

**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](#) - [Forteana](#) - [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](#) -> 'Alien Autopsy' - Film Testing

UFO UpDates Mailing List**'Alien Autopsy' - Film Testing**

From: James Easton <100626.2242@compuserve.com>

Date: Sat, 4 Jan 1997 22:18:25 -0500

Fwd Date: Sun, 05 Jan 1997 12:48:13 -0500

Subject: 'Alien Autopsy' - Film Testing

On 17 Dec 1996, I mentioned on the UpDates list to Theresa Carlson:

"I wonder when Ray told Bob Shell that there was no intention to submit any film to Kodak. Presumably this must have been after Bob had made all of the arrangements and had spent almost a year being patiently optimistic this would take place.

This is of course assuming Bob does know. Maybe he doesn't; I'll ask if he would like to make a statement on this and a couple of other points.

>I doubt any independent lab would do it for free either but they may be less expensive than Kodak.<

>From what Bob has previously said, only Kodak have the means to match the chemistry of the sample against their records. That's one of the points I'll raise with him".

This is the result of that public correspondence with Bob and it will hopefully contain some information of interest to subscribers:

Bob,

To help clarify a couple of points and to basically take stock of the current situation re the question of testing the theoretical archive film, it would be appreciated if you would consider the following points and perhaps release a statement for dissemination.

During the forum conference on 24 March, 1996, Ray Santilli commented:

"Yes there are further plans with regard to the verification of the film and this will hopefully be done at the time of the cameramans interview However we will NOT be going to KODAK.

[...]

With all due respect to KODAK I simply do not trust an American corporation with lucrative defence contracts".

By the 24 March, you had spent the best part of a year making arrangements with Kodak to have the testing undertaken for free, and were patiently awaiting a meaningful sample of film.

When were you first aware that Kodak would in fact specifically not be

asked to undertake any testing?

Any further comments on this subsequent refusal to involve Kodak?

Although there was no known testing undertaken at the time of the "cameraman" interview, if an independent laboratory was used, would the theoretical tests be conclusive without access to Kodak's expertise and historical records?

As we approach the second anniversary of the film story, do you still believe that a meaningful sample from the alleged film will be made available to you?

If so, why do you still believe this will happen?

If it was, what would you now do with it?

Thanks.

James.

We've gone back and forth a lot on this with Kodak. Kodak spokespersons have told others that they would test the film if brought to them, but when I have tried to do this they have backed out or changed the rules. Initially they said they only needed a tiny bit from one frame. When I informed them that I had film and would supply a frame, suddenly they needed a 20 inch strip. When it looked like I had gotten Volker convinced to provide this, they suddenly wanted a 16 foot strip. It is my belief that Kodak has never been dealing with us in good faith on this issue. Also, let me go on record to point out that not a single item of many promised by Kodak's Tony Amato has ever been mailed to me. This includes a variety of documentation promised in telephone and e-mail conversations. This is not typical of my dealings with Kodak in my magazine work. Usually anything I request is on my desk the following day. Not so on this issue.

On a recent visit to a film factory of one of Kodak's competitors, I took advantage of the opportunity to discuss this problem with their chief chemical engineer and one of his associates. Both agreed that it would take a piece of film "the size of a pin head" to definitively test the acetate for vintage. They have a vast computer data base on film base materials and production dates. I have asked them to test a piece of the film for me, and they have agreed to do so if their corporate management agrees. This is going through the bureaucratic channels right now.

Meanwhile, Professor Malanga did tests at the University of Pisa and pinned the film base down to one of three acetate types made by Kodak. When I asked Kodak to provide manufacturing dates for these acetate types their response was completely evasive and they did not supply this simple data. I think that tips their hand.

As all should know by now, I am not a full-time investigator into this. My time is limited by the necessity of getting out a major montly magazine every month. I am spending as much time on this as I can afford, and if that produces movement which is slower than you and others like, tough. I said last year that I envisioned this as being a five year project, and nothing has come along to change my mind.

Bob

Bob,

>We've gone back and forth a lot on this with Kodak...

