



## 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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:31:07 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:40:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:42:48 -0500  
>Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:07:27 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Arnold claims to have filmed two UFOs over Mt. Lassen in 1952,  
>one of which was transparent, an experience which led him to  
>believe that flying saucers were living creatures capable of  
>changing their density at will.

So? I guess this is leading to the usual Stacian argument that Arnold was a screwball and/or liar, and probably a rapist and drunkard as well.

Let's assume for the moment that Arnold flipped his wig and started claiming to see all sorts of weird things flying around some time after his first report of June 24, 1947? What's that got to do with the specifics of his first sighting?

What has remained impressive about this sighting for the past half century is how detailed and methodical Arnold was in his observations. Using what he had on hand he systematically attempted to gauge object speed, size, distance, shape, separation, and elevation. He was flying in a plane on a parallel course, which puts a lower limit on the possible speed. He timed their flight between two prominent landmarks from an excellent vantage point. In fact, I've been racking my brain to recall any other comparable case where somebody did a timed measure of speed. All other measures of UFO speed that I can think of have come from radar or eyeball estimates.

If one assumes the witness was honestly reporting something he saw to the best of his ability, then the report is rich in details that enable one to analyze various hypotheses ("birds!") quite independently of what the witness may have thought.

Arnold was clearly upset afterwards by press ridicule, something that continues into the present in the form of calling him a "fruitcake" in public forums -- eh Dennis? Certainly at the time, people who spoke to him were impressed with his sincerity and level-headedness. But maybe hurt and also primed to the reality of something strange flying around after his first sighting, it's conceivable later Arnold blew up sightings of lesser things in his mind. Since there are almost no details on his future sightings (unlike his first), there is really little to be said or concluded about them. Maybe he wanted personal vindication after his perceived bad treatment in the public

media following the first sighting.

I don't know that this happened. It's a possibility. But certainly the first sighting was uncontaminated by preconceived notions. That comes through in the methodical and detailed nature of Arnold's observations, in which he was testing various conventional hypotheses in his mind as the sighting occurred. The flashed brightly in the sun. Their shape was unusual. They flew in a screwy, co-ordinated formation. He knew they were flying fast, but he didn't know how fast. Maybe they were a new type of military jet plane. He timed their flight, and was later astounded when he calculated their speed as well into the supersonic. Nothing he knew of flew that fast. So he started talking to fellow people in aviation about what they might be. Word got around. The press got involved. And then it blew up and Arnold was at the center of a storm of controversy.

I don't see someone here seeking fame or fortune or attention, but just an ordinary, honest guy who was very curious and also a very good observer of detail. He just wanted an explanation for what he had seen. What happened afterwards was totally unexpected to him. And I rather doubt that he changed that much afterwards to warrant your rather nauseating description of "fruitcake."

>Wouldn't you agree that this film would be much more compelling evidence than a spoken or written account of having seen something?

Since I haven't seen this film (and neither have you), why would it necessarily be compelling evidence? There are all sorts of UFO film and photos which are dismissed out-of-hand as hoaxes. Oh, Arnold the "fruitcake" hoaxed a film to vindicate himself! Or maybe the images are of poor quality and lack points of reference. You can't tell much from that. In that case, spoken and written accounts might contain better quality information.

>Have you ever seen a still from this film published anywhere in the vast UFO literature?

Can't say that I have. So? What if all Arnold got on film was nondescript dots? What if the film was over- or underexposed and all detail was wiped out? There wouldn't be much to publish, would there? Since I haven't seen the film (and neither have you), how can we make any judgments about it?

>Arnold had a working relationship with Ray Palmer, editor of Fate magazine, who I'm sure would have been only too happy to publish a picture of the real thing.

Would he have published a dot? A smudge? A washed-out, overexposed image?

I took two pictures last Fall of a bright red object which seemed to be following my jetliner for some 40 minutes. It was probably just another jet on a parallel course and brightly reflecting the setting sun, but who knows?

Well, how did my sensational "evidence" come out? All I got were two faint red dots barely visible through the clouds and smeared around by camera motion. Do you think Ray Palmer would have published that, even if it had been of the "real thing" and I had been the famous Kenneth Arnold?

>In that same vast literature, have you ever run across a single account by anyone else who ever claimed to have seen Arnold's film?

No. Can't say that I have. So? Without knowing anything about what was supposed to be on the film, you seem to jump to an awful lot of conclusions. Maybe the film never publicly materialized because the images were of such poor quality they were worthless as evidence.

>For the record, I included Arnold's own account of his Mt. Rainier sighting as "What Happened on June 24, 1947," in UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers, co-edited with Hilary Evans. I have copies of the illustrated, 272-page hardback available for \$19.95, plus \$3.00 s/h.

Shameless plug slipped in nicely. Never hurts to exploit the "fruitcakes" for a little gelt, eh Dennis?

>Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles,  
>Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris  
>Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector  
>Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan  
>Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

I can see that some of us aren't on your social list. Sniffle.

>In September of this year I'll be hosting the 36th annual  
>National UFO Conference here in San Antonio. Speakers include  
>Whitley Strieber, Kevin Randle, Joe Firmage, psychotherapist  
>Constance Clear (author of "Reaching for Reality"), Jim Moseley,  
>Tom Deuley, Walt Andrus, and Linda Corley, who conducted the  
>last in-depth interview with Jesse Marcel, Sr.

>Details to follow soon.

Actually sounds interesting. Keep us posted.

Anybody know anything about Linda Corley's interview with  
Marcel? Haven't heard of it before.

David Rudiak

---

[ [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](#).