

An article on the "Santilli Alien Autopsy"

by Ed Gehrman

"From the start it was plain to see this was no Russian Spy Plane. It was a large disc "flying Saucer" on its back with heat still radiating from the ground around it...It was decided to wait until the heat subsided before moving in as fire was a significant risk, this was made all the worse by the screams of the Freak creatures that were lying by the vehicle. What in gods name they were no one could tell but one thing for sure, they were Circus Freaks, creatures with no business here. Each had hold of a box which they kept hold of in both arms close to their chests" The Cameraman.(George Wingfield Bulletin)

"I am too much of a skeptic to deny the possibility of anything." T.H.Huxley

I was one of those folks skeptical of the Roswell Alien Autopsy footage. If it hadn't been for a quirk of fate I'd still be as ignorant as most other UFO investigators, floundering in cynical hubris, easy targets for sci-cops wielding sharp edged retorts.

My wife and I were returning from in trip to New Mexico, Sunday, September 3, 1995. FM reception had been poor that day so as we approached Reno, I turned on the radio, hoping for some mellow sounds. Luckily, the scan-tune landed on Art Bell's Dreamland, and I lingered there for a consequential moment, listening to an expert on movie cameras explain film dating. The substance of his remarks and the subsequent wrapup by Bell seemed to indicate that the Roswell Alien Autopsy footage, shown on Fox TV the previous week, was probably authentic. Could this possibly be correct? All the communication coming from the UFO community for the last three months had been contrary to this notion. Art Bell's contagious excitement piqued my interest; I decided to reexamine my assumptions about this potentially explosive but controversial film footage. I hope you will, too.

Research soon disclosed that most of the public incredulity was being driven by the joint efforts of UFO scholars and Sci-cop hit squads, using ugly rumor, misrepresentation, and twisted logic to distort Ray Santilli's motives and the legitimacy of the cameraman and the footage he shot, footage that proves that the amazing series of events known as the "Roswell Incident" did occur. Our government knows that an Alien craft fell from the sky on May 31, 1947 and they have it, somewhere. Why aren't they letting us in on the secret? For the first time we all have the proof that this did indeed happen. Aren't we going to do anything about it?

Virtually everything written on the NET these days about the Roswell autopsy footage is negative. This is my contribution toward a more balanced discussion. The information compiled for this report is taken directly from the WWW. It's all there if you care to look, from the first rumblings of the Alien photos around the first of the year, to Truly Dangerous Company's self advertising coup.

I believe Ray Santilli's footage is exactly what he and the cameraman say it is and that it confirms our Army's involvement in the Roswell incident. Our government's constant denial of UFO's and their blatant lies and misleading assertions around this

issue should eventually force all of us to question whether they really are looking out for our best interests.

Kodak

It's important to first establish just what Kodak's position is concerning the footage. The following is taken from a press release that Kodak's Marketing Planning Manager P.G. Milson (not some flunky) sent to the outside world. This is the only official public Kodak release of information so far on this subject.

"We have been asked to confirm the age of a piece of film know as the Roswell film...We have seen sections of either the film or its projection leader in three Kodak locations: UK, Hollywood and Denmark...Conclusions...

1)In our process we put a code on the edge of the film which repeats every 20 years.

2)The symbols we have seen on the Roswell film samples suggest that the film was manufactured in either 1927,1947 or 1967. (This memo substantiates that the film could have been shot in 1947 so at least that one fact is secure and we now know that they saw more than just a leader but the real footage. Kodak isn't going out on a limb for this crazy happening but they can't dispute their findings, either)

3) We are therefore, unable to categorically confirm when the film was manufactured (This is a hedge if I ever heard one)

4) It should be remembered that even if the age of the film manufacture is confirmed, this does not necessarily indicate that the film was shot and processed in the same year...(the rest is disclaimer and of no consequence)"

This information should establish just what Kodak saw and what they didn't see and also that Santilli did do what he said he did, which was have the film dated.

