

Newly Discovered Anomalies Challenge "Alien Autopsy" Authenticity

Small filmstrips which "Alien Autopsy" movie distributor Ray Santilli provided to his prestigious American "authenticity investigator" Bob Shell--which Shell believed were samples of the "original" film acquired from the former military cameraman who allegedly took the movies--are really copy/duplicates, according to a very experienced cinema expert--Clive Tobin.

Tobin, who worked for more than 20 years in a motion picture processing laboratory and now is president of Tobin Cinema Systems in Seattle, is also a field investigator for MUFON. Tobin's suspicions arose when he saw a short filmstrip on the Fox TV show--similar to the two strips which Santilli supplied to Shell, who is editor of Shutterbug magazine. Tobin revealed his suspicions that the Fox filmstrip was a copy/duplicate in a short article published in the October issue of the MUFON UFO Journal. The subtle, technically complex details that Tobin observed convinced him that the Fox filmstrip was a copy that had been made using a Bell & Howell "C-printer," which was not introduced until around 1960, or possibly a model JA-printer which preceded it by several years. When SUN, which has been carrying on an extensive information exchange with Shell, learned that he had not seen Tobin's article, we supplied him with a copy, which led to direct communications between the two men.

To appreciate the importance of Tobin's discovery it is necessary to review highlights of the (alleged) cameraman's tale--as provided by Santilli. On June 2, 1947, Santilli's alleged cameraman (SAC) says he was dispatched to the Roswell Army Air Field, then driven 160 miles west to near Socorro, where he filmed a crashed saucer and its four "freaks," three of whom were still alive. Then he was flown to Wright Field (now Wright-Patterson Air Force Base) where he spent "three weeks working on [filming] the debris." In early July, he was sent to Ft. Worth where he filmed autopsies on two of the "freaks." [SUN Note: Seemingly, the UFO-naut killed in the crash was kept "on ice" for a month until the second one died. The third and fourth were still alive.]

SANTILLI'S ALLEGED CAMERAMAN'S (SAC'S) INCREDIBLE TALE

Then, in SAC's own words: *"After filming, I had several hundred reels. I separated problem reels which required special attention in processing. These I would do later. The first batch was sent through to Washington, and I processed the remainder a few days later. Once the remaining reels had been processed, I contacted Washington to arrange [for] collection of the final batch. Incredibly, they never came to collect or arrange transportation for them. I called many times and then just gave up. The footage has remained with me ever since. In May of 1949, I was asked to film the third autopsy." [Emphasis added.]*

Seemingly in the spring of 1949, top Air Force/Pentagon officials remembered that SAC had filmed the first two UFO-naut autopsies so they selected him to shoot the third--in Washington, according to Santilli. Yet they completely forgot that major portions of the first two autopsy films were MISSING (because SAC had retained them for "special processing") so nobody thought to ask SAC to bring them along when he came to Washington to film the third autopsy. **AND IT NEVER OCCURRED TO SANTILLI'S (ALLEGED) CAMERAMAN TO BRING THE ROLLS OF 1947 AUTOPSY FILM ALONG WHEN HE WENT TO WASHINGTON.**

If the small filmstrips which Santilli supplied to Shell and to Fox are from the SAME footage that Santilli (allegedly) acquired from SAC, then the autopsy films are COPIES made sometime AFTER THE LATE 1950s WHEN THE JA AND C-PRINTERS BECAME AVAILABLE, according to Tobin. This raises numerous questions.

For example, if the film Santilli acquired is a copy made on a printer that did not become available until the mid/late 1950s, then SAC's tale--as related by Santilli--can not possibly be true. Even if Tobin were wrong and the copies were made in 1947 on an earlier model printer, how was SAC able to covertly steal so many rolls of super-secret film without being caught? And why did SAC wait 45 years before trying to sell the film directly to an obscure British film distributor whom he had just chanced to meet, rather than working covertly through an agent to sell the film to a major TV network or Hollywood producer? Truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, but not all strange tales are true.

Shell Challenges Tobin But Later Concedes He Might Be Right

When Shell participated in an "Encounters Forum" on CompuServe in late August, following the first showing of "Alien Autopsy" on the Fox network, he said: *"I'm the guy in charge of investigating the film [for Santilli]. I've got lots of info that isn't public yet. I have the cameraman's statement, which I have done some research on....I have a piece of the actual film here on my desk."* Then Shell volunteered: "Based on my investigation, I give a 95% scientific probability that the film was manufactured, exposed and processed in 1947. That's my professional opinion about the film." [Emphasis added.]

