



## 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: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:48:06 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 16:01:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 00:53:47 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

><snip>

>>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?

>Bruce,

>Well, let's do get down to the crux of the matter. Since neither  
>you nor I were in the cockpit with Arnold on that fateful day,  
>neither of us have any idea as to how accurate, or inaccurate,  
>he was in his perceptions. My point was simply that you and  
>Rudiak can make any kind of calculations you want and they  
>remain essentially meaningless in real world terms. They could  
>well be right -- and they could well be off by who knows what  
>exponential factor. My point was that we don't know. And for  
>you and Rudiak to suggest otherwise -- as if the case were  
>automatically solved in non-conventional terms -- is simply  
>wishful thinking on both your parts.

>>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>>or didn't he? What did he see?

>I have no idea, since I wasn't there at the time, but neither do  
>you. But if the objects were a good 20 miles or more away, as  
>Arnold claimed, then I seriously doubt whether he could have  
>discerned "flashes of sunlight on his plane." He might have seen  
>light flashing off distant small objects, which is altogether a  
>different thing.

Amusing. You accuse me and Rudiak of making arguments which try

to be rational while at the same time saying "I seriously doubt whether he could have discerned 'flashes of sunlight on his plane.'..... He might have seen light flashing off distant small objects.... " which, of course is the crux of the matter. If he saw flashes of sunlight whether on his plane or from "distant small objects"/..... he wasn't looking at birds which don't flash sunlight. And when you say "I seriously doubt..." how do you know? You weren't there.

<snip>

>Your other questions can be addressed in similar fashion. Where >was Arnold wrong in a specific instance? I don't know. Where was >Arnold right in a specific instance? You don't know, and neither >does David Rudiak.

Logic such as this leads to throwing out everything which doesn't agree with the proposed explanation.

>>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?>

>I don't know. Do you? My question was, what if he was wrong?

We all know what it means if he was wrong.... and Hynek grabbed at this to explain the objects as ordinary military aircraft about 6 miles away.

>>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.

>So? How do you presume to know that he wasn't wrong on some major >points?

Easton has argued that the elevation was wrong and therefore you can't believe Arnold. However, I have shown that Arnold's estimate of the elevation based on the objects appearing to be on his horizon, is understandable. Could he have been wrong on any other points? Sure, to some degree. The real question is, which points and how far wrong.... i.e., what do we have to reject to get an explanation/ This is plain old case analysis which has been going on for years. Menzel was an expert.... he offered 6 explanations for Arnold's sighting. None of these was birds, by the way.

>>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..

>Sorry, Bruce, can't do. For all I know, he could have been wrong in >general. A little more than a month after his original sighting, he claimed >another one of small objects, 3-5 ft. in diameter, numbering a couple of >dozen or more. If you or Rudiak would like to exercise your mathematical >abilities on this case, you're perfectly welcome to. In fact, I wish you >would.

Have no information on that case. But, if you can't offer constructive argument on Arnold's first sighting.... then retire from it.

>A few years later, in 1952, Arnold claimed to have filmed two UFOs, one of >which could be seen through, and which apparently led him to conclude that >UFOs were living objects. Arnold would go on to claim several more >sightings in his lifetime. Lucky dude, eh?>

>Have you seen the film Arnold claimed to have taken on this >occasion? Neither have I. Odd that he didn't make it publicly >and readily available, isn't it, as it would have surely proved, >or at least supported, his earlier claim.> Who knows what it would have proved if anything. Perhaps the images were too small/ Anyway, I haven't seen it.

>>>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">>

>Sorry, we can't be clever 24 hours a day, can we?

Apparently not.

>>>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. >

>It's late here, so I'm not going to address the above statement  
>in any detail. If you had it to do over, though, I think you  
>would have put it differently.>

Yes, I would define "observation" better. Observation refers to  
the descriptive details and history of the sighting with as little  
"interpretation" as possible.

>>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..

>Well, something of the sort, although it's not quite as  
>straightforward as that. I simply have reservations about  
>Arnold's first sighting that are serious enough to lead me to  
>wonder whether or not they are worthy of the mathematical  
>calculations you and Rudiak have devoted to same, in light of  
>some other statements by Arnold.

Fine. You don't like calculations? Then go do something else.  
If you want to stand up and be counted in the "explanation"  
camp.... be my guest and join the birds.

>Such as his second sighting, little more than a month later, and  
>his claim of having filmed a living, transparent UFO in 1952.  
>(See my response to Jerry Clark for additional details.) Have  
>you ever seen this film? Wouldn't you admit that, if it exists,  
>it would prove much more evidential than anything Arnold had to  
>say about his earlier June, 1947, sighting?>

I don't know if it would prove more evidential. After all,  
anyone could claim the film was a hoax which Arnold created to  
support his earlier sighting and then he realized that the film  
wasn't very good so he didn't make it available for analysis.

>So where is the Arnold film that would obviate anything he had  
>to say about his 1947 sighting? Wouldn't it save you and Rudiak  
>some serious calculus? But what if there isn't any such film?>.

Who knows what the 1952 film would "say" about the 1947  
sighting. I don't

>I trust you or Rudiak will get back to us on this matter post  
>haste. After all, why mathematically analyze Arnold's claims  
>when you could be mathematically analyzing his film?

Sure. Get us the film.

---

[ [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](#).