

Hacking UFOlogy: Thirty Years in the Hall of Mirrors
notes for a presentation by Richard Thieme
Def Con 15 – August 2007

These are notes – meant to be supportive of the one hour presentation made at Def Con 15 and suggestive of further avenues of inquiry. Consult the select bibliography at the end for further reading. Questions? write to rthieme@thiemeworks.com or neuralcowboy@gmail.com

"And those who were seen dancing were thought to be insane by those who could not hear the music." - Frederick Nietzsche

“Men will love you if you make them think that they think but will hate you if you make them think.”

“I recommend we use scientific curiosity to see what is the physics of the phenomena so many people are describing as UFOs. Ascribing the phenomena to psychological aberrations is nonsense. There is a physical phenomena that needs explaining. Let’s get on with it in an open-minded scientifically oriented manner. Then let the *data* provide the answer.” – written almost 50 years ago by Dr. Horace C. Dudley, *New Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, 1959 -

Fifty years later, I could make the same statement. So did Peter Sturrock, a physicist at Stanford. So did Michael Swords after decades of historical study, a professor of history at Western Michigan University.

UFOlogy is a blend of facts – suppositions – intentional deceptions and disinformation – cover stories for black budget projects in the sciences and social sciences – outright boldfaced lies by charlatans, scam artists, and flimflam woman and men milking a gullible cow – a subset of religious experience and religious structures in 20th century America - and imaginary narratives promulgated through magazines, books, television, movies, web sites, etc. which become conflated “memories” blended with all of the above in the mind of society.

Hence, the need for a few benchmarks in order to discuss all this for one hour in a sane way.

First, we have to believe it is worthwhile. Hynek was asked, is there any evidence for UFOs? He replied, “Where do you want me to stop the truck?”

There is a mountain of evidence. The data is voluminous.

The burden of proof is on those who would dispute the mountain of data, but it has been turned around, putting the burden of proof on those who simply report accurately what they saw or what happened to them (physical effects). It is like the Swift Boat veterans putting a decorated war hero on the defensive while attention on a draft dodging president is deflected. (illusion, misdirection, ridicule).

It is not a scientific investigation but an historical analysis. To ask repeatability and testability of historical data for this data but no other is disingenuous.

A general at the Pentagon said to Hynek, “Do you really think we would ignore something as significant as this?”

For purposes of this brief introduction to a very complex subject, we will reference the following kinds of historical data:

- (1) official statements, newspaper accounts, magazine articles in the seminal period of the “modern era” – 1947- 1952 and a few years beyond 1952 in order to document the basic nature of a complex phenomenon and ...
- (2) the intentional management of the phenomena for multiple purposes by the government, the military, the intelligence community (IC) and others with reference to the early history of the CIA and the origins of covert action as a preferred way to wage war in the nuclear era
- (3) the use of media to distort the phenomena, which enables us to begin mapping the warping of the looking glass in the early 1950s
- (4) testimony from credible people that (a) I know well, in appropriate circumstances, with congruent affect and consistent narratives, e.g. the Major in the church basement, clergy speaking off the record, credible parties such as Captain Edgar Mitchell of Apollo 14

The context of this conversation includes but is not limited to the following:

the impact of secrecy on individuals and society
the impact of compartmentalization on historical research and historical understanding
the extent of black budget research and development and the application of technologies and methodologies chartered for use outside our borders to the management of perception inside our borders
the effects of deception/psy ops – through the manufacture and manipulation of illusions, sleight of hand to distract the population, and ridicule - above all, ridicule, which enables things to be hidden in plain sight ...

with particular attention to the use of cultural forms such as the arts, literature, and other media.

The Bigger Picture

The mutual transparency between the individual and the state has been destroyed. The state knows ever more about the individual but the individual knows less and less about the state. – Sandra Braman, *Change of State: Information, Policy and Power* (The MIT Press: 2006).

e.g. Vice President Cheney, the obsession with secrecy to frustrate transparency and accountability, and the invention of the Vice Presidency as a Black Branch of government which is neither executive nor legislative but also both. As Alice said, “Words mean exactly what I say that mean, no more, no less.”

speaking to an official NSA historian, I asked: “what can we discuss with a realistic sense that we are talking about the same or a similar shared history?”

NSA historian: “Anything that happened up until 1945.”

Ulrich Beck said in the late 1980s: Causal chains are already so long and complex that they often evade perception by existing statistical and other mechanisms. As a result, it can be impossible to determine the actual effects of the use of complex technologies and to assign accountability for undesirable consequences. *Beck predicted that in an environment in which causality could not be determined, people were likely to return to non-rational modes of explanation.*” (Braman, p. 147) (emphasis mine)

Or ... “If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you can fool all of the people some of the time; you can ever fool some of the people all of the time; but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.” – Abraham Lincoln

The more outlandish and disconnected theories about UFOs and government conspiracies, then, are at least in part direct consequences of disinformation – lies and half-truths salted with truths for credibility that constitute a Big Lie – and the impossibility for an outsider without access to actual data to appraise the totality.

A corollary: UFO studies however designed are impossible to do *fully and accurately* outside of black budget realms. We can only pursue them partially, with limited data. But still, there are dots to connect ...

What does this mean for science? That real science, “outside” the IC and black budget R&D, is fragmented through compartmentalization and secrecy, so can not be done; it can only be done inside, where DATA i.e. FACT is real and aggregated. So only those who direct various projects with a maximum of knowledge can direct research and development. This also means that it will be done for their purposes, i.e. social control, military advantage, informational advantage, the financial reward of collusive partners, etc.

Science as a pursuit of the truth for its own sake – if it ever existed – exists no longer.

Another corollary: the basis of science is the FACT. John Locke introduced the concept of the fact - sensory data the interpretation of which can be shared and trusted.

UFO encounters – the real ones – in their essence, are FACTS that have been turned into PHANTASMS. As a friend who assists political campaigns in a stealthy way said, “you can’t change reality but you can change the facts.”

An experienced pilot says that a circular craft that looked like polished aluminum paced his plane and took off at a fantastic speed. He is told that it was Venus or meteorological phenomena. He is aghast as a fact becomes a phantasm.

This experience is not emotionally or morally neutral. The falsification of a significant event is a betrayal of the social contract.

Another corollary: inevitably a society of information haves and have-nots has evolved. There is little room for an informational middle class because big pictures can only be conceived in totality or not at all. A part of a big picture based on partial knowledge is not a big picture. It is a delusion.

When a society consists of haves and have-nots ... and non-rational projections and hypotheses fill the empty spaces in the matrix ... and people can believe almost anything and claim to have a case, however fantastic the claim ... and when truth is in fact more fantastic than those claims ... then that society is ripe for a revolution. Not a traditional revolution ... not a revolution of arms ... but a stealthy revolution of information used powerfully, analogous to what real and sophisticated hackers do with multiple identities, individual and corporate, in small trusted cells.

