



# 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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

From: Gary Alevy <[galevy@pipeline.com](mailto:galevy@pipeline.com)>  
Date: Sun, 01 Nov 1998 13:33:50 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 00:10:51 -0500  
Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

>Date: Fri, 30 Oct 1998 19:51:51 +0000  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Keith Stevens <[k.stevens@virgin.net](mailto:k.stevens@virgin.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

>>Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 00:37:39 -0500  
>>From: Gary Alevy <[galevy@pipeline.com](mailto:galevy@pipeline.com)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

>>While I do not doubt that you have some experience in the  
>>"secret document" area and have trouble believing what several  
>>credible people have testified to under their own names.

>>So what. You just have to get over it.

>>You know, I also had trouble believing that the CIA had run  
>>drugs in Southeast Asia and had hired terrorists to mine the  
>>harbors of nations we were not at war with.

>>But, you know, my "belief" had nothing to do with it because  
>>these things happened, were testified to by credible people  
>>under their own names, documented and independently verified.

>>Do you know of any nation which has not had its secure documents  
>>compromised?

>>Weren't those classified documents found in Aldrich Ames' home?  
>>The inside operative is toughest to find as James Angleton knew  
>>to well.

>>How about the voluminous amount of documents transferred by  
>>Pollard to our embarrassment.

>>As to your statement "I find it very hard to believe that anyone  
>>would admit to having a copy of this particular document". Well  
>>all of these men - Ruppelt, Keogh and Hynek did go on record  
>>saying they had read the document and at least transiently had a  
>>copy of it.

>>Wishful thinking won't solve the questions raised. Your dog  
>>doesn't hunt.

>>Gary

Keith,

You have raised some good points which need to be addressed.

>Hi Gary and list

>The trouble with using the activities of the CIA as examples is  
>that you are talking here of mostly established facts. These are  
>all out in the Public domain. The story fully(?) documented  
>now. The same goes for Aldrich Ames. In his case he never openly  
>claimed to have any documents in his possession prior to his  
>arrest.

As far as Aldrich Ames - "never openly claimed to have documents in his possession prior to his arrest". Well that is a nonsequitur. I can't quite imagine any traitor intelligence employee making such a claim prior to his arrest either. Nonetheless the arresting agencies, FBI and CIA did claim that he had removed physical, classified documents he had access to and that physical documents were recovered from his home at the time of his arrest. This has been documented in news accounts and books written about this case. The point I am making here is that although there are procedures and legalities regarding the handling of these documents, people can and do violate them. Using established facts as examples doesn't exactly stretch the credibility of the reader. Most people have enough experience from their own lives in understanding the wide range of human behaviours. Are you one would believe that because a rule or law has been established that those are themselves enough to proscribe those behaviours from ever happening?

Also let's not forget to note the the 6x10 foot room of documents that our government likes publicize was removed by Pollard. I wonder who was actually assigned the task of making those measurements before this information was offered to a journalist.

>No I feel that in this particular case we are not talking about  
>a substantiated event but an unsubstantiated event. As of yet  
we >still do not have the Document which would prove the case!  
All >we have are unsupported claims by various individuals that  
they >have seen it.

>Now I am not saying that they are making false claims, far from  
>it. The exceptional does sometimes happen. However from my  
>own, admittedly modest 17 years, Military Service experience, I  
>find it very hard to believe that a doubtless Top Secret  
>Document has been down graded to Unclassified status immediately  
>prior to destruction, and, that-if- a copy of this Unclassified  
>Document does indeed exist why has it not been shown in public?  
>To me it makes little sense.