...It is my belief that Kodak has never been dealing with us in good faith on this issue. Also, let me go on record to point out that not a single item of many promised by Kodak's Tony Amato has ever been mailed to me. This includes a variety of documentation promised in telephone and e-mail conversations.<

This seems to cut both ways. <g>

I have a copy of an interview with Tony, from last year, where he states:

"We were promised film back in July. we have been promised film right along on this. I was told before that we had film coming and got everyone ready to do the test as quickly and expeditiously as possible. And the film never showed up".

> *When I asked Kodak to provide manufacturing dates for these acetate types* their response was completely evasive and they did not supply this simple data. I think that tips their hand.<

In what way; are you suggesting that Tony Amato and some of his colleagues at Kodak are part of some conspiracy?

>*I am spending as much time on this as I can afford, and if that produces* movement which is slower than you and others like, tough.<

It's a tough old world. <g>

The absence of any corroborative film is hardly your fault. But at what point was the decision taken not to involve Kodak in any theoretical testing - it must have been sometime before the 24 March conference?

Was this Ray's decision, your recommendation, or a mutual agreement?

James.

Tony Amato supposedly said:

>*"We were promised film back in July. we have been promised film right* along on this. I was told before that we had film coming and got everyone ready to do the test as quickly and expeditiously as possible. And the film never showed up".<

I'm sorry, but that is simply bullshit. If Amato said this, he is a liar.

>*In what way; are you suggesting that Tony Amato and some of his colleagues* at Kodak are part of some conspiracy?<

I'm not suggesting anything. Just stating facts.

>*The absence of any corroborative film is hardly your fault. But at what* point was the decision taken not to involve Kodak in any theoretical testing - it must have been sometime before the 24 March conference?

Was this Ray's decision, your recommendation, or a mutual agreement?<

None of the above. It was a statement supposedly made by Ray which I knew nothing about until after the fact.

Bob

Bob,

In your statement, which Philip Mantle has now circulated, you suggest that Kodak have not "acted in good faith".

Are you sure this is really supported by the evidence?

During September 1995, Tony Amato was asked if he could clarify what requirements Kodak had specified for testing any film. He replied:

"We don't have a requirement. All we need is a few inches of film. Mr. Shell has three frames of the film of the empty room. We can authenticate those frames, but only those frames. It was Mr. Shell that has suggested to provide an entire roll therefore the roll would be authenticated".

He also commented:

"Well, we haven't got any film yet to take a look at. We have been told

that we will have some film and we have been waiting months now.

...Mr Shell has left me a message saying that he does have three frames to send me. But I have not seen them.

...Yes. We have to do a destruct test. But we only need two inches of film to do that.

...My position now is: we set up the test once we have the film in hand. I can't go spending peoples time on a wish".

In the January 1996, Skeptics UFO Newsletter (SUN), we heard that:

When we informed Blamphin* that Shell had earlier told SUN that a Kodak movie film specialist in Rochester, named Tony Amato, had agreed to test the Santilli film without charge if Shell would provide a two-inch long sample from the autopsy film [SUN #35/Sept. 1995], Blamphin said he would talk to Amato to confirm such an offer. Several days later, Blamphin confirmed Amato's offer.

Shell told SUN during our Sept. 7 interview that Santilli had agreed to provide the two-inch strip of autopsy film. But when SUN next talked with Shell, on Oct. 6, he reported that Santilli's financial partner, a German named Volker Spielberg -- who, reportedly, had stored all of the original autopsy film in a Swiss vault -- had flatly refused to provide the two-inch strip that Kodak needed. Shell explained that because Spielberg had put up the money to acquire the film, he "owned it" [SUN #36, Nov. 1995].

*A spokesperson for Kodak's public affairs office.

The problem at this point appears to have been the refusal, or inability, to provide a corroborative film sample. No fault of Kodak's.

During October 1995, you explained the current position on the sample frames you had:

Kodak has refused to do anything with this film. They want to see a strip at least 50 frames in length so they can do some sprocket spacing measurements.

Spacing of sprocket holes was changed around 1960 when new equipment was installed, and Kodak can easily determine whether the film was made before or after this equipment change if given a long enough strip.

Kodak also needs to see a strip which is intact from edge to edge, since this is an important measurement to determine film shrinkage. Film shrinks as it ages.

Kodak also wants to perform chemical tests on a piece of film which can be firmly established to be from the same film on which the alien appears. There is no hard evidence that the film Bob Kiviat and I have is from this, only strong circumstantial evidence. That's not good enough.
[End]

Would you agree there was no dispute with Kodak's intentions at this point?

