



# 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](#) -> [Feb](#) -> **Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

From: [yogi@iadfw.net](mailto:yogi@iadfw.net)  
Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 14:52:52 -0600  
Fwd Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 19:04:25 -0500  
Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

> Date: Mon, 10 Feb 1997 14:25:34 -0500  
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
> From: [skaeser@nmaa.org](mailto:skaeser@nmaa.org) (Steve Kaeser)  
> Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

Steve,

> Please understand that these thoughts are merely my opinions, and nothing  
> more. I have been watching this matter since it first hit the "net" in  
> January of '95 and have communicated with a number of the principals in  
> this. My comments are based on those communications and my memory. To be  
> quite honest, I have avoided making broad statements regarding the "film"  
> to avoid being drawn into an endless debate. But these questions were  
> raised, and I have decided to respond with some of my thoughts:

In all honesty, I didn't realize that I had raised so many questions with my previous message. ;) I too have followed this thing from the beginning.

> Perceptions can indeed be wrong, but the comments I have heard come from  
> those who knew Ray long before his involvement with the Santilli "film",  
> and most of them come from those who don't like his methods.

I don't doubt that. He does seem a little weasely to me, but that is only my opinion of course.

> Obviously Ray couldn't be the only person involved in this, even if it is  
> faked. The creation of the video would have required a set, props, actors,  
> not to mention the model makers and special effects help. The special  
> effects community is fairly close, and it would be likely that an effort by  
> a known special effect shop would have been recognized. Those who perform  
> this type of hoax usually come forward to claim their due credit, and laugh  
> at those who were fooled. This may yet occur, but so far it has not.

> Ray has been quite honest in admitting that he knows more than he's  
> telling. He obviously knows the source of the "film" or video, and has  
> provided a story that we can either accept or reject. If we reject it out  
> of hand, then we are left with the "film"/video without any provenance  
> whatsoever. If we accept it, we are faced with even more questions than  
> answers and there is no way to track it much further. Neither solution is  
> a good one, and both rely primarily on our "gut reaction" rather than  
> evidence.

I agree with most of what you stated in your first paragraph. But the thing is we have absolutely nothing to go on without the film or the cameraman. Ray Santilli is the ONLY one who can provide the provenance genesis of this video/film. He is the one who presented this to the world and it is he who holds all the answers. The story provided by Ray that we are to accept or reject has been thoroughly gone over and

has been proven to be full of holes. Why do you give it any credence to the story provided by Ray? Can you list anything that gives any credibility to the story at all?

> An honest opinion, and I appreciate that you didn't state it as fact.  
>  
> I know many businessmen who hold their cards close to their vest, and like  
> the feeling of power they feel as they move forward in their business.  
> Employees and customers might feel that they had been deceived at times by  
> some decisions, but they were reached through careful thought, or perhaps  
> on a whim, by the person who holds the power to make such changes. Ray is  
> spokesman for those who control the "film" (or controls it himself) and  
> changes in his position regarding the "film" may be economic from his  
> perspective, and don't prove that he is merely trying to be devious. Ray  
> would be the first to admit that he opens his mouth too much at times, and  
> has made statements that have come back to haunt him. But those that I've  
> seen were explainable as misquotes or poor judgement. Neither of which  
> serve as evidence, one way or the other.

As far as Ray's deception goes, I can state a one important fact. Ray did purposefully and blatantly lie about Harry Truman being visible in the video. He told numerous people (Stan Friedman, Reg Presley, Colin Andrews and I believe Phillip Mantle and Michael Hessesman) that Truman was visible in the film and that is not true. As a matter of fact we could have Stanton Friedman confirm what Ray told him. I have Stan on tape on Don Ecker's UFOs Tonight radio show stating that Ray told him President Truman was visible on the film at the crash site and that it was so clear that you could read Truman's lips. When Ray was asked about this in a recent TV interview with Sightings, Ray gave a convoluted answer saying yes it was a discrepancy, but never denying that he said it.

> Do you know much about Ray? Are you aware of his involvement in other  
> entertainment areas? It is my understanding that Ray would rather let this  
> entire matter go away at this point, but Volker wants to get the rest of  
> the "film" out to maximize his profits. Ray, on the other hand, isn't  
> exactly jumping at the prospect of being hounded by UFOlogists and the  
> press. The fact is that Ray doesn't need this "film" to pull him away from  
> more profitable pursuits.

