

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



[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](#) -> [May](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Ruppelt the Liar?

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 7 May 1999 16:35:01 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 08 May 1999 13:01:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Ruppelt the Liar?

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>Date: Tue, 27 Apr 1999 11:40:25 -0700
>Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Apr 1999 20:50:54 -0400
>Subject: Re: Ruppelt the Liar?

>Dear Brad, Fran, and Mike,

>Since I posted the above title, it has been cross-posted all
>over the Internet without the context of all the other messages,
>so there is a lot of heat coming down on my head. However, the
>idea was to simulate further discussion.

>In any case my correspondents pointed out several things
>which are interesting and are further developed here:

Hi Jan,

I finally got a chance to respond to your thoughtful posting.
See comments below:

> 1) Ruppelt's original manuscript was much larger than the
>final book. Only Brad and Michael Swords have read the larger
>version, to my knowledge.

Yes, few have read the full-length Ruppelt manuscript. The longer version is very dull, and I can see why it needed to be edited down for popular readership. Very few if any deletions have any hiding-a-secret connotation to them. Most of these kinds of secrets Ruppelt simply kept hidden in his unpublished papers. One deletion took out a Sept 23, 1948, AEC case that gave a last time-frame for the Top Secret Estimate of the Situation, as Ruppelt claims this sighting was in the Estimate. However, Keyhoe told me he was shown the Estimate in 1952 and it had a Received date at USAF HQ of Aug 5, 1948, and that it was signed by two colonels (apparently Col Howard M. McCoy and L/Col William Clingerman of AMC Intell Dept). So there's a conflict here that will not likely be resolved till an actual copy of the Estimate turns up someday.

> 2) In cutting down the book to a reasonable length, did the
>Fort Monmouth sighting get compressed in time to make it a "good
>read?"

Nope. Ruppelt falsely compressed the dates of the sightings and ATIC investigation into a tight 4-day period instead of the actual 3-week period, to cover up ATIC's bungling of the case, and he made up the date and time of the message that triggered the Rosengarten-Cummings field investigation, claiming it was an Operational Immediate teletype received at "the EXACT TIME" of

3:04 PM on Sept 12, 1951. In fact, Ruppelt's own 1955 interview notes in preparation for his book avoid giving a bogus exact date and they give the time of receipt differently, as "about 1300" or 1:00 PM -- not 3:04 PM. Ruppelt's notes say nothing about it having an "Operational Immediate" message precedence either. Apparently all these phony details were jazzed up later for dramatic effect and appearance of authority in the book.

The files reveal that the message that "initiated" the Rosengarten-Cummings ATIC investigation was actually a transcribed telephone conversation (NOT a teletype) from AF Intelligence received at about 2 PM on Sept 28, 1951 -- more than TWO WEEKS LATER than the bogus Sept 12 date given in Ruppelt's book (p. 91). The Rosengarten-Cummings trip actually extended over 4 days not 2 days, from Sept 28 till briefing Gen Cabell's staff and the general informally late on Oct 1, before the formal briefing the next morning.

> 3) Considering that MG Cabell, was hot and heavy on the >Fort Monmouth, NJ, sighting, there was pressure to come up with >something on the sighting to get him off ATIC's back. Any >reasonable sounding answer would do. (McDonald also >investigated this sighting and was critical of the explanation.) >Ruppelt being successful in deflecting the heat on this case was >probably please with himself and just used his explanation which >he seemed pretty proud of in his book.

This sounds reasonable.

> 4) ATIC was in a funny position. The ATIC was part of AMC >although the Directorate of Intelligence considered ATIC in a >special relationship as field unit of DI. Even so, unless your >name is Patton or Hollingsworth you don't go firing people in >commands run by a superior officers. I have discussed staff >and command relationships elsewhere. Basically, staff "pukes," >as one commander put it, are not important. They are adjuncts >of the commander. The important relationships are commander to >commander. Staff officers exercise supervision--not command--in >their areas of expertise. Now if Cabell wanted to clean people >out of ATIC, he might have gotten with personnel to reassign >people at ATIC, but not without first taking the matter up with >the AMC commander in a back channel. In his own office, >obviously, he is the authority to move or fire people as >required. (It also goes without saying that superior staff >have their commander's ear, so you cross them at your own >peril.) (Perhaps there is something, I haven't seen here. >Was ATIC actually under DI in a command relationship? Was >it simply attached to AMC at the time? It seems that has >to be answered. I did see a memo concerning the "special >relationship" with DI as a field unit, but was that formalized? >Gad, you have to copy everything you see, because there is no >telling when it will show up as something important.)