In mid-November, when Shell began his direct dialogue with Tobin, Shell sharply challenged Tobin's conclusion that the filmstrip shown on the Fox "Alien Autopsy" TV show was not a "camera-original" film. In a Fax/letter dated Nov. 16, Shell said that the three-frame strip of film mounted in a 35 mm slide mount and shown briefly in the Fox broadcast *"has been examined by experts at Kodak and at the George Eastman House Museum and they have concluded that it is original camera film which was reversal processed, not a duplicate or print. My two strips, which are generally similiar, have been examined by a number of 'old timers' who were working in the 40s as well as by film experts and also pronounced as camera originals."* [Emphasis added.]

During the ensuing dialogue, Tobin sent Shell a sample of film processed on a C-Printer, so he could compare its tiny characteristic "fingerprints" near the sprocket holes with the two filmstrips which Santilli had provided. Barely a month later, on Dec. 17, Shell posted a public memo in the MUFON section of CompuServe, saying that as a result of data supplied by Tobin, he was *"disturbed and puzzled....My puzzlement stems from the fact that every expert other than Mr. Tobin who has examined the film is convinced that it is camera-original film."*

However, Shell reminded readers that Santilli *"initially said he had been given 22 reels of 'release prints' [i.e., copies] and one reel of negative film: Whether he just assumed that these were 'release prints' or whether he was told this by the cameraman is a question which must be resolved. Ray is in bed with the flu right now, but as soon as he is up and around I will address this question with him. We have all been working on the assumption that this was camera-original material because all of the experts pronounced it as such. If it now turns out that all of these experts were wrong, and Mr. Tobin alone is correct, we will have to go all the way back to square one on the authentication process. Obviously, dating of a 'release print' will not prove the date of the original, and will not satisfy the skeptics."* [Emphasis added.]

WHO WERE SHELL'S "EXPERTS" WHO ASSESSED THE FILM?

Recalling the claim made by Shell in his Nov. 16 letter to Tobin that his two filmstrips had *"been examined by a number of 'old timers' who were working in the 40s as well as by film experts and also pronounced as camera-originals,"* SUN asked Shell to provide the names and addresses of the *"experts you yourself consulted and indicate what material you provided to them to facilitate their accurate assessment."* Shell responded: *"These experts were the ones FOX showed*

the filmstrips to, the experts that Phil Mantle [British UFO Research Assn.] showed them to, the experts TF-1 [French TV] brought in, those used by Italian, German, Rumanian, Hong Kong, etc. TV networks."

Tobin also questioned whether the 16 mm. filmstrip samples had sprocket holes along both edges ("double-perf") or only along one edge ("single-perf"). The Bell & Howell Filmo camera (widely employed in the 1940s by military cameramen) could not use "single-perf" film because the camera had a double-claw sprocket. By a curious coincidence, BOTH filmstrips that Santilli provided to Shell, AND the one shown by Fox, HAD ONE EDGE TORN OFF, MAKING IT IMPOSSIBLE TO TELL IF IT WAS "SINGLE-PERF" OR "DOUBLEPERF."

Shell Offers Two Possible Explanations For Missing Edges

In Shell's Dec. 17 CompuServe memo, he acknowledged that this key issue cannot be resolved because "one whole edge of the film is torn off" in both of his filmstrip samples and the one shown by Fox. "The simple explanation is that this film was damaged in projection, or in the camera, and this accounts for the tearing. The more sinister explanation would be that this side of the film was intentionally torn off to hide the fact that this was 'single-perf' film." [Emphasis added.] [SUN doubts that Santilli would resort to such fraud and suggests another possible explanation: Extraterrestrial microbes that penetrated the camera during the autopsies, and which like to eat movie film but get full after eating one edge.]

Shell added that the "film scraps" which Santilli provided to British TV producer John Purdy [reportedly] were all "double-perf" and, Shell said, "John's film pieces have been pronounced camera-originals by the experts he has submitted them to." But Shell added: "John has quite a bit of film, but has not been willing to let me examine it at any length. I have had only a brief look at it."

In the wake of these discrepancies, SUN recently asked Shell if he now would like to revise his "95% probability" estimate that the "Alien Autopsy" film is authentic. Shell responded he "would today give a high probability, something like 80% or so, that the original film was manufactured, exposed and processed prior to 1957 [sic]" instead of his former "95% probability that the film was manufactured, exposed and processed in 1947."

