

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is **[OPEN](#)**

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Dec](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: The X-Factor' (issue 25) - Question to Corso

From: **Theresa** <Tcarlson1@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 9 Dec 1997 21:31:16 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 Dec 1997 02:58:08 -0500
Subject: Re: The X-Factor' (issue 25) - Question to Corso

>Date: Tue, 9 Dec 1997 08:39:56 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Bob Shell <bob@bobshell.com>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: The X-Factor' (issue 25) - Question to Corso

Dear Bob,

>Yes, Theresa sent me her overlays a while ago. She has
>demonstrated that if you adjust size and angle it is possible to
>make the upper outline of the left thighs line up in images from
>the two autopsies. But when you do this "manipulation" (Theresa
>objects to my use of that word), then NOTHING else in the images
>lines up, not even the lower outline of the same thigh.

For some strange reason, you seem to be the only one that didn't notice that this particular frame from first autopsy has the object's axis rotated differently. Everyone else figured that out and went and captured stills that were at the proper rotation and found that way more than just the left thigh lines up. The overlay you received was created to show that the bodies were on both on their backs. But it made people curious and they went and checked.

Bob, did you capture frames and do your own overlays? I know you weren't part of the peer group, but I still suggest that you do that anyways. I have no doubt that other people will.

There are frames in the released footage that need no rotation of the frames to see the matches. I just happened to like that frame.

As far as resizing, it's a little more than just resizing it to fit the "other" body. The frame that Mark sent me is an odd size, probably because it was cropped, printed, scanned etc.. But we have a scale to that first autopsy still. Other items that can be matched to objects in the released autopsy appear in the still. The instrument tray, some of the instruments on that tray, the autoclave and the pan on top of it in the background.

You see there were some constants there to work with. You can call it manipulation, but it isn't done haphazardly.

A lot of the things that seem to be bothering you about my work I already explained on my video presentation. I simply couldn't afford to make a bunch of videos. It was quite expensive as it was. (And I still have one daughter to put through college.) Since you had already dismissed the preview without checking into it yourself, I didn't see any use in sending you any more.

I wish I could afford it though. I explain some of the difficulties and limitations of working with 2D images of 3D objects. Some things that are helpful for people that aren't

familiar with image analysis such as yourself.

Now, even if you do all this and you still say that only the left thighs are a match, how do you justify those matching? You stated in November, 1995 that the left femur on SUE was broken and the lump there was swelling from. You stated that your medical professionals confirmed this. So, both bodies have broken femurs and both swelled the same? Both have a lack of bruising in the inner thigh area where said swelling appears?

Are these the same medical professionals that look at it and say that it looks like a real body?

And that's not all. If you don't line up the bodies, there are blemishes on both that are in the same areas and the same shape. How? We can't say that they both sustained the same injuries. SUE's right leg is half gone and SALLI's appear to be pretty much intact.

>I have talked personally to everyone who is known to have seen >both autopsies. Every one of them stresses differences in the >bodies rather than similarities. Since Philip is one of those >people, perhaps he would care to comment on his own impressions >of the similarities/differences of the two bodies.

How observant were those people that saw the first autopsy? I have a message from you that you quote Philip M. as saying that the body in the first autopsy was "shriveled up like a raisin". No matter what way I look at this still from the first autopsy, I can't describe it in anything like those terms.

If your counter is that he was confused about the first autopsy and the tent footage, go back to my first question as it is even more relevant in that case, how observant were the people that were allowed to look at this? If they couldn't keep the different footages straight, don't expect them to keep different bodies straight.

The similarities in the two bodies are just an interesting aside for me tho. What convinced me was the inconsistencies in the "blood" marks in the footage. I can not conceive of any way this could have occurred in a real autopsy. Why haven't you addressed this instead of beating on some body comparisons?

Complaining about the overlays may get you a lot of attention but the real story is in the released autopsy. These things people can look up for themselves on the copies of the videos they already have. This is what convinced me, and in the end is what will probably convince most.

Ray Santilli has already given me his "explanation" or "best guess" or what ever it was. Do you have an explanation also?

I know that you have a CD to sell and that this is probably a bad time for you to have to look at things objectively. I have offered this information as evidence not proof, as I already stated.

Proof is up to each individual, but they should have as much information as possible to make that decision.

Early on in this saga, Ray Santilli offered some photocopies of some labels alleged to be on the autopsy film cans. Those labels were studied and researched. Mr. Rob Irving did excellent research on them, and I double checked his work on my own. Will you be offering the information on that research on your version of the CD?

The camera man's tale doesn't work. Many points there, will you be including those?

If you really want people to make up their own minds about this, give them ALL of the information. You have the opportunity to make a difference, and maybe even set a precedence in this messed up field.

Please? Pretty please, Bob?

Regards,

Theresa Carlson

tcarlson1@Compuserve.com

Search for other documents to/from: [tcarlson1](#) | [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

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](#).