Real hackers, a tiny minority of the vast sea of alleged hackers, see the social and political implications of hacking, both as an action and in terms of the contents it secures and reveals. They do not see only the machinery and the mathematics, they see what it all means for social and cultural constructions of reality ... and the future of humanity.

One question becomes, then, what is the nature, what is the form and structure of the revolution that current conditions demand?

One danger of movies like *The Matrix* is that people are enabled to engage in an imaginary revolution, which manages and diminishes the dissonance they feel by having their intuitions and perceptions made visible, then transcended. This is analogous to the “fear and pity” which Aristotle said characterized tragedy – spectators fear for persons like themselves, but purge that fear through pity in the resolution of the tragic dilemma.

Hence, movies, books, multi-player online games, narratives of all kinds, can be means for diminishing anxiety, managing cognitive dissonance, and rendering the population stable and supportive of the status quo.

Unfortunately, such a society creates its own enemies by rendering the unthinkable thinkable. e.g., Operation Northwoods means that 9/11 as a deliberate plot by elected officials is thinkable. The toppling of Saddam’s statue as a staged event means that the idea that we did not land on the moon but enacted the deception on a sound stage is thinkable.

In an environment in which causality can not be determined, people are likely to turn to non-rational modes of explanation.

All of this is preamble and relevant to the subject.

What methodology is required, then? A hacker state of mind.

Beginner's mind, Zen mind.

A methodology or model from information security and profiling, which is outlined by paraphrasing an experienced, CIA profiler ... who said:

Profiling like chasing black hat bad guy hackers raises some of the same issues:

To know who is the enemy you must **KNOW YOURSELF**.

Zen meditation helps distinguish between mind and system.

Warnings and indicators –look with a beginner's mind – with no preconceived notions. “**THE DATA WILL TELL ME WHAT I NEED TO KNOW.**” Whether hackers or serial killers. The stereotype, any preconceived notion, such as “a young male hacker,” must be disregarded. There is no template in particular cases but people still bring preconceptions to the case. Like the DC sniper. The mind imposes patterns automatically.

Network patterns – data – revealing a series of behaviors => leads to hackers. Usual conceptualizations of the problem are far too narrow and unsophisticated when you watch a good hacker. E. g. as Matt Blaze said, “the weakest link in the security chain is the definition of the problem - and the real definition of the problem is frequently not the definition that people work with.”

For Infosec the customary approach, then, is sophomoric. Only the data will tell you what they are doing, what they left behind. Focus on the evidence they leave. What were they after? => track the data. be meticulous. Covering tracks completely is rare. There is always a m.o. of a person entering a system, whether a house or a computer network – unconscious or conscious, patterns and identity will reveal itself.

The work requires: **INTENSE CONCENTRATION AND CONSTANT SELF-MONITORING**. There are a thousand puzzle pieces and no box with a picture. The degree of **CLARITY** required is great. “If I had a stereotype in mind, I always blew it. **I LEARNED NOT TO FORM A PATTERN TOO QUICKLY.**”

Exactly the opposite – the popular conception of the profiler as someone who leaps to a conclusion is WRONG. We have to UNLEARN before we can learn, like the Zen cup story.

Observe yourself => notice yourself jumping to a conclusion in thought or word => once you see that, say: wait! stop! interrupt and back track.

Ask: is this REALLY true? or does it only seem or feel true?

Ask: how do you feel about thinking that way? Stop yourself from completing the loop too quickly. Look at your self and ask: who am I to know that, think that – without sufficient data?

In pursuit of INSIDERS – look for the one WHO DOES NOT FIT THE PATTERN.

This m.o. is also appropriate to the study of UFOlogy.

A danger of doing this work or any spooky work is SECONDARY TRAUMA

“HOW TO LIVE IN A WORLD WITHOUT WALLS”

the story of the IC professional who lost his self, his identity, in the process of doing his work. The high degree of mental illness in the IC. How it is handled inside and the disconnect with the real process of healing.

some of the difficulties in UFOlogy:

complexity (Bill Gates’ commencement address, Bruce Schneier) is real intentional confusion

the national security state

The Cultural Cold War by Stonor – the entire context of my life was bent. Stephen Spender, my teacher, and his magazine, Encounter, a CIA operation from start to finish. And publishing. And abstract art.

“The Cultural Cold War” – 1000+ books, publishing, influence, journalists – what does this MEAN for the assumed CONTEXT?

magazines, books, publishing, abstract modern art – Steinbeck remember the historian at NSA – we can discuss only shared assumptions to 1945.

how bad is it? ... ? well, we don’t know what we don’t know but we know we don’t know.

how did Fodor’s begin?

insurance companies – a conversation with a CEO

The devil in Woody Allen's Deconstructing Harry, "Sometimes you're up, sometimes down. In the end, the house always wins. It doesn't mean you didn't have fun."

The effects of COMPARTMENTALIZATION:
e.g. JFK autopsy: "it was the damndest thing ... " projection onto blank spaces.

A friend reports his psy ops briefing, thirteen stories down, underground, at an AFB base - "that's exactly what we want people to believe"

The purpose of propaganda (Joseph Goebbels: "Entertainment is the best form of propaganda.") and psy ops is for people to believe they have chosen to act as they do for reasons that are their own, when in fact they are not. Beliefs are also a behavior, a mental activity, every bit as much as other physical actions. Beliefs are actions, because they frame how we will act, what we will do, and what we believe about why we did what we do. Studies show that people act, then invent reasons for why they acted which are rationalizations, e.g. after hypnosis. Actions are for unconscious reasons, conscious processes often make things seem smooth, intelligible, safe. Fuzzy logic distorting the truth of our lives.

If you determine the questions people ask, you don't have to worry about the answers.

Some consequences of secrecy and psy ops: blowback:

Alexander Haig and disinformation

The Gulf of Tonkin.

connecting the dots: CINQUE and Cujo of the SLA LEARNING TO BRAINWASH at Vacaville State Prison in a CIA program

Ted Kozynski as an undergraduate brutalized in a covert operation

Army counter-intelligence in Haiti and cocaine routes.

Gary Webb.

the impact of Secrecy – Daniel Moynihan, Ted Gup. To what end?

beyond mutuality, the enemy is GROUP THINK

cultures assimilates us.

Margaret Mead – one week and one year

the antidote: Mutuality, Feedback, Accountability – all three must be there.

UFOs and UFOlogy

why is UFOlogy, virtually alone of all interesting areas, NOT STUDIED?
at least under social sciences, as studies of delusion, misperception?
because the more one studies the data, the more one realizes there are many
credible cases. The nature of the inquiry changes. One moves through a
looking-glass. The extent of the interface with other life becomes difficult to
grasp.

So how are we to proceed?

- 1) stay with the public data
- 2) stay with the self-collected data
- (3) but do stay with the data

The beginning, for me, of a contextual shift: the Major in the church
basement.

what I did as a result while a priest – what I heard
the other clergy in the hotel room with Edgar Mitchell and Allen
Hynek. They did not question that UFOs exist. They discussed only, were
they from other places? other times? other dimensions? not, was the
phenomena real – they KNEW that it was – but what was it? and why was it
managed as it was?