Santilli's "Double-Talk" About Authenticating His Film

Television viewers in the Seattle area had the opportunity to see and hear "Alien Autopsy's" Ray Santilli when he participated in an hour-long talk show, via satellite link, on station KOMO on Nov. 12. The show was hosted by a somewhat skeptical Ken Schram. At one point in the program, Santilli acknowledged that his company has "made some money" from the sale of TV rights and home videos. But he added: "We are not into any kind of profit and we won't be until the film is proved to be genuine."

When host Schram and skeptical panelists asked why he had not accepted the offer of Eastman Kodak to have its scientists evaluate a several-inch-long sample of the autopsy film, Santilli replied: "Film with image--and not leader tape--has been given to Fox and to Bob Shell, who's an independent film expert. Kodak has film. The film has been given to the English broadcasters, to the French broadcasters...and if we keep giving away film there will soon be very little left." (The 22 rolls of film Santilli says he acquired would be 2,200 ft. in length.)

During the closing moments of the KOMO-TV show, host Schram asked Santilli "why you haven't gone to every length to get this film authenticated....Do you feel you've done everything you can and should?" Santilli responded: "I've given it to the broadcasters and I've asked them to

investigate it. They've got the money and the resources to do it." (Earlier Santilli claimed that "Millions of dollars world-wide has been spent on investigating the film and the film still maintains its integrity.") When Schram asked, "Why not submit this to Kodak?" Santilli replied, "It has been submitted to Kodak by the broadcasters."

Eastman Kodak's Response To Santilli's Claim

SUN decided to check out Santilli's claim with Kodak on Nov. 30 and talked with Jim Blamphin in the company's public affairs office. He said that the only film that had been submitted to Kodak was a "two-inch section of solid white leader, which serves to thread a film into a projector, whose edge-coding indicates it was manufactured in 1927, 1947 or 1967." Blamphin said that Kodak's British affiliate had offered to conduct a detailed chemical analysis to determine approximately when the "Alien Autopsy" film had been manufactured and processed if Santilli would provide a 10-in. strip of film and pay \$8,000. "But we've not heard further from him," Blamphin said.

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].

When Santilli had appeared on a British radio talk show on Aug. 21, a panelist said he hoped the original film was safely stored "in a big vault somewhere." Santilli responded: "Yeah, I was going to say, Switzerland in a safe.... Some went back to the cameraman. And some is still with us." Seemingly, Santilli had a sufficient surplus of film such that he opted to return some of it to the 80+ year old cameraman. Yet it never occurred to him to send a several-inch-long-strip of film to Bob Shell to submit to Eastman Kodak for chemical analysis.

SUN Erred On The Vintage Of Autopsy Room Telephone

The wall-type telephone seen in the "autopsy room" of the Santilli films is not the Type 500 (Henry Dreyfuss) design introduced in 1956, as reported in the last (November) issue of SUN, which would have been hard proof that the film is a hoax. A close-up enlargement of the wall-telephone, provided to SUN by Bob Shell, shows it to be a Type 350 which was introduced around 1946-47. A photo of this model, published in the Autumn 1947 issue of the Pacific Telephone Magazine carries the caption: "New wall-type combined telephone set developed by Bell Labs and manufactured by Western Electric..."

But the "new wall-type" telephone shown does not have a coiled cord, like the one which appears in the Santilli film. SUN, having learned the hard way that authors of books on the history of the telephone are not always 100% accurate, has spent many hours in the Library of Congress examining publications of the late 1940s and early 1950s, including Telephony: The Journal of the Telephone Industry, to determine when coiled cords became "standard equipment." An advertisement by Western Electric (AT&T's manufacturing subsidiary), in the Feb. 19, 1949, issue of Telephony, showed its then-current Type 300 desk-set telephone without

a coiled cord. The July 1953 issue of the National Geographic magazine carried an AT&T ad with three photos showing persons using telephones. None of the phones had a coiled cord.

If the Santilli film is authentic, then the wall-telephone was a brand new model with coiled cord which had been installed quite recently. However, examination of its coiled cord reveals that some coils are stretched, or "baggy." An advertisement by Koiled Kords Inc., which manufactured such items, appearing in the Oct. 22, 1949, issue of Telephony, claims its cord "always retracts, never gets baggy or loose no matter how often it is stretched." Because the Santilli film coiled cord appears extremely baggy and stretched, this strongly suggests that the autopsy room wall-phone and its coiled cord were many decades old, not brand new, when the Santilli film was shot. (Old-model phones can be purchased from antique phone dealers, such as Phoneco Inc., Galesville, Wisc.)

