The Roswell Incident, The USAF and the New York Times

Sept. 26, 1994

Stanton T. Friedman
79 Pembroke Crescent
Fredericton, NB Canada
E3B 2V1 506-457-0232

The Roswell Incident, the USAF, and New York Times S.T.Friedman

BACKGROUND Sept.26, 1994

As the nuclear physicist who, in 1978, began the research into the US Government's retrieval of crashed flying saucers in New Mexico in July, 1947, I have been eagerly waiting the results of a comprehensive General Accounting Office (GAO) search for documents related to those events. Congressman Steve Schiff of New Mexico had instigated the GAO efforts in early 1994 after being stonewalled by the Department of Defense in his efforts to provide answers to constituents demanding them. He had received the same kind of totally misleading and deliberately false official responses about Roswell from the USAF Office of Congressional Liaison as had many other members of Congress as noted in my 5 page letter to USAF Colonel Shubert.

I had been impressed by my contacts with both Schiff's office and the GAO. Because of my own many weeks spent at 15 government document archives and because I handled thousands of classified documents during my 14 years working on a variety nuclear Research and Development programs in industry, I know how easy it is to keep secrets. For example, at none of the archives was I ever able to view formerly TOP SECRET PLUS documents though they certainly exist somewhere. I would expect that anything relating to recovery of two crashed flying saucers and several alien bodies would be Special Compartmented Information or well above TOP SECRET.

I was, therefore, quite surprised when the US Air Force attempted to stage a preemptive strike against the GAO on Sept. 8 by releasing a 23 page "Report of Air Force Research Regarding the "Roswell Incident". Schiff's objective had been for the neutral GAO to review all possible government (Army, Navy, USAF, AEC, etc) files that might contain information relating to Roswell. There had been many charges that the Air Force had been covering up what happened at Roswell. Trying to pass off an essentially internal report as definitive would be like having the fox guard the chicken coop. It was good to hear that the GAO is continuing its efforts to get to the truth.

It was certainly NOT surprising that the Roswell Report continued a long, easily documented, history of USAF misrepresentation about UFOs especially when I found out that the author of RR was USAF Colonel Richard Weaver. He had made outrageous claims about the Roswell-related Operation Majestic 12 documents being fraudulent, but then he was unable to provide any documentation to support those claims in response to my Freedom of Information Request. Although the report was released by the USAF Media Relations Division at 1690 Air Force Pentagon, Weaver works for

the Air Force Office of Special Investigations. He now is with the Region 2 OSI District Office, at Langley AFB near Hampton , Virginia.

BENEFITS

Fortunately there are a number of benefits arising from this attempted preemptive strike:

1. The AF investigators have done some good work showing that what crashed and was retrieved Southeast of Corona and Northwest of Roswell (and in the Plains of San Augustin almost 200 miles to the west) in early July, 1947, was NOT an aircraft, nor a stray missile, nor related to a nuclear weapon incident.

2. The USAF has for the first time, since they admittedly lied and called the wreckage the radar reflector from a weather balloon at about 5PM on July 8, 1947, given a definitive statement as to their explanation (Project Mogul Balloons) for what happened.They even admitted the earlier lie, supposedly done to protect the highly classified Project Mogul, even though they reiterate that the balloon technology, as opposed to the application relating to the detection of Soviet nuclear tests, was NOT classified.

3. It is now easy to demonstrate, based on careful review of the 23 page RR and of hundreds of pages of attachments that the new explanation is once again a LIE. It is not surprising that the attachments have been almost impossible to obtain given the clear evidence of misrepresentation they provide. I do wish to acknowledge the special efforts of researcher Phil Reynolds to gain access to and hand copy the attachments at the Pentagon.

MOGUL

Serious crashed saucer researchers have been aware of Project Mogul for more than a decade. The Project Engineer of the Project, C.B. Moore, was interviewed by William Moore (no relation) when Bill and I were busily researching Roswell in the early 1980s. Aviation/Science Writer Don Berliner, with whom I co authored "Crash at Corona", and I met with C.B. Moore and separately with one of his Mogul colleagues years ago. We had no reason to doubt Moore's sincerity in trying to fit the Roswell wreckage with the remains of a stray Mogul balloon train.The assemblies of conventional balloons could be as long at 500 feet. The key factor seemed to be that Dr. Moore and many others assumed that the description given by sheep rancher Mac Brazel in an article "Harassed Rancher who Located 'Saucer' Sorry He told About It" on the front page of the July 9, 1947, Roswell Daily Record, truly reflected what he retrieved.

Much of that article is quoted in Weaver's report (p.4) and serves as the basis for everything that follows. As one might expect, the long quote doesn't include the very next line of the article "I am sure that what I found was not any weather observa-

tion balloon" . Far more important is the simple fact, which has been documented in all 4 of the Roswell books (all listed in Weaver's opus, though selectively ignored) that Brazel had been grabbed by the Army Air Force and been brought back from his ranch into town and then told an entirely new story to the local press.

All over the world people were waiting with baited breath for the rest of the story, epitomized by the RDR news headline of July 8 "RAAF Captures Flying Saucer on Ranch in Roswell Region". Similar sometimes larger headlines appeared in other evening papers from Chicago west in response to the press release at about noon Roswell time on July 8 from Lt. Walter Haut . For example, The Los Angeles Herald Express, another PM paper, on July 8 had a huge headline, "Army Finds Flying Saucer"

Haut was then the Public Information Officer among other titles at The Roswell Army Air Field home of the 509th Composite Bomb Group. The 509th was a unique military group having dropped the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August, 1945, and set off two more at Operation Crossroads in the summer of 1946. All the officers had been handpicked, including then Major Jesse Marcel, 509th Intelligence Officer. Marcel had followed Brazel from the Roswell Sheriff's office back to his not-easy-to-get-to ranch with Counter Intelligence Officer Sheridan W. Cavitt in separate vehicles the afternoon of July 6.

The newspaper article's description clearly indeed describes a conventional balloon and radar reflector and notes a date of June 14 for the non-exciting retrieval. The simple fact of the matter is that Brazel would never have made a special trip to town with balloon wreckage. Sheriff Wilcox would never have called the base in response to balloon wreckage. Major Marcel would never have wasted more than a day of his time and CIC man Cavitt's time to go out to the ranch for a balloon or ballons of any kind and would certainly not have been ordered by Colonel Blanchard, the Base Commander and head of the 509th, to fly the balloon remains to Wright Field, in Ohio, with an intermediate stop at 8th Air Force Headquarters in Ft. Worth, Texas. All of the old testimony, much of it obtained prior to the 1980 publication of "The Roswell Incident" for which Bill Moore and I did 95% of the research, clearly made several important points;

1. The retrieved material, unlike components of Mogul Balloons, had very special properties including very light weight and very great strength. Some of the foil like material could be folded and creased, but then would return to its original shape. The I-beam like pieces (less than .5" across, had the weight of balsa wood, but couldn't be broken or cut or burned. There were embossed strange unrecognizable pastel symbols on the inside of the beams. Dr. Jesse Marcel, who handled pieces of the wreckage on the evening of July 7 as an 11 year old boy has drawn those symbols. The thin metal pieces, which were also very light and very strong, couldn't be broken through or dented with a sledge hammer. There was no mention of embossed tape which is so impor-

tant to the Mogul explanation and which apparently was well over an inch wide.