Ray Santilli

The following is a one hour question and answer conference, real time with Ray Santilli fielding questions being asked by just plain folks, all on line. It took place June 26, 1995. As far as I know, his story has never changed from this first raw and honest discourse, and I think this is still the truth as he knows it.

HOW DID YOU GET THE FILM?

We came across a freelance cameraman of the 50's during research for a music project, two years ago. The film has been authenticated in writing by two separate offices of Kodak. The most important aspect of this is that Kodak (in writing) have stated that apart from the date of the safety print film which is 27, 47, or 67, the original negative was also 27, 47, or 67. Thereafter codes changed. Negative film stock is only usable for around three to four years. Next week a collection of your senators will see it. I myself have never seen a UFO.

WHAT CONDITION WAS THE FILM IN WHEN YOU RECEIVED IT?

50 year old film is difficult to preserve and will deteriorate. For the greater part the footage was in dreadful condition. Unfortunately some parts were so corroded, we could only rely upon digital enhancement to retrieve the image. The film stock was NOT numbered at that time; only codes were used. There are a number of reasons for the film's condition, the primary one being the passage of time and poor storage. And no I don't know where the Aliens came from.

HOW CAN YOU VERIFY THAT THE FILM IS REAL?

The film has been authenticated apart from Kodak. We have brought in five medical experts from London, Paris and Rome. They have all confirmed that the creatures are real and not possibly human. In addition we brought in leading film special effects companies and model makers to determine whether or not the technology existed around the Kodak dates to hoax the footage. They all answered, NO! There are no zoom shots in the film.

WHO WAS VOLKER SPIELBERG?

We did not have the right amount of money. He helped us out.

WHAT IS THE CAMERAMAN'S TIME LINE FOR THE ROSWELL INCIDENT?

He was first informed on June 2, 1947. He says that they thought they had the entire area cleaned up only to discover as a result of the information coming out of Roswell in July that they had missed an area. It seems as with any aviation crash the debris was scattered and some was found by Brazel.

HOW COULD A CAMERAMAN MAKE FILM FOOTAGE LIKE THIS THAT IS THEN OVERLOOKED BY HEAVY MILITARY SECURITY?

Once the filming and cleanup was over there were hundreds of canisters of film. The first shipment was sent on to McMullan in Washington. The second was missed as Washington assumed the material was sent. We got the second shipment. There is only one type of Alien shown in the film. The typical reaction of those that have seen the film is that it is real. But we know that the film comes from Roswell and that the creatures are real, not human. You will have to see the medical reports. We will know the military's position next week. It is heating up.

HAS THE CAMERAMAN BEEN INTERVIEWED?

The cameraman's identity is protected for now. Should he wish to come out into the open, that is another matter. I know that many of you think his reasons for keeping quiet are not sound but you are forgetting that this man is in his 80's. His view of life is very different from yours and mine. He just doesn't want the hassle and the trouble this would bring.

WHERE WAS THE CRASH SITE?

The cameraman was flown into Roswell and then driven for a few hours to the crash site which was close to a Mescalero Reservation, near White Sands.

CAN WE SEE THE ALIEN'S BRAIN IN THE FILM?

Yes you can. The camera did not have a zoom. Every time a closeup was needed, the cameraman had to move in. He had to put on the same Bio-Hazard outfits as the doctors. It meant that the camera was not easy to operate, however the shots are all quite good. The mail order footage will be raw and not digitally enhanced.

HAVE YOU SHOWN THIS FILM TO RELIGIOUS LEADERS?

Yes, we covered all faiths. The reaction was very bad. Most walked out.

Have we become so cynical that we're unable to believe straight answers when they are given. Why can't we take Santilli at face value? He realizes that he now owns a very contentious strip of film, but I don't feel he's "just" trying to make money. Later Santilli statements only clarify and enhance this original attitude of open honesty.