HOPKINS DISCOVERS "NEW" UFO ABDUCTION PATTERNS

If you ever experience a UFO abduction, don't be surprised if you find yourself in a special uniform helping the UFO-nauts with their routine chores, according to Budd Hopkins, chief guru of the UFO abduction cult. When Hopkins spoke at the Fifth New Hampshire MUFON UFO Conference in Portsmouth, Sept. 9-10, he reported his recent discovery of a pattern in which UFO-nauts "co-opt" their "abductees," forcing them to assist their captors.

For example, Hopkins cited one petite woman from Connecticut who "*remembered being inside a UFO. She is wearing a blue, skin-tight uniform without buttons, without zippers and she doesn't know how she got into it. And she's with the Aliens and they instruct her telepathically what she has to do....She walks out of the craft, which is on the ground, and there was a car that had stopped. And she walked over to the car and sitting in the car is an absolutely terrified large man, an African-American man, and he is obviously paralyzed. She takes him out of the car, zip....And he is looking at her with terror--she's a tiny woman. And she leads him up to the entrance of the craft and that was it. That's what she had to do. Now, while she's doing that, she's upset with herself [asking] 'Why am I doing this?'*"

Another such "co-option" case described by Hopkins involved a woman "*who remembered being in a craft wearing a blue, skin-tight uniform--very thin--and she didn't know how she got into it....And she knows what she has to do. She walks into one room of the craft and there are four or five naked humans, looking terrified....And she makes a gesture and takes one of them and leads them from one room to another. And that's it. She's done her job. And she is terrified, angry with herself because they [humans] are looking at her with fear and hatred.*"

Hopkins revealed that "*the very first person I ever heard this from--from her own personal experience--was Linda Cortile. It could almost be called the Linda Cortile Syndrome.*" [Linda "Cortile" Napolitano first attracted Hopkins' interest when she claimed she was "beamed up" from her Manhattan apartment to a UFO hovering overhead and Hopkins later received letters from alleged observers to confirm Linda's tale. See SUN #17/#18/#19; Sept./Nov. 1992, Jan. 1993]. Hopkins declined to provide any details on Linda's "co-option," saying these would be disclosed in his forthcoming book, to be called: "Eagle's End: The Brooklyn Bridge UFO Abduction." Hopkins offered no hint as to when his new book would appear.

HOPKINS OFFERS NEW THEORY TO EXPLAIN CHILDHOOD ABDUCTIONS

Hopkins' earlier theory that the purpose behind UFO abductions was to obtain female ova and male sperm to create a hybrid species did not explain the claims of UFO abductions during childhood, before the subjects had reached puberty. Now Hopkins has devised a new hypothesis to fill this void: UFO-nauts "are studying the way humans form relationships with other humans from childhood on."

Hopkins explained that his new theory is based on about a dozen cases in which two persons, typically of opposite sex, meet as adults and find that the other party looks familiar. Each, reportedly, recalls how the other looked in childhood--even though the two lived in different towns, sometimes even in different countries. Eventually, Hopkins reported, "they will begin to recall, through hypnosis and normal recollections, that in fact they were abducted together when they were little children, from time to time, and again and again." But instead of being placed on tables for extraction of sperm/ova, the two "were brought together, left alone and allowed to interact--as if the UFO occupants are studying the way humans form relationships with other humans."

Hopkins revealed that the very first time he ever heard of such repeated abductions from childhood was from Linda Cortile. Hopkins added that Linda's tale "will be gone into in my book. It adds credibility and a very different story to her recollections. Amazing credibility."

In Hopkins' closing remarks he admitted that "there are people in mental hospitals because they had abduction experiences and reported them to the wrong people. There are suicides. There are all kinds of bad things that have happened." Hopkins offered the following advice to persons who believe they have suffered UFO abductions: "The first thing is NOT to dwell on it all the time--because life goes by."

Abduction Therapist Boylan Seeks To Regain License

The Sacramento (Calif.) Superior Court will soon consider the request of prominent UFO abduction therapist Richard J. Boylan that it overturn the action of the California Board of Psychology which last August revoked Boylan's psychotherapist license [SUN #35/Sept. 1995]. Boylan, who in late 1993 established the Academy of Certified Close Encounter Therapists (ACCET) to train other psychotherapists in how to treat "abductees," claims he himself has experienced a UFO abduction.