Rancher Mac Brazel's son, Bill, had himself recovered a number of pieces at the debris field after rain storms long after the event and also noted the special characteristics. Naturally his testimony is not noted, though he is still alive, and Weaver claims that Cavitt is the only survivor who handled wreckage on site. By implication the now deceased Marcel and Rickett were exaggerating incompetents. I having been in both their homes could not disagree more.

2. There was a huge area covered by the wreckage . Major Marcel spoke (for example, in my 1979 documentary movie "UFOs Are Real" and in the TV Program "In Search of" and in an extended WWL-TV Interview, New Orleans, and in a December, 1979, interview with Bob Pratt of the National Enquirer, published in February 1980) in terms of an area 3/4 of a mile long and hundreds of feet wide. Brazel was primarily concerned, when he originally found the wreckage on about July 3, (not June 14) that his sheep refused to cross the large debris field. He would also have been concerned about ingestion of the material, if it had been balloon like. Jesse noted that both his vehicle and that of Sheridan Cavitt had been filled with debris, but that most of the wreckage was left behind.

3. Major Marcel was familiar with all kinds of weather balloons from his very extensive wartime military service in the Pacific. Rancher Brazel had previously recovered two weather Balloons on the property he managed. Dr. Marcel is familiar with weather balloons, and was certainly familiar with aircraft wreckage having later been shot down himself in Southeast Asia, having served on Military Aircraft Accident investigation teams and being a pilot and flight surgeon. Colonel William Blanchard had extensive military and piloting experience during World War 2. Obviously, considering their jobs with the 509th, Blanchard and Marcel were considered very competent. Blanchard was a 4 star General when he died of a heart attack at the Pentagon years later. Obviously neither Marcel, (who was promoted to Lt. Colonel after the incident) nor Blanchard were punished for stupidity . Marcel also had on his staff persons knowledgeable about weather balloons.

There are also key points made by Weaver:

1."the materials recovered by the AAF in July 1947, were not readily recognizable as anything special (only the purpose was special) and the recovered debris itself was unclassified"p.18

2.In a long paragraph (p.18) dealing with Mogul balloons, it was noted that "it is very probable that this TOP SECRET project Balloon train (Flight 4) made up of unclassified components came to rest some miles northwest of Roswell, NM, became shredded in the surface winds and was ultimately found by the Rancher , Brazel, ten days later." Earlier Weaver stated that Flight 4

would have to have been made with standard neoprene balloons because the new polyethylene balloons weren't available until after July 2 . He also quotes C.B. Moore as stating that ruptured and shredded neoprene "would almost look like dark gray or black flakes or ashes after exposure to the sun for only a few days". "Flight 4, a service flight, was launched on June 4 but not recovered by the NYU group and was found by Brazel ten days later". This, of course, matches nicely the newspaper story of July 9.

It is easy to see that this all comes down to massive misrepresentation once one adds in Cavitt's description of what he found when he supposedly went to the "crash site" in early July with Marcel and Sgt.Rickett one of Cavitt's Counter Intelligence Corps agents. "The area of this debris was very small about 20 feet square and the material was spread on the ground, but there was no gouge or crater or other obvious sign of impact. I remember recognizing this material as being consistent with a weather balloon. We gathered up some of this material, which would easily fit into one vehicle." From Tab. 17. Note: One balloon, standard issue, no mention of reflector, no ashes,no tape, no symbols no flakes, 400 square feet ground space, and we are to believe that Brazel would have gone to the sherrif with this???

The newspaper article quotes Brazel's (preprogrammed) statement as saying the wreckage was "scattered over an area 200 yards in diameter". This is only 700 times greater than the area mentioned by Cavitt. Brazel supposedly left it in place until gathering it on July 4 a full month later. He then, supposedly after hearing about flying discs on July 5, presumably during a trip noted elsewhere to Corona, then took it to the sheriff on July 7.. This sequence is completely contradicted by the family of Sheriff Wilcox, by Brazel's son Bill, by Jesse Marcel Sr. who stated back in 1978 that he had gone only with Cavitt. Rickett later went with Cavitt, not Marcel, to the site , as Marcel had gone off to Texas and wasn't part of the CIC in any event.

In my first conversation with Jesse in early 1978, he noted that they spent overnight on the Brazel ranch and had a can of beans.This clearly was July 6, since we know that the press release and Jesse's trip to Fort Worth took place on July 8. Brazel clearly came or was brought back to town after Marcel left for Texas or his interview would have been in the PM paper on July 8 not on July 9. It must be noted that Brazel had no phone and no electricity.

Obviously the neoprene material having been out in the sun for a month would have been broken down into ashes or flakes, and of no interest at all to anyone. The tin foil and balsa wood were hardly indestructible. Considering the circumstances it is impossible to accept Cavitt's testimony. In the first place, if he had recognized it as a simple weather balloon, he would never have hesitated to say so to the many researchers who beat a path to his door after I found him and informed Bill Moore of his whereabouts. He would certainly have made sure that no special flight

took place, would not have returned to the site, would not have denied ever being there as he did . The sheriff would not have been impressed with the remains of a very conventional neoprene balloon. He wouldn't have called the base. If he had, Major Marcel would not have been impressed either.

Furthermore, in attachment 32 we have the following statement by Lt. James McAndrew in response to his own question as to how experienced military people could have not recognized the wreckage for what it was. "The balloon that was found on the Foster Ranch consisted of as many as 23 350 gram balloons spaced at 20 foot intervals, several radar targets (3 to 5), plastic ballast tubes, parchment parachutes, a black "cutoff" box containing portions of a weather instrument and a sonobuoy".

There is no way all this junk (having been shredded and out in the sun for a month) could have been thought worth a long trip to Roswell. It could not have fit in an area 20 feet square or in one vehicle.

Note that Cavitt says nothing about the radar targets or the string that held things together.

ATTACKS ON RESEARCHERS

Weaver takes every opportunity, sometimes justifiably, to complain about the quality of some of the UFO research.Over the years I have exposed a number of frauds including Guy Kirkwood, William Spaulding, Bob Lazar, "Dr." Frank Stranges, Robert Oechsler. I have noted many false claims about Roswell as well. For example, he notes that in one book (Probably "UFO Crash at Roswell)", a list of 11 names of military persons stationed at Roswell is given and the claim made that there are no military records for these people. In fact, Weaver's people found records for 8 of the 11 and there were too many persons with the same name to identify the other three.