Bob Shell

People were asking who the hell I am. And rightly so, because I am not a member of the UFO community, and have not been actively involved in UFO research. So here I come out of the blue offering to help solve a very important core mystery of the UFO community. I've got some nerve. Actually, I started out as a zoologist, and worked in that capacity at the Smithsonian institution. This was in the mid and late 60s. During this time I met, became friends with, and was heavily influenced by the late Ivan T.Sanderson, one of the most intrepid investigators of Fortean phenomena whoever lived. Ivan showed me how to open my mind to other possibilities about how the world worked. Also, while at the Smithsonian, I met Don Keyhoe who was operating NICAP out of an office on Connecticut Avenue in DC, just off DuPont Circle. Don was a weird old bird, who was always hinting that he knew a lot more than he could say. I spent a lot of interesting time in his library. But I never really got into the mainstream of UFO investigation, partly through lack of time, and partly through the stigma attached which would have been death to my job at the museum. While at the Smithsonian, I also pursued my interest in technical photography, and as the years went by I became more interested in photography and less interested in pure science. Part of this was that I discovered that you could make a lot more money in photography, and it was a good way to meet "chicks" (as we said in those days).

Since 1972, I have made my living in photography, and have studied all aspects of photography, nowadays working heavily on digital imaging. I am writing a book right now provisionally titled Photography: Electronic Imaging for Rockport Press. This will be my fourteenth book on photographic topics when it is published next year. My most important research project to date was a detailed history of the Canon Camera Company, which was published in England last year by Hove Photo Books as Canon Compendium...I am widely published and considered a technical expert in photography. In addition to the books, my regular job is as Editor of Shutterbug, the world's third largest photo magazine. I am Technical Editor of Photo Pro magazine, Technical Editor of Outdoor & Nature Photography magazine, Technical Correspondent for Color Photo in Munich (one of Germany's top two photo magazines), and have written for photo magazines and journals in England, Australia, India, Japan, South Africa, etc. etc. I do free-lance photographic consulting, and am currently a consultant for two major Japanese camera companies, providing input on design. I have acted as a photographic technical consultant for the FBI, for intelligence agencies, and for private industry. I have been

qualified as an expert witness on photographic interpretation in several federal court cases (the side I was on won every time!). I do not claim to be an expert on motion picture photography. I have done my share of 16 mm filming, including one hour long documentary. My reason for offering to help in this matter was that it was obvious from the documents I saw that Ray Santilli was not going to the right people at Kodak. Over my many years working in the photo industry I have developed a good working relationship with many of the technical staff at Kodak in Rochester, and I knew just which channels to go to for information on 16 mm film dating (Neil Morris, Manchester University)

Bob Shell plays a very important part in this unfolding drama. With that in mind, here's excerpts from a Shell interview, I think his latest, published in Nov-Dec. 1995, in Photo Shopper Magazine.

PHOTO SHOPPER: Cutting directly to the chase - you've seen a lot of the original film and analyzed it, so what do you think? Is it authentic?

BOB SHELL: Well, the film is certainly authentic in the sense that the film stock is 1947-vintage Kodak 16mm Super XX Pan chromatic high speed safety film. Which is correct film for the time scale that we're talking about. It was used by the military for a number of different types of photography, so there's really no anachronism involved in the type of film, or the date of manufacture of the film itself.

PS: How did you determine the date of manufacture?

SHELL: Well, Kodak uses an edge code of geometric symbols on their 16mm films to indicate a date of manufacture. Until the sixties they repeated those edge codes every 20 years. The edge code on this particular film is a square followed by a triangle. Which would indicate 1927, '47, or '67. Because of contextual things within the film, no one has seriously suggested it could have been made in 1927. A wall clock, a telephone, and other things are visible in the film that were not available in '27. Besides, Super XX film wasn't available then, either. So we really didn't consider 1927 worth being concerned with. So we then looked at the possibility of the film being made in 1967. That was equally unlikely. In 1957 Kodak made a major change in their 16mm films. They adopted a new, high temperature, more caustic chemical process. When they did this, they discontinued all of their films and issued either revised versions of those films or new films to replace them. Super XX was discontinued during that change-over. If Super XX was not made after 1957, this stock could not have been made in '67.

PS: What if some insider counterfeited the edge-code on some other film made after 1957?

