



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: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:36:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:31:07 EDT
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>>From: Dennis Stacy <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

><snip>

>>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 havene'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.

What an absurd, convoluted, crappy cop-out! And I thought you
were supposed to be a UFO investigator. Find the film and then
analyze it.

>>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?
>

David,

I never said that I could make any judgments or claims about
Arnold's alleged film, having never, as you quite rightly say,
seen it. Has anyone else?

My point was simply to raise it as an issue in regards to
Arnold's overall reliability. He made a claim to having seen

nine, disc-shaped objects over Mt. Rainier. Five weeks later he claimed to have encountered another large flight of UFOs. In 1952 he claimed to have filmed two UFOs, one of which was transparent and led him to conclude that UFOs were living organisms. Over the next few years he reported another three or four sightings.

I thought you might find his claim of filmed UFOs worthy of interest and further pursuit. Instead, you and Maccabee both respond to this list as if Arnold's claim of having filmed "living" UFOs were somehow my problem.

Then you whine about what would we know if the images turned out to be fuzzy or not too clear. Document the existence of the film in the first place and then you can worry about any images captured thereon.

I frankly don't care whether his captured images are good or not. I simply want to know whether something he claimed (the film) can be verified or not. Something you and Maccabee don't seem the least bit interested in.

As hot-shot UFO investigators, I thought one or the other of you might make a token phone call or two in order to determine whether such a film still exists, or ever did exist.

But, no, you'd rather argue angles of elevation ad infinitum.

>>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?

Ray Palmer? You bet your ass! He would have published anything he could have gotten his hands on (and demonstrably did). Incidentally, not having seen the claimed Arnold film yourself, why do you assume it was of such poor quality?

<snip>

>Well, how did my sensational "evidence" come out? All I got
>were two faint red dots barely visible through the clouds and
>smearred 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?

See the above and consult Jerry Clark, not to mention past issues of publications edited by Ray Palmer. Palmer would have published anything. And in the absence of anything, he wasn't beyond creating his own evidence. Apparently you're not familiar with Palmer's checkered career, which is closely intertwined with Arnold's, as in co-author of Arnold's autobiography. Palmer wound up editing a quarterly, "Inner Space," which adhered (if that's the word) to the theory of a hollow Earth, the source of the saucers, among other things. He may not have given rise to the entire UFO phenomenon, as John Keel claims, but he certainly predated (and predisposed) its conspiratorial ambience. Just in case you ever wonder where you're coming from, although I don't get the impression that introspection is one of your strong suits -- or even a passing fancy.

>>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.

Excuse me, but haven't you just done the same thing of which you accuse me of? Besides, the point -- which I continually have to drone into your head -- is this: I don't ultimately care what is on the film. I don't care if it's clear or vague, although, obviously, the clearer the better.

I simply want to see some corroboration of its existence by someone other than Arnold. Unlike his 1947 sighting, which none

of us can corroborate or disprove, here is a patent claim of physical evidence in Arnold's own words, which should be subject to proof or disproof.

I simply asked -- and still ask -- what, if anything, the historical (or contemporary) UFO literature had to say about same. As far as you and Maccabee are concerned, you've already answered my questions. You aren't the least bit interested in Arnold's other claims, as long as your mathematical analyzes of his first sighting (whatever that represents) holds up in court.

>>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?

Friedman does it all the time, Dave. I hadn't in awhile, so thought I would. Feel free to shamelessly plug your own publications. Er, you do have your own publications to plug, don't you? Sorry, but you set me up.

Actually, this perfectly good survey of 50 years of UFO history has sold miserably, no matter what plugs I or the publisher or the publicists have made in its favor. Proving once again, that you can keep a good book down. Jerry Clark referred to it as "the most intellectually stimulating UFO book of the year," or somesuch, causing sales to drop off even further. Thanks a bunch, Jerry! Couldn't you have said it surpassed Corso and Birnes in sensationalism, Strieber in weirdness, and Jacobs in believability? Then we might have sold a copy or two.

But, NO000, we tried to compile a reasonable, responsible account/history of UFOs over the last half-century, and this is the thanks we get? Try a copy, David, you might like it. Ditto, Bruce. A dollar off for my autograph, and that goes for all you other fruitcakes out there who don't by any of my publications. Allow me this one rant: As a whole, ufologists are the biggest cheapskates and tightwads on the planet. There, I feel much better!

>>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.

Yes, but many of us are. Maybe if you had been nicer...and I had known you way back when.

>>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.

Thanks, David, I will.

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

>David Rudiak

Corley's interview with Marcel is a conference scoop. It reportedly contains some "surprises," the details of which I myself am not yet aware. (I have no idea what Firmage is going to say, either.) Third parties say it's interesting, though, to say the least.

Financials for fruitcakes to follow.

Dennis Stacy
Alliterator
<http://www.anomalist.com>

[[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](#).