He, as with most propagandists, says good things about people whose work he approves of, for example, referring to Robert Todd as a serious researcher. I am mentioned in the report twice, but there is no indication that I am a nuclear physicist with BS and MS degrees in physics from the University of Chicago, who had a "Q"clearance, visited many archives, worked on classified programs, published scientific papers. Todd has no degrees, had no clearance, has visited no archives, lives at home, has published no scientific papers . He certainly has filed a zillion Freedom of Information requests and seems to have provided Weaver with most of the input on Mogul. He has a long history of letting his personal animosities interfere with objective thinking.

Quite frankly, I had to laugh at this comment by Weaver giving the genesis of the investigation of Roswell as a major UFO event : "In 1978, an article appeared in a tabloid newspaper, the National Inquirer (sic), which reported the former intelligence officer, Marcel, claimed that he had recovered UFO debris near

Roswell in 1947. Also in 1978, a UFO researcher, Stanton Friedman, met with Marcel and began investigating the claims that the material Marcel handled was from a crashed UFO." The truth of the matter is that I didn't actually meet with Marcel in person until early 1979, but had phone conversations with him beginning in early 1978 after having been referred privately to him by an old ham radio buddy of his at a TV station in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The date of Enquirer reporter Bob Pratt's interview with Marcel was actually December 8, 1979, as noted in Karl Pflock's report which, in turn, is referenced by Weaver. The article appeared in February, 1980, and obviously had nothing whatsoever to do with the extensive prior research by Moore and I. This sequence of my involvement was reported in "Crash at Corona" and in my 1991 paper "Update on Crashed Saucers in New Mexico" also not mentioned by Weaver, though he does refer to Bill Moore's 1985 paper "Crashed Saucers: Evidence in Search of Proof." Certainly Weaver implies that Marcel contacted the Enquirer and that my research was stimulated by the Enquirer article.. both are nonsense. As it happens, Pratt whose work I was very familar with and greatly admired (unlike that of William Broad's NY Times UFO" investigation") got Marcel's location from me after almost all of our research had been done.

There are several more places in Weaver's piece that refer back to the July 9 RDR article. It is, of course, not surprising that essentially no mention is made of so much other relevant first hand testimony available, for example, in the 104 minute video "Recollections of Roswell" with testimony from 28 witnesses.

Naturally, Weaver never mentions the Operation Majestic 12 Documents which I believe are genuine despite the attacks by Robert Todd, Kevin Randle, Philip Klass, etc,and his own totally unjustified attacks on them. He never deals with the very important recovery of an almost intact saucer and alien bodies in the Plains of San Agustin in New Mexico, at the same time and West of Magdalena. Matter of fact, while taking potshots at the notion of alien bodies, he avoids discussion by claiming that since what was recovered was a Mogul balloon, it couldn't have carried bodies! Nothing like research by proclamation.

Weaver claims "What was later characterized as 'the UFO Wave of 1947' began with 16 alleged sightings between May 17 and July 12 ,1947, (although some researchers claim there were as many as 800 sightings during that period)." "Crash at Corona" references the "Report on the UFO Wave of 1947". Author Ted Bloecher has maps and tables and lists 853 reports, a number of which were checked out by University of Arizona physicist, Dr. James E. McDonald. Bloecher continued his collection after the report was published and found over 700 more. Too bad Weaver couldn't be bothered.

Weaver stresses that there is disagreement within the UFO community about the location of crash sites and exact dates of the crashes. From a rational viewpoint, the correct question is "was

there a crash and recovery of at least one alien spacecraft in New Mexico in July, 1947? The answer agreed to by all of us who have written books about the matter is unquestionably "yes", no matter how much we disagree about some of the details.

Weaver alludes to profit making by people concerned with Roswell. I wish I knew where all this profit was as a result of my 16 years of effort and enormous telephone and travel and time expenses. He never mentions that three of the people interviewed Lt. Colonel Sheridan Cavitt, USAF ret, The Mogul Project Officer Colonel Albert Trakowski, USAF Retired, and weatherman Irving Newton, Major, USAF Ret., are all collecting nice pensions, get medical care, etc and have a very strong vested interest in NOT upsetting the apple cart at this point in their lives. They don't need to be threatened.

INDEMNIFICATION

Weaver claims that the Secretary of the Air Force, Dr. Sheila Widnall, has given them the opportunity to tell without fear of retribution anything they might know about these events including anything that might have been classified, to the investigators. The indemnification documents are not listed among the attachments. I challenge the US Air Force to make a blanket declaration indemnifying any and all former Army Air Force or Air Force personnel from punishment should they speak their mind about any aspect of the recovery and analysis of any crashed flying saucer in New Mexico in 1947. If there were no crashed saucers and no coverup, they have nothing to fear.

Weaver also suggests that it would be impossible to conduct a serious investigation of crashed flying saucers and alien bodies without leaving a huge Air Force paper trail. During World War 2 Dr. Vannevar Bush headed the Office of Scientific Research and Development under which aegis the Manhattan Project was operated to develop atomic bombs along with projects relating to the Proximity fuse, radar, and many other technologies. He noted in his Oral History at MIT that there were weekly meetings of the four leaders of the Manhattan Project. There were no secretaries, no agendas, no minutes; in short no paper trail. They surely got the job done.

Since much of the Manhattan Project was conducted in New Mexico, it seems very very likely that the recovery of alien spacecraft and alien bodies would have induced a similar project like the Manhattan Project relating to the saucers, such as Operation Majestic 12, a special effort completely outside the USAF and other standard military groups. The USAF concern is the here and now, not the futuristic technological, economic, biological, religious, etc implications of alien visitations. Quite rightly they were concerned with defending against the expected attack from the Soviet Union. One must note that the NSA was established as an interservice group by a classified executive order in the early 1950s.

PHOTO ANALYSIS

Weaver makes a big deal of having located the pictures of General Ramey, Colonel Dubose, Major Marcel, Major Newton taken in Ramey's office at Fort Worth, and having those pictures analyzed by the CIA. I originally had located those pictures in 1979 at the Fort Worth Star Telegram. Not one researcher of whom I am aware seriously believes that the material shown in those pictures is the strange stuff found at the Foster Ranch. It was indeed the tin foil and balsa wood radar reflector used with weather balloons. It hardly matches either the Mogul balloon wreckage of which Weaver is so fond or the weird material described by the Brazels and the Marcels and others.

Weaver claims that the threats supposedly made to witnesses were obviously ineffective since so many people have talked. He fails to note the that there are still individuals from the military unwilling to go public. We need a blanket indemnification for these people. I don't mean characters like Frank Kaufman who were everywhere, knew everything, but can provide nothing to substantiate their off-the-wall claims so have nothing to fear except the contempt of those who find their testimony totally unbelievable.

After all, the pictures of balloon radar reflector wreckage and Jesse Marcel, DuBose, Ramey, and Newton appeared in many newspapers. Much of what they said was actually a matter of public record. Walter Haut's name, often misspelled, was all over the place. Most of the people who were threatened WERE NEVER NOTED IN PUBLIC do NOT have documentation to prove their claims nor are still alive. After all, if that TV Station manager hadn't suddenly suggested my talking to Jesse Marcel, we would still know nothing about Roswell.

