



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: btbmag@ro.com (Michael Malone)
Date: Sun, 16 Feb 1997 11:02:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 05:42:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

>Date: Sat, 15 Feb 1997 11:14:57 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Steven Kaeser <skaeser@konsulting.com>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Autopsy Cameraman photos

>I would suspect that the simple answer to your question is:
>No, there are no broad laws to cover this situation, which is a
>shame since a court of law might be able to force additional
>information to the surface. The problem is once again "intent",
>which has to be proved in the U.S. "beyond a reasonable doubt",
>and I doubt that Ray would have any problems obtaining a good
>lawyer to insert such a "doubt" into the minds of a jury.

"Reasonable doubt" is a tenant of law that exist only in American criminal courts. Santilli has been very careful to include statements and disclaimers to prevent himself from falling victim to criminal law. Civil law is a different matter, and a different standard is used. Preponderance of evidence. Ray's real threat has always been civil action.

>In a broad sense, there is no law (in the U.S.) against lying
>to one's fellow man. Of course, I'm not a lawyer and would
>appreciate being corrected if this is untrue. A scam is defined
>as "a fraudulent business scheme; a swindle" (according to the
>American Heritage dictionary), and since Ray has included a
>statement that he really doesn't know what the "film" is of, an
>intentional fraud would likely be difficult to prove beyond a
>doubt.

There are several laws, both actionable criminally and civilly, which cover lying to one's fellow man. The most commonly used law is Fraud, of which a form exists in all 50 states. I agree that criminal law would be difficult to prove, however. And the problem with a civil case is the issue of damages.

After spending thousands of dollars getting Santilli to appear in the state that the suit is filed (And without false or fraudulent means), filing suit, preparing a defense, and taking the case to trial, the end result would be a maximum return on investment equal to three times your damages. (I think pain and suffering and punitive damages would be exceedingly hard to prove.) Wow, 50 bucks for a videotape? A max of a couple hundred bucks? Hardly seems worth it. The only thing truly worthwhile that might come out of such a move would be the discovery process. If something "interesting" was discovered. However, Santilli is probably smart enough to offer to settle out of court and prevent the discovery process from occurring.

>But the concept of profiting from statements or allegations,
>that have little or no background that can be checked, is

>certainly not new to UFOlogy. As an example, there are many
>specific allegations included in William Cooper's book, which has
>sold thousands of copies and helped him to become a speaker on
>the conference circuit, and many of those can't be checked
>against the official record. What about the allegations
>presented by Robert Dean, William Hamilton III, Richard Boylan,
>and many others. They often include many statements from
>mysterious sources, or records that cannot be accessed. We are
>left with only their anecdotal commentary and our faith in their
>veracity. Unfortunately, this leads us to rely on our "faith" in
>what we accept (or believe) to be real as a foundation from which
>to judge. That can also have the impact of placing blinders on
>us, preventing us from seeing a larger truth, but that is a
>psychological discussion best saved 'til later.

Not everyone refuses to questions the unfounded allegations of others. Unfortunately, when we do ask for simple proof we are often ridiculed, labeled disinformation agents, or otherwise shunned. And heaven forbid we catch someone in a lie, then the whole world comes crashing down and the spin doctors go into HIGH gear.

>I've expressed the opinion on several occasions that I really
>don't think that it is Ray's interest to validate the film,
>regardless of whether it's real or not. If it is a fake, then
>such testing would result in fewer sales of his product. If, on
>the other hand, Ray releases information that prove to be the
>"smoking gun" that showing once and for all that the military has
>been involved in a conspiracy of silence, Ray's film segments
>would become nothing more than a footnote in history as the color
>glossy photos, reports, and full length films are forced into the
>open by an angry public and Congress. Again, his sales would
>plummet and his role in this would fade to obscurity.

I agree. Despite Bob Shells claims to the contrary, Santilli is not acting like someone who wants to be forgotten. Hell, he and his company are better known today than prior to this happening. Draw your own conclusions.

>My official opinion (whatever that is) is that we don't really
>know enough about the "film" to pass a final judgement on it.
>The evidence both for and against its validity is anecdotal in
>nature, and the only hard evidence we have regarding the video
>itself seems to check with the provenance given to it by the
>"cameraman" via Ray. Teresa Carlson, who has performed a
>tremendous amount of research into the video, has said she
>believes it to likely be a fake, but hasn't been able to find a
>flaw to prove that contention.

The fact that the "hard" evidence matches the story of the cameraman is hardly evidence at all, if the "cameraman's" story was developed after the creation of the film. And my position has always been that without evidence, we have an interesting theory. And we have NO evidence. Hard or otherwise.

Michael Malone

--

Michael Malone
Kilo Foxtrot Four Mike Yankee X-ray

Search for other documents to/from: [btbmag](#) | [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](#).