

# You forgot "www." at the beginning of the server name!

You have accessed this page though an incomplete server name: ufomind.com instead of www.ufomind.com --- so some services may not work. Please go to the [correct address for this page](#) to make this message go away.



## 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](#)

### New Bookstore Additions (Random Selection)

[Death Valley Ghost Towns, Volume 1](#) (used booklet) Stanley W. Paher - \$9.50  
[The Gospel According to Reagan](#) (used trpb) James P. Friel - \$5.00  
[For the Record: From Wall Street to Washington](#) (used pb) Donald T. Regan - \$3.00  
[Tender At the Bone: Growing Up At the Table](#) (used hc) Ruth Reichl - \$5.00  
[Conquering AIDS Now! with Natural Treatment: A Non-Drug Approach](#) (used trpb) Scott J. Gregory & Bianca Leonardo - \$7.50  
[Repressed Memories: A Journey to Recovery from Sexual Abuse](#) (used trpb) Renee Fredrickson, PhD - \$4.50

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

[Log-In Here](#)

For Advanced Features

[More New Items](#) | [Subjects](#) | [Main Catalog Page](#)

Thousands of new & used titles, including many you won't find anywhere else!

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Here

[Our Focus](#)

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:43 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:07:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:30:47 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400  
>>Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:22:39 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Regarding:

>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 21:29:44 -0300  
>>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>I've been a bit put off by the impression being floated, by

>>>some, that Arnold was some kind of dolt who was frittering  
>>>around the mountains with no particular idea of where he was,  
>>>didn't know birds from jets, couldn't estimate distances or work  
>>>out a speed/time problem, despite the fact that he would have  
>>>done them dozens of times during each flight.>

>>Very much appreciated. It doesn't follow that Kenneth Arnold was  
>>an idiot if he made an exited, two minute, error of judgement.>

>Typical Easton vagueness. What errors of judgment? Explain IN  
>DETAIL (not handwaving) how such errors of judgment allow birds  
>to explain the sighting.>

>Since Arnold was MOVING at 100 mph+, for anything to fly past  
>him on a parallel course they have to be flying faster than  
>his. Even \_extremely gross\_ errors in distance estimates or  
>altitude don't affect this fundamental fact, something Easton  
>apparently can't get through his head.>

>So for Arnold to have thought that "pelicans" were flying  
>forward of his position instead of falling behind him, as they  
>would have to because of lesser air speed, he would indeed have  
>been an idiot.

A comment on Rudiak's long post/respose:

David codesn't come right out and say it, but he probably realizes that the approach taken by Easton, Brookesmith, etc., which involves (a) inventing a theory which seems to agree with PART of the sighting description and (b) ignoring or "arguing-away" all descriptive data which conflicts with the suggested theory, is (1) a scientific approach when one with \_care\_ and \_respect\_ for the witness description or (2) Classic Debunking when \_little\_ respect is shown for details which stand out as likely to be well reported.

For example, Arnold's description of these things "flashing" as would a metallic surface is concompatible with birds. Rudiak's comment that to see them flashing against Rainier would require reflectors much "brighter than white" (the "color" of snow) is well taken. Birds at a mile or more, even if at Arnold's altitude (which I doubt) would \_not\_ be seen in their optimum reflectivity, and, even if they were, they aren't "whiter than snow." Hence they would appear as \_dark\_ objects or dots (depending upon how far away).

In response to this, Easton appeals to bird experts who, apparently, aren't really aware of the conditions of Arnold's experiment. But, anyway, the bottom line here is that birds seen against a white background...white haze of the atmosphere or white snow on a mountain...are not going to appear bright compared to the background.

In a previous post I pointed out that a mirror reflection is like looking at a piece of the sun (if the mirror is smaller in angular size than the angular size of th sun). Hence a small metallic object COULD give appear much brighter than the background sky or white snow.

With regard to 2 above, let me once again bring up the speed problem. I posted a message in which I invited interested parties to reconstruct in some manner Arnold's sighting as if it had been birds at some initial distance and some initial starting direction. Whether Easton did this or not, I do not know. What he did was avoid the consequences of this reconstruction... In some reconstructions the birds don't even get as far as Arnold's path eastward before he passes them.

In the reconstructions where they do pass his path, if he turned to follow them he would realize immediately (a) that they were close (by observing the parallax relative to distant peaks...and if you don' understand this, better gve up trying to analyze Arnold's sighting) and (b) he would realize very shortly that he was catching up with them.

I presume that Easton wouldn't categorize himself as a debunker but rather as a very careful skeptic. However, there are "limits to rational skepticism".

When I discovered how the "experts" explained sightings years

ago (e.g., Hynek...before his apostasy, Menzel who was never publicaly an apostate and Klass ...) I became skeptical of the skeptics.

---

[ [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](#).