



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

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: PROJECT-1947: Ruppelt, Air Defense & UFOs

From: jan@cyberzone.net (Jan Aldrich)
Date: Sun, 01 Feb 1998 12:34:32 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 03 Feb 1998 17:17:22 -0500
Subject: Re: PROJECT-1947: Ruppelt, Air Defense & UFOs

> Date: Fri, 30 Jan 1998 12:02:20 -0500
> From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
> Subject: UFO UpDate: PROJECT-1947: Ruppelt, Air Defense & UFOs
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

> >Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 11:50:53 -0800
> >From: Jan Aldrich <jan@CYBERZONE.NET>
> >Subject: Ruppelt, Air Defense & UFOs
> >To: PROJECT-1947@LISTSERV.AOL.COM
>
> >The obvious implications of UFOs for Air Defenes were not lost on
> >some newspaper columnists, the Alsop brothers during the 1947
> >wave did a column on this.

> >About the time Project Sign was being authorized there was an
> >articles in the New York Times connecting Air Defense with UFOs.
> >Basically, it urged that the Aircraft Warning Service's Ground
> >Observer Corps be reactivated.

> <snip>

> >It has always bothered me that Alvarez during the Robertson Panel
> >discussions found no radar cases that interested him.

> <snip>

> >Duh?! Huh? Hello! These are scientists? They are not at all
> >curious about such a phenomenon. They don't even recommend the
> >funding of a small study so that some colleagues could get some
> >work and funding. Why not? Do they have bigger fish to fry?

> >Some points to consider. Nothing is proven. We need more
> >information about Project Lincoln and Air Defense.

> >Once the Air Defense structure is in place. Air Defense would have
> >an interest in minimizing UFO accounts. UFOs become "politically
> >incorrect." "If it flies, it dies," is meaningless if you admit
> >that you have things running around that you can't explain. The
> >public loses confidence in the Air Defense and the military in
> >general.

> I guess your point here is that it should have been (i.e., it
> was) obvious to the AF that UFOs played a role in Air Defense,
> even if UFOs turned out to be natural electric phenomena, so the
> Robertson Panel should have recommended an effort to understand
> these phenomena at least from the scientific point of view if not
> from the point of view of needing to be able to identify things
> immediately to separate out the "natural phenomena" from the "bad
> boys" coming over the horizon from the north.

Yes, that was my point. I was really just throwing out snippets for consideration.

> I, too, think that th Robertson Panel people did not get the best
> evidence or the best presentation to look at.

Yes, you definitely have a point here. Presentation was important. Also, it was expected that the panel members would take the intelligence reports made available to them and study them after the meetings. Page indicated that not too much serious effort was made here.

> I think the
> presenters took an apologetic attitude for seeming to seriously
> consider the sightings which obviously could not be natural
> phenomena (observations and film/photos of structured objects).
> However, your suggestion that there was a hidden agenda
> pressuring the Panel to conclude there was nothing to these
> sightings is a good one. However, as evidence of just poor
> preparation on th aprt of the Blue book staff I am reminded of
> Ruppelts recitation of the Newhouse film case as presented to the
> Robertson panel. They showed the film several times and the
> Navy presented the results of its 1,000 hours of work on it....
> and then the panel said "probably birds." HOWEVER, Ruppelt points
> out that the panel was not told Newhouse's verbal testimony.
> The reason that the panel was not told Newhouse's testimony is
> that Ruppelt didn't know what that was ! Ruppelt says several
> years later he met Newhouse and Newhouse described his wife
> calling his attention to a group of cuircular objects flying
> through the sky. He immediately stopped the car but it took
> several minutes fr him to get his camera going and by that time
> the objects were farther away (a repeat of th Great Falls,
> Montana/Marianna film situation). Ruppelt asked "How did you know
> they were round?" Newhouse answered "I saw them ...they were a
> lot closer," or words to that effect. Then Ruppelt points out
> in his book that this information was not known to Blue
> Book/Ruppelt at the time of the Newhouse investigation/ analysis
> because Ruppelt had not asked the local field investigator to ask
> Newhouse about his visual sighting.. Ruppelt jusified this by
> saying..."why ask what something looks like when you've got a
> movie of it.." or words to that effect.

Exactly. Perhaps the witness testimony would not have convinced anyone, however, it might have opened the door to further investigation.

> One can only speculate what th RobertsonPanel would have done
> with the film had Dewey Fournet (the presenter?) or Ruppelt been
> able to recite the testimony of Newhouse and his wife BEFORE
> showing the film (better yet, get Newhouse there; he was, after
> all, an official Navy photographer).

> I suspect the truth is a combination of the above: there WAS an
> agenda to minimize UFO sightings, but also there were slip-ups in
> presenting th evidence to the scientists.

> On another matter, regarding the Air defense Command and radar:
> I have been trying to locate records related to the radar
> inspired national alert on December 6, 1950 at about 10:30 AM
> when radar picked up a number of objects approaching the
> northeastern United States. I have a chapter on this in my book
> THE UFO-FBI CONNECTION because two days later, according to a
> message found in the FBI file, the counter-intelligence corps was
> put on immediate high alert for any information related to flying
> saucers (Dec. 8). There appear to be NO RECORDS OF THIS EVENT in
> the files of the Secretary of Defense, other than one document
> which provides a few details that could only have come from other
> documents .

I have been to find nothing more than the information Loren Gross has in his books. However, my search is far from exhaustive or exhausted.

> Furthermore, it is clear that the SECDEF office was involved in
> this event which resulted in planes being scrambled AND THE
> PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF STATE
> BEING ALERTED!.

> Could this be a real radar detection of a group of UFOs that was
> effectively covered up by the defense department?

Possibly, it is still classified in a SCI project. I was rather suprised by the level of classification of routine air defense information. Locations and missions of units were Top Secret.

I would add to what was said about Alvarez. He was a supporter of a strong offensive policy. He was an expert on radar and had looked at a number of problems involving radar. He was a Nobel laureate. He was a complete skeptic concerning UFOs. Given all this, he would be "disinclined" to look closely at any UFO evidence presented. He might look at some slightly interesting reports and consider that they might for the moment be puzzling, but he probably would not recommend a big study to look into the possible "air defense implication." Why open a can of worms? He was a support of Teller after all.

So I am not saying that Alvarez was dead set against UFOs because he supported Teller, and there is some dark conspiracy here. It is more like:

- 1) UFOs are a complete waste.
- 2) Yeah, there might be some momentarily puzzling things here, but nothing to worry about.
- 3) If we open this up to a larger study, it is a waste of resources and who knows where it would lead or how the other side might use it.

--

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.iufoq.org/project1947/>

Search for other documents to/from: [jan](#) | [brumac](#) | [project-1947](#)

[[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](#).