SHELL: They would have to match the type of film base material, as well. After the '50s, Kodak used triacetate, basically the same stuff they use today. But in 1947 they were using an earlier form of acetate called acetatepropionate. This decomposes with age. It shrinks in physical dimensions, and after it's aged for a while it has a very characteristic, acidic odor. Based on the odor and the shrinkage characteristics, we've said that this film is the older form of acetate. Therefore it would be 1947 film.

PS: What prevented someone from having acquired a bunch of 1947 film and shooting it in 1985 or '90 or '95?

SHELL: Nothing prevents anyone from doing that. But the finished film would have noticeable levels of fog caused by background atmospheric radiation and cosmic rays. It was a high speed film, meaning that it would fog fairly rapidly. And this film shows no measurable levels of fog whatsoever. This would indicate to me that it was exposed and processed while it was still quite fresh. So I would say that probably the film was exposed and processed within a couple years of its manufacture in 1947.

PS: I've heard that this particular film had a really short shelf-life as well.

SHELL: A two year shelf-life was what Kodak put on the packaging. That is, the "use by" date was two years from the date of manufacturing.

PS: All right, so it seems that if this were a fraudulent undertaking, it was undertaken in 1947.

SHELL: Yes, if it's a fraud it was done in 1947. Which creates very large questions of its own, as to why someone would have faked such a film in 1947 and who would have done it, and who would have had the budget to do something like this?

PS: Who would have?

SHELL: No one except for the U.S. government.

PS: And why would they have done it?

SHELL: I have no earthly idea, really. The only suggestion that I've heard of a hoax by the U.S. government that makes even a little bit of sense is this film was to be intentionally leaked to the Soviets, to scare Stalin into thinking we had inherited alien technology and could whip the socks off him if he bothered us. But that's a suggestion that really doesn't to me seem very logical. If we really wanted to scare Stalin, I think we would use something besides dead aliens.

PS: Like live bombers.

SHELL: Right.

PS: When you appraise the film, I assume that you pretty much restrict your comments to its physical condition and its physical properties. Are there any other elements involved with it that give you an opinion one way or the other?

SHELL: Professionally, I'm commenting only on the physical aspects of the film itself, because I haven't really wanted to step outside of the range of expertise that brought me into the case. But my original training was in zoology, and I have attended autopsies and done dissections myself. I did all the photographs for a college-level laboratory manual on anatomy and physiology. So I'm quite aware of what an autopsy looks like and what the insides of people and animals look like, and how a body behaves when it's being cut into and manipulated by surgeons. The impression I have from looking at the film is that this is a real body, being operated on by the doctors, surgeons, pathologists, whatever they may be. And that what's

inside this body is not human organs. In other words, it's a real, non-human body being dissected.

PS: What are the telltale attributes of a real body as opposed to some kind of faked body?

SHELL: Well, we have to look at that in two different contexts. Certainly, we can fake a body that would have all or most of the attributes that this one does, today, with a big enough budget and time and a reason to do it. But if we assume that I am correct in my film dating, then we have to assume this was done in 1947. And in 1947, special effects technology was not particularly advanced and the only materials available to make such a body were fairly limited: latex and plaster and that sort of thing. And there are certain things about the way the body moves when, say, the hand is lifted and the fingers are flexed by the surgeon, or when the skin is cut and pulled back, that I don't think could be done with latex. It doesn't look like latex to me, it looks like real skin and the finger flexing looks like real joints being moved. The organs inside look like real organs with connective tissue holding everything together...They're just shaped differently than any organs I've seen.

PS: Now I understand that there's some controversy about the identity or even the authenticity of the cameraman.

SHELL: Well, at the moment no one, except for Ray Santilli, the British producer who bought and released the footage, has actually met the cameraman face to face. So we're taking it on Ray's word that there is a cameraman...Another British producer by the name of John Purdy, who produced a program about the autopsy film, has talked to the cameraman on the telephone, in a call set-up by Ray. He said that the man he talked to was obviously an American. And he thought the man had a Brooklyn accent.

PS: Who is this guy alleged to be, and what about these rumors we're hearing that he disappeared?