The suggestion that it was managed as it was and is for good reasons:
The Brookings Institute study on the impact of extraterrestrial encounter.

What the NSA analyst said, the analogy with the Japanese.

How he interviewed people, as I did, in secrecy and in confidence.

Some cases:

the fisherman on a Wisconsin lake early in the morning
a typical event - my employee, what she saw
the potter having a smoke outside his shed at midnight in the
countryside
the man walking in the woods at twilight
the hunter and his shock when he entered the clearing
the Air Force Lieutenant and his direct report – the reality of his
fear – “those eyes, I’ll never forget those eyes”

reports of humanoids – widespread, consistent. Examples. The work of the French. The COMETA report on behalf of Europe.

people who waited after talks – the farm in North Dakota, Viet Nam vets

conversations with others:

NSA analyst

historian in the “invisible college” for decades

Jerome Clark

Richard Hall

journalist Leslie Keans

Some historical background:

Fortean events

the edge is the center – collecting at the edges

Reports long before World War 2. Our time is not the time of the universe.

Foo fighters and ghost rockets

the beginning of the modern era – 1947-1952

The phenomena was mediated always through media (duh). So ... let’s talk about media coverage - newspaper coverage in the beginning and how it changed in the 1950s.

Look Magazine “Hunt for the Flying Saucers” July 1 1952 – three weeks before the Washington flap that precipitated a crisis

“Saucer evades jet, pilot reveals” – headline of The Washington Post

Typical articles in the NY Times, Washington Post. The article in Life Magazine, the extraterrestrial hypothesis.

What about disreputable media like ... the National Inquirer?

Generoso (Gene) Pope - the founder - was in CIA doing psy ops in 1952

the newspaper did not make money until the 1960s. Where did the large amount of money come from to sustain it? Through Frank Costello, the same Mafia family that was used in a few later to plot to assassinate Castro.

The Missing Times cases - turning everything into anomalies so they don’t connect. Like every political assassination in the United States is by a “lone gunman.” There is “no conspiracy.” The CIA told Congress even Lincoln was not a conspiracy, despite efforts to kill others at the same time.

The JFK solution was announced within a few hours. It is a cover story – that does not say what the real story is, only that the cover story is not the real story.

UFO stories never made much money for the NI but were carried frequently. Celebrity stories, others, made more money.

John Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India, became incensed at a periodical like the NI because of the trash it published. He investigated. It was a CIA operation.

connect the dots: The Cultural Cold War.

what is the subject of The Missing Times?

a friend in 1975 told Hansen that UFOs were appearing over ICBM silos near Great Falls Montana. Many accounts appeared in the local press. Some were also in official USAF records, hidden until FOIA requests made them public.

Much regional coverage: no national coverage. Over 130 reports of sightings in Montana in late 1975.

More context:

UFO sightings at ICBM sites and nuclear Weapons Storage Areas

By Robert L. Hastings

Although the vast majority of Americans are completely unaware of its existence, the UFO/Nukes Connection is now remarkably well-documented. Air Force, FBI, and CIA files declassified via the Freedom of Information Act establish a convincing, ongoing pattern of UFO activity at U.S. nuclear weapons sites extending back to December 1948.

For more than 30 years, I have been interviewing former and retired U.S. Air Force personnel regarding their direct or indirect involvement in nuclear weapons-related UFO sighting incidents. These individuals—from retired colonels to former airmen—report extraordinary encounters which have obvious national security implications. In fact, taken to their logical conclusion, the reported incidents have planetary implications, given the horrific consequences that would result from a full-scale, global nuclear war.

At the time of their experiences, my former/retired USAF sources held positions ranging from nuclear missile launch and targeting officers, to missile maintenance personnel, to missile security police. The incidents described occurred at Malmstrom, Minot, F.E. Warren, Ellsworth, Vandenberg, and Walker AFBs, between 1963 and 1996. Other sources were stationed at Wurtsmith and Loring AFBs, where B-52 nuclear bombers were based during the Cold War era

Herb Strentz, Prof of Journalism, in 1970 survey of UFO press coverage – estimated “Hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million or more, UFO news items were published in the nation’s daily newspapers during the years 1947-1966. – also he was on staff for the Condon Committee, **I talked to him**, and he said it was anything BUT science.

link to the historical background of the National Security State
1952. What was happening?

Allen Dulles was director in 1953

Lt Genl James Doolittle said in 1954: “There are no rules in such a game ...hitherto acceptable norms of human conduct do not apply.” This was something NEW for the USA. While criteria for war crimes were invented for the trials at Nuremberg, Operation Paperclip was well underway. Truman ordered it shut down but it continued covertly into the 1970s. The President is not always in the loop. (Is that a conspiracy theory? No. It is a fact.)

By 1953 the CIA was six times larger than in 1947.

By 1952 ¾ of the CIA budget went to clandestine collection and covert operations, e.g. Operation Ajax ousted Iran’s Mohammad Massadegh. Operation Success in 1954 ousted Guatemala’s Jacobo Arbenz Guzman (Eisenhower hired Eddie Bernays to manage the public “spin” of Operation Success, applying public relations to covert operations).

What was the relationship between the media and the CIA in the 1950s?

socialization of a reporter and Leslie Kean’s experience

Carl Bernstein 1978 Rolling Stone - 400+ American journalists did work for the CIA – at least 200 signed secrecy agreements

THEY DID ASSIGNMENTS FOR 25 YEARS.

These media execs – among others - cooperated:

William Paley, CBS

Henry Luce, Time

TIME MAGAZINE – November 7 1955 – “The USAF has explained in non-sensational ways almost all sightings to date.”

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, New York Times, - signed a secrecy agreement

Harry Bingham Sr., Louisville Courier-Journal

James Copley, Copley News Service

Life held the Zupruder film for years and reversed the print when publishing the head shot

Has this changed? CIA guy at Def Con 12 years ago: "it's easier to get forgiveness than permission" - heh heh

Coral Lorenzen p. 83 – recounts a meeting with Hynek and Lt. Robert Olssen from ATIC (Air Technical Intelligence Command) who surprised her by saying outright: "we're going to try to keep reports out of the newspapers."

and ...

Dorothy Kilgallen – d. 1955

Dorothy Kilgallen was the most famous syndicated woman journalist of her day. Stationed in England in 1954 - 55, and privy to the highest levels of English society and its secrets, she wired two unusual dispatches which may have contributed to her death. The first, sent in February 1954, mentioned a "special hush-hush meeting of the world's military heads" scheduled to take place the following summer. The 1955 dispatch, which barely preceded her death from an alleged overdose of sleeping pills and alcohol quoted an unnamed British official of cabinet rank, 'We believe, on the basis of our inquiry thus far, that saucers were staffed by small men-probably under four feet tall. It's frightening, but there is no denying the flying saucers come from another planet.'

