

## **UFOs and Science**

### ***A long history of preconceptions, prejudices and recurrent misunderstandings***

© by Luciano Perla

The scientific world has often taken a critical stance with regard to the UFO question, so much to represent almost a constant in the history of the UFO-science relationship, and an example of incommunicability, prejudices, and misunderstandings. On the other hand, this also represents a recurrent and natural sociological phenomenon, expressing the difficulties of dialogue that can be determined between heterogeneous social and cultural disputes.

The scientific environment is, by its very nature, a cultural context closely constrained and polarised by precise conceptual and procedural philosophies, which therefore leave little room for what does not fit into this philosophy of view. The "UFO phenomenon" Yes and place since its beginnings (by convention from the now distant 1947) and for its peculiarity, elusive and random, what an ambiguous and somewhat compromising, perennial and precarious balance between myth and striking objective reality. The media played a significant role in the definition of this (misleading) stereotype, which still influences the image of the UFO question. The difficulties, the problems, and the misunderstandings that have arisen from the outset in the UFO-science debate appear almost inevitable.

The mistake, or rather the misunderstanding, which is the basis of this debate is precisely in wanting to put in the foreground the science in the discussion of the UFO question. Mind you, the UFO question also concerns scientific issues, science is always looking for an objective acknowledgement, a confirmation, of the existence of intelligent life forms in the universe. The point is that the facts and events presented by the UFO case, based on the overall data of the case study itself, do not represent properly and directly a scientific question.

The term UFO is eloquent and substantially unique in this respect. UFOs are configured (based on facts) properly as "aircraft", technological artifacts, performance and characteristics of these objects, incidentally, exclude a terrestrial origin. So UFOs represent, as we would see, in the first place an issue that directly relates to issues and sociological issues rather than physical sciences. Since the presence (and activity) of flying objects of extraterrestrial nature on our planet, it prospers relationships and/or interactions between cultures and civilizations on a cosmic scale (!), with the relative and remarkable, if not enormous, implications that this entails. Consideration of the latter which represents the appropriate key for the interpretation of the UFO question, and also the real and main motivation (veed, not directly visible) that underlies the controversial and inconclusive debates of the confrontation UFO-Science.

If we consider the history and vicissitudes of the UFO phenomenon we see that the attention for these objects, in fact, has not arisen from the scientific circles, at least officially, but from the environments of the civil and military aviations of the whole planet, in particular by the USAF. The projects on UFO studies promoted by the USAF, by Project Sing (1947), Project Grudge (1949) to reach the Blue Book (1952), represent the best-known official governmental documentation on this phenomenon until 1968, the year of the publication of the infamous Condon Report of the University of Colorado. Now the fact that the attention to UFO question historically starts from the military environments, in the specific case by the U.S. military aviation, appears completely natural and connects, inter alia, directly and properly (as mentioned above) at the very end of UFO, Unidentified Flyng object, then unidentified flying object, artifact, technological product. The UFO case is very eloquent and unequivocal in this respect. Very different term of "phenomenon", as generally, and improperly, are often defined these events (even in this text...), much more generic and generally referred, in fact, to natural physical phenomena. It therefore appears entirely consequent that the subjects involved in the foreground in the UFO question are historically represented by the personnel of the military and civilian aviations of the whole planet, in particular by the pilots of the military air Forces, because In the surveillance and defence of the national territories. The fact that the focus on the UFO issue has progressively developed mainly in the US

appears equally consequent, in view of the role of the US in the international political and strategic framework. All the more so if one takes into account the climate of "Cold War" which was determined at the end of the Second World War.

When at the end of the Forties the U.S. Aviation Ministry received a report from the director of the Air Technical Intelligence Center with the explicit statement and conclusion:-Flying saucers are real-(UFOs are real), a question was posed Of fundamental importance for the American government, both in military terms and in political terms: if UFOs are real what is their origin? Are they of Soviet origin or, as they seem to indicate the peculiar characteristics of these objects, of extraterrestrial origin? Question as disturbing as it is surprising that it brings, as mentioned above, to research and verification projects on this issue by the USAF.

