

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: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 21:35:20 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1999 09:35:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1999 00:30:16 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 04:08:03 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

Previously, James had written:

<snip>

>>The two main accounts which Arnold gave of the entire incident  
>>were in a letter he subsequently sent to the US Air Force and in  
>>his much later book, 'The Coming of the Saucers'. It doesn't  
>>help matters that both accounts seem to be significantly  
>>different.

<snip>

>>Arnold maintained that the objects took one minute and forty two  
>>seconds to travel the approximate fifty miles between Mt. Rainier  
>>and Mt. Adams, therefore, they should have taken about twice as  
>>long to first of all reach Mt. Rainier from their starting  
>>position 100 miles northwards and he should have had the objects  
>>in view for around three minutes before they even arrived at Mt  
>>Rainier.

>>Now we know that simply isn't correct, Arnold previously having  
>>clarified in his letter to the Air Force that the total duration  
>>of his sighting only lasted for, "around two and one half or  
>>three minutes".

>>A further uncertainty is that in the early radio interview, he  
>>stated differently: "the whole observation of these particular  
>>ships didn't last more than about two and a half minutes".>

>>Worse still, in one of the first newspaper reports, the 'Chicago  
>>Daily Tribune' of 25 June, quoted Arnold as confirming he  
>>"checked off one minutes and forty two seconds from the time they  
>>passed Mount Rainier until they reached the peak of Mount Adams"  
>>and that, "All told the objects remained in view slightly less  
>>than two minutes from the time I first noticed them".

Bruce replied:

>From Arnold's statements one gets the definite impression that  
>the sighting lasted about 2.5 -3 minutes. So, how do we handle  
>his statment that he first saw them almost 100 miles north near  
>Mt. Baker? What is more likely to be wrong: that his time  
>estimate is too short or his estimate of initial distance is  
>wrong? I vote for the initial distance estimate.

Hi, Bruce.

I've always had a great deal of respect for your posts. However, I really feel that Mr. Easton brings up some valid points; most importantly that Arnold's version of events changed from one interview to the next. I've been reading the list over the last week or so and everyone seems to be dragging Easton over the coals about his "Pelican Theory". Granted, his theory only works if a specific version of Arnold's story is applied and not all versions. Granted, it only works if you fill in the "blanks" with some practical logic about what else could account for the mystery objects. And it only works if you make some assumptions that Arnold was wrong about some of his "facts".

However, considering your statement above, it would appear that you are not only being selective about which of Arnold's versions is the "truth"; but you are also making an assumption that a part of his statement is "incorrect" because it doesn't jive with the outcome you'd like to believe. In fact, your own theory seems to be that you don't know what the objects were; but that they were not, and could not be, Pelicans.

I mean no disrespect, Bruce, but isn't that what everyone is bitching about Easton doing? I'm not saying that the objects in question were Pelicans. However, your applied logic seems to dictate that we should also selectively view some of Arnold's statements as "wrong" in order to disprove Easton's theory in favor of your own.

Why?

I still have the greatest respect for your work. But I must say that I admire Mr. Easton for standing by his theory. I feel that he put a great deal of thought and effort into it and is sincere in his belief. I don't understand the reaction from the UFO community on this issue, at all. I'm mean, let's face it; Arnold's stories were so inconsistent that just about anything could fit the mold, even, I'm sorry to say, Pelicans.

Take care,

Roger Evans

---

[ [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](#).