe MUFON forum:

Regarding the recent misunderstandings concerning Kodak's dating of the alleged Roswell film, with the permission of Quest International and Mr Peter Milson of Kodak, I have transcribed some of the relevant conversations which took place.:

Peter Milson: Just to let you know what happened yesterday...basically my colleagues in Los Angeles, Hollywood, basically said the same as we did. My colleague in Denmark, who's not perhaps as much experienced and it isn't such a big market place, had looked at the film, looked at the first bit of the chart and said "1947".

Now, what I've done this morning is , I've talked to my Danish colleague and I said, "the edge code you looked at", he said, "yeah", I said, "what did you say?". (He said) "Well, it's '47". I said, "yeah, but it also could be '27 and '67".

"Ah...", he said, "didn't realise that", 'cause he's fairly inexperienced. So I said to him, "OK, go back to the distributor and say you've got more information and it could be '27, '47 and '67."

Then we have a consistent line and we're all saying the same thing. I mean, you know, if it is '47 and it's genuine...hey...you know, whatever... I'm looking forward to seeing aliens (laughs).

Tony Dodd: So are we! (laughs)

[...]

Tony Dodd: Has he given you any reason why he hasn't let you see the original?

Peter Milson: No, and I'm still waiting for them to do that, you know, we've said to them a number of times, delighted to look at it, but nothing has come back.
[End]

The film sent to Kodak in Copenhagen was forwarded by Tripple Entertainment, based in Denmark. As far as I know they are in the entertainments industry and were negotiating a business deal at that time with Ray's company, "The Merlin Group".
[END]

It's somewhat academic, but that's the story.

>So we do have official written verification from Kodak that the film >was 1947, but this was wrong. When Ray stated that Kodak had verified >the film, this is what he was referring to.

In July of 1995, Ray acknowledged that, "Mr Milson today also stated that his office in Denmark should have included 1927 and 1967, that being the case it's their error not mine".

True, but as recently as a couple of months ago...

"The "X Factor" asked music and film producer Santilli if the autopsy film had been authenticated".

"Yes. Pieces of the film were sent to Kodak for analysis. They've confirmed that it dates from 1947".

...he still didn't realise these claims were perhaps misleading?

Ray is of course entitled to make any claims he wants, it's just an exercise in pointing out how many of them are "unreliable".

"and I said to Philip at the time...", being a prime example.

James.
E-mail: pulsar@compuserve.com

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

[[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.

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