SHELL: The fellow is in his mid-eighties (now). He was a military cameraman for 10 years, from 1942 to 1952 as I recall. He was assigned to military intelligence, and filmed quite a number of top secret projects during his time as a cameraman. This would have been the most secret project he was ever involved in. His version of the story is, (that) he's now older, and not in the best of health, and he wanted to come forward with the film and get some money for it, and he gave the money to his granddaughter. That's the story as I understand it. As far as verifying that the man really exists, I have not been able to do that myself yet...I've been promised that I will have a face to face interview with him at some time.

PS: O.K., when skeptics look at this footage, what conclusive evidence do they point at to call it a fraud?

SHELL: So far, I've seen nothing from any of the skeptics that really holds any water. You know, there have been lots of people on television and in articles saying "Well, it's obviously a fake because there are no aliens. "You can't really argue that way. You have to find something wrong with the film if you want to demonstrate it's a fraud. The first thing that came out was someone saying, "Obviously, it's not true

because in 1947 they didn't have coiled phone cords like we see in the film, or wall telephones." Well, we researched that with the Bell Telephone Museum and found that these phones definitely were available in 1947. Someone else said the wall clock was not made in 1947. We went to General Electric and verified that this wall clock was introduced in the '30's. Other people have said the Shure microphone visible in the film, that the surgeon is speaking into periodically during the autopsy, is the wrong vintage. I talked to a technical specialist from the Shure corporation, and he said it is the right vintage. Some people have attacked the film because it goes out of focus when the camera moves in close. That's just because the camera he used, a Bell and Howell Film 70, doesn't focus very close, and if you move in closer than a certain distance, the pictures do get blurred. That's just a characteristic of the camera. So, so far all of the things hauled out by the skeptics to use to debunk the film haven't really proved anything.

PS: I have to assume that in a top-secret operation like this, the cameraman would have had top-secret clearances, and might have been under observation himself. How many rolls of film were there?

SHELL: Twenty-two rolls. One hundred foot rolls.

PS: Twenty-two one hundred foot rolls. So how is it that he had these in his possession? How was he able to get them past his own superiors?

SHELL: His story is that these 22 rolls were rolls he held back for special processing because they had problems of one sort or another. They needed push processing, the camera had jammed and they had torn sprockets, or for whatever reason these were all rolls he wanted to hand process. So he processed all of the films that didn't have problems and sent them on through to Washington. He kept the remaining rolls back, processed them a few days later, called Washington and said they were ready, and his story is that no one ever came for them.

PS: There were 2200 feet of top-secret motion pictures floating around, and no one came for them?

SHELL: It doesn't sound likely to most people, but it actually isn't that unlikely. At the time this event occurred, the U.S. Army Air Force was being split off into a separate agency and made into the U.S. Air Force. And there was considerable confusion in terms of who was in charge of what...lots of things slipped through the cracks...Now that's one possible interpretation. Another possibility is the cameraman intentionally kept the films.

PS: Is there anything about the films that you've seen that would support the fact that they did need special care?

SHELL: Oh, yeah. Some of them have apparently been push-processed. I base this on the contrast and grain structure; it looks like push-processed film. Some of the film does have badly shredded areas on the edges where the camera messed up and tore the sprocket holes. Also, those rolls of film all show uneven processing, which is characteristic of processing in a small hand tank rather than in a processing machine.

PS: Over how many days of shooting did these 22 rolls get produced?

SHELL: Well, part of these rolls show the debris of the crashed craft and the other part shows two separate autopsies. The crash occurred on the last day of May in 1947. The official recovery operation started on the first day of June, and lasted for three weeks. The autopsies were done on the 12th and the 14th of July in Ft. Worth, Texas. So the period from the 1st of June to about the 14th of July was when these films were made. And he doesn't say precisely when they were processed, but they were processed at some point after that.

PS: That's a month and a half for this creature to sit around and putrefy.

SHELL: Not necessarily. What he says was that when he got to the crashed craft site there were four creatures there. All four were alive when he arrived on site.

