



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: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

From: Roger Evans <moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 21:32:29 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 08:54:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1999 17:07:57 -0400
>Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 10:38:45 -0400
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's 'Flying Discs'

Previously, Bruce had offered:

>>>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.

To which I had essentially questioned why it was okay for Bruce or others to make assumptions about the validity and accuracy of Arnold's statements to support their own theories; but not for Easton to have the same right, regardless of what his theory might be.

Bruce responded:

<much respected snip>

>Everyone is "selective" in deciding whether to
>accept ("believe") in the accuracy of certain values of
>quantities or certain descriptions by witnesses. The
>descriptions have to be rated on a scale of something like
>"probability of being correct" or "which is more likely to be
>correct."

<snip>

>Returning to the main discussion, yes, I have chosen to assume
>his initial distance estimate was wrong. There is no way he
>could have known exactly how far away they were when he first
>saw them unless they in some way "interacted with" a landform at
>a known distance.

<snip>

>EVERYONE is "guilty" of picking and choosing the "data"
>(descriptions)... When it comes to analysis of a UFO sighting
>we are given the testimony of the witness (no photos, etc. in
>this case) and we have to make the most of it. Witnesses will
>sometimes say things that seemingly could not be.

<snip>

>If Easton is correct, then Arnold said
>something that could not be true. If Easton is correct, why in
>the world would Arnold think that the objects had traveled on
>the opposite side of a mountain peak (or mountain peaks)? But
>Arnold said it. Is there any reason to doubt Arnold's

>statement?

<snip>

Come on, Bruce. Be fair, here. By your own admission, you have chosen to believe some of Arnold's claims but not others. And the fact is that he has given several versions of the same story. Which one do you believe is true and why?

Moving on, Bruce offered:

<snip>

>Therefore Arnold could be reporting
>accurately his impression of seeing the objects "at his
>altitude" whereas they were actually below his altitude by
>several thousand feet, and, hence, they could, in principle,
>have been flying "in and out of the high mountain peaks. Is this
>being "selective" of the data? Sure. But it is backed up by
>some analysis.

<snip>

>As for myself, I have assumed a constant speed and concluded
>that the initial sighting location was about 40-60 miles north of
>Arnold.

I think you missed my point; or perhaps I wasn't clear enough.

It is obvious that for your own theory to "work", it is important to assume that some of Arnold's claims were either untrue or incorrect. And let's not be vague about this; there is a big difference between "interpreting" his information and simply claiming Arnold was wrong or making something up. It is also obvious from your previous statement that you feel free to "fill in the blanks" about some things that you admit neither you, nor anyone else, could possibly know. The justification you give is that doing so "makes sense"...to you.

If it is alright for you to make assumptions, fill in the blanks and disregard statements that don't fit your theory, then why can't anyone else, including Easton?

For the record, I don't believe that what Arnold saw was Pelicans. My own reasoning is less than scientific; I'd simply like to believe what he was were UFO's. However, I offer this info regarding the "dissapearance" of the pelicans behind mountain peaks. I have some video that I shot of my relative's kids playing frisbee. On more than one occasion, the frisbee flatened out to the point that it "dissappeared" behind a tree almost a hundred feet in the distance. The effect was quite startling. I have no doubt this was the effect Easton was talking about. Considering we lose our sense of three dimensional perception beyond about 35 feet or so, it would be easy to be fooled by this effect in mid air. Just a thought.

Later,

Roger

[[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](#).