The Psychology Board's action was prompted by complaints filed by three of Boylan's female patients, identified in the report by their initials as D.S. and K.G. After 20 days of hearings in late 1994 and early 1995, the Board concluded that Boylan had "abused his role as a therapist and was grossly negligent...in imposing his personal views on the existence of extraterrestrials into the dreams and memories of D.W. and D.S." The Board concluded that Boylan had "committed gross negligence" in violation of business and professions codes when he:

- "Invited D.W. to his home in Nov. 1992 and engaged in nude hot tubbing [and] when he gave D.W. a massage in his hotel room in Las Vegas."
- "Invited K.G. to his home in Dec. 1991 and engaged in nude hot tubbing [and] when he bartered therapy for nude massages from K.G."

However, the Board did not conclude that Boylan's act of inviting D.S. and K.G. to Harbin Hot Springs for nude therapy sessions constituted gross negligence. Nor did the Board conclude that Boylan had engaged in "sexual misconduct" with any of the three women.

The Psychology Board report cited the following description involved with counseling for about 30 years, first as a Catholic priest and later as a licensed therapist...He is married and the father of two and the stepfather of two. At the time of the recent hearing [Boylan] was president of the Sacramento Valley Psychological Association."

Boylan called SUN an article by name in which he was named in the Sept. issue which might be construed as indicating that he recognized that he had provided nude hot tub therapy for "abductees." This, he said, was not true.

Boylan provided SUN with a lengthy rebuttal to the Psychology Board's charges and actions in which he claimed he was a victim of those seeking to perpetuate a "UFO cover-up." Boylan charged that *"the engineers of the UFO Cover-Up fear, resent, and have not been able to refute the data I have exposed about UFO reality, the extraterrestrial presence, secret U.S.-UFO manufacturing, the literal Star Wars object of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program, and the covert apparatus behind the UFO Cover-Up. Therefore, they have selected their chief alternative strategy: to smear and discredit this researcher, with sensationalized and reputation-destroying allegations, in the hope of terminating my credibility and professional reputation."* [For additional background on Boylan, see SUN #23/Nov. 1993 and SUN #24/Jan. 1994.]

Congressman Schiff Continues His Roswell/GAO Cover-Up

"Crashed-Saucer" Congressman Steven Schiff of New Mexico, who achieved international fame by charging that the Pentagon/U.S. Air Force failed to respond to his request for information on the "Roswell Incident," continues to "stonewall" SUN's request for information on his role in shaping the final report issued by the General Accounting Office (GAO) on July 28, dealing with its Roswell investigation [SUN #35/Sept. 1995]. It has now been five months since SUN wrote Schiff on Aug. 6 to request a copy of the first draft of the GAO Roswell report "together with a list of changes/revisions which you suggested to GAO." A second request was sent on Aug. 20. As of early 1996, SUN has received no response.

SUN has now obtained (from a confidential source) a copy of the initial draft of the GAO Roswell report as well as some other information supplied to GAO. When the GAO verbally informed the congressman that its investigators (with top-security clearances) could not find any documents that indicated that a UFO had crashed near Roswell in 1947--contradicting claims made by some New Mexico voters which Schiff had earlier voiced--this put him in an embarrassing situation. By a curious coincidence, when the GAO published its final draft of the report, it decided to add a NEW paragraph which emphasizes documents which GAO could NOT find.

When Schiff made public the GAO's Roswell Report on July 28, 1995, his office issued a press release which was headlined: *"SCHIFF RECEIVES, RELEASES ROSWELL REPORT (Missing Documents Leave Unanswered Questions)."* Schiff's press release went on to say: *"The GAO report states that outgoing messages from Roswell Army Air Field (RAAF) for this period of time were destroyed without proper authority."* [Emphasis added.] Not surprisingly, the "missing documents" were featured in the headlines of subsequent news media coverage.

The original version of the GAO report said: *"...our investigation indicates that RAAF administrative records (March 1945 through December 1949) and RAAF outgoing messages (October 1946 through December 1949) have been destroyed....they should not have been destroyed."* But when GAO invited comments on its initial draft, the Chief Archivist of the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, W.G. Seibert, wrote GAO to challenge this claim on the basis of Par. 53b of Air Force Manual 181-5, which sets out rules governing disposal of old records. (In the mid-1950s, the Defense Dept. was culling out old records in preparation for transferring 33,000 cu. ft. of material from Kansas City to its new center in St. Louis.) Seibert's letter prompted GAO to admit in its final report: *"Our review of records control forms showing the destruction of other records--including outgoing RAAF messages for 1950--supports the Chief Archivist's viewpoint."* [Emphasis added.]

