



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Dec](#) -> -= [For The Record] =- Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.5b

UFO UpDates Mailing List

-= [For The Record] =- Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.5b

From: Jerry Cohen <rjcohen@li.net>
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 21:55:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Dec 1998 14:53:13 -0500
Subject: -= [For The Record] =- Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.5b

Archival:

Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.5b
continued from 5a

A researcher's response to James Oberg's:
"IN SEARCH OF GORDON COOPER'S UFOs"
by Jerry Cohen

Excerpts from "The UFO Experience"
(Hynek takes us INSIDE "Blue Book")

.
ON SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGE WITH THE OUTSIDE SCIENTIFIC WORLD
OR WITHIN THE AIR FORCE ITSELF Appendix 4, Section C,
Paragraph 1

"There has been little dialogue between Blue Book and the
outside scientific world or between Blue Book and the various
scientific facilities within the Air Force itself."

"I know of very little scientific correspondence in the blue
book files; this is probably because scientists wish to
correspond with persons of like training. It would be pointless,
for instance, to query Blue Book on the scientific reasons for
evaluating a given case, say, as caused by a temperature
inversion: Blue Book has never availed itself of the
meteorological know-how within the Air Force itself to determine
just how much of an inversion is necessary to produce the
effects reported by the witness, if at all."

J.C. Communication has been found in FOIA released documents
that prove Hynek was wrong about this last statement. He just
didn't see them back then. <2>

". many astronomical evaluations have been made by Blue
Book without consulting their scientific consultant (who is,
after all, an astronomer) which have brought ridicule in the
press. The midwest flap of reports of July 31-August 1, 1965 can
be cited as an example."

J.C. Above, Hynek's defense concerning the erroneous Air Force explanation discovered by Robert Risser, director of Oklahoma City's Kirkpatrick Planetarium

ON STATISTICAL METHODS EMPLOYED BY BLUE BOOK
Appendix 4, Section D, Paragraph 1

"The statistical methods employed by Blue Book are a travesty on the branch of mathematics known as Statistics. A chapter in a doctoral dissertation at Northwestern University, soon to be published, deals specifically with this aspect, and I will later quote from it (Herbert Strentz, "A Study of Some Air Force Statistical Procedures in Recording and Reporting Data on UFO Investigations," included in "A SURVEY OF PRESS COVERAGE OF UFOs, 1947-1967, a doctoral thesis at the Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University") and preface it with my own observations which, incidentally, I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the Blue Book staff but to no avail."

J.C. *** Hynek states outright that the statistics being quoted by Blue Book were a joke. ***

ON LACK OF ATTENTION TO SIGNIFICANT CASES
Appendix 4, Section E, Paragraph 1

"There has been lack of attention to significant UFO cases, as judged by the scientific consultant and others, and too much time on routine cases which contain few information bits; too much time and effort are demanded of the Blue Book staff for peripheral tasks (public relations, answering letters about evaluation of old cases and answering requests for information from various and sundry sources)."

J.C. Researchers who have looked at the number of people employed had ago determined that the project was incredibly understaffed & under-ranked. It was felt this showed the real value the military placed on it.

"A scientist who finds something in his laboratory that he can't explain is no scientist if he labels it "unknown" and files it away and spends the rest of his time in routine matters. It is precisely the Unknowns that Blue Book should be concerned with, not making impressive (?) counts of how many people cannot properly identify a satellite or a meteor."

J.C. It appears the military was more concerned with public opinion than science. Above point made by critics of the Condon Report regarding *that* study as well.

INFORMATION INPUT
Appendix 4, Section E, Paragraph 1

"The information input to Blue Book is grossly inadequate and certainly the cause of much of the inefficiency within the Book by the almost consistent failure of UFO officers at the local Air Bases to transmit adequate information to Blue Book, and, I might say, it was considerably worse in the long period before there were UFO officers so designated.

J.C. i.e. There were probably more cases but we didn't get the proper information on them.

ANOTHER CASE SELECTED BY HYNEK TO ILLUSTRATE THE LACK OF RIGOR IN THE SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY OF BLUE BOOK
Appendix 4, Section G, Paragraph 5

"Incident at Redlands, California (4 Feb 68)

It was investigated by no one at Blue Book, superficially by a

member of Norton AFB, and for a total of three months by Dr. Philip Seff, professor of geology, Dr. Reinhold Krantz, professor of chemistry, Dr. Judson Sanderson, Professor of mathematics, and artist John Brownfield, professor of art (who drew an artist's conception from the descriptions given independently by the witnesses and whose composite painting was verified by the witnesses), all of the University of Redlands. It is of interest to note that no one at Blue Book has seen fit to contact these investigators and discuss their investigation at least over the phone."

The case itself concerns the reported sighting by some twenty observers of an object with seven lights on the bottom, which appeared as jets, and a row of eight to ten lights on top which were alternating in color. The object was reported to have proceeded at a low altitude (estimated about 300 feet) in a northeasterly direction for about a mile, to have come to a stop and to have hovered briefly, jerked forward, hovered again, then to have shot straight upward, stopped, hovered again, then wavered to the northwest, gained altitude, and then to have shot off to the northwest with a strong burst of speed. It was under observation for about 5 minutes. The object was estimated to have been at least 50 feet in diameter. The estimates of 300 feet altitude and 50 feet must be considered jointly; only the apparent diameter can be judged, of course, but on the assumption of a given distance the estimate of 50 feet was arrived at. Clearly, if the object had been several miles away, the unchanged apparent diameter would lead to an unbelievably large object. For these reasons these estimates cannot be summarily dismissed.