As for Weaver's apparent shock at the suggestion that the USAF has covered up anything about UFOs, besides lying about the weather balloon to protect Project Mogul, whose technology was totally conventional, and needed no protection, let us note some examples:

A. In October 1955 The USAF issued a press release concerning a huge study done about UFOs. They, of course, didn't say where the work was done (Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, a very well respected Research and Development firm), nor give the names of the researchers or even the title of the Huge Final report of the Study "Project Blue Book Special Report 14". They put out a supposed summary of the study which gives none of the data included in the more than 240 charts, tables, and graphs in the report. The focus was on new strange aircraft on which the government was working. The press release included this completely false statement by, of all people, the Secretary of the USAF " On the basis of this report, we believe that no objects such as those popularly described as flying saucers have overflown the United States. Even the unknown 3% could have been identified as conventional phenomena or illusions if more complete observation-

al data had been available."

These two "factual" statements are both lies. 21.5 % of the 3201 sightings investigated by BMI could not be explained (not 3%), completely separate and distinct from the 10.5-% listed as insufficient information. The data in the report show that the better the quality of the sighting, the more likely to be listed as an Unknown, and that the probability that the Unknowns were just missed knowns was less than 1%. In short, the USAF lied and the press repeated the lies.It isn't surprising that none of the 11 anti-UFO books even mention BBSR 14, even though all the authors were aware of it.

In 1969, when Project Blue Book was closed, another splendidly done totally misleading press release was issued by the Air Force giving three totally misleading conclusions from Project Blue Book namely that "No UFO reported, investigated and evaluated by the Air Force has ever given any indication of threat to our national security 2.There has been no evidence submitted to, or discovered by the Air Force that sightings categorized as "Unidentified" represent technological developments or principles beyond the range of present day scientific knowledge and 3) There has been no evidence indicating that sightings categorized as "unidentified" are extraterrestrial vehicles." Obviously penguins in Antarctica aren't a threat to US security either, but they certainly are real. If one of the 3 functions were performed by some other agency (NSA or NRO, CIA,DIA, NASA,ONI, Majestic, etc) the statement would be true, but irrelevant. I have worked on fission and fusion programs for deep space travel so number 2 is meaningless as well. For 3 what if those really good cases were listed as Interstellar Alien Craft or some such rather than Unidentified???

Not surprisingly, the USAF in 1993 and 1994 was feeding out more lies now to Congressman, again focusing on Project Blue Book and its totally misleading 1969 conclusions. They also falsely claimed that the USAF didn't get involved in UFO research until 1948 (gets rid of Roswell the easy way), that the USAF knows of nobody besides the National Archives who has any UFO data, that all there was, was Blue Book, Sign and Grudge. These are all lies especially in view of the legal actions against the CIA and the NSA which proved that both are withholding UFO data and the USAF General Carroll Bolender's 1969 memo which states that reports of UFOs which could effect national security would continue to be made in accordance with JANAP 146 and Air Force Manual 55-11 and are NOT part of the Blue Book system. The Air Defense Command was NOT part of Blue Book and BB didn't have a need to know for their data.

NEW YORK TIMES

As bad as Weaver's piece is, the press coverage, especially by the New York Times, is actually much more distressing because it will have influenced so many more people. There it was Front Page of the Sunday Edition, Sept. 18, 1994. The 60 column inch piece

was by science writer William Broad, whose work I normally admire. For example, he early on broke a story about over 100 unannounced underground nuclear explosions conducted in the Southwest. Broad seems to have started from the proposition that there is nothing to the notion of flying saucers in General or crashed saucers in particular. It is only in the last 3½ inches of his piece that he says anything about the Roswell story.

The rest of the article tells us far more than we want to know about the Mogul Balloon Project. For reasons unknown, Broad seems to think this long cancelled project is important news in 1994. He did interview Colonel Trakowski who casually remarks, as though he knew anything at all about the matter "In New Mexico flying saucerism has become a minor industry. There are whole museums dedicated to the presentation of outrageous fictions". Broad can't be bothered mentioning the 509th (the only atomic Bombing group in the world), or Major Marcel, its intelligence officer. He lists some books about Roswell, but not "Crash at Corona" though I am the original investigator and this is the only Roswell book co-authored by a scientist and an Aviation/ Science writer as opposed, for example, to a writer of fiction.etc..

He mentions and quotes Walter Haut at the Roswell UFO Museum and Research Center, but doesn't even mention that he was the one who issued the press release. Despite Trakowski's crack about fictions, Broad doesn't mention that Trakowski is almost blind, that the museum is staffed by volunteers and charges no admission fee. Broad couldn't be bothered mentioning or interviewing any of the key witnesses such as Dr. Marcel, Bill Brazel, Glenn Dennis, etc.

Broad has no qualms at all at about repeatedly insulting those of us who, after many years of effort, have come to the conclusion that some UFOs are alien spacecraft. Included in his article are such terms as "flying saucer fans, cover up theorists, flying saucer cultists, conspiracy theories, flying saucer devotees," etc ad nauseum. He seems completely oblivious to the fact that opinion polls have shown for thirty years that believers outnumber non-believers, and that the greater the education the more likely to accept the notion of UFO reality. Polls of engineers and scientists show that about 2/3 of them who express an opinion accept UFO reality. It is the nasty noisy negativists and debunkers who deserve the insults for their irrational unscientific comments about UFOs.

Not for Broad is there any mention of the Five large scale scientific studies, the dozen or so PhD Theses, the hundreds of UFO articles by scientists such as Dr. Bruce Maccabee and myself. One is reminded of the comment in Dr. Herbert Strentz's 1970 PhD Thesis about Press coverage of UFOs:

" The high degree of ridicule present in the UFO phenomenon was reflected in the press coverage.. the coverage has been marked by superficiality, redundancy, silliness, careless reporting and lack of relevant information... The lack of relevant information

was also attributable to the reluctance of the press to ferret out information about the phenomenon and those involved in it."

It is 24 years later and yet Broad's article shows how right Strentz was.

As other good examples, we have this statement from the Los Angeles Times (Sept. 27, 1973) "A two year old Gallup Poll reported that more than three million Americans believe Flying Saucers are real. But that still leaves 98 % of the country somewhat doubtful". The fact is that 64% of those who expressed an opinion said they were real. Note this totally false claim from SCIENCE August 20, 1976. "The number of people believing in Flying Saucers remains at about 6% of the adult population according to the Gallup Polls". Both publications refused to publish corrections even when sent the relevant polls!!

Colonel Weaver had claimed that the USAF decision to dig into Roswell was primarily triggered by an article in the January 14, 1994 , issue of the Washington Post about Congressman Schiff and the GAO. I did a 4 page critique of the numerous errors of fact and tone in this article, but had no impact on the editors nor the ombudsman. The basic rules here for debunkers are 1. "Don't bother me with the facts, my mind is made up", and 2. "What the public doesn't know, we are not going to tell them." and 3. "If one can't attack the data, attack the people."