PS: The cameraman himself saw this.

SHELL: Yes. Within hours of the time he arrived on site, one of them died. Of the other three, two of them lived about a month, and the other one lived for two years. It died in 1949 and a separate autopsy was done at the time and filmed by the cameraman.

PS: So the two existing autopsy sequences, then, are of the first one to die and the last one to die?

SHELL: No, the two we've got are the first and second ones to die. Or maybe the second and third, out of the four. We don't know if the one that died at the crash site is among those in the autopsy footage.

PS: So where is the footage of the last one?

SHELL: He, (the cameraman), kept none of that.

PS: So, how many rolls altogether does he claim he exposed?

SHELL: Over two hundred.

PS: So that means over 180 rolls of 16mm 100-foot lengths of film are floating around someplace. That's about twice the running-time of "Close Encounters."

SHELL: Right.

PS: But we have no idea where?

SHELL: Oh, we have a good idea where. Somewhere in the U.S. government's possession in Washington DC. Most likely anyway.

PS: Who is Dr. Detlev Bronk?

SHELL: The cameraman says that the two surgeons in the room are a Dr. Detlev Bronk and a Dr. Williams. Forensic pathologists who have watched the film have said that it looks to them like the man doing the work is not a pathologist, but a surgeon, based on the way he cuts and the way he holds the instruments and the way he

manipulates. Apparently there's a difference in the way surgeons and pathologists handle their implements. Which supports the cameraman's claim that he was a surgeon. We do know that Dr. Detlev Bronk was a real person. At the time of the autopsy, he was chief of Air Medicine, the United States Army Air Force. Which would mean he would have been called in at any unusual air crash or event like that. From 1952 onwards, he was president of the Rockefeller Institute of Medicine, and they have his personal papers. When I went to the Rockefeller Institute several weeks ago to inquire about this, they said they had all of Dr. Bronk's personal papers, including his personal diaries, his date books, his correspondence, etc. When I said that I wanted to see this material for 1947, I was told that all of Dr. Bronk's personal diaries are missing and unaccounted for...

PS: When did the word first get around that this footage existed?

SHELL: Well, the first rumors that I heard got around at the beginning of this year. The first showing of the film anywhere in the world was in May, in London, for a small group of UFO investigators and international press. Followed by showings in Italy and in France and then later on in the U.S. The film was also shown to a U.S. Congressional delegation sometime in June.

PS: Now, what is the content of this research? What are they looking at, just the films or ...

SHELL: No, no, no ... They're looking at the physical artifacts of the crash, like the boxes, which are shown in the film of the debris. The boxes are metal looking objects with imprints for six-fingered hands, with what look like buttons underneath parts of the fingers and palm. The person I spoke to, who claims to have been involved in the research, says they are computers and that the hand prints are the input system for the computers. That after studying the computers for all the many years we've had them in our possession, we've learned very little about how they work.

PS: There seems to be a big abyss between investigators and authentic records in some areas of this case, but here you are describing almost a direct link, people who seem very specific with first-hand descriptions.

SHELL: Well, of course, these people are speaking to me off the record, and at risk to their positions if they were exposed through talking about it.

PS: A great number of people would have been involved in finding this crash in 1947, loading it, transporting it, cleaning up ...

SHELL: Certainly a reasonable number of people were involved. But how much most of those people knew is probably quite minimal. Interestingly enough, the crash occurred on the last day of May in 1947. It occurred 10 miles southwest of Socorro New Mexico and was witnessed by local ranchers...

PS: They actually saw the crash?

SHELL: ...they saw the crash, yes. On June the 1st 1947, an abandoned and played-out magnesium mine about a mile from the crash site was reopened by the military. The Bureau of Mines records are still in existence, and show that this mine was reopened, operated for several months, but no mining of any sort was done. Then it was shut down again. The mine itself has been visited recently by investigators. It's

a very large mine shaft supported by heavy metal 'I' beams. It's not a primitive mine by any means, and quite a lot of material could be put in there and hidden from public view. That to me is one of the strongest pieces of circumstantial evidence substantiating that something was going on there.