In your latest statement you comment:

"I spent a lot of time working with Ray and got Volker to agree to supply such a strip for them. At this point they said they needed 16 feet, at which point I got disgusted with them and gave up on them".

It was my understanding that the only reference to "16 feet of film" was by Peter Milson, at Hemel Hempstead and had no bearing on Tony Amato or your arrangements with him.

That aside, the statement that Ray/Volker had actually agreed to supply a strip of at least 50 frames in length, is central to your claim that Kodak's requirements had been met.

However, on 8 December 1995, you mentioned that, "I have forwarded a detailed description of Kodak's requirements to Volker Spielberg via. Merlin, and have received a response that he is not willing to provide what they are asking at this time. He has indicated that he may soon be willing

to provide "about half" of the 50 frame strip with the creature on it that Kodak wants".

So, at this point, there was in fact a refusal to supply the 50 frame strip, and at best, you might some day have access to about half of what Kodak apparently now required. Then again, you might not.

But the problems still all lie with the absence of any corroborative film.

When were you subsequently told that the full 50 frame strip was definitely to be made available? Or was this perhaps just another indication from Ray that some day things might change.

I'm trying to square this with Ray's comments from the 24 March 1996 conference, that there was no way Kodak were going to be asked to test any film in the first place.

I'm also trying to square it with Ray's comments to Philip Mantle, at the end of 1995:

Q: Why hasn't a segment of film showing the 'creature' on it been released for analysis.

A: Plenty of film has been released with a variety of images including images of the autopsy room. Giving away film with the creature would be a last resort as the frames are far too valuable. I think it is also unnecessary as it is part of the same material already released.
[End]

Doesn't this confirm that there was in fact never any intention, or perhaps the ability, to provide a meaningful film sample to you?

>None of the above. It was a statement supposedly made by Ray which I knew nothing about until after the fact.<

The statement was made by Ray during the CompuServe conference and I believe there's still a transcript in the library.

Again, if you didn't know it had been decided that Kodak would specifically be precluded from any potential testing, it does all suggest that Ray was telling you personally what he maybe thought you wanted to hear, but he knew this would never materialise.

As you acknowledge, Ray is capable of doing so, although not necessarily intending to be deceitful.

On the question of film verification, Ray mentioned something puzzling during that conference:

Ray Santilli: Yes there are further plans with regard to the verification of the film and this will hopefully be done at the time of the cameramans interview.

Q: Can you give us more details about the verification of the film you plan to do.

Ray Santilli: Sorry I cannot right now apart from saying that the matter is in hand and with an independent.

It did perhaps indicate a change of attitude, but I wonder....

Could this simply have been a reference to the independent testing of Philip Mantle's non-corroborative sample, which Professor Malanga was to undertake?

We haven't heard of any other candidates since March of this year and Professor Malanga's testing does seem to have taken place around the same time as the "interview".

It seems a reasonable assumption that's what it referred to and basically, there endeth the film "testing".

On a separate matter, remember the reel of film which Michael Hesemann

brought back from a trip to Roswell in early to mid 1995 and which, conversely, having access to a meaningful sample, Kodak had no problems in dating to 1945?

Who had that reel processed, was it possibly Ray?

In theory, any technical reason why there couldn't have been some images recovered from it, although that wasn't perhaps acknowledged?

James.

James,

On the first part of your missive, I stand by my statements that Kodak's spokesperson appears to be telling me one story and a different set of stories to others. I know now from interviewing film scientists at the lab of another major film manufacturer that only a very tiny bit of film, the size of a pin head, is needed for full analysis, and I think this makes it clear that Kodak has just been pulling our chains. Also, from the same source, I have learned that this test is simple, quick, fully automated, and very inexpensive. Five minutes lab time. Now if Kodak claims that five minutes of lab time with an automated spectrometer costs thousands of dollars, I think we can see through that.

>On a separate matter, remember the reel of film which Michael Heseemann brought back from a trip to Roswell...<

I do not know who actually processed the film, but processing was arranged by Ray with a lab he had worked with before. During this processing, the first fifteen feet of the film, the part which had actually been shot in the camera, disappeared and was not returned to Mike. We never have gotten a satisfactory explanation for what happened to this film. Only the unexposed 35 feet from the 50 foot cartridge was returned.