One more example to illustrate rule 2. Weaver mentions the memo of July 8, 1947, from the Dallas FBI Office and uses this quote " "The disc is hexagonal in shape and was suspended from a balloon by a cable, which balloon was approximately 20 feet in diameter... the object found resembles a high altitude weather balloon with a radar reflector.. disc and balloon being transported.." Weaver leaves out this clause after radar reflector " But that telephonic conversation between their office and Wright Field had not borne out this belief." I think it is fair to say that this omission is significant.

Isn't it time for those of us who have studied the data to make our voices heard instead of being apologist ufologists or closet ufologists? I have lectured on the subject "Flying Saucers ARE Real" at more than 600 colleges and over 100 professional groups in all 50 states, 9 provinces and 4 other countries. I have only had 10 hecklers, two of whom were drunk . The audience took care of the other 8. If we stay quietly in the closet, we only have ourselves to blame for the misrepresentations of the Weavers and Broads of the world. Remember that we are paying Weaver's salary and Cavitt's retirement benefits.

Top headline Gen. Ramey Empties Roswell Saucer
Full width

July 9, 1947, Roswell Daily Record
-Page 1, Bottom

Harassed Rancher who Located 'Saucer' Sorry He Told About It

W. W. Brazel, 48, Lincoln county rancher living 30 miles south east of Corona, today told his story of finding what the army at first described as a flying disk, but the publicity which attended his find caused him to add that if he ever found anything else short of a bomb he sure wasn't going to say anything about it.

Brazel was brought here late yesterday by W. E. Whitmore, of radio station KGFL, had his picture taken and gave an interview to the Record and Jason Kellahin, sent here from the Albuquerque bureau of the Associated Press to cover the story. The picture he posed for was sent out over AP telephoto wire sending machine specially set up in the Record office by R. D. Adair, AP wire chief sent here from Albuquerque for the sole purpose of getting out his picture and that of sheriff George Wilcox, to whom Brazel originally gave the information of his find.

Brazel related that on June 14 he and an 8-year old son, Vernon were about 7 or 8 miles from the ranch house of the J. B. Foster ranch, which he operates, when they came upon a large area of bright wreckage made up on rubber strips, tinfoil, a rather tough paper and sticks.

At the time Brazel was in a hurry to get his round made and he did not pay much attention to it. But he did remark about what he had seen and on July 4 he, his wife, Vernon and a daughter Betty, age 14, went back to the spot and gathered up quite a bit of the debris.

The next day he first heard about the flying disks, and he wondered if what he had found might be the remnants of one of these.

Monday he came to town to sell some wool and while here he went to see sheriff George Wilcox and "whispered kinda confidential like" that he might have found a flying disk.

Wilcox got in touch with the Roswell Army Air Field and Maj. Jesse A. Marcel and a man in plain clothes accompanied him home, where they picked up the rest of the pieces of the "disk" and went to his home to try to reconstruct it.

According to Brazel they simply could not reconstruct it at all. They tried to make a kite out of it, but could not do that and could not find any way to put it back together so that it would fit.

Then Major Marcel brought it to Roswell and that was the last he heard of it until the story broke that he had found a flying disk.

Brazel said that he did not see it fall from the sky and did not see it before it was torn up, so he did not know the size or shape it might have been, but he thought it might have been about as large as a table top. The balloon which held it up, if that was how it worked, must have been about 12 feet long, he felt, measuring the distance by the size of the room in which he sat. The rubber was smoky gray in color and scattered over an area about 200 yards in diameter.

When the debris was gathered up the tinfoil, paper, tape, and sticks made a bundle about three feet long and 7 or 8 inches thick, while the rubber made a bundle about 15 or 20 inches long and about 8 inches thick. In all, he estimated, the entire lot would have weighed maybe five pounds.

There was no sign of any metal in the area which might have been used for an engine and no sign of any propellers of any kind although at least one paper fin had been glued onto some of the tinfoil.

There were no words to be found anywhere on the instrument, although there were letters on some of the parts. Considerable scotch tape and some tape with flowers printed upon it had been used in the construction.

No strings or wire were to be found but there were some eyelets in the paper to indicate that some sort of attachment may have been used.

Brazel said that he had previously found two weather observation balloons on the ranch, but that what he found this time did not in any way resemble either of these.

"I am sure what I found was not any weather observation balloon," he said. "But if I find anything else besides a bomb they are going to have a hard time getting me to say anything about it."

TELETYPE

FBI DALLAS 7-5-47 6-17 PM

DIRECTOR AND SAC, CINCINNATI.

FLYING DISC, INFORMATION CONCERNING. [redacted], HEADQUARTERS EIGHTH AIR FORCE, TELEPHONICALLY ADVISED THIS OFFICE THAT AN OBJECT PURPORTING TO BE A FLYING DISC WAS RECOVERED NEAR ROSWELL, NEW MEXICO, THIS DATE. THE DISC IS HEXAGONAL IN SHAPE AND WAS SUSPENDED FROM A BALLOON BY CABLE, WHICH BALLOON WAS APPROXIMATELY TWENTY FEET IN DIAMETER. [redacted] FURTHER ADVISED THAT THE OBJECT FOUND RESEMBLES A HIGH ALTITUDE WEATHER BALLOON WITH A RADAR REFLECTOR, BUT THAT TELEPHONIC CONVERSATION BETWEEN THEIR OFFICE AND WRIGHT FIELD HAD NOT [redacted] POINT OUT THIS BELIEF. DISC AND BALLOON BEING TRANSPORTED TO WRIGHT FIELD BY SPECIAL PLANE FOR EXAMINATI INFORMATION PROVIDED THIS OFFICE BECAUSE OF NATIONAL INTEREST IN CASE. [redacted] AND FACT THAT NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, ASSOCIATED PRESS, AND OTHERS ATTEMPTING TO BREAK STORY OF LOCATION OF DISC TODAY. [redacted] ADVISED WOULD REQUEST WRIGHT FIELD TO ADVISE CINCINNATI OFFICE RESULTS OF EXAMINATION. NO FURTHER INVESTIGATION BEING CONDUCTED.

VYLY

RECORDED 62-8384-18

INDEXED

29 JUL 22 1947

END

CKXXX ACK IN ORDER

UA 62 FBI CI MJW

BPI MAC

8-38 PM O

6-22 PM OK FBI WASH. D.C. VK

cc: Mr. [illegible]

Figure 2.

AIR FORCE EXPLANATION OF 1947 "Roswell" UFO CRASH A LOT OF HOT AIR

The U.S. Air Force recently "explained" the highly controversial story of material recovered from an alleged UFO that crashed in central New Mexico in 1947 as a once-secret Project Mogul balloon. A careful analysis of the 23-page official report, by the Fund for UFO Research, has revealed enough holes in the Air Force theory to bring down the sturdiest of balloons.