The Blue Book project, closed in December of 1969, substantially confirms the conclusions of the previous and surprising reports of the Sign and Grudge project that pose the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs among the main, if not the principal, assumptions that emerge To the analysis of facts. Even if, as we shall see, such evidence will systematically be eluded. The sensational radar-visual sightings of Washington (luglio1952) will complete the framework of the events that lead, under the pressure of the media, to the so-called Robertson Panel (January 1953). Governmental, military and Civil Commission, (ten members: Six researchers, the director of ATIC and three of the CIA) in order to assess the situation and to define a philosophy of conduct, official, with regard to this issue, with the main purpose of Reassure public opinion. The notable implications of the conclusion that UFOs represent flying objects of extraterrestrial origin is the keystone of the whole UFO issue. The final recommendations of the Robertson Panel are therefore aimed at reducing the UFO issue to the lowest terms.

UFOs were increasingly a matter that was far beyond the USAF's direct competences, configuring itself as a matter of considerable socio-cultural implications and unpredictable developments. Taking time, directly involving the scientific environment in the UFO affair, represented a skillful and effective strategy of the USAF (American government) to cool a situation, and a question, as said by unpredictable developments. This is also strong of the fact, determinant, that UFOs were not (and do not represent) a direct social, economic or political problem, and therefore a question subject to easily fall back into the shadows as soon as the media reflectors move elsewhere. Also in consideration, even determined, that this reality seems not intended to interfere openly and directly in human affairs, at least in appearance.

The Project Blue Book closes, as mentioned, officially in March of 1969 and not by definitive conclusions, not that: UFOs do not pose a threat to national security.

The USAF in this way does not compromise, save "goat and cabbage", safeguard its professionalism, having performed its function, and involves science in the UFO issue, in line with the decisions of Robertson Panell, and then with the American government.

It is In fact reasonable to assume that the aforementioned historical events of the UFO question represent only the public aspect of these events, while the actual search and control of the whole affair took place, and they unfold, elsewhere and in the shade, and to Global.

To involve science in the UFO affair was then the USAF who commissioned the University of Colorado to undertake a study on these objects, the direction of which in turn entrusted the direction of the project to Dr. Edward U. Condon (physicist, known for taking part in his time Manhattan plan, for the realization of the first atomic boom).

The Condon report, or the Colorado Project, is therefore not an initiative stemming from the scientific community in order to assume a unique and official position on the UFO issue, on the basis of systematic and organic research and at international level, but A further initiative of the USAF (U.S. government laws). Initiative financed with its own funds, with the specific purpose of covering up the whole issue. Directly involving science in the "UFO phenomenon", deviating and configuring UFOs from unidentified flying objects to the generic phenomenon to be defined, represented a skillful political strategy and, as we would see, an evident instrumentalization of Science. All the vicissitudes and background of the Condon report seem to confirm this reality.

Beginning with the resignation of two of the main members of the Condon Commission: Dr. David Saunders and Dr. Norman Levine put on the door by Condon himself.

Dr. Norman Levine had laid out a memorial that pointed out that the Condon Commission was nothing more than a skillful hoax, behind which was concealed the policy line and the decisions of the Robertson Committee, and therefore of the American government. Norman Levine had accidentally discovered a document written before the signing of the contract with the USAF, signed by the Administrator of the Condon Committee, Dr. Robert Low, on the criteria to be used for drafting the above report. Criteria anticipating the negative conclusions of this report (!). Superfluous every comment.

Dr. Norman and Dr. Saunders communicated this memorial to several colleagues, including Dr. James E. Mac Donald, physicist of the University of Chicago (at the time a world authority in the field of meteorology), who for some time had placed his attention to the controversial vicissitudes of the UFO question. The criticisms posed by Mac Donald against the Colorado Project as said put the two researchers at the door. Later, David Saunders, Mac Donald, and Alen Hinek (scientific adviser to the USAF dal1947) will represent the main figures of the American academic world who denounce and dispute the American government's policy and maneuvers against UFO question. The US intelligence organizational machine will still achieve the goal of freezing and reducing the UFO issue to the lowest terms.

