

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: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:55:58 -0400
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@globalserve.net

>The Eastonian Times-Picayune is back, starting off with the
>usual bird-brained theories about the original Kenneth Arnold
>sighting. Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others argued ourselves
>blue in the face with all sorts of mathematical and other
>arguments why birds couldn't possibly work (can birds outfly a
>plane?). A lot of good it did. Don't get me started.

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?

You treat the Roswell case and its witnesses in the same fashion. When they support your argument, such witnesses as Proctor et al are absolutely accurate and inviolable in their recall, never mind interviewed 30 and 40 years after the fact. When they don't -- as in the case of Kent Lorenzo, first interviewed by Friedman in 1992, but never conveniently mentioned since -- they must be, what, part of the ongoing cover up?

Don't get me started.

You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over, whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddam thing unless you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error in perception whatever.

Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that UFOs were living organisms.

Troubling, isn't it?

Unless you're the editor of the Rudiak Real Times-Picaynue.

Dennis Stacy

[[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](#).