

# PROJECT 1947

---

## Intelligence Budget for Fiscal Year 2022 Section 345 Support for and Oversight of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force

Commentary by Jan L. Aldrich

The [2022 FY budget in this section](#) contains instructions concerning the actions of the UAP (Unidentified Aerial Phenomena) Task Force, DNI (Director of National Intelligence) and Secretary of DOD, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security and the US Navy. While the instructions outline the various tasks assigned to the combined agencies, many of these directions invite questions about how they will actually be implemented.

We note that both Directors of National Intelligence are instructed to continue to coordinate their intelligence activities. Is the DNI to continue as the de facto head of the operation as the DOD press spokesman deferred to the DNI in various press briefings prior to the release of the 180-day report?

The ODNI and DOD, and elements of each with UAP data, are required to make such information available immediately to the UAP Task Force (UAPTF) and the National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC).

Does this mean that NASIC is now to be involved with UAP investigations? Will the UAPTF continue in the lead role? Will the USAF silence on UAPs be finally lifted?

Given that the history of official UFO investigation goes back many decades, why was such a recent starting point for data evaluation — an "Hour Zero" if you will — chosen as November, 2004, in the ODNI Preliminary Assessment of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena?

Are the agencies designated to only disgorge historical UFO data since November, 2004? Or is hour zero moved back perhaps to the closure of Project Blue Book in 1970, or June 1947, or even further back to 1943 when the General

of the Air Forces took cognizance of the fact that aircraft were observed and interfered with by strange objects at Schweinfurt, Stuttgart, and Alfonsine? These objects turned out to Nazi devices, but from that time on instances of unknown aerial phenomena were collected by military intelligence.

Historical evidence not previously released includes wide angle camera photographs, possible satellite observations (Christmas Island observation, etc.), NORAD records not turned over to the University of Colorado investigation, and in many other cases data that was not made available to Project Blue Book and the University of Colorado during their operations.

In 1977 the Assistant [Secretary of Defense for Public Relations Thomas B. Ross](#) said that UFO reports were no longer investigated, just recorded and stored. The National Military Command Center was named as the storage location. Will these records be located and evaluated?

The [previously released DOD Inspector General letter](#) required the DOD department and agencies to appoint a mid-level pay grade point of contact for UAPs. The letter stated that the DOD IG would be performing an evaluation, but the character of its interest could change as necessary. Perhaps the reason for DOD IG's interest is the balking by various agencies to the instructions sent out by DOD. Perhaps the DOD IG's letter was also a result of complaints by Luis Elizondo concerning adverse comments made by Pentagon spokespersons about his tenure at DOD?

This would not be the first time that specific individuals in the UFO field were singled out for action by government officials. The USAF for a number of year denied that they had released 41 USAF case files evaluated as unidentified to Major Donald E. Keyhoe. (See <http://www.nicap.org/chop.htm>) Keyhoe demanded that he be recalled to active duty and court martialed if his claims were false. The intervention of Senator Harry Byrd forced the USAF to acknowledge that Keyhoe did in fact receive the 41 case files. Col. O'Mara at ATIC had to write a letter of apology for stating publicly otherwise.

In the 1960's, with possible Congressional hearings on UFO pending, the USAF encouraged National Investigation Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP) board member, retired Vice Admiral R. H. Hillenkoetter, to resign from NICAP. The USAF believed that the Vice Admiral's previous role as former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency would lend too much credence to any information that NICAP might present at any hearings. The USAF felt that the removal of Hillenkoetter from NICAP's board would weaken the momentum for any public

inquiry. The intention of approaching Hillenkoetter is detailed in the Project Blue Book files and was ultimately successful in silencing him. Hillenkoetter resigned from the NICAP board and made no more public statements on UFOs. Is History repeating itself?

The UAPTF, or other entity that the Deputy Secretary of Defense may designate, will submit a report to Congress 90 days after this section is enacted and quarterly thereafter concerning its findings. At a minimum the contents should contain all reported UAP incidents that occurred during the previous 90 days and other accounts that were not submitted in preceding reports.

The quarterly report will be classified.

Going back to the information collection protocols during Project Sign's investigations, quarterly reports were also required but not submitted to Congress.

It should be noted that throughout the decades of official UFO investigation history, information collection and data analysis measures have been outlined many times. Despite the masses of data collected during Project Sign, Project Blue Book, the University of Colorado study and the current UAPTF, a lot of time and effort appears to be spent "re-inventing the wheel" rather than applying lessons learned from information already in hand.

There also seem to be issues of non-compliance, and possible in-fighting among various agencies. Designating November 2004 as "Hour Zero" seems to be a way of avoiding political in-fighting and recriminations concerning previous handling of the UFO problem. Existing systems for reporting UAPs have not apparently been reemphasized for action – (Communications Instructions for Reporting Vital Intelligence (CIRVIS) and Operational 3 reports OPREP3) It should be noted these two reporting systems are now considered as Operations reports and not part of the Intelligence network.

— Jan Aldrich

---

---

---