The Condon ratio (three volumes and 1485 pages) polarized on critical positions, and of contradictory crater, beyond the compromising and vicissitudes that led to its drafting, cannot in any way represent a scientific report on the UFO question. It does not represent, as already noted, an initiative created by the international scientific community, as an organic and systematic research in order to define a unique position on this issue, even if that relationship has been approved by the National Academy of the US sciences. You have to consider the circumstances and pressures, and then analyze the vicissitudes, which led the ANS to such a decision. The Condon report therefore does not represent a scientific report on UFOs, but a skillful attempt to give the systematic reduction of the facts of UFO cases a scientific appearance, because of the decisions made by the Robertson Panell. This is what emerges from the analysis of the events that led to the definition of this relationship.

On the other hand to confirm this picture of the UFO-science history are the equally significant vicissitudes which characterized in France the constitution of the Gepan (Groupe d'étude des phénomènes aérospatiaux non indentifiés), group studies Geospatial phenomena Unidentified, French government agency for the Study of UFOs (1978). Today reconstituted in Sepra (Service d'études des phénomènes rares aérospatiaux), established within the CNES (Centro National de la recherches scietifique).

Again, the initiative that led to the establishment of the Gepan (1977-1988) leaves, as in the USA, an institution for the defence of the national territory, the Ihedn (Institt des Hautes études de Defese Nationale), as a consequence of the accumulation of Detailed reports on UFOs that came to command and headquarters from the military and civilian aviation, and the Gendarmerie, French. Gepan's staff was limited to two full-time people, the director, Prof. Claudie Poher (physicist) and the Secretary, and the part-time collaboration of some researchers of the CNES.

On 378 analyzed UFO reports (1978) 25% are unidentified, with the same characteristics of the 701unidentified cases of the Project Blue Book (5.5% dei12618 examined at the USAF), data confirming the specificity and peculiarity of the UFO phenomenon, which Technological artifact of a non-terrestrial nature.

After one year of activity, Prof. Poher will abandon the Gepan officially for personal reasons. That's what Dr. Alan Esterle directing the Gepan until 1983, when the CNES assigns to Alan Esterle other assignments. The management of the Agency is therefore assigned to a technician, Jean-Jaques Velasco, and the Gepan is reconstituted in Sepra, with considerable reduction of the funds.

The Gepan does not from, like the USAF, definitive conclusions on the UFO issue. However, some detailed reports on specific cases of UFO sightings that the body considered are eloquent and unequivocal. Reports that as stated however confirm and reiterate the concept of unidentified

flying object, as a technological artifact of a non-terrestrial nature. The case of "Amaranto" (France, 21/10/82) and the case of Renato Nicolai (France, 8/1/1981), represent two significant examples that affirm this concept. Detailed and eloquent reports, confirming once more the implicit conclusions of the USAF, that the conclusions of almost all private UFO research groups scattered across the planet, of the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs.

The facts and the background that have marked (and that mark) the research projects on UFO's across the Atlantic are repropounded punctually in Europe, in this case in France. The comments, opinions and confidences of the researchers of the French CNES who worked and/or collaborated with the Gegan, only confirm the systematic reticence of the planetary establishment towards the UFO affair. Starting with the real reasons that led Claudie Phoer to resign from the Gegan: The impossibility of overcoming the obstacles that directly or indirectly arise in addressing the UFO issue. Difficulties that as we have seen are right by the unanimous and occult decisions taken by the planetary power in order to hinder the clarification of this issue, as a consequence of the profound socio-cultural implications that the UFO question entails. Opinion and position shared by Jean-Francois Gile, researcher of the CNES who collaborated with the Gegan, for which the causes of the Blak-out of the UFO affair are fundamentally of socio-political nature. Others such as Pierre Guérin, astrophysicist of the CNES, explain the reticence of the scientific community in regard to the UFO question as a ruling conformity in the face of an ambiguous and compromising business, and by the fact that today science is not able to integrate this question conceptually, the times are not ripe. Dr. Jean-Pier Petit, another researcher of CNES who collaborated with the Gegan, even compares the CNES to the Condon Commission. So the CNES as a mirror for the larks, as a on-time commentary Francois Gile, while the actual research, and control, of the whole UFO affair takes place, as already mentioned, elsewhere and secretly.

