



## 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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jan](#) -> **Re: Santilli Knew 'Tent Footage' Was a Fraud?**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Santilli Knew 'Tent Footage' Was a Fraud?

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob@bobshell.com](mailto:bob@bobshell.com)>  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:48:47 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:36:40 -0500  
Subject: Re: Santilli Knew 'Tent Footage' Was a Fraud?

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>To: "UFO UpDates Subscribers";;  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Santilli Knew 'Tent Footage' Was a Fraud?  
>Date: Mon, Jan 25, 1999, 10:20 PM

>From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 13:42:59 +0000  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Santilli Knew 'Tent Footage' Was a Fraud?

>Just wondering, do the number of unprocessed reels that Santilli  
>told you he received jive with the number Mr. Easton cites in  
>the following:

>>The seller of the film apparently went on to offer Santilli 15  
>>cans of undeveloped film, filmed by him while in the military,  
>>of the Roswell crash scene from the ground and air, and of the  
>>alien autopsies.

My impression from Ray is that all of the film he claims to have  
bought from the cameraman were already developed. Remember that  
Ray is a rather young person, of the video generation rather  
than the film generation, and therefore uses terms like  
"process" very vaguely. I think the processing he referred to  
is the transfer to video.

><snip>

>>The man dragged out the old cans  
>>and permitted a small piece of film to be cut from the leader on  
>>one film to be taken to London for analyses. According to  
>>Santilli, Kodak (sic) in London reported that the film was of  
>>about 1948 vintage. That was good enough for Santilli who  
>>purchased all the cans for \$100,000 (he has also mentioned  
>>\$150,000).

>The accuracy of the price notwithstanding, is it known if the  
>"test piece" was taken from a processed or unprocessed reel?

Processed. And Kodak in London looked only at the edge markings,  
triangle and square, and said the film was definitely 1947. So  
did Kodak in Denmark. However, just like Ray these were younger  
people who did not know that the film identification chart they  
were using, printed by Kodak in Rochester, has an error which  
makes it seem that only in 1947 were a solid triangle and square  
used, while the ID marks for 1967 are shown in outline. When  
apprised of this error, they amended their statements to say the

film could be 1947 or 1967 (and remotely 1927).

But it turns out that they were also looking at copy film, as everyone else who has seen any film has been shown. The ID date designators are printed through onto the copy film.

This could, of course, be faked.

BTW, Ray has always evaded the question when I have asked how much was paid for the film. My guess, around \$ 100,000.

>If it was a processed reel, then the leader would have not been  
>part of the actual film at all, since labs add plastic leader  
>after processing to facilitate projection. On the other hand, if  
>it was unprocessed, then the "leader" would be the actual film.  
>

We discussed this in 1995. Ray doesn't know the difference between blank film at the beginning of a roll and leader which is spliced on. There is apparently no leader, just a few feet of blank film at the beginning of each roll.

>Regarding the "Kodak cartridge" you mentioned above, was the  
>film regular 8mm? The reason I ask is that, to my knowledge,  
>16mm film was always used on reels and not cartridge unless it  
>was to be used as "split 8mm" in home movie cameras. If it had  
>been processed and not split it would, in fact, still look a lot  
>like regular 16mm film. The difference, of course, would be the  
>dual 8mm images side by side but would have unusual "pitch" or  
>sprocket hole spacings. Might this be a possibility? Or was it,  
>in fact, 16mm film?

Roger, again you amaze me. Cartridge load 16 mm, which holds 50 feet per cartridge, is a common 16 mm format. It was used in the 40s and 50s, and is still in use by a small minority today. There are companies which reload the cartridges for people.

The cartridge which was given to Ray was a sealed Kodak load, which should have held the full 50 feet. Ray only returned some 33 feet or so to Mike after having it developed. As I said, the remaining film, which is what would have actually gone through the camera, was not returned or accounted for.

Bob

---

[ [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](#).