You may not have seen my posting which addresses this issue, trying to make sense of information about individuals, documents and procedures which is difficult to understand. I had posted this explanation scenario under a new subject "The Estimate of the Situation - As A Ticking Time Bomb". Here is the relevant explanation from that posting. Based on the information available to me at this time, this makes a lot of sense (to me at least, hey, I posted it!). So let's hear what does and doesn't support this scenario.

abstracted from:

The Estimate of the Situation - As A Ticking Time Bomb

Copyright (C) 1998 Gary Alevy

There was a problem with the Estimate of the Situation written by PROJECT SIGN, a problem that may not be at all apparent to civilians, patriotic minded individuals and even those with military experience; the Estimate was an "ordinary" TOP SECRET document. How can a TOP SECRET document be "ordinary"? The answer lies in understanding that military considerations and documents are not really the utmost consideration of those at the top of the pyramid, they are but a means to an end. Even what becomes a military consideration is often defined by others outside the military chain of command. This is not to belittle the role of the military rather it is a realistic recognition the role the military plays in the republican form of government in these United States. Moreover, these kinds of documents are subject to leak and counter-leak within the military itself or confiscation by means of espionage. The creators of the Estimate document took their job seriously, without any baggage due to "outside considerations" of the kind that Alphabet Agencies (intelligence agencies, e.g. FBI, CIA, etc.) and others (politicians, world leaders, religious leaders, etc.) typically

are concerned with. That is, ATIC was concerned only with military security, in the here and NOW, and was not creating or "spinning" their document for a boss really near or at the top of the pyramid outside the military, or worried about higher-order political, social, international or even worldwide problems that UFO revelations might present to the government, society or humanity as a whole. The Estimate spoke plain English, a fatal flaw, and "proved" that UFOs were the real deal, of some kind, whether or not they were "interplanetary".

The military, by its nature, wants to do something NOW about a problem, and there WAS a problem. There is no doubt, even as early as the time of the Estimate that the UFO problem had become so important that the regular military was not going to be allowed to deal with it anymore. Only the very secretest, personnel and organizations were going to be allowed to do that.

"Tippy-top" scientists (scientists of high order with backgrounds in intelligence) like Howard Robertson who had served as General Eisenhower's science advisor at SHAEF, well, they may have been aware of other information and playing another game, along with their tippy-top secret bosses in the Alphabet Agencies and elsewhere. What else can explain what happened in 1953, when a panel (the Robertson Panel, Ruppelt's panel of experts) consisting of the best secret scientists in the inventory (with intelligence and military backgrounds, e.g. Howard Robertson, Louis Alvarez, Samuel Goudsmit, etc.) blew the UFO out of the water and denied it respectability with everyone, the regular military being only one of many. How could the Robertson panel have done this when ostensibly no scientific investigation had been completed? Well it is obvious -- the REAL investigation was by then complete, or nearly so, and no help was required from anyone (including the military) who was not a part of the empire served by the then secret Alphabet Agencies.

Now we can see why the Estimate was not made public after its declassification; to do so would have been ruinous to anyone contemplating a career anywhere in the vast caverns of government employment or the outside military, industrial and consultancy organizations that work hand-in-hand with government. One would have to be brain dead not to realize that a "declassify-then-burn" order had to have been applied to a very dangerous document indeed. Indeed, it is fascinating that Ruppelt even mentioned it, even in the diluted way that he did. It makes one wonder who might have been steered onto the Estimate as a result of The Report and whether such "steerage" was one of the effects Ruppelt intended. Remember, Ruppelt later repudiated in 1959, under duress many said, nearly everything he wrote in the original edition of his book which was published in 1956. Then he had a heart attack in 1960, an event that many might have contemplated to their benefit as the years of the Arnold Age unrolled and passed into the history books.

--- end of abstract

As a brief aside I would also like to point out some little known background about Dr. Howard Robertson, who was appointed the head of the Robertson Panel.

During WWII Robertson was head of the Scientific Intelligence Advisory Section under SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces) and also served General Eisenhower as a scientific adviser at USFET (United States Forces European Theater) headquarters. He was also chief of the scientific branch of FIAT of the Joint Intelligence Objectives Agency and a member of the Alsos Commission.

As recently as 1997 Gerald Haines, a historian for the CIA, stated for the record that the scientists on the Robertson Panel were non-military. [Haines, Gerald K. Studies in Intelligence Vol.1 No.1, 1997. CIA's Role in the Study of UFOs, 1947-90 (A Die Hard Issue)Langley, Central Intelligence Agency,1997.] Although Haines was unable to state the facts correctly about the background of the chairman of the Robertson Panel, information available in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Haines now works at the NRO as its historian. To my knowledge it has not yet been revealed who were the individuals who selected Robertson to head the panel. Ruppelt mentions four "scientists" but never named them or the organization they worked for. Perhaps an updates reader is familiar with this aspect of the history of the panel.