To complete the framework of the UFO-Science reports in January of 1998, thirty years after the Condon report, it was diffused by the Society for Scientific Exploration (Society for Scientific Exploration) the concluding report of a meeting organized by This institution between a group of researchers and professors of various scientific disciplines, and some well-known scholars of the UFO phenomenon. Meeting which essentially is configured as independent scientific review of the questionable Condon relationship.

The Society for Scientific Exploration is an organization founded in 1982 by the American physicist Peter Sturrok of Stanford University, with the stated aim of promoting the study of all those phenomena that remain, for various reasons, ignored or excluded from Context of scientific research.

The organization is funded by private contributions, in this case with the financial contribution of billionaire Laurence Rockefeller, also known for his interest in the UFO issue.

The conference was held at the Congress of Pocantico Tarrytown, New York, between September 30 and October 4, 1997. A commission of nine scientists, directed by Peter Sturrok, examined some of the most significant data of UFO cases, in order to evaluate both the objectivity (the physical evidence) and the interpretation of the UFO events, also in relation, as said, to Conclusions of the Condon report. Among the UFO cases examined, the aforementioned sighting of Trans-en-Provence (Renato Nicolai January 8, 1981), and the case of the helicopter pilot Coyne Lawrence (Captain Lawrence J. Coyne, Ohio October 18 of 1973). Cases selected and documented, as mentioned, by a group of well-known scholars of UFO events, such as Jean-Jasques Velasco del Septra (CNES). Subsequently, this commission found itself on 28 and 30 October of 1997 in San Francisco, to discuss and define the final report of the meeting.

The conclusions of this Convention itself disagreed with the conclusions of the Condon report, as they disagree with this report on the fact that science has nothing to gain in deepening the study of UFOs, nor does it trace the substance. Since this report argues that, "There is insufficient evidence to support the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs."

Apart from considerations that can be found only by a rooted conceptual conformism, out of place in this case, it is still difficult to understand the logical-deductive criteria that led to conclusions that

with all evidence Contrast with the reality of the facts. Also in consideration of the particular and significant cases of the UFO case studies examined at this conference.

Objectively, the Committee organized by Sturrok could not be opposed to the ANS, who in his time endorsed the Condon Commission, without re-opening the "Pandora's Box" (the remarkable and unpredictable implications of the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs) that had Consists. In view of the fact that little, or nothing, has changed in the attitude of Governments towards the UFO issue since the publication of the Condon report.

In other words, the Sturrok report simply "Softens" the Colorado Project's conclusions, and configures itself as the "modern " and independent (?) surrogate of the latter. Leaving substantially unchanged the artificial and difficult relationship UFO-science. Especially because this initiative, if born with objectives and in different circumstances of the Condon Commission, does not represent (like the Colorado Project) in any way the result of an effective and organic scientific research on UFOs.

The recent and Sibilino Comet Report (Francia1999) *Les ovni et La défense: A quoi doit-on se prèparer?* (UFO and defense: to what should they prepare you?) Drafted by a private group of former military and consultants of the authoritative ihedn (Institut des hautes études de défense nationale), it does not reinforce and complete the above considerations. This report concludes, in essence, with the explicit affirmation of the physical objectivity of UFOs as intelligent will-controlled aircraft, and that only the extraterrestrial hypothesis can take into account all available data. Now if we consider the signatories of this report, professionals who had a prominent position in the Ihedn (the preface to the report is the former director of Ihedn, the general of the Air Force Bernard Norlan), or in specific military institutions and And that Gepan itself was also set up on the initiative of the IHEDN, this report assumes a particular significance and relevance, reflecting the specificity and particularity of the UFO question. Paradoxically (maybe not...) Specific evaluations and conclusions on the UFO issue come from a committee of private citizens who in the past have occupied positions of importance in specific military and civilian institutions, and not by the Gepan, wanted by the same Institutions. The comet report is very eloquent in defining the UFO question, and perhaps even more so for what it does not say...