The work done on this film to date and authenticate it was done by a totally different Kodak facility, and not through Kodak in Rochester. Tony Amato was not involved in this testing.

Bob

Bob,

>On the first part of your missive, I stand by my statements... I know now from interviewing film scientists at the lab of another major film manufacturer that only a very tiny bit of film, the size of a pin head, is needed for full analysis...<

Possibly, but Kodak surely have the right to set out their own conditions for what they would determine as "full analysis". As I mentioned, you had explained what Kodak's exact requirements were and why, and agreed that any sample had to be of proven genesis.

If another company now states they would perhaps specify less requirements than Kodak, it doesn't seem consequential that Kodak were unhelpful, or deliberately placed unnecessary obstacles in the way.

It also seems irrelevant if there was never any prospect of Kodak being involved in the first place.

>...and I think this makes it clear that Kodak has just been pulling our chains.<

I'm afraid I can't see how that's clear at all.

Again, as you reaffirmed a few months ago, "Kodak is adamant that they will test nothing unless it has the creature on it, and none of the available film does". The absence of a relevant film sample will always be the reason why Kodak weren't able to undertake any examination, no matter how many frames they specified.

If Ray Santilli has suggested to you that some meaningful film will be made

available, it's Ray Santilli who has been telling a different story elsewhere.

As he told your colleagues:

Ray Santilli: Questions and Answers
by SUSAN and PHILIP MANTLE

In an attempt to clarify some of the points raised in 1995 regarding Ray Santilli and the alleged Roswell film footage, we put a list of questions to Ray at the end of 1995. What follows are those questions and Ray Santilli's reply. Make of it what you will.

Q: Why hasn't a segment of film showing the 'creature' on it been released for analysis.

A: Plenty of film has been released with a variety of images including images of the autopsy room. Giving away film with the creature would be a last resort as the frames are far too valuable. I think it is also unnecessary as it is part of the same material already released.

[...]

Q: Can segments of the original tent footage be made available for analysis.

A: See above.

Q: Can segments of the debris footage be made available for analysis.

A: See above.

[End]

I can't recall any occasion during the past year when Ray indicated his attitude had changed, except for his previously mentioned comments during the CompuServe conference. Those comments may relate only to the testing of Mantle's film strip, there's been no indication of any other planned testing.

If that was the case, it seems Ray must have been involved with the planned testing of Mantle's sample - Ray stated that, "_we_ will NOT be going to Kodak" and he spoke of this some months before the testing took place.

Are you aware of any other planned testing, which would specifically not involve Kodak, that might be a candidate for the testing Ray was referring to?

>During this processing, the first fifteen feet of the film, the part which had actually been shot in the camera, disappeared and was not returned to Mike. We never have gotten a satisfactory explanation for what happened to this film.<

But presumably you have both asked for one - what was Ray's answer?

I suppose the next question asks itself; is there any reason why some or all of the film samples given out by Ray couldn't possibly have come from that missing fifteen feet of film?

I know it would be a very fortuitous set of images if that was the case, the chances are that any recoverable images wouldn't be remotely usable in connection with the "autopsy footage". If the samples were handed out before Ray had possession of this reel, that alone would obviously answer the question.

James.

>I suppose the next question asks itself; is there any reason why some or all of the film samples given out by Ray couldn't possibly have come from that missing fifteen feet of film?<

Yes. It was a different type of film.

Bob
[End]

Hopefully, at least some issues further clarified.

One issue which hasn't been, relates to the last public comments I can trace from Ray Santilli about any film testing. These were the previously mentioned comments during the CompuServe MUFON forum Conference and I believe that's the only occasion I have seen or heard Ray indicate he had any such intentions.

This is perhaps a significant factor and it's maybe not generally appreciated just how many times Ray said he was satisfied that the film had been authenticated, e.g., on 3 November 1995:

Q: Has the authenticity of the film been definitely proven?

A: 100% by me, for other people I don't know.

If the planned testing which Ray mentioned during the 24 March conference related to Philip Mantle's sample (which does not contain any images from the central "autopsy" footage), it posed some questions about Ray's involvement with that testing.

