



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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Arnold Saw Pelicans

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 14:32:26 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 20:46:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Arnold Saw Pelicans

>From: Brad Sparks <[RB47Expert@aol.com](mailto:RB47Expert@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 19:44:30 EDT  
>Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 08:58:54 -0400  
>Re: Arnold Saw Pelicans

>The bird theory runs into the following fundamental problems,  
>among others:

>(1) ARC-LIGHT OR SUNLIKE BRIGHTNESS.

<snip>

>(2) MORE THAN 100-DEGREE FLIGHT PATH.

<snip>

>(3) ARNOLD'S PLANE WOULD HAVE OVERTAKEN BIRDS.

<snip>

>(4) ALTITUDE TOO HIGH FOR SPEED.

<snip>

To this list add:

(5) THE OBJECTS WERE TOO FAR APART TO BE FLOCKING BIRDS. Arnold said they were flying in a linear formation, strung out over 5 miles at a distance of approximately 25 miles (the 5 miles was a distinct plateau which Arnold said he later flew over and measured). Arnold was thus describing the formation covering an angle of  $5/25 = \sim .2$  radians, or about 11 degrees. Even if Arnold were grossly in error about the actual distance to the objects, this still would have no effect on the observed angular size of the formation. All one needs to do is rescale to any given distance to get the length of the formation.

E.g., if the "pelicans" were 5 miles away instead of 25, their linear formation would be one mile in length instead of five. Each of the nine "birds" would be separated from the next by over 600 feet. But in the real world, birds have to be only a few feet apart to flock and play follow-the-leader with the bird in front. Even if you reduce the distance to an absurdly close 1000 feet, the birds would still be in a formation 200 feet long and separated from each other by 25 feet, again too far apart for proper flocking.

>Notice I'm carefully refraining from getting into heated  
>arguments over the SHAPES, FLIGHT PATTERNS and ANGULAR SIZE.  
>These could be argued endlessly so I don't think it fruitful  
>to pursue.

Very wise, since Easton is still engaged in his equally absurd line of argumentation that the saucer shape was created by the media and never described by Arnold. In fact there are number of quotes from Arnold immediately after the sighting in which Arnold described the basic shape as saucer-like, disk-like, like a pie plate, etc. His drawing to the Air Force two weeks later was again of thin objects rounded in front and coming to a rounded point in back, just like his verbal descriptions. Easton is well aware of these quotes, but simply ignores them like they never existed.

LATER, Arnold added that the lead object was somewhat different from the rest, having the double-crescent rear edge, giving it a flying wing type appearance. There is a picture which Easton obsesses on, where Arnold is holding a drawing of this singular object. To Easton, that's ALL Arnold ever described, conveniently ignoring all of Arnold's earlier descriptions that the other 8 objects were saucer-like in appearance. The double-crescent was a pelican, and pay no attention to the rest.

>I posted the following on James Easton's UFO Research List and >on the Project 1947 List where he also posts, but as far as I >know there has been no response.

Easton will never respond properly to these devastating criticisms of his pelican theory, because he is incapable of doing so. He seemingly can't comprehend even the simplest scientific objections and then respond in kind with well-formulated logical counter-arguments. He is a wordsmith, not a scientist. Obfuscation through judicious editing and semantic quibbling are his tools of debate. The Arnold case is certainly not the first time I've seen him deliberately ignore evidence that strongly contradicts his opinions.

Unable to respond to his critics, he and his flock of admirers take another tack. The critics of his theories have no valid points that merit response. They are simply "true believers" who can't bear to have their pet sightings explained.

Not so. I for one don't mind reasonable explanations that do a good job of explaining most of the details (the mark of a good theory). What we so-called "true believers" can't stand are the utterly idiotic "explanations" put forward by people seeming to lack all common sense and/or intellectual integrity.

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](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](#).