



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: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 11:05:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 15 Feb 1997 02:31:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

> Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 20:11:54 -0500
> From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
> Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

James,

> >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".

Thanks for the reference.

> Ray has offered his explanation for this on a number of occasions, the most
> detailed perhaps being in the ISCNI interview he gave to Linda Moulton
> Howe:

If this is the best he can do he needs to hire a better spin doctor.

> Howe: And he filmed American military and intelligence personnel examining
> the live creatures?
>
> Santilli: Absolutely. And he goes further than that. It's been a great bone
> of contention. But he insists that Truman was there for one of the
> autopsies as well. I know that the Truman Library says that Truman couldn't
> have been there - but JB insists that Truman was there and that a
> significant number of the military hierarchy were there as well at the
> time. I don't know the names, but certainly people who mattered. He
> confirms that in fact on one of the canisters we have, we see the name
> "Truman" and a reel number, but unfortunately we weren't able to process
> that one piece of film.

This is amusing. Ray says he knows that the Truman Library says that Truman couldn't have been there. But that's not the story he told to Stanton Friedman in Jan 1995. Back then he told Stan that they had contacted the Truman Library and had proved that Truman was there in Dallas at the autopsy.

Quoting Stanton Friedman on UFOs Tonite radio February 1995.
"What really raised an eyebrow ... He(Ray) tells me he's got proof of everything, they've been researching this. ... He(Ray) said, we've proven that Truman was in Dallas at that time. I said oh! Did you talk to the Truman Library? And he(Ray) said, yes.

Well, needless to say Stan contacted the Truman Library to try and followup on Ray's claims. Guess what? Stan was told by the Truman Library that Truman was nowhere in the state of Texas from July thru October of 1947.

> Howe: Why are there conflicting stories about whether U. S. President Harry
> S. Truman can be seen viewing one of the humanoids during autopsy?
>
> Santilli: I had no experience dealing with the UFO community. I come from
> the very commercial world of music and video. And when we first received
> the footage, I felt that today's technology would be able to retrieve all
> the images and it wouldn't be a problem. I did make the mistake at the
> beginning of saying to people: "Well, here's what we've got. Physically we
> have got it." And I said that because it was the information given to me
> by JB. I relayed the information in good faith that the cameraman was quite
> certain that Truman was there, that he was in the autopsy room and JB said
> "even if you can't hear him, you can lip read him because he's that close
> on film." However, we have just not been able to retrieve the image on that
> particular reel. A good 50% of the footage we had, we were not able to
> retrieve an image from. But I made the mistake in the early days of saying
> to everyone: "This is what we've got" and I've been hamstrung and quartered
> because of it. But that was a mistake and we all learn by our mistakes. So,
> I won't make that mistake again.
> [End]

This is such a lame excuse it's not even worth commenting on.

> As an assumed hoax, it seems odd that Ray would claim he had film which he
> presumably knew didn't exist, but there's a lot of strange aspects to the
> affair.

IMO, it was just a piece of the overall scam. He baited us with the
idea that President Truman was in the film.

> >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.

>
> The current issue (no. 5) of a relatively new UK magazine called the "X
> FACTOR", has a 6 page article on the "alien autopsy" story.

>
> The article is basically a summary of various elements in the story and
> Ray's reported comments, although brief, are of some interest. I quote:

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

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

We all know this is NOT TRUE.

> Could the alien be seen in the pieces of film sent for analysis?

>
> "No... I'm not prepared to give away any frames showing the creature. The
> film's too valuable to cut up and send away".

This is LAME. How much would it hurt to have 2 frames with the
creature in it analyzed? I've heard that is what Tony Amato at Kodak
requires to verify the film.

> How do you feel, playing such a large part in this story?

>
> "It's been a nightmare. I've got a business to run, and all I've done in
> the past year is answer questions about this film. I'd love to wash my
> hands of it, once and for all".
> [End]

All he has done in the past 2 years is deceive, recant, backtrack and
generally change his story about 10,000 times.

> This seems to confirm the point I was making about Ray clearly confirming
> well over a year ago, that providing some corroborative 16mm film samples
> was no longer even an issue.

>
> It never really was an issue. To my knowledge, he never publicly said that
> he would provide any substantive evidence.

>
> The comments about Kodak dating any film to 1947 are obviously not correct,
> but he has said this on a number of occasions now and that seems to be the
> final stance.

It's so obvious that this whole thing is a SCAM. Are there no laws that can deal with this? It seems criminal to me. Maybe it's not against the law to profit from gullibility and stupidity. But it should be.

Regards,
Bill Ralls

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

[[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](#).