



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
 Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 18:44:19 -0600
 Fwd Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 23:05:52 -0500
 Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

> Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 22:39:41 -0500
 > To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
 > From: Steven Kaeser <skaeser@konsulting.com>
 > Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

Steve,

RE: Harry Truman is in the film...

> 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.

Stop the presses. I need to correct this. I hate to be one who adds more rumor to the mix. Stanton Friedman did NOT use the "read his lips" comment. I was wrong about that. I went back and listened to that particular (Feb'95) radio show and nowhere does Stan use or reference the "read his lips" comment. Stan did say that Ray had told him that Truman was there at the autopsy and that it was performed in Dallas. The Dallas comment was peculiar in itself. But according to Stan, Ray claimed that they had contacted the Truman library and had confirmed with them that Truman was there in Dallas on that exact date at the autopsy, but he would not give Stan the exact date. Stan followed up with his own contacts at the Truman library and they could find no record of Truman being anywhere in the state of Texas between July and October of 1947. I'm not exactly sure now where the "read his lips" comment came from originally. I'm pretty sure it was said, but can find no direct quote. I did find one reference to it by Dwight Schultz in an interview with Bob Shell on UFOs Tonite radio in Sept95, but it is not a direct quote. I hate to go on memory here because I already made one mistake, but I will stick my neck out and say it might have been Reg Presley who made the comment early on. Can anyone help me out here? Any direct quotes?

> 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.

True, but it was not Stan. It was MY MISTAKE. I want to make that prefectly clear.

> 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.

Maybe it was blown out of proportion, but he did make the comments to a number of people knowing it wasn't true. And I call that deliberate deception, not hype. I suppose it's the intent that's important here in trying to determine whether it was just hype or deception.

> 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 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.

Well, IMO Ray has never honestly tried to validate anything. All of the claims that the film was being tested and verified by Kodak as well as Bob Shell was only a smoke screen to try and add some sort of legitimacy to his bogus film. He's had ample opportunity for the past 2 years to have the film analyzed. It is not going to happen because he knows it's a hoax. This excuse you keep using that Ray doesn't care whether the film is real or not is hollow. We all know how much more valuable the alleged film would be if it were validated and Ray does too. Ray's reluctance to have the alleged film tested suggests that he knows it's a hoax and that if it were tested would prove to be a hoax. Ray doesn't want this to happen because his cash-cow will dry up. This is the most logical reason I can think of for his reluctance to have the film tested.

The alleged "first autopsy". You yourself suggested that this first autopsy would probably eventually show up on video. It doesn't matter if it is too graphic to show on network TV or not because they can sell it around the world in video stores. MO' MONEY!

> 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.

Now this I can not challenge. I too find it very curious that the hoaxers would not have used the more conventional and recognized 4 finger variety that have been claimed by some Roswell witnesses.

> 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.

Now, this is where it gets sort of controversial. Exactly how much film is required by Kodak for authentication? I've heard so many different amounts. Everything from a few frames to a couple of reels. What is it? Do we have an exact quote from someone of authority at Kodak that outlines or states their minimum criteria from validating the film?

> >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.

No I have definitely NOT mistaken Ray for someone who cares. ;)

> 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.

Who exactly, besides Ray and Gary Shoefield have claimed to have met
or talked directly to this alleged cameraman? Those are the only 2
names that I'm aware of. As far as I know all other claimed contact
has been channeled thru Ray.

> 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 really didn't want to use the EOC requires EOP statement, but it
fits so well here. Ray claims he has a film of an alien autopsy shot
on 1947 vintage film. This is the extraordinary claim. If Ray had only
claimed to have had a videotape of an alien autopsy we could speculate
forever about it's veracity and there would be no way that I'm aware
of to determine it's origin. End of story. But that is not the case,
Ray claims this was shot on 1947 vintage film. If the film were to be
authenticated and proven to be 1947 vintage film. This would be the
extraordinary evidence that would go a long way in support of the
alien autopsy being real. Ray refuses to do this. Why? You say it's
because he doesn't care if it's real or not. I say it's because he
already knows it's not.

> 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.

Well, I don't want to stoop to the level of ad-homenin attacks on Ray.
That accomplishes nothing.

> 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).

Yeah right! A real patriotic tear jerker.

> 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.

I don't see how Ray can protect his product if some adventurous video
pirates decide to take advantage of him again. It will make no
difference if his logo is there or not. That will not stop pirated
copies from being circulated.

> 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.

Exactly! Ray's story is flawed. And until we have either the film
to test or the cameraman to interview, it's only a story with an
interesting video and nothing more.

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

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](#).