



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](#) -> [Jan](#) -> Shell Responds to Chapman's 'Strange' Article

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Shell Responds to Chapman's 'Strange' Article

From: RSchatte@aol.com
Date: Thu, 2 Jan 1997 14:26:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 02 Jan 1997 17:15:12 -0500
Subject: Shell Responds to Chapman's 'Strange' Article

Forwarded message:
From: 76750.2717@CompuServe.COM (BOB SHELL)
To: BlindCopyReceiver@, @
Date: 97-01-02 13:54:47 EST

Hello All,

Please post this far and wide since I have no way of knowing if Strange magazine will print it. Many of you have seen by now the article called "Dissecting the Alien Autopsy Film" by Douglas Chapman in Strange. Since I am mentioned in the article, I'd like to correct some of the information given there.

First of all, let me congratulate Mr. Chapman for even attempting to clear up this murky subject. It is a difficult one to follow, even for someone who has been on the inside. Mr. Chapman has obviously tried hard to get his facts correct and do a good analysis of this topic in limited space. Overall, he has done well.

Claims by Ed Stewart and others that only Berlyn Brixner photographed the Trinity atomic test have been shown to be incorrect. Brixner was one of four civilian photographers. However, there may have been military photographers as well unknown to Brixner and the other civilians. "Jack" does not say in his story that he photographed the Trinity test, just "Trinity". There were many photographs taken of the site both before and after the test. "Jack" maintains that he shot aerial photos, and, in fact, aerial photos were taken, although no one today seems to know just who took them. They were certainly not shot by Brixner or any of the other civilians, and must have come from military cameramen.

The article states: "Seven stills from the Roswell Autopsy film of the "first autopsy" were shown as slides in San Marino, Italy, on May 20, 1995....in showings not open to the general public." Actually, what is referred to here is the still images from the second autopsy, which is the autopsy used by Bob Kiviati in his FOX specials and used by all of the worldwide TV networks in their programs. The second autopsy shows the creature with the leg injury. It is important to clear this up, since there are two different autopsies on film clearly identified as number one and number two, and filmed on different days according to "Jack".

The only images from the first autopsy which have been shown are still images on video tape apparently recorded from a TV screen with the VCR set on "still". This video was made at my request and I showed it during 1995 at several UFO conferences in open sessions. While I do not have permission to make copies for anyone, I am happy to show these stills to any serious researcher who wants to come to me, or meet me at a convenient location during my travels. These still images were created at my request from a video of the first autopsy to demonstrate the fact that there really are, in fact, two separate autopsy films.

These stills have not been circulated on the Internet, and have not appeared in print (yet).

I was sad to see the curly telephone cord brought up again, since it has been conclusively proven that such cords did exist in 1947. Even Phil Klass now agrees that this is the case.

The film is said to show lack of scratches. How can anyone know this since they have only seen video from the film, and Ray Santilli says this was enhanced? Lack of scratches would prove nothing one way or another anyway, since it depends on storage conditions and how often the film is projected.

I am identified in the story as "... a consultant to Kodak and the FBI named Bob Shell." I should point out that since I became openly associated with research on this film my "friends" at the FBI have been unwilling to take or return phone calls from me, so it appears that any future consulting work for them has been nixed by this project. I am a photographic consultant to a number of photographic companies, and this has not changed, but I do not divulge client's names, so saying that I am a consultant to Kodak is without basis. I have done no chemical tests on any of the film, and have not identified it as Cine Super XX. While the original may have been filmed on Super XX film, what I have been given is portions of copy film, not camera original, and it certainly is NOT Super XX. The film base does appear to be an earlier type of acetate discontinued in 1957. No one has ever claimed that the film sat in "Jack's" possession undeveloped since 1947. The film was, according to "Jack", processed right away.

Where am I in my research? I have had the film looked at in detail by a number of medical professionals, and the great majority of them have said that this is a real autopsy/dissection of something that was alive not too long before the procedure or kept in cold storage. They do not think it is a special effects dummy. Indeed, if it was actually filmed prior to 1957, as seems to be the case, this is a ridiculous idea. Special effects were just not very sophisticated in those days. As a matter of fact, I have been carefully watching recent films done by the best special effects people around the world, and have yet to see anything with the sustained gritty reality of this film. I think when special effects people say they could do it, it is just hyper-inflated ego talking.

Suggestions that these are deformed humans or results of genetic or radiation experiments gone wrong show a complete lack of understanding of biology and genetics. Again, such suggestions just do not hold up.

So, treating the film separately from all the peripheral stuff attached to it, I do think it is real film of the dissection of non-human humanoids of unknown origin. I think the UFO community has done itself a serious disservice by not paying more attention to this film and simply dismissing it as a fraud.

Bob Shell

Search for other documents to/from: [rschatte](#) | [76750.2717](#)

[[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](#).