

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: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:11:34 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:19:18 -0400
Subject: 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?

Did it ever occur to you (and Easton) that your handwaving
arguments and "analysis" of the Arnold case are only right if
you assume Arnold was an absolute drooling idiot?

Not that you apparently care or even comprehend, but the issues
of potential human error have been addressed. E.g., even if
Arnold erred seriously in his determination of distance,
thereby also throwing his timed calculation of speed badly out
of whack, birds still cannot outfly Arnold's plane. The only
way Arnold could have screwed this up is if he was completely
unable to tell the difference between objects that flew forward
of his position vs. falling behind.

Would you care to address just this one point Mr. skeptical
genius? Please explain to us with that devastating common sense
you think you possess how birds could outfly Arnold's plane.
Easton never dared tackle this, and I seriously doubt you will
either. Instead it will be off to the races with a million more
Dennis Stacy angry rants and irrelevancies.

> But what if he was wrong?

Wrong about what? Tell us specifically what Arnold could be
wrong about in his first sighting that would clearly enable
birds to explain it. Please, not your usual run-off-your-mouth
garbage, actual specifics reported by Arnold.

> 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?

Everything sounds like birds to you guys. Even if his second sighting was of birds, it was a completely different situation. The second sighting lasted only a few second in completely different flying and lighting conditions and no geographical landmarks that I know of. The observations were hurried and lacking in detail.

In contrast, Arnold's first sighting lasted several minutes during which he made a number of careful observations to try to determine what he was seeing, such as the timing of flight between two geographical landmarks while on a parallel course.

He also reported the angular spread of the objects, again using landmarks, as the objects flew past Mt. Rainier. Even if his estimated absolute distance to the objects was very grossly in error, the distance between the objects still would have been much too great for them to be flocking birds. E.g., if instead of being 25 miles away, the objects were only 2000 feet from Arnold (so close that it would be impossible NOT to recognize them as large flocking birds like geese), they still would be approximately 50 feet from one another, not the few feet distance required for flocking. This is just one of those simple mathematical arguments, which you ignorantly sneer at, but which is devastating to the bird hypothesis.

> 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"?

What if he did? Do you have a point here? How exactly does that change the original reported details of his first sighting? How does that validate some silly birds explanation of that sighting?

How do birds outfly a plane Dennis?

> 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?

Judging by your typical irrelevant ranting and use of non sequiturs, I would agree that we probably have something approaching a fruitcake on our hands.

> 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.

You treat the Roswell case and its witnesses in the same fashion. When they support your argument, such witnesses as Moore et al are absolutely accurate and inviolable in their recall, never mind interviewed 30 and 40 years after the fact.

Duhhh, talk about brainless, boilerplate debunking!

Did it ever occur to you in one of your more rational moments, that early witnesses like Floyd Proctor and Bill Brazel were interviewed at virtually the same time and completely independently of Jesse Marcel? Yet they corroborated many of the controversial details also related by Marcel about highly unusual debris properties, or the size and shape of the debris field, or of Brazel Sr. reporting an explosion? So if they misremembered, then you have to explain how they would misremember unusual details in such a similar way. That's a pretty neat trick.

> When they don't -- as in the case of Kent Lorenzo, first interviewed by Friedman in >1992, but never conveniently mentioned since --

Again off on a pointless tangeant.

If you got a problem with Friedman and his reporting, take it up

with him. Frankly a lot of us on this list are sick and tired of your endless laundry list of petty grudges.

As for what I wrote about Lorenzo, all I said was that a junior medical officer couldn't be everywhere at all times on Roswell base or off the base. So if he was unaware of anything unusual happening while he was on-duty at the hospital or off-duty at the officer's club, that's interesting information but hardly conclusive, since we have others at the base who have said they were aware of something unusual happening or were personally involved.

But only "pro-Roswell" people ignore or attack witnesses they find inconvenient, right Dennis?

>they must be, what, part of the ongoing cover up?

Like usual, you're just all over the place, aren't you Dennis? From my post on Mogul paper parachutes, you've raved about Kenneth Arnold being a nutcase and incapable of properly perceiving even the simplest possible things, how UFO and "pro-Roswell" witnesses are never accurate or honest, how you've got a gripe with Friedman about reporting one witnesses' testimony. And now we have your idiotic broad-brushed accusation that "pro-Roswell" people accuse every witness they don't like as being part of a cover-up.

>Don't get me started.

Unfortunately, nobody knows how to stop you.

>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.

So while flying on a parallel course at 110 mph, Arnold "misperceives" "birds" falling behind him for "birds" rapidly flying past him. That is the ONLY possible and virtually inconceivable misperception that would even remotely allow a bird explanation.

I'm sorry if you find such simple logical arguments like this so incomprehensible. But Maccabee and others did graduate grade school.

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

Typical Stacy talking out of both sides of his mouth. First he attacks Arnold as a "fruitcake." Then we get his grossly hypocritical lectures about how pro-UFO people are so biased in which witnesses they choose to believe and attack those they don't like.

But to label Arnold a liar and a "fruitcake," that's completely different, eh Dennis?

>Troubling, isn't it?

Only to ranting fruitcakes.

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

There, feel better now Dennis now that you've vented with one of your usual pointless diatribes?

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
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](#).