PS: A day after the crash? A mile from the crash site?

SHELL: We know within a mile or so exactly where it came down. We don't know with pinpoint accuracy where it came in, because there's nothing you can find today to tell you where the crash site was. The military apparently did a very good cover up job. There's one area where the crash easily could have happened, where about a 30-foot diameter circular area of ground has been dug up at some time in the past and replaced with soil taken from somewhere else.

PS: And this coincides with where witnesses say it came down?

SHELL: Right ... and the cameraman said it was so hot that it melted the sand underneath it. So there would be reason to dig up what was there and carry it off as well.

PS: Why Wright Patterson-why not some other facility?

SHELL: I have no idea. That's just where the cameraman says it was taken. He also says that the crew who was on-site doing the clean-up when he arrived had been there for a while. They were going through this like it was something they had done before. Those were his words, it was like something they had done before. They were going through a procedure. He had the impression that they had gone through recovery procedures on other crashes.

PS: UFO crashes?

SHELL: Right, that this was not the first one. He believes this was not the first time they saw what they were seeing and handled what they were handling, and they knew exactly how to deal with it.

PS: What's next in this series of investigations?

SHELL: Researchers at M.I.T. are using some new image-sharpening algorithms to see if they can enhance the clarity of things in the footage. For example, there's a sign on the wall near the phone; we'd like to see what it says. And the nurse during the autopsy writes notes on a pad. It would be interesting, and perhaps revealing, if we could enhance and read what she wrote. Another thing is to take the film testing itself a step further by getting Kodak to do some specialized chemical destruct tests, which will be the 100% verification of the dating of the film. I'm giving it a 95% based on my own analysis. Kodak can give me the extra 5% because they keep a very detailed record of qualities in all the chemicals they buy for their manufacturing process. For that particular batch of film from 1947, they know exactly what they should get when they do a spectroscopic analysis. So they will do this and compare it. There are also some physical measurements they can do, because in 1960 they changed the way the perforations are punched in 16mm film. New machinery that worked differently was brought in. The variation in spacing between perforations is very tiny, but if you have 50-frame strip of film you can measure it. You can

determine with 100% accuracy whether it was punched before or after this change in equipment was made. Kodak can do that for us.

PS: So that would again bring us back to further evidence that the footage is authentic from the standpoint of time?

SHELL: Right. There's no way from the film itself we can ever settle the argument of the validity of what's on the film. That's going to have to be argued and argued and argued by other people. Don Sutherland, 1995

Truly Dangerous Company

The Truly Dangerous Company debunking is funny and somewhat entertaining. It was their insistence that Kodak hadn't been contacted, and that this film couldn't have been shot in 1947 that started the negative attitude so prevalent today in the press and popular opinion. But they blew their whole case by issuing the following disclaimer: "Many of the FX techniques explained here did not exist until recently. So we should make it clear that our assumption here is that the "alien autopsy" was not shot in 1947. Despite the claims of some, the autopsy film has never been examined by Kodak or any other reputable source." See how rumors start? The film was examined by Kodak, and a person of considerable standing in the photo industry (Bob Shell) has put his prestige on the line by authenticating this footage. The Time Magazine and Skeptical Inquirer hit pieces were all generated by the TDC miscalculations. This footage could only have been shot in 1947 or 48. All the experts lambasting Santilli based their doubts on modern FX techniques. They all had their individual slants, but no one volunteered to duplicate this effect.

What I find most interesting about this case is how the UFO community has gone about, hand in hand, with their arch enemies the sci-cops to debunk the only real evidence we've ever had to prove our government's systematic involvement with the whole UFO cover up. The Feds didn't have to do a thing to cover their asses- we did it all for them, free of charge.

"Once my tent had been set up I started filming immediately, first the vehicle, then the site and debris. At around 06.00 it was deemed safe to move in, again the freaks were still crying and when approached screamed even louder. They were protective of their little boxes but we managed to get one loose with a firm strike at the head of a freak with the butt of a rifle." The Cameraman.