



# 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: **Steven Kaeser** <[skaeser@konsulting.com](mailto:skaeser@konsulting.com)>  
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 22:39:41 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 01:03:15 -0500  
Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

>From: [yogi@iadfw.net](mailto:yogi@iadfw.net)  
>Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 12:39:02 -0600  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

>Steve,

>I think the quality of the messenger should be taken into  
>consideration, but actually that's not why I have rejected the case,  
>though it would be a good reason to. ;)

I would agree that it should be taken into consideration, but not the primary basis of one's judgement.

>> 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".

>You know what they say about the word assume (ASS+U+ME). Ray's  
>assuming that there is video of Truman in one of the canisters because  
>it has his name on it is one thing. But that is far different than  
>saying that Truman was seen so clearly that you could read his lips.  
>This to me suggest firsthand witnessing of the video. IMO, Ray  
>purposefully deceived by making those statements. He knew full well  
>that this was not true.

Ray made that statement well before any of the "film" had been viewed by other than a few people outside his "inner circle". Ray certainly made an "ass" out of himself in making that statement, but the "read his lips" comment was a quote that might not have been accurate. I can check with Friedman to see what he remembers about that comment, and one could certainly check with Don Ecker, but I wouldn't have believed it until I saw it anyway.

If I remember the time frame, Friedman was very negative about the veracity of the "film" and may have emphasized the statement in a way that would make his point. Never underestimate the power of rhetoric, whatever it's source.

>> 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.

>Now, don't bad mouth Sightings. :) I think they have done pretty good  
>considering some of the CHEESY people and materials they have had to  
>work with. Occasionally they come up with some fairly interesting and  
>informative programs. Actually, I thought they treated Ray with more  
>respect than he deserved. The reporter asked him straight out about  
>the Truman statements and Ray had the opportunity to explain, but  
>chose not to clear it up, simply calling it a discrepancy. I call that  
>deception on Ray's part, not selective editing as you're suggesting.

I'll admit that I enjoy the show as well, but take it as tabloid  
journalism. I would counter that they asked the questions that they knew  
he couldn't answer to promote a viewpoint.

In my opinion, the "Truman" comment was blown out of proportion on the  
"net", with numerous comments attributed to Ray that simply were not his.  
When he began the process, he dealt with UFO buffs and reporters as he did  
when promoting music videos. The problem is that the reporters covering  
the music scene were used to bombastic exaggeration to "hype" the music,  
while those that deal with the subject of UFOs are used to those who speak  
carefully and are aware that their every word is going to be analyzed to  
the nth degree. Ray was a neophyte when this started, and he got chewed up  
pretty badly.

>> 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.

>Such as?

Ray made an effort to document the validity of the "film" by contacting a  
regional Kodak office in Europe, and also by obtaining commentary from a  
London pathologist. While the attempt was certainly not enough to sway  
skeptics, it would perhaps have been enough to convince someone that the  
investment was worth it. If Ray knew that the blank leader was attached to  
"film" with an alien image, then the letter from P.G. Milson of Kodak would  
have carried some weight. We, who only have Ray's word that the leader was  
connected to "film" with image, must require more examination of the  
original "film". I think that Ray thought he had proven his point, when in  
fact he merely increased the controversy. Someone hoaxing such a film, who  
was willing to spend the money needed to create it, would not have wasted  
time and materials in creating images that were were so poor in quality  
that no one has bothered to air them. And, I think it's highly doubtful  
they would have created a video sequence that was too graphic to use on  
television. That would, of course, be where the primary exposure would  
come from.

I also don't think that someone trying to cash in on the Roswell "myth"  
would have created aliens with six fingers, or move the date of crash back  
by about four weeks. This would draw unwanted attention to the "film", and  
just doesn't make sense.

>Yeah, I know a little about those film strips. As a matter of fact it  
>was my partner Glenn Joyner and I who first learned and made public  
>the knowledge that the strips of film that both Bob Kiviat and Bob  
>Shell had in their possession, had the edges torn off. We learned this  
>little tidbit back in August 1995 when in contact with Dave Roehrig  
>who is a close associate of Bob Kiviat's. Up until that point neither  
>Bob Kiviat or Bob Shell had revealed that their film strips had no  
>edge codes. The edge codes that Bob Shell referred to early on were  
>from a facsimile that Ray had sent him. IMO, this was just another  
>in a long list of deceitful ploys by Ray and associates to stir  
>interest in the film by trying to claim some sort of testing and  
>verification had been done. When in reality the strips of film were  
>absolutely worthless for verification of anything.

