



# 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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Kenneth Arnold's testimony

From: Don Ledger <dledger@istar.ca>  
Date: Fri, 28 Nov 1997 23:58:35 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 29 Nov 1997 11:32:17 -0500  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's testimony

> Date: Thu, 27 Nov 1997 23:01:47 -0500  
> From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>  
> Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Kenneth Arnold's testimony  
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

> Don wrote:

> >You know it seems there are a more than a few attempts at pounding  
> >a square peg into a round hole re the Arnold sighting. People keep  
> >coming up with solutions but to only 3 or 4 of twenty points. None  
> >of them match up.

> Don,

> The difficulty with Arnold's story is that there are  
> imponderables and it's unlikely we'll never quantify them.

> With any report, it's not necessarily true that all of the  
> account is accurate, perhaps rarely so, and it may be impossible  
> to explain all the evidence.

<Snipped my stuff for brevity>

> As we know, Kenneth Arnold later produced a sketch of one of the  
> objects which was apparently different from the others. I'm still  
> not sure which one of the nine objects this was supposed to  
> represent, i.e., where it was in the echelon and also why he  
> didn't impart this potentially important information to the Army  
> Air Force at the time.

> However, there's a striking resemblance with the object portrayed  
> in that later sketch and a Horton GO 229 A-1.

> I've uploaded a superb illustration of an 229 A-1 to my web site  
> at URL:

> <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pulsar/ho229A-1.jpg>

> I've been curious about this marked resemblance since becoming  
> aware of it some time ago.

Hello James,

I had a look at them, and as you say they are impressive. You know if I had seen them 20 years ago and not knowing then what I know now about the K.A. sighting I might have gone for that explanation. But none of these aircraft would have been capable of supersonic speed in 1947. The first aircraft, the Horton Go 229 A-1, has a wing built to pile up shock waves ahead of it, but that is not the biggest drawback. The intakes on those jets are

just not capable of channeling air into the engines at Mach 1 or speeds above 550-600 miles per hour. The shock waves created around the inlets would effectively stall the compressors, making it impossible for them to produce thrust. What would have been needed was variable geometry anti-stall fences at the ingest ducts to solve that problem. Avro Canada had to come up with that solution for the Arrow to get Mach one then Mack two in '57.

> But as you say, nine of them?

> I would like to get Arnold's story straight on this. If we take  
> at face value, his reported claim (I don't suppose anyone has a  
> copy of Arnold's book they would like to loan me?) that this  
> object was different from the others, then of course we only have  
> one of them and eight of something else.

> Still doesn't really make any obvious sense and, so far as I'm  
> aware, there's no evidence in the historical record re any such  
> secret testing of captured German aircraft.

> I've also uploaded to my website, an illustration of a Horton  
> Ho-1X A Series aircraft, which, as it doesn't show the two jet  
> engines, resembles Arnold's sketch even more. It's at URL:

> [http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pulsar/ho\\_ix\\_v1.jpg](http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pulsar/ho_ix_v1.jpg)

> It seems the Horton GO 229 A-1 and Ho-1X A Series were  
> essentially the same project.

I'd make a guess and suggest that the Ho-1X was a test bed for the 229. It was probably a glider. It has an X in the model series number.

> Arnold's sketch is also similar to a Northrop "flying wing", but  
> I've long thought the most obvious objection to Arnold's objects  
> being a known aircraft was the trouble which Arnold innocently  
> caused.

We've been around that "flying wing" scenario many times already. We're talking a scaled down testbed aircraft [5 in all, with propellers] that had trouble getting out of its own way. They only produced three true bombers with jets and they didn't get over 400 mph.

<Snipped for brevity>

> It seems inconceivable that if the Army Air Force, and  
> subsequently the USAF, knew the explanation, that they wouldn't  
> have done something to indicate this, somehow reassured the  
> public without disclosing the full facts and saved themselves  
> much expense and continual grief.

Well that's one of the arguments that has plagued us for years. And I think the reason is very simple. They didn't have and don't have stuff that can do what people are reporting that these things are doing. Remember, by their own admissions back in the fifties, the US, the UK, Canada and NATO were sure that the UFO phenomenon was something cooked up by the Soviets to confuse the free world just before an eminent attack. the UFO sightings before hand were thought to be done by small conventional aircraft, flashing lights and what have you in an attempt to set up a cry wolf attitude with our military so that when the real thing came, nobody would pay any attention to it. Definite proof of aircraft flying at over Mach 1, Mach 2 or even 5, must have scared the hell out of them.

> It's strange though, that there is such a close match between  
> Arnold's sketch and the aircraft envisaged under the abortive  
> Horten "flying wing" project.

> Perhaps even stranger is how some other German designs equally  
> resemble witness sketches of the Hudson Valley "boomerang".

Well you know, if you are trying to increase speed in an aircraft without increasing the power [ and thereby increasing weight and fuel consumption, more wieght] one of the ways to do it is to get rid of drag. The tail section [empennage] on any aircraft is a drag. You got a couple of wings sticking out in the wind back there and a vertical stabilizer as well. Those horizontal stabilizers are there to create a doward pressure [negative lift]

on the tail section to insure the nose does not pitch down, and because it does create negative lift it is not helping to keep the aircraft aloft. Even the fuselage stretched to the rear to support them creates friction drag. If you can get rid of all of them then you reduce drag and get increased speed. It was a worthy venture for the times. Everyone, it seems, was trying to get rid of the empennage.

So if you do succeed then you end up with just a wing but in order to maintain stability you have to have some way of getting that cantilever effect to keep that nose [or leading edge] pitching up so you sweep the wings back and affix small control surfaces similiar to elevators at the tips and "voila" you got some pitch control. You ALSO have something that looks like a "boomerang".

> For a new perspective on contemporary triangular, or  
> wedge-shaped, 'UFOs', there's also an interesting image on my web  
> site at URL:

> <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pulsar/pl2.jpg>

This image intrigues me but not because it might have any relationship to Arnold's "skipping saucers", but because it looks like a lifting body, similiar to the experimental lifting bodies that NASA experimented with while designing the Shuttle. But this one is a combination of both lifting body and jet propulsion [what do you want to bet Ramjet] with the nose intake duct having the same general shape as the F-100 Super Sabre. The attention to drag reduction and cleanness of design is really quite modern looking.

Nice URLs James.

Regards

Don Ledger

Search for other documents to/from: [dledger](#) | [pulsar](#)

---

[ [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](#).