Project Mogul was intended to detect sound waves from the first Soviet nuclear test, using a scientific payload suspended beneath a constant-altitude balloon. The clusters of off-the-shelf balloons flown in the early summer of 1947 were merely tests aimed at developing an operational system. They were not actual operational flights with highly classified scientific instruments.

According to the "Report of Air Force Research Regarding the 'Roswell Incident'", "the material was...most probably from Flight 4". But the Flight Log (Attachment #27) does not list a Flight 4, but rather begins with Flight 5, launched on June 5. There is no known evidence that there ever was a Flight 4.

Had there been such a flight, it would have have been launched no later than June 5, and thus at least a month before the debris was found on the Foster Ranch, near Corona, NM, by ranch foreman William "Mac" Brazel. The debris was on a frequently-inspected section of the ranch, and thus would have been found much sooner than early July.

Moreover, an Air Force-quoted statement from Prof. Charles B. Moore, a recognized authority on balloons, and a participant in the Project Mogul program, is seriously at odds with the official conclusion. According to Prof. Moore, the neoprene balloons used in the first test flights were susceptible to rapid degradation in the sunlight, and "would look like dark gray or black flakes or ashes after exposure to the sun for only a few days."

In a week, let alone a month or more, such "flakes or ashes" would have been so widely scattered by the frequently strong winds that no one could possibly have noticed them. Even if they could have been seen, they would hardly have been described by witnesses as resembling metallic foil.

Maj. Jesse Marcel, Intelligence Officer of Roswell Army Air Field, and one of the first two military persons on the scene, is on videotape describing an area 2/3 of a mile long and several hundred feet wide, littered with strange material. He said there was a large quantity of what looked like metallic foil, but was both lighter and much stronger

than common household aluminum foil. He said it could not be creased, cut, punctured, burned or even dented with a 16-pound sledge hammer.

He said that he and Counter-Intelligence Corps officer Sheridan Cavitt loaded their two vehicles with a small portion of the material and took it back to Roswell Army Air Field. Could the remains of a cluster of small balloons possibly account for the quantity (to say nothing of the nature) of what first-hand witnesses said they saw, handled and helped transport?

Prior to disintegrating, the balloons would have been intact, though some of them would have been damaged by the punctures or rips which caused them to descend. But the whole assembly would have still been tied together, and would have covered a very limited portion of the estimated 50 acres.

The balloons would have had to explode in order to distribute their pieces over such a large area. But helium-filled Project Mogul test balloons could not have exploded, since helium is an inert gas. Thus each of them would have been in one piece when it landed. And if what was found was neoprene, either the just-landed pieces would have been in good shape and thus recognizable as neoprene, or they would have been in the process of disintegrating, and would have crumbled when picked up by Marcell and Cavitt.

Among the items of videotaped eye-witness testimony ignored by the Air Force report is that of the son of Maj. Marcel, Dr. Jesse Marcel, who is now an M.D., Army National Guard helicopter pilot and flight surgeon. He describes, in great detail, not only the odd metallic foil, but also slender metallic I-beams which he says displayed unrecognizable symbols embossed in a strange pinkish-purplish color on their webs.

Just what it was that crashed on the New Mexico sheep ranch in 1947 is unknown. But no evidence exists to show that it was any kind of balloon, experimental airplane, test missile or anything else mundane, as suggested by the Air Force. The repressive behavior of military personnel at the time is not consistent with this view.

Was it an alien spacecraft, as so many are now suggesting? We don't know, but unless a convincing alternative explanation is forthcoming, that remains an open possibility.

For further information, contact Don Berliner, Fund for UFO Research, at (703) 684-6032.

STANTON T. FRIEDMAN
NUCLEAR PHYSICIST - LECTURER
79 PEMBROKE CRESCENT
FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK E3B 2V1
CANADA
(506) 457-0232

Richard L. Weaver, Col. USAF
Deputy for Security and
Investigative Programs (SAF/AAZ)
1720 Air Force Pentagon
Department of the Air Force
Washington,DC 20330-1000

Subject: Majestic 12 Documents

Feb. 13, 1994

Dear Colonel Weaver:

Mr. Nicholas Redfern of England has been kind enough to send along copies of your letters to him of October 12 and 28, 1993. These letters contain a number of statements about the lack of legitimacy of the MJ-12 documents. Unfortunately, there doesn't seem to be even a hint or a whisper of any evidence, any report, any investigation to substantiate these claims.

On the other hand, having first heard of these documents about 9 years ago and having devoted an enormous amount of effort, time, and money to serious attempts to determine legitimacy, I have reached the conclusion that the 3 primary documents are very likely genuine; specifically (1) the 8 pages of the Eisenhower Briefing of Nov. 18, 1952, which includes (2) the Truman Forrestal Memorandum of Sept. 24, 1947; as attachment A and (3) the Cutler-Twining Memo of July 14, 1954, I have spent hundreds of hours at a total of 15 archives. I have contacted families of MJ-12 members, have contacted former associates of President Truman and written a large report and a number of shorter papers.

My conclusions based on my intensive study and investigation are that the 3 documents are very likely genuine since there is so much internal data, not known to any one outside the government at the time they were received, that turns out to be true. In addition, I have yet to hear one anti-MJ-12 argument that stands up to careful scrutiny. If you have any, please forward same.

Having worked as a scientist under security for 14 years, I can indeed understand the need for having a policy to deal with documents marked TOP SECRET MAJIC. What I cannot understand are your totally unsubstantiated claims that

1. "The Air Force considers the "MJ-12" (both the group described and the purported documents) to be bogus." To whom in the Air Force are you referring? Or is this a purely personal, as opposed to professional, opinion not requiring substantiation?

2. the issue "is universally viewed in security and investigative circles as an obvious hoax."

I trust that you have some reports from somewhere showing that (1) is an official Air Force position based on investigation as opposed to proclamation, and that you have reports from various security and investigative circles again providing evidence? Please consider this letter an FOIA request for those documents

If you do not have any official reports or any evidence or any investigation, and having already stated that the documents did not originate with the Air Force, how can you, as a presumably responsible public official, make these claims? Isn't it incumbent that government officials tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to citizens? I am still a US citizen.

I shall enclose my 108 page Final Report on Operation Majestic 12 of which I have sold hundreds of copies. Copies of the documents are included after page 60.. not yet marked Bogus. The last 3 pages list some of the many pieces of included information that surprisingly turned out to be true. In the text I deal with a host of arguments (more are in my 1992 paper) made by anti-MJ-12 buffs. Note, too, the $1000. check to me from P.J. Klass for my proving him wrong about the Pica type on the Cutler-Twining memo. He, too, prefers to make proclamations rather than doing homework. In the interest of fairness, you ought to refer anybody seeking MJ-12 information to my report, don't you think? I am, after all a professional scientist who spent a great deal of effort. What are your qualifications in this MJ-12 matter besides writing letters? How many archives have you visited???How many investigative reports have you written about MJ-12??? This is a FOIA request for all of them.