These events and these considerations highlight the ambiguous and uncomfortable, (sometimes embarrassing) position of science in the face of the peculiarity of the UFO question, which concerns and does not concern science, and the fact that when science is involved Directly or indirettamete involved in this issue appears as an instrument for purposes and purposes other than those of actual scientific research. This is what is substantially apparent from the Condon report and the Gepan's vicissitudes. The reasons for this, as mentioned, can be found right by the inherent peculiarity of this issue, as a result of the unpredictable and significant implications that this entails.

The first consideration to be made is, as we have seen, that the scientific community did and substantially put, so to speak, to the window in regard to the UFO phenomenon. Since it does not exist, and well emphasize it once more, a unique and official position of the scientific community on this issue, as a result of an organic and systematic research. Consideration which raises, inter alia, at least perplexity and relates directly to the fact that specific governmental, military and civil environments (including specific scientific circles, just think of statements, made in times Different, and on different occasions, by more than one NASA astronaut), who, objectively, know well the terms and implications of the UFO issue. So the attitude of the scientific community towards the UFO question does nothing more than reflect the attitude of the governments involved in this issue. In other words, the "freezing" of the UFO question implemented by the planetary constituted power of reflex inhibits and/or makes it impracticable, directly or indirectly, initiatives aimed at constituting a systematic research and verification programme and International level on the UFO issue.

In any case, irrespective of the systematic reticence of the Governments with regard to the UFO phenomenon, the fact of the absence of a unique and official position of science on UFOs represents the key point of the framework of the UFO-science reports. As it places in question and discussion the scientific methodological principles, which involve in the first place the analysis and the

verification of the facts (data). It follows that the critical attitude that is often configured in the UFO Science report is, in fact, an artificial stereotype. Since it does not represent, as mentioned, a position of due consideration, and thus the result of a specific research, but objectively and substantially points of view and specific opinions (which usually show few, if not non-existent, knowledge about the terms of this issue) within the scientific environment, orchestrated by the media. With regard to the media, we must not forget the reciprocal interactions and relationships that exist between the media and the constituted power.

On the other hand, the attitude based on a specific philosophical line of the academic world with regard to the UFO question must not amaze too much. You have to consider the environment and the circumstances. On the one hand the professional "Vizio" that characterizes the researcher, which tends to conceptualise the UFO question in the context and in the logic of "phenomenon". Raising often Machiavellian and sophistic disquisitions on the evidence of the objectivity of UFOs, objections that can be found only in the scarce, or non-existent, knowledge of the UFO casuistics within the scientific environment. Especially in reason to the consideration that the physical and coherent, and practicable, to a discourse on physical phenomena natural and not, objectively, in the UFO question. Since, by force of things, "physical evidence" (often pretestuosa, precisely), the UFO landed in Piazza Navona, in Chanselise or at the Central Parck, depends primarily on the will, and/or the availability of those who long visited, and/or operates, on our planet, and not Certainly by the will or professionalism of the ufologists. The direct and blatant physical evidence, which would in fact be tantamount to contact (...), is not our faculty. of source to the UFO question we are not, evidently, the conductors. On the high side the evidence of the objectivity of UFOs, and of their extraterrestrial origin, have been more than obvious and, in fact, objective (physical), represented by the facts of the overall UFO case, for example, from the traces left to the ground by these objects, in reason to weights of tens of tons, or, another example, by the radar-visual feedback). But as said there is no more deaf than those who can not or do not want to hear.

These considerations represent, incidentally, a central element of the misunderstandings and inconsistencies of the science-UFO confrontation. Since it is not possible to express, as already noted, a coherent opinion of a specific issue irrespective of the knowledge of the elements that compose it.