Whatever the source (rumored to be the Earl of Mountbatten), this kind of leak in the atmosphere of the mid- 50s was an unacceptable leak. It is well to recall that the secret CIA-orchestrated Robertson Panel had met in 1953 and issued the Robertson Report. Briefly summarized, this document-and the attitudes reflected there - represented a new hard-line attitude to covering up all significant UFO phenomena.

[IN FEBRUARY 1996, an independent task force of the Council on Foreign Relations led by Richard Haass, a former senior director for Near East and South Asian Affairs of the National Security Council in the Bush administration, proposed taking a "fresh look...at limits on the use of non-official 'covers' for hiding and protecting those involved in clandestine activities." Haass later publicly expanded on this point, challenging what he characterized as the prohibition on the use of journalists as undercover intelligence agents. The outcry among journalists-including many who are

members of the Council of Foreign Relations-led council president Leslie Gelb to distance himself and the council from the task force and its recommendations.

The reaction to the controversy among U.S. intelligence professionals, however, was quite different-and far more disturbing to journalists. John Deutch, director of Central Intelligence, appeared before Congress and said there was no need to change U.S. policy as Haass had advocated, since the CIA already had the power to use U.S. reporters as spies. Under the terms of the guidelines adopted after the Church Commission report, the CIA director retained the right to approve such recruitment if he judged it necessary, Deutch explained. Deutch received public support for his interpretation of the CIA's prerogative from Stansfield Turner, the CIA chief in the Carter administration. Speaking to a gathering of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Turner revealed that he had authorized the use of journalists in intelligence operations three times during his tenure as CIA director.]

CIA when Ramparts was publishing on covert activities including the use of reporters smeared the publishers

you have to get below the filter to see the data

if you treat the filter as if it is the data, you are OWNED

What was happening in the 1940s and 1950s with UFOs?

December 1952 H. Marshall Chadwell, asst. director of scientific intelligence at the CIA, sent a memo to the Director about the UFO situation: “Reports of incidents convince us that there is something going on that must have immediate attention ... sightings of unexplained objects at great altitudes and traveling at high speeds in the vicinity of major US. defense installations are of such nature that they are not attributable to natural phenomena or known types of aerial vehicles.”

Ruppelt, 1956, The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects: “UFOs were seen more frequently around areas vital to the defense of the United States,” such as White Sands, Oak Ridge, SAC bases, Los Alamos-Albuquerque, etc.
– see article in Look Magazine 1952.

Project Sign was instigated following a recommendation from Lt. General Nathan Twining then head of Air Materiel Command Just before this, Brig.

Gen. George Schulgen, of the Army Air Force air intelligence division, had completed a preliminary review of the many UFO reports--then called "flying discs" by military authorities--which had received considerable publicity following the Arnold sighting of June 24, 1947. Schulgen's study, completed in late July 1947, concluded that the flying discs were real craft. Schulgen then asked Twining and his command, which included the intelligence and engineering divisions located at Wright Field), to carry out a more exhaustive review of the data.

In his formal letter to Schulgen Twining wrote:

- **a. The phenomenon reported is something real and not visionary or fictitious.**
- **b. There are objects probably approximately the shape of a disc, of such appreciable size as to appear to be as large as a man-made aircraft.**
- c. There is the possibility that some of the incidents may be caused by natural phenomena, such as meteors.
- **d. The reported operating characteristics such as extreme rates of climb, maneuverability (particularly in roll), and action which must be considered evasive when sighted or contacted by friendly aircraft and radar, lend belief to the possibility that some of the objects are controlled either manually, automatically or remotely.**
- e. The apparent common description of the objects is as follows: ...
- f. It is possible within the present U.S. knowledge... to construct a piloted aircraft which has the general description ...
- g. Any development in this country along the lines indicated would be extremely expensive...
- h. Due consideration must be given to the following:

(1) The possibility that these objects are of domestic origin - the product of some high security project not known to AC/AS-2 or this command.

(2) The lack of physical evidence in the shape of crash recovered exhibits which would undeniably prove the existence of these objects.

(3) The possibility that some foreign nation has a form of propulsion, possibly nuclear, which is outside of our domestic knowledge.

Project Sign was established in late 1947, charged with investigating "flying saucer" reports. In line with orders from high-ranking U.S.A.F

officers, Sign's personnel operated on the principle that the subject should be taken seriously, on the grounds that UFOs may represent genuine aircraft whose origins are mysterious and possibly threatening to US security.

Though Sign earlier investigated earlier UFO reports, Historian David Jacobs writes that the Chiles-Whitted UFO Encounter of July 24, 1948 "had a great impact at Sign" (Jacobs, 47). In that encounter, two experienced airline pilots claimed a torpedo-shaped object nearly collided with their commercial airplane. Sign personnel judged the report convincing and compelling, partly because the alleged object also closely matched the description of an independent sighting from The Hague a few days earlier.

According to Michael Swords, Sign personnel "intensely investigated" the Chiles-Whitted for several months. Despite the lack of physical evidence, some Sign personnel judged this and other UFO reports quite persuasive, and concluded that UFOs could have only a non-earthly source. Swords writes,

"The project members reasoned that they had several dozen aerial observations that they could not explain, many of them by military pilots and scientists. The objects seemed to act like real technology, but their sources said they were not ours.

Given that there was no evidence that either the Americans or Soviets had anything remotely like the UFOs reported, Sign personnel gradually began considering extraterrestrial origins for the objects.

Swords argues that this consideration of non-earthly origin was "not as incredible in intelligence circles as one might think." Because many in the military were "pilots, engineers and technical people" they had a "'can do' attitude" and tended to regard unavailable technologies not as impossibilities, but as challenges to be overcome. Rather than dismissing UFO reports out of hand, they considered how such objects might function. This perspective, argues Swords, "contrasted markedly with many scientists characterizations of such concepts as impossible, unthinkable or absurd." (Swords, p93)

According to Swords, the "Estimate of the Situation" was probably completed in September 1948. The Estimate also argued that UFO reports might closely coincide with the approach of the planets Mercury, Venus or

Mars to Earth, that the UFOs might be using the planets as launching bases, and predicted a wave of UFO reports in mid-October.

In late September or early October, 1948, the Estimate was approved by Colonels William Clingerman and Howard McCoy (Sneider's superiors), who then submitted it to the office of General Charles Cabell, the chief of Air Force intelligence.

According to Swords The Pentagon went into an "uproar" over the Estimate, which generated "intense" debate. Cabell was newly-appointed, and found himself in charge of a "split house:" some were sympathetic and intrigued, if not entirely convinced of the Estimate's accuracy, while others rejected the very idea of interplanetary saucers as impossible. Unsure of how to proceed, Cabell eventually submitted the Estimate to his superior, General Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief-of-Staff of the U.S. Air Force.

According to Ruppelt, the Estimate was rejected by Vandenberg primarily due to lack of supporting physical evidence, and was "batted back down" the chain of command.

