

minus 10 or 20 percent. But even if they were off by 100% in altitude and size (a factor of two: for example, perhaps the object was only 75,000 ft. high and 15 ft. in diameter) there would be no natural phenomenon or manmade device which could explain the sighting. It is interesting to note that the 30 ft. size calculated by Mr. Mitchell is the same as the calculated size of the object seen by C.B. Moore almost exactly a year earlier, if Moore's object had been at an altitude of 100,000 ft.

A reasonable question to ask is, why didn't Elterman mention the successful triangulation? Perhaps he never saw the report by the Mathematical Reduction Unit, but this seems hard to believe since he was the Project Scientist. Clearly Elterman was aware of the sightings in April and May 1950, and also of other multiple witness sightings and also of other multiple filmings of objects.

One very weak aspect of the Project was pointed out in Elterman's report: there was no provision for in-depth analysis of the photographic data they had. According to Mr. Warren Kott, who was in charge of Land-Air, as stated by Elterman, "A formal report covering the year's vigilance has not been issued since the contract contained no such provision." Kott pointed out that "...a time correlation study should be made covering the film and verbal recordings at both Askania stations. This would assure that these records did not contain significant material. However, such a study is quite laborious, and would require about thirty man-days to complete. Again, no provisions are contained in the contract for this study." (Emphasis added.)

Pity the poor Air Force Cambridge Research Lab. The data were available, but there was no money to analyze it. Guilty of dereliction of scientific duty or of simple stupidity? You be the judge!

Mr. Kott went on to say that Land-Air personnel might be able to analyze the data later on in their spare time, but there are no records available to show whether or not that was done. According to Elterman's report, at the end of the project all the film and tape recordings were sent to the GRD. In 1952 Capt. E.J. Ruppelt, the first director of Project Blue Book, learned of the White Sands/Holloman movies and tried to locate the data. He was not able to do so. (Reference 13)

Elterman's report clearly was not complete, since the bulk of the hard data had not yet been analyzed. One wonders, therefore, why he repeatedly stated that "no information" was gained. Was he a "sloppy" scientist? Did he have his mind made up already and think that he didn't need further analysis to confirm his feelings? Was he afraid of what might be found in the data? Was he trying to prevent the rest of the scientific community from discovering that the data proved the reality of TRUFOS? Unfortunately, we don't know the answers to these questions.

All right, AFCL, where are those films?

The previous discussion shows two things: (a) the data to prove