

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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:01:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>>To: updates@globalseve.net

>Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and
>Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the
>Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely
>incapable of human error? But what if he was wrong? What if, for
>example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too
>long after his original sighting which certainly sound like
>birds to most of us? What if he went on to report seven UFO
>sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are
>space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?

>See Clark's "The UFO Book," p. 62.

>Would this lead you to conclude that you had something
>approaching a fruitcake on your hands, or would you prefer to
>conclude that a living organism crashed at Roswell?

I'm at a loss to understand what Dennis is trying to say here. The notion that UFOs may be living organisms -- "space animals" -- long ago went out of fashion, but it was a view held (however naively in retrospect) by a number of Ken Arnold's prominent contemporaries. Even Project Sign personnel characterized it as "one of the most intelligent theories we have received." The eminently respectable Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York (Bloecher, Davis, Mebane) took the idea seriously, and it was discussed in writings by a variety of other early UFO writers, including Charles Fort, Desmond Leslie, M. K. Jessup, John Philip Bessor, Curtis Fuller, Trevor James Constable, and Ivan T. Sanderson. Arnold picked up his ideas from notions current in the late 1940s and 1950s.

For a full discussion of the theory and its history, see my The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp. 872-77.

Arnold was anything but a fruitcake, and I am startled and depressed that Dennis would suggest as much on such flimsy -- well, actually, nonexistent -- evidence. This is revisionist ufology at its worst. I would have expected better of Dennis.

Jerry Clark

[[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](#).