Then the academic environment, like any community, is subject to all phenomena involving sociocultural interactions. Competition, image problems, conservatism, fear of ridicule, and positions of opportunity, linked perhaps to career issues, represent elements that may have a role not indifferent, often decisive, in influencing points of view and Attitudes of researchers in the public debate of the UFO issue. In addition to this, as paradoxical as this may seem, the academic environment is not immune from socio-cultural conditionings and polarizations, such as rooted anthropocentric positions.

It should also be borne in mind that the media often advocates, and often also registers, the involvement of the scientific community in the UFO issue. Because in one way or another they represent, or arbitrarily pose, the public's bass drum, and hence the people's intermediaries in the debate on this issue, and who have historically seen science as an appropriate interlocutor in these events. The private UFO research groups have gradually become established and affirmed later, in order to clarify on this issue also, in fact, in consequence of the ambiguous (sometimes incredible) position of science on these events. Position that actually represents, as we have seen, individual people's viewpoints within the scientific community.

The conflicts, or rather the misunderstandings, which were determined in the comparison UFO-science do not represent only the result of the inconsistencies of the scientific world with regard to the UFO question, but also from the philosophy of the media that often tends to Favoring the sensational rather than the information (in bad or good faith), with series and TV episodes on UFOs that most often leave the time they find. The media therefore played a significant role in the UFO-science confrontation also in view of the fact that the UFO question was, and is, the subject of the interest of a nourished and "Coloured" range of people, and characters, who have polluted and misled The image of that question. "Ufologi " who have often slipped the UFO question in the

context of the incredible, how unlikely, cauldron of the "mysterious mysteries" and then make it an argument obviously compromising in the eyes of the scientific environment. Account this that directly shifts the discourse on ufologists.

Unlike the considerable socio-cultural homogeneity of the scientific environment, people who have supported and developed the discourse on UFOs, or otherwise involved for various reasons in this issue, and characterized, on the contrary, by a marked variability Sociocultural that ranges from housewife to astronomer. This is due to the large number of people directly or indirectly involved in the UFO case studies, or more generally in the UFO question. It is therefore natural, and must not amaze, the multifaceted image of the ufological Panorama, and its, as said, "coloured" lapels. The interpretation and meaning of a specific phenomenon, or of specific experiences, and also the expression of our vision of reality, and therefore suffers considerably of cultural influences. Regardless of who, deliberately, has exploited the UFO question (which lends itself well) for personal purposes and purposes, or as a guiding element of self-styled currents of thought of mythic-religious mould, New Age style, and which has misled and deteriorated the image of the whole question. Facets that have almost constantly characterized the landscape ufological, determining not little confusion and perplexity to those who sought, and seeks, a reference in order to define and configure the UFO question in its reality. Landmarks that still exist and have consolidated over time. Confusion and disorientation which, among other things, meant that the media gave space to characters, and/or groups, as "coloured" as they were unreliable, thus bringing water to the mill of detractors of the UFO question.

This is a complex situation, which requires discrimination and weighting in order not to risk, as we say, to throw away the dirty water together with the child, a serious mistake that many people often make against this issue. Overcoming this temptation and adopting a critical constructive sense, far from preconceptions and prejudices, has not been, it must be said, a very widespread attitude of the academic environment, indeed. Besides this sociocultural conditionings and polarizations do not leave the time that they find even in this environment. Then, as we have seen, certain is the fact that there is no political will to clarify the UFO question, and therefore so to speak the socio-cultural atmosphere conducive to individual initiatives in order to develop and sustain this discourse within of the scientific environment.

On the other hand, the emotional attitudes, the "warheads against the wall", of many ufologists as a response to the critical position taken by science in relation to this question, is thus to say an operative error of the ufological environment in managing the Comparison with the conceptual and philosophical conformism of the scientific environment. Environment that is ill-suited to an issue that is not, incidentally, (as emerged from these considerations) properly and directly a scientific question. So giving science some responsibility for the fact that the UFO issue continues (despite everything) to be suspended between myth and striking reality, means not to fully assess the real meaning and scope of this issue. The ufology, it is good to affirm it once more, it is not a religion, nor much less a philosophy, and even less a science, it represents simply, one makes to say, a series of facts and documented events (one must as said to overcome prejudices and preconceptions, and to have the Willingness and interest to document themselves), which can find consistent explanation only in extraterrestrial terms.