However, in the closing portion of the final report, GAO added a new paragraph which said: *"Our search of government records was complicated by the fact that some records we wanted to review were missing and there was not always an explanation."* [Emphasis added.] Perhaps the explanation for why Schiff has not supplied SUN with a copy of his letter to GAO suggesting changes in its first draft is that his only file copy was "destroyed without proper authority."

But if any of the "missing" OUTGOING messages from RAAF dealt with the "flying disk" incident, they should have been found among the INCOMING messages received by the Pentagon or Eighth Air Force Headquarters in Ft. Worth, as Roswell researcher Robert G. Todd has pointed out. BUT TODD NOTES THAT GAO INVESTIGATORS DID NOT FIND ANY, NOR DID THEY REPORT ANY "MISSING INCOMING DOCUMENTS."

More Evidence Shows Maj. Marcel Prone To Making Spurious Claims

Roswell researcher **Robert G. Todd** has uncovered additional evidence that during **Maj. Jesse Marcel's** later years, when he was being interviewed about the Roswell Incident, he was prone to telling "tall tales." This is revealed by a 1979 tape-recorded interview with **Robert Pratt** of the **National Enquirer**. A transcript of the Pratt interview was first made public in **Karl Pflock's** "Roswell In Perspective," published in mid-1994 [SUN #29/Sept. 1994]. Pflock noted that Marcel falsely claimed he had prepared the statement which President Truman read on the radio, announcing the USSR's first atomic bomb test. The announcement came via a White House press release. Several other spurious claims were revealed in SUN #29, such as Marcel's false claim that he had a degree in nuclear physics.

The results of Todd's study of nearly 200 pages of Marcel's military records--going back to his application for a commission in early 1942--appear in a sharply worded four-page report titled: "The KowPflo Quarterly." (The spelling is intended to needle Karl Pflock.) In Todd's report, he notes that Marcel told Pratt that he was a private pilot and had 3,000 hours of flight time before entering the service, which would have made him a logical candidate for military pilot training. But Marcel's application for a commission, which lists his amateur ("ham") radio and photography hobbies, makes no mention of extensive pilot experience.

Marcel claimed he had received five Air Medals for shooting down five enemy aircraft, and that his combat experience included flying as a pilot and bombardier as well as waist-gunner. Todd notes that Marcel's military record shows he received only two Air Medals, and that he had no training as a gunner, bombardier or military pilot. Dr. Jesse Marcel, Jr., has claimed that if the Brazel ranch debris really was from a balloon-borne radar reflector, his father should have recognized it because he had received training in radar. Marcel's military record shows he took a three-week course in airborne radar, which dealt with its use for bombing and navigation, not tracking weather balloons. (If you'd like a copy of Todd's report, his address is: 2528 Belmont Ave., Ardmore, Pa. 19003-2617 SUN suggests you enclose \$2.00).

Short Shrift: President Reveals Interest In Crashed Saucers: During President Clinton's recent visit to Ireland, he publicly responded to a letter from a 13-year-old Belfast boy named Ryan, who had asked about the Roswell Incident. According to an Associated Press account, Clinton said: "Now Ryan, if you're out in the crowd tonight, here's the answer to your question. No, as far as I know, an alien spacecraft did not crash in Roswell, New Mexico in 1947. And Ryan, if the United States Air Force did recover alien bodies, they didn't tell me about it either. And I want to know." Attention Hilary Rodham: If you are wondering what to get the President for his next birthday, SUN has a suggestion: Buy him a "Roswell Alien in a Chamber," a four-foot-long ET made of latex, like the one featured in the movie "Roswell." It comes in an illuminated chamber that is 54 in. long by 18 in. wide, and stands 15 in. tall. It can be purchased at the Sharper Image store only three blocks east of the White House. The price is only \$1,695.

NOTE: Opinions expressed in SUN are those of its Editor--unless otherwise noted--and do not necessarily represent the views of any organization with which he is affiliated--or his spouse. We thank Dr. Gary Posner for help in proofreading.

SKEPTICS UFO NEWSLETTER (SUN) IS PUBLISHED BIMONTHLY. SUBSCRIPTION RATE (SIX ISSUES) IS \$15/YEAR FOR U.S./CANADA. OVERSEAS RATE (AIRMAIL) IS \$20/YEAR. (Please make check/money order payable to Philip J. Klass.)