In a letter dated November 3, 1948, Cabell wrote to Sign, via McCoy, describing flying saucers as real, but rejecting the interplanetary hypothesis and asking for another Estimate. Cabell wrote:

The conclusion appears inescapable that some type of flying object has been observed. Identification and the origin of these objects is not discernible to this Headquarters. It is imperative, therefore, that efforts to determine whether these objects are of domestic or foreign origin must be increased until conclusive evidence is obtained. The needs of national defense require such evidence in order that appropriate countermeasures may be taken.

McCoy responded in a somewhat defensive letter dated November 8, 1948. He noted that many of the UFO reports were misidentified everyday phenomena), but also restated the rejected ideas of the Estimate without explicitly endorsing the interplanetary hypothesis; as Swords writes, "[Project Sign] just had their knuckles rapped, so they defended themselves." McCoy wrote,

...there remains a certain number of reports for which no reasonable everyday explanation is available. So far, no physical evidence of the existence of the unidentified sightings has been obtained...

The possibility that the reported objects are vehicles from another planet has not been ignored. However, tangible evidence to support conclusions about such a possibility are completely lacking...

When Sign personnel refused to abandon the interplanetary hypothesis, many were reassigned, and Sign was renamed Project Grudge in 1949.

(photographs from gun cameras and civilians (e.g. Trent in McMinnville Oregon), movie film – not evidence.) According to Ruppelt, “The estimate died a quick death. Some months later it was completely declassified and relegated to the incinerator. A few copies, one of which I saw, were kept as mementos of the golden days of the UFO’s.”

The first public report of the Estimate was in Captain Edward J. Ruppelt’s 1956 book, *The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects*. He wrote:

In intelligence, if you have something to say about some vital problem you write a report that is known as an “Estimate of the Situation.” A few days after the Chiles-Whitted UFO report, the people at ATIC decided that the time had arrived to make an Estimate of the Situation. **The situation was the UFO’s; the estimate was that they were interplanetary!**

It was a rather thick document with a black cover and it was printed on legal sized paper. Stamped across the front were the words Top Secret. It contained the Air Force’s analysis of many of the [UFO] incidents I have told you about plus many similar ones. **All of them had come from scientists, pilots, and other equally credible observers, and each one was an unknown ...** “ When the estimate was completed, typed, and approved, it started up through channels to higher command echelons. It drew considerable comment but no one stopped it on its way up.

No copies of this near-legendary document have surfaced since.

Ruppelt’s 1956 book, which first publicly disclosed the Estimate, was cleared by the Air Force. Clark writes (Clark, 1998), that as late as 1960, Air

Force officials denied that the Estimate was real, despite the fact that censors had approved Ruppelt's book a few years before.

According to Clark, the Estimate's existence was confirmed by U.S. Air Force Major Dewey J. Fournet, who as an Air Force major in the Pentagon served as liaison with official UFO project headquartered at Wright-Pat." (Clark, 178) Fournet has been described as being "unimpressed" with the Estimate, and was furthermore quoted as describing the ET conclusion as an "extreme extrapolation" based on scant evidence.

An Air Force consultant, astronomer Dr. Allen Hynek, also verified the Estimate's existence. (Hynek, 1973)

2. Ruppelt – The least unlikely explanation for UFOs is the extraterrestrial,

3. 1950 Wilbert Smith, a scientist at the Canadian Department of Transport, learned through "direct inquiries" through the Canadian embassy in Washington that "flying saucers exist and were the most highly classified subject in the United States government, rating higher even than the H-bomb."

4. The **Robertson Panel** was a committee commissioned by the CIA in 1952 in response to widespread reports, especially in the DC area. The panel was briefed on U.S. military activities and intelligence, hence the report was originally classified Secret.

Later declassified, the Robertson Panel's report concluded that UFOs were not a direct threat to national security, but could pose an indirect threat by overwhelming standard military communications due to public interest in the subject. Most UFO reports, they concluded, could be explained as misidentification of mundane aerial objects, and the remaining minority could, in all likelihood, be similarly explained with further study.

The Robertson Panel concluded that a PR campaign should be undertaken in order to "debunk" UFOs, and reduce public interest in the subject, and that civilian UFO groups should be monitored. There is evidence this is was carried out more than two decades after the Panel's conclusion; see "publicity and responses" below.

Critics (including a few panel members) would later lament the Robertson Panel's role in making UFOs a somewhat disreputable field of study.

In 1952, there was a wave of UFO reports in the United States, especially centered around Washington DC.. In response, so many civilians contacted various government agencies regarding UFO reports that daily governmental duties were impacted; the NY Times reported on 8/1/52 that "regular intelligence work has been affected." There was a general concern among the military that the hysteria and confusion generated by UFO reports could be utilized by the United States' enemies, primarily the Soviet Union..

The Air Force had earlier commissioned the Battelle Memorial Institute to scientifically study the various UFO reports collected by Sign, Grudge, and Blue Book. but Battelle insisted they needed more time to conduct a proper study. The CIA thought the question so pressing that they authorized a committee in late 1952.

The Robertson Panel first met formally on Jan 14 1953 under the direction of Howard Percy Robinson, a physicist, CIA employee and director of the DOD Weapons Evaluation Group.

The Panel had four consecutive days of formal meetings; in total, they met for about 12 hours.

The first day, they viewed two amateur motion pictures of UFOs: the Mariana UFO incident and the 1952 Utah UFRO film (the latter was taken by Navy Chief Petty Officer Delbert C. Newhouse, who had extensive experience with aerial photography). Two Navy photograph and film analysts (Lieutenants R.S. Neasham and Harry Woo) then reported their conclusions: based on more than 1000 man hours of detailed analysis, the two films depicted objects that were not any known aircraft, creature or weather phenomena. Air Force Captain Ruppelt then began a summary of Air Force efforts regarding UFO studies.

The second day, Ruppelt finished his presentation. Hynek then discussed the Battelle study, and the panel discussed with Air Force personnel the problems inherent in monitoring UFO sightings.

The third day, Air Force Major Dewey J. Fournet spoke to the panel; for over a year he had coordinated UFO affairs for the Pentagon. Fournett supported the extraterrestrial hypothesis as the best explanation for some puzzling UFO reports. For the remainder of the third day, the panel discussed their conclusions, and Robertson agreed to draft a preliminary report.

The fourth and final day, the panel rewrote and finalized their report.

The Robertson Panel's official report concluded that 90 percent of UFO sightings could be readily identified with meteorological, astronomical, or natural phenomena, and that the remaining 10 percent of UFO reports could, in all likelihood, be similarly explained with detailed study. However, **the Panel's conclusions also seemingly ignored eyewitness testimony in film cases that the objects filmed, while closer to the camera operators, were clearly-defined metallic flying saucers, not the rather indistinct lights seen on the films.**

Furthermore, the Panel suggested the Air Force should begin a "debunking" effort to reduce "public gullibility" and demystify UFO reports, partly via a PR campaign, using psychiatrists, astronomers, and assorted celebrities to significantly reduce public interest in UFOs. It was also recommended that the mass media be used for the debunking, including influential media giants like the Disney.. The primary reasoning for this recommendation lay in the belief that the Soviets might try to "mask" an actual invasion of the USA by causing a wave of false "UFO" reports to swamp the Pentagon and other military agencies, thus temporarily blinding the US government to the impending Communist invasion.

