



# 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](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

From: **Steven Kaeser** <[skaeser@konsulting.com](mailto:skaeser@konsulting.com)>  
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 07:00:34 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 09:02:33 -0500  
Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

>From: [yogi@iadfw.net](mailto:yogi@iadfw.net)

>Steve,

>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.

Verbosity is a sin that I am sometimes guilty of. . . .<g>

>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 provenence  
>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?

I don't entirely disagree with your thoughts here. But even if we reject Ray's story entirely, you give him the credit of being able to pull off this as a hoax, and that is what I somehow doubt. We would still be left with the images that we have seen, as well as those we have only heard about.

Ray has stated on a number of occasions that he really has no idea what the "film" is of. He claims that it is from Roswell, because that is what he was allegedly told, but it could be that he found (or obtained) a strange film that seems to fit the genre and he decided to cash in. But even if his story is a fantasy dreamed up over a few beers (that's how the concept for The X-Files was developed), it doesn't explain where the strange video came from. You discredit the "film", because you have found its source to be discredited. I don't believe that Ray is capable of creating this as a hoax, so we are still faced with the question of where the images came from.

>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 Tonite 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.

Actually, he has admitted that he said it, but not to as many sources and I believe you have quoted. Assuming that you have seen the Merlin video

tape, you will have seen images of the alleged "film" boxes, which are labeled to describe what is included on each reel. One of those boxes was labeled "TRUMANS. . .", and the alleged "cameraman" had allegedly told Ray that one of the reels included images of Truman. He assumed that was the reel, and when this entire matter began to explode in the Spring of '95, he made a number of comments based on hearsay, rather than what he had actually seen on the "film".

Ray's "recent" interview on Sightings, BTW, was actually filmed fairly soon after the airing of the "Alien Autopsy" program on FOX. The reporter asked questions that Ray had already stated that he was unable to answer, and the report was edited to portray Ray in the manner that they wished. Sightings could be a good program, but it's primarily hype and glitz at this point, IMHO.

>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.

It's not entirely irrelevant if you're trying to understand the person behind this matter. If you're trying to analyze his veracity, honesty, and motives, then his entire life needs to be analyzed. Not a single action. Of course, you are correct in that this would not have any direct bearing on the "film".

>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.

As I've said, Ray didn't have any idea about the tiger he had by the tail. The actions you describe could also be caused by ignorance. There were other actions taken by Ray early on that a hoaxer would not likely have taken, which is one of the strange facets to this tale.

The film strip story is an interesting one, and deserves a better telling than I can do in a few words. I actually corresponded with Tobin and Shell in regard to this question, and have their clarifications. Shell acknowledges that the strip he had been sent was a copy, and not an original, but Tobin has now acknowledged that the markings near the sprocket holes were not limited to a film printer that was manufactured after the mid 1950s. I would note that the "strip" of film that Tobin viewed was one that was intercepted by Kiviat's group, which was shown on the FOX program. Bob has a different "strip", as did Philip Mantle. However, analysis of these strips would prove nothing. There is no image on them that can be tied to the video that has been shown, so even if they were date tested to 1947 they wouldn't end the debate.

According to Ray, there was only one reel that was of negative film, and the rest were either positive film, or positive prints. Using negative film would allow you to easily make numerous copies of it, and given the subject matter I doubt that was the goal. If memory serves, I seem to recall that the "cameraman" claims that he was rushed to the scene with little time to prepare, and had to use what film he had available. That is why he allegedly had so many reels that needed special attention.

>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.

You have placed the burden of proof on those who don't care if it's real or not. That may satisfy your logical view of the "film", but doesn't provide any answers as to the "film", itself. Those who believe the "film" to be real only have their "faith" (in Ray) to support them, and like you there are many who quite honestly don't have that faith. I believe the "film" to be very interesting, and would like to know where it came from, which doesn't require that I believe Ray's story about its history.

Suppose someone sees a UFO in the sky and uses his video camera to capture its image. He then decides to market his video and creates a tremendous story about the ship landing near him and the occupants taking him for a

ride, just spice up his lecture tours. Even if we later find out that this person is a fraud, and has lied repeatedly about the landing, it wouldn't explain the images he captured. Quite likely the entire video would be rejected, in spite of the fact that it could well be real, just because the provenance he has given it is flawed. I would want to examine the video for anomalies that would prove it a fraud before writing it off, but that usually isn't the case.

>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.

Agreed. I think Kiviat may be having problems finding a network to fund his projects, which include "Alien Autopsy Cameraman, Fact or Fiction". He has talked about it on several occasions, but so far there is no word that it has gone into production. If anyone has a good snail mail (or e-mail) address for Kiviat, please send it to me via e-mail. I would like to approach him on this in writing, and I've already had several letters returned as "Addressee Unknown".

>> 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  
>Gucionne is already into aliens. Remember the Penthouse Alien  
>photos of the Roswell Museum dummy. What a hoot! ;0

I'm working on a page for my WEB site and in it I make a comment that the Guccionne fiasco is perhaps proof positive that P.T. Barnum was right, and one IS born every minute. . . .<g>

But, in all honesty, the other sequence would have been just as expensive to produce as the first, and if this is a mere hoax it would not have been needed. I think that it will sell very well in the video market, and almost fell out of my chair laughing when I read one post that indicated that Ray had sold it to a collector of pornography. For some reason, the concept of a bunch of guys sitting in a darkened room in long trench coats watching this sequence with anticipatory grins on their faces struck me as humorous. Actually, this is probably a reference to Volker Spielberg, and the story somehow got twisted in its telling at a recent conference.

>> 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. ;)

To quote TRUE LIES, "Fear is not an option".

Of course, without the logo, Ray would have no way to prove the video came from him and since it was allegedly stolen in the first place his ownership would already be questionable.

Until we know more about the "film", this is really a non-event. There are many strange videos for sale in this genre, and many are nothing more than the ravings of researchers who like the sound of their own voice. The Santilli video adds to the mix, and is probably in good company at some levels.

Should we ignore it and move on? Probably, unless we can get more information to try and verify. But, until the actual images have been explained, I will remain curious.

Take care,  
Steve Kaeser

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

---

[ [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](#).