

MOU Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return  
of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into  
Outer Space

- if Mr. Chery hasn't read the agreement I would be  
more than willing to provide him a free copy.

Merzel

main probe - ethics minister John F. Kennedy Dec 27, 1960  
consultant to NSA 30 years Dec 8, 1960  
National Bureau of Standards  
Dep't of Commerce  
CIA

Received: from castor  
(gcameron@castor.cc.umanitoba.ca [130.179.16.20]) by  
electra.cc.umanitoba.ca (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id AAA23572  
for <gcameron@cc.umanitoba.ca>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 00:21:23 -0800 (CST)  
Sender: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Message-ID: <328ABA61.5576@cc.umanitoba.ca>  
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 1996 00:21:21 -0800  
From: Grant Robert Cameron <gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA>  
Organization: University of Manitoba  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (X11; I; SunOS 5.4 sun4m)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Subject: Cosmos 954 crash  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----4BOA2AEB6FC0"  
Status: 0  
X-Status:

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----4BOA2AEB6FC0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<http://www.ssimicro.com/~ufoinfo/satellite.html>

-----4BOA2AEB6FC0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="satellite.html"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="satellite.html"

#### Nuclear Satellite Crashes in Our Backyard

---

I've managed to amass quite a bit of info on the Russian Cosmos 954 satellite than crashed in the NWT in the late 70's, thanks to the wonders of the Internet. However, I'm always searching for more info, so if you know any information about this event, please write and share it with me.

Meanwhile, here is what I've put together: (info taken from various web sites and magazines)

Cosmos 954 was a Soviet Radar Ocean Reconnaissance Satellite (RORSAT) which was powered by a nuclear reactor. Previous Soviet missions using such technology would split the reactor from the parent body of the spacecraft and boost the radioactive material into a higher orbit where the reactor would remain for 300-1000 years once the short lifetime of the satellite was over, which was well beyond the life of the radioactive material. Cosmos 954 had a special problem; it went out of control and the technicians were unable to separate the reactor from the spacecraft's parent body.

**The Russians sent out a warning** that one of their satellites was going to crash and it was monitored on radar by **NORAD**. On **January 24, 1978**, Cosmos 954 deorbited and came crashing into the Great Slave Lake area of the Northwest Territories, disintegrated during reentry into **a shower of radioactive debris which spread over some 124,000 square kilometers**. A radioactive portion of the craft fell near a trapper's camp. Upon finding this, the trapper looked at the unusual phenomenon and then left it alone. A massive search was begun to locate the debris - made up of over **200 troops** from both the **Canadian Air Force** and the **US military** - which **lasted until October**. Around "key" areas of the crash, tight security was present and no civilians were permitted to view the scene(s). The trapper and his radioactive find were both located and taken back to Yellowknife, where the trapper was found to be in good health and the reactor pieces were impounded. Some of the debris was flown to Manitoba for testing.

After the cleanup, the Canadian Government sent a \$15 million bill to the Soviets. The Soviets paid less than half of this amount and agreed not to take back the spacecraft. The Canadians were happy with the amount they received and were happier still that the Soviets had acknowledged the spacecraft's existence.

Of the thousands of radioactive fragments that reached the earth's surface, some were potentially lethal (i.e., the gamma ray radiation, near contact, was as high as 500 R/h). However, less than 1% of radioactive material was recovered. Think about that - 99% of the radioactive parts of this satellite are now floating around in Great Slave Lake. Better look for trouts with three eyes when you're out fishing...

As well, I received the following information from a colleague on the Internet. Here's the intro of the summary from a Cosmos 954 book - Cosmos 954: The Occurrence and Nature of Recovered Debris by W.K. Gummer, F.R. Campbell, G.B. Knight and J.L. Richard AECB INFO-0006 May, 1980

#### Summary

The Russian nuclear-powered satellite, COSMOS 954, re-entered the earth's atmosphere early on 24 January, 1978, watched first by the tracking instruments of NORAD and then by the startled eyes of a few residents of the NWT. Concern about radioactive debris, whose presence was quickly verified on the frozen surfaces of lakes and land, led to a massive airborne and ground search and recovery program that lasted from re-entry date to the middle of October, 1978, interrupted only by the spring break-up period. The search area extended from Great Slave Lake north-eastward towards Baker Lake.

Only about 65 kg of material were found, although it is probable that the satellite weighed several tons. All fragments but one - itself weighing over 18 kg - were radioactive; many showed clear evidence of melting and explosion.

As a follow-up to the above, I received this e-mail from the Yukon:

I can't help out much but I did play a small part following the crash of 954. At the time I worked with the federal department of Fisheries and Oceans. Because of the perceived risk of widespread radiation contamination across the north, we were asked to collect several hundred fish samples in the area of the East Arm of Great Slave Lake. The samples were to be screened for radioactive contamination. To my knowledge nothing was ever detected and that pretty much ended my small role in the crash of 954 and it's aftermath. I do remember each community in the western arctic (of Canada) were screen as well by teams of technicians who had to walk tight grids through the towns with radiation detectors looking for radioactive particles or debris.

Well, I am a conspiracy buff, and I'm sure there could be more to this than we were told. I plan on looking everywhere I can for information, and I've been told that:

- \* Indian and Northern Affairs may have old picture in their files, perhaps the RCMP as well.
- \* there was a big front page picture running on the Globe and Mail at the time
- \* the Yellowknifer or news/north undoubtedly ran stories on this

Any assistance in finding out more information on this would be greatly appreciated!