>You will doubtless realize that I have not tried to cast any  
>doubts on the documents reality. Its simply that I find the  
>claimed final down grading,destruction and subsequent non  
>revelation as totally unbelievable. Would someone please prove me  
>wrong.

Ah, yes this all hinges on what one considers proof. Clearly you do not consider the testimony of these individuals - Hynek, Keogh and Ruppelt totally believable. Are you one who would suggest that our judiciary system should not rely on testimony?

Yes it is pretty easy to state that you just don't find it believable and you don't think they are liars (maybe you do?). Well then offer your explanation for the situation as described by Ruppelt, the others who have claimed to have read the estimate and the historical record. Offer this for the public perusal of updates readers, that's what we are here for - aside from being entertained by the personal attack and counterattacks of the recognized ufologists on this list.

Are you searching for "smoking gun" documentation? Then you ought to read the following abstracted from:

Moynihan, Daniel P. (Chairman) The Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy

Senate Doc. 105-2  
Washington, D.C. 1997.

Here is my commentary on a portion of this important document which updates readers should be familiar with.

On page XXXI of the Chairman's Foreword is a discussion which documents how truly secret information in government which is never intended to see the light of day is only transmitted verbally and is never committed to paper and ink. This discussion and example are provided below. Another relevant example of the application of the verbal secrecy technique was its utilization by General Leslie Groves for the development of the atomic bomb during the Manhattan Project. With these examples in mind we feel it is logical to deduce that there is little to no hope for the smoking gun, secret single document to reveal the UFO mystery, if Moynihan's discussion and the Grove's example don't make clear why, then you'll never understand why. What Moynihan's discussion does hold hope for is that research and analysis can pull together a reasonable scenario based on second tier documents, created by the the "grunts" stamping on overtime; and human accounts. This is the path we are following in this book; the key here is to have a clear understanding of how intelligence bureaucracies work, possess a wide ranging knowledge of the subject matter, in this case UFOs, and then apply critical analysis to the relevant information with the purpose of building the scenario mentioned above. Also see pages 8-9 of the Commission's report for an illuminating discussion of the role of leaks and counterleaks in the struggle by proponents and opponents in the establishment of contested policy. "It is now almost routine for American officials of unquestioned loyalty to reveal classified information as part of ongoing policy disputes, with one camp leaking information in support of a particular view, or to the detriment of another, or in support of settled administration policy." Does the history of the UFO field offer examples of leaks and counterleaks? This conclusion is inescapable after careful consideration of the information and misinformation that the field nearly drowns in from time to time which has emanated from government and quasi-governmental sources.

>From page XXXI:

"Over the course of 80 years, notably in the later period, a vast system of secrecy developed within the American Government. So much that it has been termed a culture of secrecy. The system grew so vast, however, that it began to appear unavailing. Secrecy has been defined as "the compulsory withholding of information, reinforced by the prospect of sanctions for disclosure." Almost everything was declared secret; not everything remained secret, and there were no sanctions for disclosure. In the course of 1996, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate carried out a detailed inquiry into the decision by the President not to object to the

shipment of arms to Bosnia by way of Croatia. A notable aspect of this decision was that it was never put in writing. The Deputy Secretary of State explained this to the Committee in these terms:

Another reason that diplomatic transactions and internal deliberations do not end up on paper is because of the extreme sensitivity of the subject matter. What goes down on paper is more likely to come out in public, in inappropriate and harmful ways, harmful to the national interest.

This, of course, is a privilege of the privileged within the system. For the grunts the rule is stamp, stamp, stamp.

--- end of page XXXI

>Finally with regards to your 'Dog' analogy, in this particular  
>case this 'Dog' keeps hunting.....for the truth!.....its out  
>there!

Aren't we all. However I rather doubt that catch phrases from television shows and the inspiration of taglines will reveal "truth".

Gary Alevy

---

[ [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](#).