Their formal recommendation stated "That the national security agencies take immediate steps to strip the Unidentified Flying Objects of the special status they have been given and the aura of mystery they have unfortunately acquired."

Also recommended was government monitoring of civilian groups studying or researching UFOs "because of their potentially great influence on mass thinking ... the apparent irresponsibility and possible use of such groups for subversive purposes should be kept in mind."

Ruppelt's 1956 book *The Report On unidentified Flying Objects* contained the first publicly-released information about the Robertson Panel, with a summary of their proceedings and conclusions

Panel member Thornton Page would later change some of his more stridently skeptical conclusions regarding the Panel's report, and regarding UFOs in general. In his 1969 critique of the Condon Report, Page would lament the "excessive levity" he brought to the Panel's proceeding, detailing how he later thought the UFO subject deserved serious scrutiny.

Hynek's opinions changed in later years as well, so much that he became, to many, the scientifically respectable voice of UFOlogy. He would lament that the Robertson Panel had "made the subject of UFOs scientifically unrespectable, and for nearly 20 years not enough attention was paid to the subject to acquire the kind of data needed even to decide the nature of the UFO phenomenon."

According to Swords¹, the Robertson Panel's report had an "enormous" impact throughout the U.S. Government: the CIA abandoned a "major high level [UFO] investigation" planned in conjunction with the NSC. UFO research projects by personnel in the Pentagon were quashed; and Project Blue Book's hopes to establish a scientific advisory board were dashed. Blue Book was also downgraded in status and stripped of most responsibility for investigating serious, well-attested UFO cases, which were instead secretly turned over to a newly-formed division of the Air Defense Command. Directives were also issued not to discuss the unexplainable cases with the public and to reduce the percentage of "unknowns"

Though the CIA's official history suggests that the Robertson Panel's conclusions were never carried out, there is evidence that contradicts this. Perhaps the most unambiguous evidence for the Robertson Panel's covert impact on news media reporting about UFOs is a personal letter by Dr. Thornton, discovered in the Smithsonian archives by biochemist Swords. The 1966 letter, addressed to former Robertson Panel Secretary Frederick Durant, which confides that Page "helped organize the CBS TV show around the Robertson Panel conclusions." Page was no doubt referring to the CBS Reports TV broadcast of the same year, "UFOs: Friend, Foe, or Fantasy?" narrated by Water Cronkite. (Incidentally, this program was criticized for inaccurate and misleading presentations). Page's letter indicates that the Robertson Panel was still putting a negative spin on UFO news at least 13 years after the panel met.

Furthermore, according to Swords¹, there is ample evidence to prove that CSI was pressured to disband by the U.S. Government. FBI documents indicate that noted engineer Walter Riedel was pressured to resign from CSI, and not long afterwards, the group disbanded; in response, Robertson wrote to Marshall Chadwell, stating "[t]hat ought to fix the Forteans." (Robertson was referring to the devotees of American writer Charles Fort, (1874-1932), whose books argued in favor of the reality of extraterrestrial on Earth.)

Some scholars have suggested that the Robertson Panel's true objective was to justify a CIA domestic propaganda-and-surveillance campaign, rather than to investigate UFOs. Journalist Howard Blum writes that it is difficult to accept any argument that the Robertson Panel was ever intended as a serious scientific analysis: for example, the Panel's perfunctory rejection of the U.S. Navy's detailed examination of the UFO films is all but impossible to justify on scientific grounds. Similarly, Swords has argued that the Panel seems to have been designed as an elaborate theater exercise instead of a serious attempt to get to the bottom of the UFO issue. Although the Panel put on a show of evaluating some UFO evidence, its scientific analysis was cursory and its conclusions mostly likely pre-ordained. Also, the Panel only looked only at evidence in the public domain, not higher-quality classified military evidence. Psychologist David R. Saunders, a member of the University of Colorado's UFO study (the Condon Committee), had earlier expressed similar conclusions. Given that Robertson had worked as a high-level scientific-intelligence officer during World War II, he would have been familiar with the use of such tactics to hide a sensitive national-security problem from scrutiny by outsiders.

The Robertson Panel's conclusions and recommendations had a great influence on official United States policy regarding UFOs for many decades.

When the Battelle Memorial Institute finally finished their massive review of Air Force UFO cases in 1954 (called "Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14"), their results were markedly different from those of the Robertson Panel. Whereas the Robertson Panel spent only twelve hours reviewing a limited number of cases, the Battelle Institute had four full-time scientific analysts working for over two years analyzing 3201 reports. Classifying a case as "unknown" required agreement among all four analysts, whereas a "known" or conventional classification required agreement by only two analysts. Still they concluded 22% of the cases remained unsolvable. The percentage climbed to 35% when considering only the best cases and fell to 18% for the worst cases. Not only are the percentages of unknowns much higher than those for the Robertson Panel, but the higher percentages for the better cases are directly opposite one conclusion of the panel that their remaining 10% of unknowns would disappear if further investigated and more information was available. Furthermore, the Battelle study had already thrown out cases they deemed to have insufficient information to make a determination (9% of all cases). Thus, the fact that a case was classified as "unknown" had nothing to do with lack of information or investigation.

The study also looked at six characteristics of the sightings: duration, speed, number, brightness, color, and shape. For all characteristics, the knowns and unknowns differed at a highly statistically significant level, further indicating that the knowns and unknowns were distinctly different classes of phenomena.

Despite this, the summary section of the final report declared it was "highly improbable that any of the reports of unidentified aerial objects... represent observations of technological developments outside the range of present-day knowledge." A number of researchers have noted that the conclusions of the analysts were usually at odds with their own statistical results, displayed in 240 charts, tables, graphs and maps. Possibly the analysts simply had trouble accepting their own results. Others conjecture this was another result of the Robertson Panel, the conclusions being written to satisfy the new political climate within Project Blue Book following the panel.

Project Blue Book

Project Blue Book was one of a series of systematic studies of UFOs conducted by the Air Force. Started in 1952, it was the second revival of such a study. A termination order was given for the study in December 1969, and all activity under its auspices ceased in January 1970.

Project Blue Book had two goals: to determine if UFOs were a threat to national security, and to scientifically analyse UFO-related data. Thousands of UFO reports were collected, analyzed and filed. As the result of the Condon Report, which concluded there was nothing anomalous about any UFOs, Project Blue Book was ordered shut down in December 1969. This project was the last publicly known UFO research project led by the USAF. ^[1]

By the time Project Blue Book ended, it had collected 12,618 UFO reports, and concluded that most of them were misidentifications of natural phenomena (clouds, [stars](#), et cetera) or conventional aircraft. A few were considered hoaxes. 701 of the reports — about six percent — were classified as unknowns, defying detailed analysis.

