

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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Arnold Saw Pelicans

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 10:44:11 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 15:47:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Arnold Saw Pelicans

EASTON MAKES GRAB FOR PUBLICITY
BECOMES THE LATEST TO BE STUCK TO THE
ARNOLD-EXPLANATION-TARBABY

James Easton has gone public with his pelican theory.

>N E W S R E L E A S E

>Is the 'Flying Saucer' Mystery Finally Solved

>On 24 June, 1947, just before 3:00 p.m., private pilot Kenneth
>Arnold was flying over the Cascade mountain range in Washington
>state, when something caught his eye. To his left and in the
>distance was a formation of nine unusual objects which "fluttered
>and sailed", their wings occasionally reflecting light from the
>afternoon sun.

>Arnold noticed that the formation flew like a flock of geese,
>however, as it seemed they were too fast for birds, he presumed
>these must be a new type of military jet. Arnold reckoned the
>aircraft were travelling in excess of 1,000 miles an hour and
>later told a fascinated media how the objects flew "like speed
>boats on rough water or similar to the tail of a Chinese kite
>that I once saw blowing in the wind".>

>More significantly, he recalled in his subsequent book, 'The
>Coming of the Saucers', "As I put it to newsmen in Pendleton,
>Oregon, they flew like a saucer would if you skipped it across
>the water". First reported as 'saucer-like', they quickly became
>known as 'flying saucers' and hysteria followed fears of a new
>Soviet weapon or 'men from Mars'.

>Yet Arnold never claimed to have seen anything saucer-shaped at
>all! The objects were actually 'bat-like' and "flew like many
>times I have observed geese to fly in a rather diagonal chain-
>like line as if they were linked together - they were flying
>diagonally in echelon formation".>

>1. Photograph of Kenneth Arnold with a sketch depicting one of
>the 'bat-like' objects he observed:

><http://web.ukonline.co.uk/voyager/arnold.jpg>

COMMENT:

This shows a drawing of what Arnold said was ONE of the nine,
the only one with a double crescent rear end. Apparently it
stood out in Arnold's mind because it was unique.

Arnold's drawing in the Air Force report shows semicircular

objects with convex rear coming to a dull point. (Image in Trent photo 1 has a similar characteristic shape.)

>It was these distinctive flight descriptions and others which led
>Scottish researcher and writer James Easton to take up the reins
>of the 50 year-old mystery.>

>Realising the similarity with a formation of birds, yet
>unfamiliar with any species which could explain all of these
>features, Easton wrote to an Internet based discussion forum for
>Pacific North-west 'birders'. He explains, "The clue to possibly
>identifying the enigmatic objects was in Arnold's description of
>their flight characteristics. Often, birds have a distinctive
>signature, the 'jizz' as it's known, and from this a bird's
>probable identity can be determined, even if the sighting was
>inconclusive".>

>Easton's hunch proved correct and Arnold's long forgotten details
>were recognised by the American birders. And it was no ordinary
>bird they proposed. It was a formation of American White
>Pelicans.>

<snip>

>Arnold believed the objects were many miles distant, however,
>previous attempts to solve the 'flying saucer' riddle have
>deduced that Arnold could have misjudged the perspective against
>a background of snow-covered hills. Easton states, "It has been
>proven that Arnold was mistaken about his estimated height of
>nearby peaks and he used them to judge relative distances between
>himself, the 'objects' and consequently their size and speed. We
>must keep in mind that Arnold's account is his subjective
>interpretation of a 'brief encounter' with no corroborative
>witnesses and nobody ever again saw the type of 'craft' which
>Arnold reported".

It has been "proven that Arnold was mistaken about his estimated height of nearby peaks..."? He said they were going "in and out of" the chain of mountain peaks south of Rainier. An observation such as this does not require a knowledge of the actual altitudes of the peaks. No corroborative witnesses? Obviously Fred Johnson (prospector near Mt. Adams) did not see pelicans... but he did think he saw Arnold's UFOs.

But, anyway, since Easton has now placed his head publicly on the chopping block....so let's see where it falls... I challenge him to provide a pelican based explanation which makes sense by demonstrating, with maps for clarity, where these pelicans were relative to Arnold every 15 seconds during the sighting.

MACCABEE'S FIRST LAW OF UFO EXPLANATION:

"Any explanation based on a known phenomenon should obey the laws of physics and the particular phenomenon."

Therefore, it should be possible for Easton to devise at least ONE combination of pelican and Arnold flight tracks which explains Arnold's descriptions.

Naturally this "scenario" must include an assumed speed of the pelicans, an assumed speed for Arnold, the track Arnold was following when he first saw them, the track the pelicans were following (basically southward or nearly perpendicular to Arnold's track), an initial pelican location (or a set of possible initial locations), an initial Arnold location (or set of locations), a demonstration that the assumed pelicans could have appeared to Arnold as if they traveled from some location NORTH of the direction (from Arnold's initial position) of Mt. Rainier, past Rainier and southward past Mt. Adams (as viewed from Arnold's ending position).

This scenario must also include the implications of Arnold's claim that he turned his plane "sideways" and rolled down his window to be certain that there was no reflection from glass between himself and the objects. Considering that Arnold was on the left side of the plane he would have rolled down the left-side window.

Based on this one may conclude that Arnold was traveling for a

period of time in the same direction as the objects. Hence the pelican hypothesis must explain why Arnold would not have realized he was gaining on the pelicans. (No, the assumption that Arnold was traveling at only 50 mph is not acceptable. This has been discussed with Easton before.)

As an aide to the understanding of this scenario I would suggest that Mr. Easton use 15 second time marks along the trajectories and plot them on a grid so that any supporters of the pelican hypothesis can, for themselves, prove that pelicans can appear as shiny semicircular objects with convex rear ends that travel in and out of mountain peaks 20 miles away and seem to be moving at supersonic speeds.

[[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](#).