



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: **GT McCoy** <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 21:49:58 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:20:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

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

Hell just froze over, Hi all , I had to answer whether Arnold could measure Time and Distance!!!

>>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"?)>

I don't buy his 'living organismum " either,but again if the Technology is advanced enough..

>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?

There is this little thing called a compass, and for a while a
"remote compass" which was somewhat more accurate than a panel
mounted compass. Which Arnold should have (and likely did know
how to read.) Also, (from my own experience) any one who is a
Native or long time Resident of the Northwest U.S., especially
Pilots, knows what is north or south in the Cascade Mountains
period.

>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?

It is extremely hard to judge altitude in the sky given the
conditions Arnold had.

>4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is
>not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

Swamp gas, Obivoiusly.

>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?

Well it's a instrument panel, not a dash, but he knew what he
was doing, if he was a decent navigator.

>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?

Arnold was obviously worried about distortion (something we in
the UFO community seem to not worry enough about).

>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.

Back when Arnold was a Pilot you had to know how to figure time
and distance, speed etc. or die . they didn't have some satellite
feeding you information.

>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.

He may not have been "dead on" but he saw _something_ and risked his credibilty.

>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..

Neither do I.

GT McCoy

[[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](#).