



# 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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Sep](#) -> Roswell 'Alien Autopsy' Film Junk

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Roswell 'Alien Autopsy' Film Junk

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 23:09:17 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 12:15:06 -0400  
Subject: Roswell 'Alien Autopsy' Film Junk

Hey, all.

After reviewing a variety of articles and websites, the story I get about the Santilli Roswell film is as follows: The film was shot by an Army cameraman in a hurried state using a standard issue Bell and Howell wind-type 16mm camera under normal and low lighting. Some of the film was processed right away and is currently under "top security" lock and key by the government. The balance of the film (approximately 25 reels) required special "push" processing due to the low lighting and was kept separate by the cameraman. Changes in command as the Airforce took over ufo investigations allowed the cameraman to "slip through the cracks" and keep the processed reels. Later, he sold the films to Santilli where they then ended up on national television amid much debate, yadda, yadda, yadda...

Amazingly, there still seems to be those that believe the film is real. I can guarantee that it isn't. Here's why:

If the cameraman is to be believed, the autopsy footage was shot under low light resulting in the need to have the film "push" processed. For those unfamiliar, this means that the film was underexposed during the shooting and then processed longer than normal to help bring out the latent image. This is supposed to account for the tell-tale grainy look of the film. If this is true, then why is most of the film OVER exposed? I've been a professional cinematographer for 20 years and I can assure you that push processed film will appear properly exposed, at best, with occasional patches of underexposure but never overexposed.

But why should the film be underexposed in the first place? Light bulbs are THE cheapest thing that the military would need to provide for such an important event. Did they really draw the line for such an acquisition? I picture a high level meeting where the line items are approved:

"Armed escort?"  
"check"  
"Personel carriers?"  
"check"  
"Security?"  
"check"  
"Alien containment vessels?"  
"check"  
"Cover story in place?"  
"check"  
"Surgical team on stand by?"  
"check"

"Quaranteen facility?"  
"check"  
"Documentation Cameraman?"  
"check"  
"Film?"  
"check"  
"Light bulbs?...Uh, light bulbs?"  
"Sorry, General, it's not in the budget."  
  
"Oh...Well...That's okay. We'll just underexpose the most important piece of cinema in history and overprocess it later to make the image really grainy and soft."  
  
"Good idea! Besides, push processing is SO much cheaper than additional light bulbs."  
  
"Uh...Couldn't we borrow a couple of lamps from some of the other offices on the base?"  
  
"Are you kidding, man? We'd need another acquisition form. This project is too important to waste time going through channels!"  
"Of course, sir. How silly of me..."

In addition, the type of camera used wasn't a "reflex" type. That is, there was no way to view directly through the taking lens. Therefore, these cameras were fitted with fixed wide angle lenses, usually around 10mm, to provide a field of view wide enough to frame the subject despite the lack of accurate "targeting". Even if the aperture were wide open (which surely it would be if operating under low light) a 10mm lens would still allow proper focusing from about 3 inches to infinity. So how come much of the image is out of focus?

Because it's fake.

The only correct thing about the Santilli Film is the emulsion. It would be a B&W reversal and not a negative as some people have suggested.

The cameraman may be the real deal, maybe not. I'm sure there is an authentic film in some government vault, rotting away. But the Santilli film isn't it. At best, it might be a reconstruction of what the cameraman remembered shooting long ago. Who knows? Maybe the "film" Santilli bought from him was unused B&W stock from that time period. I've shot B&W film dated as old as 1958. It processed up just fine. At worst it might come out soft and grainy...

Hmmmmmm.....

Later,  
Roger Evans

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).