There is no question that government agencies are indeed withholding UFO information.This is fact NOT theory. If you don't believe it, then please provide, as a minimum, the 156 NSA UFO documents which were also withheld from Federal Judge Gesell, or the 11 CIA UFO documents (just the tip of the iceberg) withheld from me. Perhaps you could also provide a justification for the Dec. 1981, USAF OSI memo instructing its units NOT to follow their own regulations should they receive a FOIA request from me about UFOs? A copy of this disgraceful OSI document is enclosed along with the brief paper about the Cosmic Watergate.

Colonel Weaver, the cold war is over. Hopefully the days of blind acceptance of anti-UFO propaganda issued by various US government agencies are over as well.Even the KGB is talking about UFOs. I would be willing to make a presentation about MJ-12 in particular or the UFO subject in general before any group (official or not) of your choosing. Are you willing to put your anti-MJ-12 case on the line? More importantly, do you have an anti-MJ-12 case?

Awaiting your response with great interest,
Most cordially,

Stanton T. Friedman

Enclosures include my MJ-12 report, my CV which lists my 62 UFO papers, a few responses from my more than 600 college and 100 professional lecture audiences, and information about my book Crash at Corona, which also includes the MJ-12 Documents.

CC: Congressman [illegible]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC 20330-1000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OCT 1 2 1993

SAF/AAZ
1720 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330

Mr. Nicholas Redfern.
20 Paradise Lane
Pelsall
Walsall
West Midlands
WS3 4NH
England

Dear Mr. Redfern

This is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request (undated) concerning the so-called "Majestic 12" or "MJ-12." We have no documents responsive to your request.

Having said that, however, I can state that the Air Force considers the "MJ-12" (both the group described and the purported documents) to be bogus. In fact, we mark copies of the "documents" that come into our possession with the annotation "NOT AN OFFICIAL AIR FORCE DOCUMENT, NOT CLASSIFIED, SUSPECTED FORGERY OR BOGUS DOCUMENT."

Such marking, of course, only proves to "true believers" that we are obviously part of a gigantic on-going cover up regarding the "documents". These marking do, however, alert persons who may come into contact with them that they are not really dealing with TOP SECRET classified documents, and do not have to employ security measures to protect them (usually at great cost and inconvenience to all concerned).

Copies not so marked do, however, from time to time show up in government offices in the following manner: An MJ-12 buff mails a copy of the "documents" to a government office or hands them to a security guard, purposely pointing out that they are marked TOP SECRET. The guard or secretary panics (most have never seen a TOP SECRET document before) and begins to take heroic measures to protect the "information" from further disclosure. Calls to the authorities are made, security containers acquired, guards posted, security officers notified, etc. Ultimately, of course, it is learned that these "documents are bogus". Meanwhile, the "MJ-12" buffs,

conclude that, since such security measures are employed only for classified material, the initial government reaction and application of such procedures to the "documents" is acknowledgment by the government that they are, in fact, classified. Hence, their prophesy is fulfilled and they can use this incident as further "proof" to verify their claims of authenticity of "MJ-12."

Your question concerning prosecution for this hoax is an interesting one. While, it appears there are several statutes that the "author(s)" may have violated; there is no current effort by the government to attempt to identify the author(s) or prosecute them. The whole issue is viewed as a nuisance not worth wasting more time or money on.

If you consider this "no records" determination as an adverse action you may appeal it to the Secretary of the Air Force within 60 days from the date of this letter. Please state your reason for reconsideration and attach a copy of this letter. Mail it to:

SAF/AAIS (FOIA)
1620 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1620

Sincerely

RICHARD L. WEAVER, Col, USAF
Deputy for Security and Investigative
Programs (SAF/AAZ)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC 20330-1000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OCT 29 1993

SAF/AAZ
1720 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1720

Mr. Nicholas Redfern
20 Paradise Lane
Pelsall
Walsall
West Midlands
WS3 4NH
England

Dear Mr. Redfern:

This is in response to your letter of 22 Oct 93 requesting information regarding the so called "MJ-12 documents".

I do not have readily available the citations to potential criminal code violations that the author(s) of the "documents" may have violated because, as I previously stated, no one has been interested in seriously pursuing the issue, which is universally viewed in security and investigative circles as an obvious hoax. Hypothetically, various fraud statutes could possibly be applicable, although many of those require some direct pecuniary gain by the perpetrator(s) as an element of the offense. In this particular case, there appears to be no direct pecuniary gain; although a number of people have obviously benefited indirectly because they used the "documents" to write books. The only real loss (although intangible) is to the U.S. taxpayers who pay the salaries of the government employees who must take time out of their necessary duties to debunk these "documents" when they come to their attention. Additionally, many of the people who either personally bring or write to us regarding these "documents" also lose indirectly because they have been taken in by the perpetrator(s) of this hoax.

As for the second part of your request, I have attached suitably marked copies of these "documents", specifically: (a) "Briefing Document: Operation Majestic Twelve"; (b) "Executive Briefing: Project Aquarius" with the "Snowbird Document," (which references "Sigma"); and (c) the so-called "Aquarius Document."

Hopefully, these will be helpful to you. Good luck in your endeavors.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. WEAVER, Col, USAF
Deputy for Security and Investigative
Programs (SAF/AAZ)

Attachment
a/s

STANTON T. FRIEDMAN
NUCLEAR PHYSICIST - LECTURER
79 PEMBROKE CRESCENT
FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK E3B 2V1
CANADA

(506) 457-0232

Richard L. Weaver, Colonel, USAF
Investigative Programs (SAF/AAZ)
1720 Air Force Pentagon
Department of the Air Force
Washington, DC 20330-1000

Dear Colonel Weaver: April 3, 1994

This a just a quick note to remind you that my letter of February 13, 1994.(Copy enclosed) included 2 Freedom of Information Act requests related to the Operation Majestic 12 Documents. The law, as I understand it, allows 10 working days for response time. It has been 6 weeks. May I have a response, please?

Most cordially,

Stanton T. Friedman

Stanton T. Friedman
Enclosure

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC 20330-1000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4/12/94

APR 11 1994

SAF/AAZ
1720 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1720

Stanton T. Friedman
79 Pembroke Crescent
Fredericton New Brunswick E3B2V1
Canada

Dear Mr. Friedman,

This is in response to your letter of 3 Apr 94 which was characterized as a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. The other letter you referenced, dated 13 Feb 94, was not received by this office.

We have no records responsive to your request.

We are not required by the FOIA to provide answers to questions.