Though many accepted Blue Book's final conclusions that there was nothing extraordinary about UFOs, critics — then and now — have charged that Blue Book, especially in its later years, was engaging in dubious research, or even perpetuating a cover up of UFO evidence. Evidence suggests that not only did some UFO reports bypass Blue Book entirely, but that the U.S. Air Force continued collecting and studying UFO reports after Blue Book had been discontinued, despite official claims to the contrary.

leading to ...

The Condon Committee

The **Condon Committee** was the informal name of the **University of Colorado UFO Project**, a study of UFOs, undertaken at the U of Colorado and directed by physicist Edward Condon from 1966 to 1968. The Condon Committee was instigated at the behest of the USAF which had studied UFOs since the 1940's.

After examining many hundreds of UFO files from the Air Force's Project Blue Book and from civilian UFO groups, the Committee selected 56 to analyze in detail for its final report; a document which, wrote Hynek, was intended "presumably to settle once and for all ... the vexing problem of UFOs with which the air force had been saddled for 20 years." (Hynek, 192)

This final report (Formally titled **Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects** but commonly called the **Condon Report**) was published in 1968. It officially concluded that no UFO reports were anomalous, all UFO reports had conventional explanations, and further study of the subject would not be worthwhile. The Report's conclusions were generally welcomed by the scientific community, and have been cited as a decisive factor in the generally low levels of interest regarding UFOs among academics in subsequent years. Peter Sturrock writes that the report is "the most influential public document concerning the scientific status of this (UFO) problem. Hence, all current scientific work on the UFO problem must make reference to the Condon Report."

However, critics--then and now, including some of the Committee's members--have charged that the Committee's final report was biased, unscientific and shaped by the Air Force's expectations. Furthermore, critics have noted that Condon's summaries of UFO case studies are often sharply at odds with the reports they attempt to describe.

Astrophysicist Peter Sturrock writes that "The great weight attached to this report by scientists, by the public and perhaps by officers of the federal government, is based on the presumption that the study was, in fact, scientific. This has been disputed by a number of individuals," perhaps most notably physicist James E. McDonald and astronomer Hynek. (Sturrock, 37)

Sturrock himself offered a detailed critique of the Committee, noting what he argues are often glaring errors and contradictions.

Among the most obvious discrepancies frequently noted by critics is the fact that while the Condon Report declared that all UFO reports had prosaic explanations, they simultaneously classified 30 percent of their 56 case studies as "unknown"; this was a higher percentage of unknowns than any previous Air Force UFO study. A few of the cases were judged most puzzling, even after detailed analysis, but Condon made no mention of these instances.

Beyond the Report's disputed conclusions, the Committee was plagued with infighting and controversy nearly from its inception. Of sixteen original Committee members, two were fired, one resigned in protest, and another stepped down after facing legal troubles unrelated to the Committee. Citing work by Dr. Swords, Sturrock notes "of the fifteen top staff members, at least twelve ... definitely disagreed with (Condon)" and his methods, ideas and conclusions. (Sturrock, 46) This infighting led to a high turnover rate amongst the staff.

On August 9, 1966, Low wrote a memorandum intended to persuade the more reluctant faculty to accept the UFO project. This so-called "Trick Memo" explained how the University could perform the project without risking their reputation, and how the University UFO research project could arrive at a predetermined conclusion while appearing objective. In part, Low wrote:

"Our study would be conducted almost entirely by non-believers who, though they couldn't possibly *prove* a negative result, could and probably would add an impressive body of thick evidence that there is no reality to the observations. The trick would be, I think, to describe the project so that, to the public, it would appear a totally objective study but, to the scientific community, would present the image of a group of non-believers trying their best to be objective but having an almost zero expectation of finding a saucer." Low also suggested that if the study focused less on "the physical reality of the saucer", and more on the "psychology and sociology of person and groups who report seeing UFOs", then "the scientific community would get the message". (Clark, 594)

THE MEMO: On August 9, 1966, Low wrote a memorandum intended to persuade the more reluctant faculty to accept the UFO project. It explained how the University could perform the project without risking their reputation, and how the University UFO research project could arrive at a predetermined conclusion while appearing objective. In part, Low wrote:

"Our study would be conducted almost entirely by non-believers who, though they couldn't possibly *prove* a negative result, could and probably would add an impressive body of thick evidence that there is no reality to the observations. The trick would be, I think, to describe the project so that, to the public, it would appear a totally objective study but, to the scientific community, would present the image of a group of non-believers trying their best to be objective but having an almost zero expectation of finding a saucer." Low also suggested that if the study focused less on "the physical reality of the saucer", and more on the "psychology and sociology of person and groups who report seeing UFOs", then "the scientific community would get the message". (Clark, 594)

In other words, focus on ad hominem arguments and not the data ...

Major Tony Pfaff – “lest everyone think we’re loonies.”

Herb Strentz, Prof of Journalism, in 1970 survey of UFO press coverage – estimated “Hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million or more, UFO news items were published in the nation’s daily newspapers during the years 1947-1966.

Also – he was on staff for the Condon Committee, I talked to him, and he said it was anything BUT science.

A CONTINUING STUDY HAS BEEN SUGGESTED SEVERAL TIMES, SECRETLY, INSIDE THE GOVERNMENT.

Who would do it? Relevant corporate – scientific – government – and intelligence professionals. We can keep secrets. e.g. U-boats off the Atlantic Coast during WW2. Japanese flying bombs reached as far east as Pennsylvania. No one knew.

deception: illusion, misdirection, and ridicule

ridicule:

NASA responding to astronaut reports by calling them on “bleary eyed astronauts”

commercial pilots on accusations of drinking

fighter pilots fearing they won't fly again

JAL incident over Alaska – Richard Haines told me he testified on behalf of the pilot who was quietly reinstated without a black mark. He had reported an immense craft near Alaska (as have others) and was relived of his duties.

Quote from Edgar Mitchell (see interview at www.thiemeworks.com) - yes there is a group managing it. From intelligence liaison to the joint chiefs.

One reason for managing this event: “cultural intrusion”

On **December 14, 1960**, **The Brookings Research Institute** in Washington released a report prepared during 1960 for NASA entitled "Proposed Studies on the Implications of Peaceful Space Activities for Human Affairs", including a section entitled "Implications of a Discovery of Extraterrestrial Life". (Commonly referred to as "the Brookings Institute report".) The report discusses effects of meeting extraterrestrial life: "It is possible that if the intelligence of these creatures were sufficiently superior to ours, they would choose to have little if any contact with us. . . "

SPACE-LIFE REPORT COULD BE SHOCK, UFOI, Vol. I, No. II (Dec 1960 - Jan 1961 issue)

The discovery of intelligent space beings could have a severe effect on the public, according to a research report released by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The report warned that America should prepare to meet the psychological impact of such a revelation.

The 190-page report was the result of a \$96,000 one-year study conducted by the Brookings Institution for NASA's long-range study committee.

Public realization that intelligent beings live on other planets could bring about profound changes, or even the collapse of our civilization, the research report stated.

