



# 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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Dec](#) -> [Re: The X-Factor' \(issue 25\) - Question to Corso](#)

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

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

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob@bobshell.com](mailto:bob@bobshell.com)>  
Date: Thu, 11 Dec 1997 09:11:48 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 Dec 1997 22:16:59 -0500  
Subject: Re: The X-Factor' (issue 25) - Question to Corso

>Date: Tue, 9 Dec 1997 21:31:16 -0500  
>From: Theresa <[Tcarlson1@compuserve.com](mailto:Tcarlson1@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: The X-Factor' (issue 25) - Question to Corso  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Theresa,

Thanks for your lengthy post. I am responding here to the points that I have answers/comments on:

>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.

When you sent me the overlay, you did not say that it was to prove that both bodies were on their backs, something that needed no proof in the first place.

>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.

Yes, I have captured frames and floated them over the stills from autopsy one. All this has shown me is that the two bodies are very similar. That doesn't really prove anything, one way or the other. They could be clones, in which case I would expect them to be very similar. You speak of a "peer group" and say I was not part of it. Since I have done more work on this film than anyone other than, perhaps, yourself, what criteria did you use to select this "peer group"?

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

Did I ever say it was 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.

If this is a real concern, and you really want my feedback, how much does one more copy cost? Currently this video of yours is in the same mythical category as the ones Jose Escmilla said he was mailing around three months ago. I can't comment on or respond to things I have not seen. I get my blank video tapes for the videos I produce and sell for about \$ 3 each. Let me know how much you want to burn me a copy and I'll send you a check.

>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?

How do I explain that? Simple, I was wrong. We only had one video to look at then, and the thigh looked "deformed" by human standards. If a human thigh was that shape, we would know that the femur was broken. Obviously if we have two bodies with similarly shaped thighs, then they either have identical fractures (highly unlikely) or this is how the thigh is shaped normally. New data modifies old research, and I'm sure you know that.

>>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.

How observant they were certainly varied. Both Philip and Susan Mantle saw the first autopsy, and both have told me that they would have paid a lot more attention if they had known that it would be withdrawn from circulation. But both (and Philip please correct me if I am wrong) have said the bodies looked different.

>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?

I haven't addressed this because you have not shared it with me. All I know is that you said something about painted on blood drips not changing. If you want to give me the full details, I'll look and comment.

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

Explanation of WHAT?

>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.

My opinion is my opinion, it has nothing to do with a few possible bucks from CD royalties.

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

Agreed. So give it to me.

>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?

No. Except for a contribution from Paul Fuller the material on the CD is all from Mike, Philip and me. I'm not in charge of

this project, and I am sure that there is no way that Mike (and Perhaps Philip) would have let me include anything from Mr. Irving.

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

No. It seems to work for me and many others except for the bit about how he got to keep the film.

>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.

Why? Have the skeptics done so? I don't think that's bloody likely!

We will make it possible for informed skeptical material to be posted on our web site when it is up and running. ETA, around January 15.

> Please? Pretty please, Bob?

I'm doing what I can. I don't see why it is up to me to reform UFOlogy.

Bob

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

---

[ [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](#).