I certainly agree with the last sentence, which is a point that Bob made  
many times over. The actual amount of film that would be needed to  
authenticate the date of the "film" is  
more than Ray or Volker have been willing to provide so far, and I see no  
indication that they will change their minds. For right now, I think that  
is probably a dead issue.

>Ray and associates are the only ones who have access to the alleged  
>film or this alleged cameraman. They are the only ones who can provide  
>the absolute proof. How do suggest we proceed any further without  
>access? People who make extraordinary claims are asked to provide  
>extraordinary evidence to support their claims. Usually, this is not

>practical. But in this case it is. There is a physical video/film  
>somewhere on which this film was shot. Ray and associates only need  
>to submit a few frames with the alien for verification from Kodak.  
>They have refused to do this. It smacks of a hoax.

Are you mistaking Ray for someone who would care what people think about the "film", as long as he's able to sell the rights to it? Ray, from the beginning, has stated that he's only in it for the money.

There are only a handful of people that have met, or spoken to, the alleged cameraman. You are correct that almost all of them are in the employ of Merlin Entertainment. I honestly don't believe there is any way to investigate this further as long as Ray and his group control the "film". We have what we have, and if one's forced to reach a conclusion at this point it would have to be that the "film" has no real worth without proof of its provenance. That may be were it will end, but I doubt it. There is too much money to be made, and I think that Ray and Volker would like to "milk" this for all its worth. Since this is the 50th Anniversary of UFOlogy, it could be argued that Ray has been orchestrating this from the beginning to culminate in July of this year. Rays still denies that there are any plans to release additional "film", but the year is young.

The overused phrase that "extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence" sounds good, but merely adds to the rhetoric of the genre. Science is primarily a building block process, with each discovery based on the foundation of previous discoveries. An observed "effect" that couldn't be linked to the existing foundation would be unacceptable to the scientific community. In the end it would likely be rejected as an errant observation, and the observers veracity would be questioned. Science has a habit of trying to maintain the status quo, and the phrase above is one of their tools to keep our view of the world around us in line. This is an interesting facet of the psychology of this genre that deserves more comment, but perhaps this is not the time.

>I think this is a different thing entirely. It's one thing to have an  
>anomalous object on modern video tape. It's a different thing entirely  
>when we have an alien image that is claimed to have been shot in 1947.  
>The testing and verification of the video median on which the alleged  
>Alien Autopsy was shot would go a very long way in lending some  
>credibility to it, if it was proven to be of 1947 vintage.

I've seen anomolous photos of objects in the sky that "appear" to be ships, and we have a "film" here that contains an anomolous creature that "appears" to be non-human. In the case of many UFO photos, we don't have the negatives or original photos to examine, so I think it is sometimes very similar. Both rely on the veracity of the spokesmen involved, and we are left to our own intuition and belief structure to pass judgement. Ray has defined the limits of his abilities in this, but most are unwilling to accept his limits and many seem to feel that he "owes" them further proof. In fact, some of those on the "net" became quite demanding and resorted to flaming and name calling to try and force the issue. It was another interesting facet of the psychological impact of this event that probably deserves greater study.

>> 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".

>  
>Try KiviatProd@aol.com

Thanks, I'll give it a try. Of course, he get a busy signal when he tries to log in and it will probably take a week or two for my message to be read . . . .<g>

>> 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.

>  
>So now, Ray is gonna copyright a stolen video. Interesting.

The cameraman's story indicates that he took the "film" without permission, and his recent statement indicates that he regrets that he "betrayed" his country (I think this is where the Star Spangled Banner is supposed to fade in slowly).

The first video was actually forwarded to a handful of researchers in the U.S. prior to its airing on FOX, and copies of it were later pirated and sold for much less than Ray was asking. This was a mistake that Ray is not likely to repeat.

While I think his claim would be difficult to prove (if it can be shown that the "film" was military property in the first place), he would have no chance at all if he can't identify it as being his. That is why a logo would be important, even though it would reduce the value of the video image to a limited degree. Someone might claim that the video had come from another "mysterious" source that was unrelated to Merlin, and since Ray's story could allow for that possibility, he would need further proof.

>> 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.

>  
>I too find the images on the video interesting and will remain curious  
>as to how it was accomplished. But I would really like to know of it's  
>origin. I would like to learn who and why it was created.

Indeed. Ray's story surrounding the "film" is flawed, but I don't think he is capable of coordinating this type of hoax. I think there are others that could, but I'd like to see some evidence to that effect before trying to reach any conclusions.

Take care,

Steve

---

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

---

[ [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](#).