The perspectives and the remarkable implications of the presence of flying objects of extraterrestrial nature on our planet, represent the real underlying motivation that "freezes" the UFO question, because apparently conflicting with the comparison Historical-cultural (?). Both the attitude of non-contact, blatant and official, of this reality with our civilization, and the reticence of the planetary Establishment against the UFO question (which, objectively, knows well the terms and implications of these events) seem Support these considerations.

The UFO-Science debate appears in many ways an inconclusive confrontation almost discounted. On the one hand there is (in reality) a unique and official position of science on UFOs, in accordance with an organic, systematic, and internationally research, on this issue (which would not do that would confirm the extraterrestrial origin of these events), The positions of specific people to this issue within the scientific environment therefore do not make text to that effect. On the other

hand, the UFO "phenomenon" to the analysis of the facts does not represent a properly and specifically scientific question. The term-UFO phenomenon-which is often used to define such events is improper and misleading, since it is of flying objects, technological artifacts (case studies UFO in the hand), which is spoken, while phenomenon, as already mentioned above, represents a very generic term Mostly related to natural physical phenomena. Flying objects whose characteristics involve an extraterrestrial origin of the same. The close Encounters of the third type, for example, only put emphasis on this. So a question that presents relationships and/or interactions between cultures and civilizations on a cosmic scale (...), with all the notable (if not huge) implications that ensues. Perspective that is configured as a cultural confrontation and event of historical significance.

The real underlying problem of the UFO question is not the objectivity of these (long-established) events, but what they represent and entail for human culture and civilisation. The decision (rightly or wrongly) of the planetary Establishment to "freeze" the UFO question seems, as said, to support these considerations. Perhaps this decision is (at present) the only possible (?) in relation to the current and overall sociocultural planetary configuration.

The prospects and implications arising from the presence, and/or activity, of flying objects of extraterrestrial nature on our planet, seem to place such a reality in conflict (?) with the current sociocultural configuration of our civilization, which appears Unprepared and/or incompatible (?) to such prospects. That this represents a coherent and natural situation in reason of the historical-cultural process, or in some way piloted (inside and/or "from the outside", or both, because of specific opportunities and prerogatives), represents a remarkable and Decisive question to be defined.

In conclusion, the UFO-science confrontation, beyond prejudices, preconceptions and misunderstandings, as said appears an inconclusive debate almost discounted, since in reality such a confrontation does not concern what it is, but what it represents: And what it represents must Confront the historical-cultural process.

© Luciano Perla 2004

V2 C1 2006 P. 22-4-2016

## Bibliography

Henry Durrant IL LIBRO NERO DEI DISCHI VOLANTI 1971 Edizioni Dellavalle

Alan Esterle IL GEPAN e lo studio del fenomeno UFO CNES 1979

Pierre Guérin (CNES) lettera aperta. Lumières dans la Nuit N. 215-216 1982. Traduzione di Pier Luigi Sani

Jean-François Gille (CNES). Lettera aperta. Conoscenze N.2 1983 (GAC) di Saint-Giles. Traduzione di Pier Luigi Sani.