This is all irrelevant to the question of whether the film is real or not. But if they really wanted to maximize their profits they could have had the film tested and proved it's authenticity a long time ago. If real this would have made the film worth much more than what they have made so far. This one thing alone suggests that they know the video/film is not real. Another act of deception on Ray's part was the claimed testing of the 3 frames of film by Bob Shell. Ray never bothered to tell Bob that what he had sent him was print film and not the original camera negative. Somehow Bob didn't recognize the difference between print and negative film and at first we were led to believe that this film might be real. It wasn't until later that researcher Clive Tobin learned that what Bob had in his possession was actually print film and not camera negative.

> Don't get your hopes up. I had heard that the FUJI-TV showing was about  
> half the length of the original, but those that have seen it say that it  
> contains no new information. The only new information is the image of the  
> alleged cameraman, and that (as you note) is of questionable value.

I've seen the video and can confirm that there is nothing new here. The still captures that have been seen on the internet are probably about as good as any in the video. I'm sure anyone who wants to see this video can probably acquire a copy thru channels. :) The copy I have seen just magically and anonymously appeared on my doorstep one morning. So I know there are copies of the Japanese broadcast out there. It would be even better if it were broadcast on TV to get the most exposure.

> The problem is that I require proof from both sides in this issue to  
> convince me. I don't have proof that Santilli's scenerio is fake, and I  
> don't have proof that it is real. However, the lack of proof on one side,  
> does not IMHO add weight to the other side. It merely points to our lack  
> of knowledge. If Santilli's story is to be accepted, then the cameraman  
> must at least exist as far as he is concerned. The question of whether or  
> not the cameraman's a real person hasn't been answered, but for Ray he  
> would indeed be real. If Santilli's story is rejected, then this video is  
> one more effort on his part to prove his case. I suspect that the  
> cameraman "interview" was the result of an earlier agreement between Ray  
> and Kiviat regarding an interview. I think that Kiviat had hopes of  
> actually interviewing the "cameraman", but that later fell through. It is  
> my understanding that Kiviat provided the equipment, tape, and questions to

> Ray, and they were forwarded to the "Cameraman". I think that Ray (with  
> his partners) decided to make a few extra bucks and sold a portion of it to  
> FUJI-TV, leaving Kiviat to release it in the U.S. Unfortunately, the  
> Internet has once again shown that it is making the world a smaller place  
> and much of what Kiviat has is now old news.

I require proof as well, but it is not us who must prove that this is a hoax. It is the ones who hold the alleged film and the keys to the whereabouts of the alleged cameraman who should be held responsible for proving this thing is real. They hold all the answers and can easily prove it's authenticity. They have refused to do so thus far and until they do it should be considered a hoax. The burden of proof is theirs.

I don't even want to speculate why the cameraman interview was released in Japan first. Hopefully Kiviat will soon be able to show this on US TV. It is probably our only chance that someone might recognize him.

>  
> This entire debate will be raised a level or two if Ray actually releases  
> the other "autopsy/dissection" sequence. It certainly won't prove anything  
> by itself, but raises the level of complexity if it's a hoax. Among other  
> things, one will have to question why hoaxers would spend time and  
> materials in creating a sequence that is gynecological in nature, and  
> unshowable on television (in most places). Kiviat has gotten a lot of  
> criticism for his masking the crotch area in the FOX Network program he  
> created, and I can imagine the problems he would have with a sequence in  
> which one of the doctors allegedly sticks one arm into the creature up to  
> his elbow. From what I've heard, it is obviously not human, but that won't  
> appease the censors who would likely view this as objectionable.

Might be able to sell it to Larry Flint. ;) Or better yet, Bob Guccione is already into aliens. Remember the Penthouse Alien photos of the Roswell Museum dummy. What a hoot! ;O

> There are obviously far more questions than answers with regard to the  
> Santilli "film". My instinct tells me that Ray will take advantage of the  
> 50th Anniversary of UFOlogy and release the rest of the video sometime this  
> Spring. Given the nature of the video, I would also suspect that direct  
> sales will make up a larger portion of the release this time around. The  
> images will all have a logo in the corner to identify it as copyrighted  
> material, which can help to limit the piracy that plagued his last release.

> Will it help to prove anything. No.

> But it will at least be interesting, and take the debate into areas where  
> it hasn't gone before.

Yeah, that LOGO ought to really scare the video pirates. ;)

Regards,  
Bill Ralls

Search for other documents to/from: [yogi](#) | [skaeser](#)

---

[ [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](#).