If you interpret this "no records" response as a denial, you may appeal this decision to the Secretary of the Air Force within 60 calendar days from the date of this letter. Include in your appeal your reasons for reconsideration, and attach a copy of this letter. Address your letter as follows:

SAF/AAIS (FOIA)
1620 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. WEAVER, Colonel, USAF
Director, Security and Special Programs
Oversight

STANTON T. FRIEDMAN
NUCLEAR PHYSICIST - LECTURER

79 PEMBROKE CRESCENT
FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK E3B 2V1
CANADA

(506) 457-0232

Certified Mail

SAF/AAIS (FOIA)
1620 Air Force Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Subject: Appeal to denial of FOIA request concerning materials on Operation Majestic 12, MJ-12, Majic-12

References (enclosed): A. FOIA Requests to Colonel Richard L. Weaver dated Feb. 13, 1994, with copies of letters from Weaver to Nicholas Redfern dated October 12 and October 28, 1993

B. Reminder letter Friedman to Weaver dated April 3, 1994.

C. FOIA Denial: Weaver to Friedman dated April 11, 1994.

D. "Final Report on Operation Majestic 12" by S. T. Friedman

E. Miscellaneous background information.

Gentlemen: April 21, 1994

I am hereby appealing the April 11 denial to my FOIA request.

The basic ground for my appeal is that I simply cannot believe that such negative OFFICIAL statements as were made by Colonel Weaver concerning Majestic 12 Documents could be made without there being a paper trail leading up to them. His letters were on Official stationery. Surely there must be memos, letters, records of phone conversations, reports, investigative summaries, some rational basis for the claims he made??? Perhaps instructions from his commanding officer? The comments, after all, were made in his official capacity not as a private citizen. Surely if the views expressed were purely personal ones, they would have been prefaced with a statement to that effect?

Colonel Weaver may well be right that FOIA does not require him to respond to questions. Surely his official oath of allegiance to the government and constitution of the United States requires that he deal honestly with US citizens and not reflect dishonor on his office by expressing personal bias to foreigners in the guise of professional opinions.

Perhaps it would refresh Colonel Weaver's memory if I noted that USAF OSI has made negative statements about the MJ-12 Documents as well? and even informed the FBI that they were bogus? Copies??

I eagerly await your reversal of this miscarriage of justice. To use the vernacular, if Colonel Weaver can't put up any data, than shouldn't he be told to shut up? Retract, apologize??

Most cordially,

Stanton T. Friedman

Stanton T. Friedman, US Citizen

STANTON T. FRIEDMAN
NUCLEAR PHYSICIST - LECTURER
79 PEMBROKE CRESCENT
FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK E3B 2V1
CANADA
(506) 457-0232

OP-ED
for NY Times

The Roswell Incident, the USAF, and the NY Times S.Friedman
Sept.23, 1994

As a nuclear physicist who has studied UFOs for 36 years and, in 1978, began the research into the 1947 Roswell Incident, I was not surprised at the recent misleading USAF report about the event. There is ample evidence that cooverup has been the USAF rule, and that we are dealing with a Cosmic Watergate not a "white lie". But when the NYT (Sept. 18) does a 60 column inch front page story completely ignoring the relevant evidence, that is surprising.

William Broad's article tells us a great deal about Mogul whose existence had been known for many years. It tells us nothing about the overwhelming evidence, outstanding individuals and groups involved in the Roswell Incident. Instead he disparages "flying saucer fans, devotees, cultists". Not a word about 5 large scientific studies, 12 PhD theses, hundreds of articles by professional scientists like myself. Opinion polls for 30 years have shown that UFO "believers" far outnumber non-believers and that, the greater the education, the more likely to accept UFO reality.

I have lectured about UFOs to over 100 professional groups, and 600 colleges and have two University of Chicago physics degrees. Perhaps that is why "Crash at Corona" by myself and aviation science writer Don Berliner isn't mentioned? Cultists?? The UFO debunkers and noisy negativists are the cultists.

The Roswell military group was the 509th, then the world's only atomic bombers, with hand picked officers. A key witness was Major Jesse Marcel, the 509th's intelligence officer . His son, who also handled wreckage, is now an MD, pilot, flight surgeon and served on military aircraft accident investigating teams. There is old testimony from both Marcels and many other witnesses which is in direct conflict with the newly concocted Mogul balloon explanation. There was, after all, nothing special about the Mogul balloon materials. The real wreckage was very special.

In 1979 I located the pictures taken in General Ramey's office. Every book notes that the wreckage is indeed a balloon radar reflector. Why the USAF had the pictures analyzed is beyond me. I can understand this false statement, "In 1978 an article appeared in a tabloid newspaper the National Inquirer(sic) which reported that the former intelligence officer, Marcel, claimed he had recovered UFO debris near Roswell in 1947. Also in 1978 a UFO Researcher, Stanton Friedman, met with Marcel and began investigating the claims..". The Enquirer article actually appeared in February, 1980, long after I and others had conducted a serious and still ongoing investigation. I was referred to Marcel by a TV station manager, a ham radio buddy of Marcel's. There are many notarized statements from first hand witnesses, NOT interviewed by USAF.

The only real correlation between a balloon and the wreckage comes from a July 8 interview with rancher Mac Brazel who made the long trip to Roswell on July 6 (not July 7) and had previously recovered two weather balloons. It has been well documented by Roswell media persons, Brazel's son and neighbors, that he had been taken into custody by the USAAF and given a new story. The AF report even leaves out the next line of the newspaper article, otherwise quoted almost in its entirety, "I am sure that what I found was not any weather observation balloon".

Is there any indication that the much quoted Colonel Trakowski knows anything about the Roswell story in particular, or UFOs in general? Why no mention that several of the key witnesses interviewed by the USAF collect substantial pensions? No vested interests? Why no mention that the Roswell UFO Museum charges no admission and is staffed by volunteers? I have been there. Has Trakowski? Broad mentions Walter Haut, UFO museum president, but not that he was the officer ordered by Colonel William Blanchard, 509th Commander and later a 4-star general, to issue the crashed disc press release.

Pensioned OSI officer Sheridan Cavitt's new testimony is totally at odds with his own previous testimony, with that of others who supposedly accompanied him to the crash site, and with the official USAF conclusion!!

Although both contain much factual material, the NYT article and the USAF piece are almost textbook examples of propaganda with selective choice of data, positive and negative name calling, false reasoning and a cavalier disregard for the truth. FOR SHAME. Text 698 words

For free scientific UFO info send an SASE to UFO, POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958 -30-

To NY Times. In a 700 word article it is impossible to go into any detail, but I can substantiate all my claims. In 60 column inches, Broad should have noted key details about the Roswell story, not just irrelevant trivia about the MOGUL story.

Here is what Cavitt is quoted as saying (Tab 17) " The area of this debris was very small about 20 feet square, and the material was spread on the ground, but there was no gouge or crater or other obvious sign of impact. I remember recognizing this material as being consistent with a weather balloon. We gathered up some of this material, which would easily fit into one vehicle."

Lt. McAndrew, in contrast, says Tab 32, "The balloon that was found on the Foster Ranch consisted of as many as 23 350 gram balloons spaced at 20 foot intervals, several radar targets (3 to 5) plastic ballast tubes, parchment parachutes, a black "cutoff" box containing portions of a weather instrument and a sonabuoy (Atch.3)." There is nothing here to justify Brazel's long Roswell trip nor Major Marcel's very different 1978 description. If Cavitt recognized a balloon, why not tell all the investigators?