Roberto Pinotti GEPAN: la grande illusione GDM 209 pg.61 1989

Gildas Bourdais Cometa Report 1999

Frank Edwar La verità sui Dischi Volanti. Longanesi 1969

Roberto Pinotti UFO TOP SECRET. Bompiani 1995

FOIA Documento CIA 12-03-1953 (<http://www:bralpha.sever.com/articoles.8258.html>)

FOIA Documento US AIR FORCE Project Sing (<http://www:lesovnis/html/foia.30/html>)

FOIA Documento US AIR FORCE. FBI Project Blue Book (<http://www:foia.gov.htm>)

SEPRA/CNES Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (<http://www.marcogee.free.fr/sepra.html>)



Society for Scientific Exploration

([http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/articles/ufo\\_reports/sturrock](http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/articles/ufo_reports/sturrock))

Illobrand von Ludwiger (<http://www.nidsci.org/articles/haines.html>)

Richard Haines (<http://www.nicap.dadsol.co.uk/bio-haines.htm>)

Mark Rodeghier (<http://www.nicap.dadsol.co.uk/bio-haines.htm>)

John Schuessler (<http://home.mho.net/schuessler>)

UFO-USAF. Casi specifici (<http://www.ufoevidence.org/documents/doc632.htm>)

Mac Donald (<http://www.cohenufo.org/condon.html>)

Alen Hinek (<http://www.cohenufo.org/condon.html>)

Promemoria Robert Low ([http://keyholepublishing.com/book\\_review\\_ufo\\_mag.htm](http://keyholepublishing.com/book_review_ufo_mag.htm))

Rapporto Condon (<http://www.digilander.libero.it/mirkopellegrin/html>)

<http://www.ufoscience.org/history/swords.pdf>



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION  
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

26 January 1953

Henry Holt & Company  
383 Madison Avenue  
New York 17, N.Y.

Dear Sirs:

This will acknowledge your letter of recent date regarding a proposed book on "Flying saucers" by Major Donald E. Keyhoe, U. S. Marine Corps, retired.

We in the Air Force recognize Major Keyhoe as a responsible, accurate reporter. His long association and cooperation with the Air Force, in our study of unidentified flying objects, qualifies him as a leading civilian authority on this investigation.

All the sighting reports and other information he listed have been cleared and made available to Major Keyhoe from Air Technical Intelligence records, at his request.

The Air Force, and its investigating agency, "Project Bluebook," are aware of Major Keyhoe's conclusion that the "Flying Saucers" are from another planet. The Air Force has never denied that this possibility exists. Some of the personnel believe that there may be some strange natural phenomena completely unknown to us, but that if the apparently controlled maneuvers reported by many competent observers are correct, then the only remaining explanation is the interplanetary answer.

Very Truly Yours  
*Albert M. Chop*  
Albert M. Chop  
Air Force Press Desk

MINISTERO DELLA DIFESA  
UFFICIO DELLE PUBBLICHE INFORMAZIONI  
Washington 25, D.C.

26 Gennaio 1953

Henry Holt & Company  
383 Madison Avenue  
New York 17, N.Y.

Egregi Signori,

accusiamo ricevuta della Vostra recente lettera riguardante la proposta di un libro sui 'dischi volanti' del Maggiore a riposo Donald E. Keyhoe, dei Marines degli Stati Uniti. Noi dell'Aeronautica Militare conosciamo il Maggiore Keyhoe come un relatore responsabile ed accurato. La sua lunga permanenza fra noi dell'Aeronautica e la collaborazione che egli ci ha fornito sullo studio da noi condotto sugli oggetti volanti non identificati, lo qualificano come una autorità civile di primo piano per queste indagini. Tutti i rapporti degli avvistamenti e le altre informazioni che ha riunito, sono stati forniti e resi disponibili per il Maggiore Keyhoe dagli archivi del Centro Informazioni Tecniche dell'Aeronautica, dietro sua richiesta. L'Aeronautica Militare ed il suo ufficio investigativo, il 'Project Bluebook', sono a conoscenza della conclusione cui è pervenuto il Maggiore Keyhoe, secondo la quale i 'dischi volanti' provengono da un altro pianeta. L'Aeronautica non ha mai negato l'esistenza di questa possibilità. Alcuni credono che si tratti di strani fenomeni naturali a noi sconosciuti; tuttavia, se i fatti apparentemente controllati riferiti da molti osservatori competenti sono esatti, allora la sola spiegazione che ci rimane è la risposta interplanetaria.

Distinti saluti,  
Albert M. Chop  
Ufficio Stampa  
dell'Aeronautica Militare