I've asked Ray if that's what he meant and I also asked Philip Mantle about that possibility. I put it to Philip:

"For the following reasons, it's now assumed that this independent testing was in fact the testing of your sample:

1. At the end of 1995, in your Q + A text file, Ray told Sue and yourself that any further samples were "unnecessary".
2. The timescale of the testing was around the time of the cameraman "interview".
3. Kodak would specifically not be involved and it would be an "independent".
4. There was no other known testing planned, or which took place.

Would you agree that what Ray was referring to was the testing of your film strip and not some other independent testing, which Bob Shell seems to know nothing about?"

Philip replied that he had no idea which film testing Ray was referring to, "although it is logical to "assume" that it was the sample that I sent to Italy".

I pointed out to Philip that, if the assumption were correct, then Ray must have known the testing was planned and the fact that Ray was giving the impression he was responsible for initiating the Italian testing was obviously of interest.

I asked Philip if he could confirm whether, as at 24 March, Ray knew of the plans for the testing of Philip's sample.

Unfortunately, Philip has now responded that he has said all he can and has nothing further to add.

The first public mention of the testing seems to have been in June of last year and Bob Shell confirmed that, "Ray has nothing to do with this testing. Philip Mantle and I instigated it".

Bob further explained, "I've grown tired of being yelled at for not testing any film. Kodak is adamant that they will test nothing unless it has the creature on it, and none of the available film does. So they are out of the picture.

Philip Mantle and I have arranged for a highly credentialed European laboratory to do a chemical analysis of a small piece of film which came into Phil's possession last year".

Rob Irving then asked Bob, "What's the point in testing a film sample when there's no evidence that it's part of the autopsy footage? What would that prove?"

Bob duly responded, "Simple question, simple answer: There's no real point

in testing any of this film that is available. But some people are convinced that there is a point, so I am willing to go along with this to the extent of assisting in testing and interpretation of results. If it had been up to me alone, I wouldn't be wasting time on testing this stuff".

It was Theresa Carlson who next asked Bob a key question, "Did you say that you and Mantle set up these tests, and Ray wasn't aware or involved?"

Bob replied, "I do not know if Ray is aware of these tests or not. I haven't discussed it with him. However, he was not involved in getting it set up. Philip Mantle did this. My involvement is to tell the lab what to test for, and hopefully make some sense of the results when they are in. Results will be shared with Ray, of course, since the piece of film actually belongs to him, as do all the pieces "loaned" to investigators".

I then asked Bob, "Does Philip have Italian colleagues with the required expertise, or does he mean that his colleagues are simply organising the testing; if the latter, the obvious question is why?"

Philip is I believe on good terms with Maurizio Baiata in Italy and perhaps this is the "Italian connection".

Bob confirmed that, "Yes, our friend Maurizio is in fact the one arranging the tests, which are being done by a prestigious Italian university laboratory".

There seems to be a conflicting perspective on the question of who initiated the testing, why, and who was responsible for the arrangements, however, the "highly credentialed European laboratory" was apparently that of Philip Mantle's colleague, Professor Corrado Malanga, a chemist at the University of Pisa.

This wasn't quite the independent testing that it might seem; the person arranging the testing, "our friend" Maurizio Baiata, was also Ray Santilli's business agent in Italy.

Both Malanga and Baiata are Directors of Centro Ufologico Nazionale (CUN), and both individually and via that organisation have vehemently promoted the authenticity of the "autopsy" footage. Long before this testing took place, RAI2, the Italian TV channel, featured a program on the "alien autopsy" film story and the "pro" side of the invited guests included Malanga, Baiata and Mantle.

There is of course no reason why Philip Mantle shouldn't arrange, via Baiata, for Malanga to have tested the film sample and there's no suggestion that the results, which didn't seem to determine anything of major significance, were compromised.

At the moment the question remains; is there any reason to believe that Ray Santilli has, or ever had, the intention or the ability to provide a significant sample of the claimed 16mm film for analysis, irrespective of whether the film is allegedly held by himself or Volker Spielberg.

Judging by what Ray himself has said publicly, there seems to be a strong case that he has never had any such intention and doesn't even consider it to be an issue.

If Ray clarifies matters further - some questions he answers, some he doesn't - I've asked if I can pass on his comments.

Both Philip Mantle and Bob Shell are of course more than welcome to do likewise.

As indeed is anyone else.

James.
Internet; pulsar@compuserve.com

[[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](#).