



# 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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> **Re: Secrets of Literary History**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Secrets of Literary History

From: **Peregrine Mendoza** <101653.2205@compuserve.com>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jul 1997 17:20:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jul 1997 00:17:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Secrets of Literary History

The Duke of Mendoza presents his compliments.

>From: DRudiak@aol.com  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jul 1997 20:03:54 -0400 (EDT)  
>To: updates@globalserve.net  
>Subject: Secrets of Literary History. Was: Brookesmith Smears Marcel

My carp here is about lying and whether I did it or not. Leaving the=20 Rudeboy to his own opinion, on reflection I think a couple of points=20 in his latest post do need clarification.

Dave Rudiak extols the virtues of Jesse Marcel Sr, and complains:

>Yet according to Brookesmith, Todd, Korff, etc., Marcel was an=20 >incompetent intelligence officer who couldn't even identify ordinary=20 >materials,

Wrong, in my case anyway. There's plenty of published evidence, and=20 yet more has been supplied by Jan Aldrich to this List, that a=20 weather balloon & RAWIN target \*didn't\* (and probably still don't)=20 constitute "ordinary materials" to non-specialists. So Marcel's=20 competence in this is not at issue; just his \*familiarity\* with what=20 Brazel found.

>>and call me a liar if he likes to do that too,

>Well, since he insists. In the course of recycling Todd's arguments, >Brookesmith did clearly lie about (1) Marcel having no radar=20 >tracking experience, and (2) Marcel claiming to be the sole survivor=20 >of a plane crash during WWII. Not only are these statements=20 >incorrect, they even contradict what Todd wrote.=20

(1) To be really picky, doing a course in something \*doesn't\* make=20 you "experienced" at it. But if I'd been sufficiently picky when=20 reading the page proofs of the book, I would have seen that the word=20 "devices" had dropped out of the sentence "He had no knowledge of=20 radar tracking or weather balloons." So thanks for drawing my eye to=20 that error. Once corrected, it won't contradict what Todd wrote.

I might mildly point out that making a mistake is rather different=20 from lying, just as there is a difference between reporting and=20 "parroting". I could also count up the number of times I've drawn=20 attention, on this List, with due attendant cringing, to the=20 misidentification of Marcel with Irving Newton in another book --=20 which error has been corrected in all subsequent reprints.

(2) This is what Robert Todd wrote on Marcel as crash survivor:

'Major Marcel also claimed he got shot down once, on his third=20 mission. Not only did he claim he got shot down, but he also claimed=20 that, when he bailed out, his main parachute malfunctioned and failed=20 to open. He said he bailed out at eight thousand feet and fell six=20 thousand feet before he got his reserve parachute open, leaving him a=20 margin of error of only two thousand feet. When Bob Pratt asked=20 Marcel if everyone survived, Marcel said, "All but one crashed into a=20 mountain."'

Read Marcel's lips: "All but one crashed into a mountain." But Marcel=20 didn't. So is he the sole survivor here or is he not? And what do you=20 think Tobert Todd thinks? Why, he says:

'One gets the feeling Marcel would have claimed he had been one of=20 the men who died when he crashed into the mountain if he thought he=20 could get away with it. Apparently it would have taken a discrepancy=20 that obvious in nature before certain of the crashed-saucer promoters=20 started doubting Marcel's veracity. Marcel's personnel file does not=20 confirm his claim of being shot down, nor does it dispute it. But=20 considering his other fanciful claims, there is reason to doubt the=20 story.'

So where is the contradiction? Where is the lie? I think I spy=20 something not unlike a gigantic misrepresentation, at the very least,=20 reclining at its ease there in the teeth of Mr David Rudiak.

Quite possibly, apart from a certain precipitateness over the Brazel=20 debris, which a wise superior might well choose to overlook after a=20 decent bollocking, Marcel was an exemplary officer in the 1940s. So=20 what? We have to bear in mind that the Jesse Marcel of 1978 had had=20 30 years to embellish his memories. To point this out isn't a smear:=20 self-aggrandisement is a simple human frailty. But if it ends in=20 untruths and BUNK that (as in this case) have led thousands of people=20 into useless and pointless imaginings, it should be debunked. Simple=20 as that.

For the record & for those who don't already have it, Todd concludes:

'Given Major Marcel's documented inclination toward Walter Mitty-like=20 fantasies, and his propensity for making wildly exaggerated claims,=20 coupled with his embarrassment over having made a stupid mistake back=20 in 1947, any statements he made in connection with the Roswell=20 incident are virtually worthless, except to the faithful who will=20 continue to cling to Marcel as a knight in shining armor. In his=20 Showtime movie, Roswell, Paul Davids did his level best to turn=20 Major Marcel into a folk hero who blazed the trail to the "truth"=20 about the Roswell incident. But the truth is that Major Marcel was a=20 mythomaniac who was responsible for the brouhaha back in 1947, and=20 without whom the Roswell story would never have lived again in the=20 1980s and 1990s. Clearly Marcel had a problem with the truth.'

'In Marcel's "testimony," we see the origins of every sensational=20 claim being made about the Roswell incident, repeated and embellished=20 by "witnesses" =AD real and imagined =AD who have followed in his=20 footsteps. Although he never mentioned the recovery of bodies, his=20 face-saving claim that the debris was "not of the Earth" certainly=20 opened the door for others to make that claim. Marcel primed the pump=20 of sensational claims, and it's been gushing ever since.'

It may seem psittacine to the Rudeboy, but I do rather agree and, in=20 agreeing, see no reason not to repeat the argument. Especially as=20 there are a lot more interesting enigmas in ufology waiting to be=20 [re]solved than the mountain of crap that "Roswell" has become.

Yours rhetorickally  
P. ("Pretty Boy") Mendoza Britspook  
"That professional irritant" - Rob Irving

Search for other documents to/from: [101653.2205](#) | [drudiak](#)

---

[ [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](#).