When ATIC was established in May 1951, it became part of AF Intelligence and the intelligence community for the "first time" in the history of it and its predecessors, according to the FTD's 1967 history. Prior to that time T-2 and AMC's Intell Dept were part of the R&D side of the Air Force.

Thus, Watson came directly under AF Director of Intelligence Gen C. P. Cabell for the "first time" in May 1951 and within a month Watson was transferred out. As you say, if Cabell had been dissatisfied with Watson prior to that time, he would have had to take it up with AMC's commander. But now he could fire or transfer Watson on his own. I think the last straw was when Great Falls UFO filmer Nicholas Mariana filed a libel suit on May 4, 1951, against Hearst publications for a vicious anti-UFO article that prominently quoted the anti-UFO Watson.

>5) Ruppelt in his book does not do justice to those people >that thought UFOs represented a possible Soviet jump ahead >especially in the early days.

Ruppelt seemed unaware of the Top Secret Air Intelligence Study of Dec 1948, or else he was extremely good at covering it up.

>6) Exactly what was Ruppelt's mission? When you consider >that, then you might understand why he acted the way he did. >What do the higher ups want from him?

Good questions. At times Ruppelt's "mission" as he understood it clashed with what his superiors in AF Intelligence wanted, e.g., with his attempt to investigate the first Washington National incident while he was in Washington and the abrupt orders home on July 22, 1952, (which he completely falsifies and covers up in his book with the fictitious "staff car" story) and his efforts to inform the CIA of the results of his staff's UFO investigations prior to the Robertson Panel, which were suppressed and kept from CIA on orders from AF Intelligence.

At other times, Ruppelt's vision clicked with what higherups wanted, e.g., his plan (NOT the CIA's) of July 1952 to turn Blue Book into a PR/propaganda shell to debunk UFO sightings and reduce public interest in the subject. Yes, you read that right, this was planned by Ruppelt and AF Intelligence long before the Robertson Panel came into existence and well before any of the steps by the President and the CIA leading up to the Panel.

>(From the Hynek and Friend tapes it is obvious that they
>are both interested in UFOs and delving into the subject, but
>they also understand that what they were required to do is to
>offer some kind explanation for UFO cases that sounded
>reasonable.) (Asside: I might add sounded reasonable--it did
>not have to be reasonable.)

>Ruppelt did recommend an enlargement of Project Blue Book in
>1952. He pulled out all the stops here. He also complained
>about lack of access to CRIVIS reports and other intelligence
>materials.

Yes, Ruppelt even recommended a quadrupling of Blue Book to the Robertson Panel on Jan 18, 1953, which agreed with it, as proven in the minutes/records of the Panel, contrary to Leon Davidson and other critics who mistakenly pounced on this as a falsehood by Ruppelt, while overlooking numerous other actual falsehoods.

I'm not familiar with Ruppelt's complaints about lack of access to CIRVIS reports. I think it is true that JANAP 146 did not include AMC or ATIC as a recipient along with AF Intelligence until their successor FTD was added in 1966 apparently. I do recall that Ruppelt had trouble getting complete Sign/Grudge files reconstructed and had to go to AF Intelligence on Jan 29, 1952, to locate complete copies or copies of about 50 missing reports -- which shows you who was really running the show and maintaining the most comprehensive coverage of the UFO subject (it was NOT Wright-Pat).

According to the FOIA expert on the history of CIRVIS/JANAP, Bob Todd, the reporting instructions began in WW2 and the first JANAP 146 was in July 1948 but did not include UFO's or Unconventional Aircraft. These were CIRMIS (Communications Instructions for Reporting Military Intelligence Sightings). In Sept 1950, UFO's were first included in the revision called JANAP-146(A), as "Unconventional Aircraft" (if I recall correctly), and CIRMIS was changed to CIRVIS. You might ask Bob what is the current or latest known successor to the CIRVIS and JANAP-146.

>Ruppelt did criticize the Air Force publicly on several
>occasions concern their investigations after he left the USAF.
>Did he perhaps hope that he might be recalled to lead a new,
>better investigation? Perhaps this was also the purpose of his
>book.

This is a very perceptive and excellent interpretation. Yes I think Ruppelt was hoping his book would make the case for his return to head up Project Blue Book or something better. Notice that if that is so, the purpose of the book wasn't to reveal cases to help support ETH but to help support the need for investigation perhaps with Ruppelt at the helm. There's a difference.

Also, Ruppelt was all over the map on UFOs, sometimes
>depending on with whom he was talking. When Halstead visited
>with him he said one thing and another to the press.

Ruppelt was caustically anti-UFO in his private papers, with no

one holding a gun to his head making him call Keyhoe "Psycho" or making him utter other anti-UFO comments or making him suppress pro-ETH belief which is nowhere to be found in his papers.

[[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](#).