



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[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: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:47:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.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@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"?>

Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the subject
of my discussion... there is no assumption that Arnold was
"absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks there
was such an assumption does not understand the nature of the
analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could have
been in error in some places. But, let's get down to the crux
of the matter: which Arnold statements would you like to reject
or modify?

- 1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he
or didn't he? What did he see?
- 2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of
Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there
something else?
- 3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was
(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude
was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?
- 4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is
not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

5) Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through his open window. At this time he would have been flying south, parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?

etc.

Any sighting can be broken into a series of observational details, each of which can be analyzed, but all together of which form the information content of the sighting.

The skeptic assumption is that Arnold was wrong in one or more of his descriptive details. For example, that Arnold overestimated the distance. But he said the objects were going in and out of mountain peaks which were about 20 miles away. Was he wrong?

Clearly if the details can be modified "at will" any sighting can be explained. The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been carried out with the fulfill realization that Arnold could have been wrong on some fine points. But to get a conventional explanation one has to assume Arnold was wrong on some major points.

If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to assume he was wrong..

>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 goddamn thing unless >you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error >in perception whatever.

Not very clever remark. Sounds "whiney"

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

>Troubling, isn't it?

Perhaps, but so what?

When the interpretation is separated from the observation and the observation is analyzed, the witness' suggestion as to the interpretation becomes irrelevant.

You seem to be saying that because Arnold in later years concluded saucers were animals, that therefore one can't believe the observational details in his first sighting.

Sorry, I don't buy it..

[[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](#).