You will undoubtedly be interested to know that Blue Book classified this object as "probable aircraft." How this was arrived at with no investigation is, of course, a striking example of methodology of Blue Book. Norton AFB reported that March AFB radar painted no unusual targets (ignoring completely the fact that an object at 300 feet altitude would have been missed by this radar) and that a light plane had landed at Tri-City airport at 19:15 PST, whereas a check of the police blotter and of all witnesses, agreed that the sighting could not have occurred earlier than 19:20. Further, a check made by the university professors, (but apparently not even thought of by Blue Book) with the authorities at the airfield showed that the plane was coming in from Los Angeles and never approached closer than six miles to the city of Redlands and therefore never passed over the city of Redlands, whereas all witnesses agree that it was actually close over the city. The plane which landed (which Blue Book did not think to inquire about) was a Bonanza single engine propeller aircraft which the professors took the trouble to examine while in its hangar at the airfield. [The Redlands case is the sole subject of a book now in production by David Branch and Robert Klinn, entitled Inquiry at Redlands.]

The discrepancy between what was reported and the Blue Book evaluation is so great as to be laughable. The law, further, states that planes cannot fly lower than 1000 feet over Redlands. It appears inconceivable that twenty or so witnesses would misidentify a light, single engine plane, several miles away, as a brilliantly lighted, unconventional aircraft at 300 feet that jerked, hovered, and sped away, and went straight up in the overcast."

J.C. Mind you, this was the Air Force's own "number one" civilian consultant who had said all this. I believe it is obvious that Dr. Hynek's words are in full support of the three statements I indicated earlier in "Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.4". Now you can see at least one reason why the Air Force wanted to dismantle Project Blue Book; a project I said that..... "had become an embarrassment to itself." The "solid bedrock" skeptics once stood upon, (i.e. the Air Force's claim that most UFOs have been explained), crumbled to bits with the publishing of Hynek's "The UFO Experience" in 1972. Likewise, so did Air Force credibility with regards to how honest the Air Force was being with the public concerning UFOs.

REGARDING COOPER & THE EDWARDS AFB PHOTOGRAPHS: Mr. Oberg's following words regarding the Edwards AFB photographs take on a different meaning when one has been appraised of the preceding:

Oberg =B6 49 Now, in fact those photographs did not vanish after all: they had been sent to Project Blue Book, at Wright-Patterson AFB in Dayton, Ohio, per regulations (I even have talked to the officer who did the original Blue Book interviews, former Captain Hubert Davis, who had been greatly impressed with the witness's sincerity).

Oberg =B6 50 The Air Force must have found a satisfactory solution -- but what?..... That answer had been around since 1957, but not widely circulated in the UFO media for obvious reasons: the Air Force said it had been a weather balloon.....

A weather balloon. Where have we heard that before? Perhaps the reasons were a lot less obvious than Mr. Oberg has previously thought. The real question is "How valid is the Air Force's explanation?"

Also, cases such as the initial one quoted from Section A this installment, as well as other military or government cases that happen in a close proximity of time, such as the ones I mentioned in "Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.4", (i.e. "Coast Guard Cutter Sebago RADAR/visual case", "James Stokes, engineer from the Missile Development Center at Holloman AFB, Alamogordo N.M.", and Kirtland AFB case"), occurring within 4 days of each other if not less, lend great support to the argument that the Air Force and our government know more about UFOs, and perhaps even what they are, than they have presently acknowledged. I'll examine these closely after our next installment. However, imagine, with the RADARs we now possess; RADARs that can paint an actual picture of an object on a screen, what statistics and data the branches of our service and government must already have? The visual/radar Belgium Sightings from 1989/90 have added solid NATO (North American Treaty Alliance) gun camera data, etc. as well. <3>

Furthermore, to think that another department in our defense system hasn't been quietly receiving all this UFO information without studying it would be to imply that our defense system is highly incompetent. Since we all know this is not the truth, I would hope it is safe to assume that some defense group(s), somewhere is (are) well appraised of the situation. FOIA documents obtained through standard requests and lawsuits, where necessary, have apparently confirmed, at the minimum, definite interest from various parts of the government regarding UFOs even though the public has been led to think otherwise. <4>

- - - - -

Bibliography:

- <1> Hynek, J. Allen "The UFO Experience" Henry Regnery Company 1972, appendix four (Excerpt of a Letter from J. Allen Hynek to Colonel Raymond S. Sleeper)
- <2> Fawcett, L. & Greenwood, B. "The UFO Cover-up" Simon & Schuster Fireside Book 1992
- <3> CUFOS Journal (International UFO Reporter) . July/Aug 1990 . p. 23 : Documentation displayed to public in an "Unsolved Mysteries" television episode narrated by Robert Stack
- <4> Newsday (Long Island newspaper) Fri 1/19/79 "UFOs seen at Air Bases in 1975 : Gersten, Peter . Frontiers of Science . May/June 1981 . "What the U.S. Government Knows About Unidentified Flying Objects" : Fawcett, L. & Greenwood, B. "The UFO Cover-up" Simon & Schuster Fireside Book 1992

- - - - -
". . . and McCoy became a raving maniac until he gave Spock back his soul. "

"Who is Spock?YOU are!"
- - - - -

End: Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.5b
continued in: 6

HYNEK & PROJECT BLUE BOOK
(The study that wasn't)

My next installment is a two-page summation of what we've discussed so far and ideas where to locate cases which have the greatest potential of being judged "the real thing" if proper investigations were to be conducted thereupon. Immediately following that summation will be a detailed accounting of the three cases I mentioned which, when combined with all other available evidence, strongly suggests there is good reason to believe Gordon Cooper was probably telling the truth concerning his 1957 Edwards AFB claim.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Cohen
E-mail: rjcohen@li.net

[[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](#).