"Societies sure of their own place have disintegrated when confronted by a superior society," said the NASA report. "Others have survived even though changed. Clearly, the better we can come to understand the factors involved in responding to such crises the better prepared we may be."

Even though the UFO problem was not indicated as a reason for the study, it undoubtedly was an important factor. Fear of public reaction to an admission of UFO reality was cited as the main reason for secrecy in the early years of the AF investigation. (Confirmed to NICAP's present director in 1952-3, when the AF was planning to release important UFO reports, also the famous Utah motion-pictures of a UFO formation.)

This report gives weight to previous thinking by scholars who have suggested that the earth already may be under close scrutiny by advanced space races. In 1958, Prof. Harold D. Lasswell of the Yale Law School stated:

"The implications of the UFOs may be that we are already viewed with suspicion by more advanced civilizations and that our attempts to gain a foothold elsewhere may be rebuffed as a threat to other systems of public order." (UFO Investigator, Dec. 1958.)

(asking a CIA agent – how should we talk about this? answer: you can't. and don't forget how easy it is to discredit people. [they'll think we're all loonies ...]" an Army Counter Intelligence Specialist]

COMETA - 1999 - speaking for Europeans – "It is clear that the Pentagon has had, and probably still has, the greatest interest in concealing, as best it can, all of this research, which may, over time, lead the United States to hold a position of great supremacy over terrestrial adversaries, while giving it a considerable response capability against a possible threat coming from space."

[On Friday July 16, 1999 an important document was published in France entitled, UFOs and Defense: What must we be prepared for? ("Les Ovni Et La Defense: A quoi doit-on se préparer?"). This ninety-page report is the result of an in-depth study of UFOs, covering many aspects of the subject, especially questions of national defense. The study was carried out over several years by an independent group of former "auditors" at the Institute of Advanced Studies for National Defense, or IHEDN, and by

qualified experts from various fields. Before its public release, it has been sent to French President Jacques Chirac and to Prime Minister Lionel Jospin.

In its final recommendations, COMETA stresses again the need to:

1. Inform all decision-makers and persons in positions of responsibility.
2. Reinforce means of investigation and study at SEPRA.
3. Consider whether UFO detection has been taken into account by agencies engaged in surveillance of space.
4. Create a strategic committee at the highest state level.
5. Undertake diplomatic action with the United States for cooperation on this most important question.
6. Study measures which might be necessary in case of emergencies.

Finally, this document is accompanied by seven interesting appendices which are worth reading even by seasoned ufologists:

1. Radar detection in France
2. Observations by astronomers
3. Life in the Universe
4. Colonization of space
5. The Roswell case and possible disinformation
6. Antiquity of the UFO phenomenon and elements for a chronology.
7. Reflection on various psychological, sociological and political aspects of the UFO phenomenon.]

Incident at Exeter – first-hand report from a NSA analyst whose son-in-law was at the base and told him the USAF issued a cover story and **that “we did not have any idea what they were.”** There was no B52 exercise that night, as claimed, and Hynek was told by officers at the base when he investigated: “We just don’t know.”

If the research IS being done ... how would we know?

a conversation with an intelligence professional about recruitment ... symptoms of crossing the threshold.

Some concluding thoughts – what might “they” be doing? Why are governments like ours still reluctant to reveal what they know when the governments of Brazil, France, Belgium, and others have opened files and called for global collaboration in responding to the phenomena? What are the genuine security concerns and implications? Why is it inappropriate to speak of the “government” as the agency that is acting in this instance?

A Short List of Selected Resources

This abbreviated list is intended to suggest a little of the context in which this complex domain might be explored.

Public Opinion by Walter Lippmann (Free Press: Simon and Schuster: copyright 1922 renewed 1949)

Propaganda by Edward Bernays (Ig Publishing: Copyright 1928, renewed 2005)

The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects by Edward J. Ruppelt (Ace Books: 1956) - (compare first and second editions)

Flying Saucers: Top Secret by Major Donald E. Keyhole (G. P. Putnam's Sons: 1960)

Flying Saucers by Coral E. Lorenzen. The New American Library: 1962.

Flying Saucers: Serious Business by Frank Edwards (Lyle Stuart Inc.: 1966)

The Invisible Government by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross. Random House. New York. 1964.

Incident at Exeter. John G. Fuller. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1966.

The controversy over unidentified flying objects in America: 1896-1973 by David Jacobs (Thesis - University of Wisconsin, Madison: 1973)

The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence by Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks (Dell: 1974)

The UFO Experience: A Scientific Inquiry by J. Allen Hynek (1975, reissued Marlowe and Company 1998)

The Tears of Autumn by Charles McCarry (Fawcett 1976 reissued Overlook TP: 2007)

Wilderness of Mirrors: Intrigue, Deception, And the Secrets that Destroyed Two of the Cold War's Most Important Agents [James Jesus Angleton and William Harvey] by David C. Martin (The Lyons Press: 1980)

Uninvited Guests by Richard Hall. Aurora Press. 1988.

Unconventional Flying Objects: A Scientific Analysis by Paul R. Hill. Hampton Roads Publishing Company. 1995.

The Closed World: Computers and the Politics of Discourse in Cold War America by Paul N. Edwards (The MIT Press: 1996)

The UFO Book: Encyclopedia of the Extraterrestrial by Jerome Clark. Visible Ink. New York. 1998.

The UFO Encyclopedia : The Phenomenon from the Beginning (2 Volume Set) by Jerome Clark. Omnigraphics. 1998.

The UFO Enigma by Dr. Peter A. Sturrock. Warner Books. 1999.

The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters by Frances Stonor Saunders. The New Press. New York. 1999. (published in the UK under the title "Who Paid the Piper?" by Granta Publications.

CE-5: Close Encounters of the Fifth Kind by Richard F. Haines, Ph. D. (Sourcebooks Inc. 1999)

Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky (Pantehon: 2002 (reprinted edition))

The Missing Times: News Media Complicity in the UFO Cover-up by Terry Hansen. Xlibris: 2000.

UFOs and the National Security State by Richard M. Dolan (revised edition). Hampton Roads Publishing Company. 2002.

Change of State: Information, Policy and Power by Sandra Braman (The MIT Press: 2006).

selected works by Jacques Vallee:

Passport to Matagonia: On UFOs, Folklore, and Parallel Worlds by Jacques Vallee (McGraw-Hill: 1993)

Anatomy of a Phenomenon: Unidentified Objects in Space – A Scientific Appraisal by Jacques Valle (NTC/Contemporary Publishing: 1965)

Revelations by Jacques Valle (Ballantine Books – reprint: 1992)

Confrontations by Jacques Vallee (Independent Publishers Group: 1990)

Dimensions by Jacques Vallee (Souvenir Press: 1988)

items to google:

“How to Build a UFO ... Story” by Richard Thieme. originally published in Internet Underground and anthologized in numerous collections.

“Are There UFOs on Mars?” by Richard Thieme, at www.thiemeworks.com, with a collection of interviews

“I was a Victim of the KGB” by Richard Thieme, published in Common Dreams (March 16 2005)