-----4B0A2AEB6FC0--

Received: from pollux  
(gcameron@pollux.cc.umanitoba.ca [130.179.16.6]) by  
electra.cc.umanitoba.ca (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id XAA07554  
for <gcameron@cc.umanitoba.ca>; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 23:57:18 -0600 (CST)  
Sender: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Message-ID: <32993537.1395@cc.umanitoba.ca>  
Date: Sun, 24 Nov 1996 23:57:11 -0600  
X-UIDL: 848901508.000  
From: Grant Robert Cameron <gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA>  
Organization: University of Manitoba  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (X11; I; SunOS 5.4 sun4m)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Subject: Rogue Chinese satellite hurtles to earth  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----7FFB61154773"  
Status: 0  
X-Status:

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----7FFB61154773  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

[http://www.nando.net/newsroom/ntn/health/030896/health12\\_20457.html](http://www.nando.net/newsroom/ntn/health/030896/health12_20457.html)

-----7FFB61154773  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="health12\_20457.html"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="health12\_20457.html"

RETURN TO HEALTH & SCIENCE: NORMAL ;; LOW-GRAPHICS

-----  
[For Adults Only--Click here for more information]  
-----

Rogue Chinese satellite hurtles to earth  
-----

Copyright c 1996 Nando.net  
Copyright c 1996 Reuter Information Service

LONDON (Mar 8, 1996 9:15 p.m. EST) - A rogue Chinese satellite is hurtling out of control towards the earth and tracking stations warned on Friday it could crash anywhere early next week.

The spy satellite is travelling at the speed of a bullet. It contains no nuclear materials but is the size of a small car and would have the impact of a small bomb if it crashed into a city.

As it spirals down to earth in ever lower orbits, the satellite is being tracked by the U.S. Space Command, the European Space Agency and Britain's Defence Research Agency.

It is expected to crash at 0400 GMT on Tuesday but officials said that estimate could change at any time. They will only have two hours warning of its final destination.

"It comes over Britain about four times a day for five minutes at a time. Its final orbit is when we can finally pinpoint it," a British Defence Research Agency official said.

He said it is now travelling at 18,000 miles (28,970 km) an hour and will hit the ground at 400 mph (644 kph). "It will be intact as it is designed to survive re-entry," he said.

The chances of its emergency parachutes working are considered slim. Precision calculations on its exact impact point are impossible due to variable atmospheric conditions.

British Home Office (interior ministry) officials have put local authorities on alert to activate emergency measures in case of a full-scale disaster. Insurers reassured householders that they will be covered if it crashes through their roof.

"It is a hard one to deal with. We have had panic-stricken calls and people who want to treat it flippantly. It is a remote, negligible possibility but it is a possibility," an official said.

Tracking station officials said its chances of hitting Britain were about 500-1 and one bookmaker said: "It is the same odds as the Loch Ness monster being found."

The 4,500 pound (2,041 kilogram) FSW1 satellite failed 10 days after it was launched on October 8, 1993 as part of a Chinese military reconnaissance programme, aviation experts said.

The industry journal Aviation Week said the spacecraft malfunctioned when commanded to head for a landing site in the Chinese province of Sichuan, going into an uncontrollable oblong orbit that has dipped to an altitude of 100 miles (160 km).

Space junk is an increasing danger for spacecraft.

The U.S. space agency NASA estimates there are at least 7,000 "substantial" objects such as satellites in low earth orbits. But almost all are either in stable orbits or designed to be vapourised by the heat generated by re-entry.

There were two reported accidental crashes onto land by unmanned spacecraft in the 1970s. The U.S. Skylab space station came down in remote western Australia and a Russian nuclear-powered spacecraft hit Canada.

-----  
[ GLOBAL ; STATESIDE ; SPORTS ; POLITICS ; VOICES ; BUSINESS ; INFOTECH ;  
HEALTH & SCIENCE ; ENTERTAINMENT ; MAIN ]  
-----

Copyright c 1996 Nando.net  
Do you have some feedback for the Nando Times staff?

-----7FFB61154773--

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 00:30:04 -0600  
From: Grant Robert Cameron <gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA>  
To: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Subject: The Cosmos series satellites

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----664267FE7A39  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<http://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/heasarc/missions/cosmos.html>

-----664267FE7A39  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="cosmos.html"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="cosmos.html"

[Image]

The Cosmos series

---

#### COSMOS 60

Cosmos 60 was launched by the USSR on 12 March 1965. It was in an orbit with apogee 287 km, perigee 201 km, inclination 64.8 degrees. The orbital period was 89 minutes. The satellite reentered the Earth's atmosphere on 17 March 1965.

#### Instrumentation

Cosmos 60 carried a 16-channel NaI(Tl) scintillator 40 x 40 mm in size. It was surrounded in a charged particle rejection scintillator. The spacecraft weighed 1600 kg and the detector was located inside the vehicle. The detector was sensitive to 0.5-2.0 MeV photons.

Cosmos 60 measured the gamma-ray background flux density to be  $1.7e4$  quanta/sq-m/s. As was seen by Ranger 3 and Lunas 10 & 12, the spectrum fell sharply up to 1.5 MeV and was flat for higher energies. Several peaks were observed in the spectra which were attributed to the inelastic interaction of cosmic protons with the materials in the satellite body.

#### COSMOS 135 and 163

Cosmos 135 was launched 12 December 1966 into an orbit with 660 km apogee, 250 km perigee, and 49 degree inclination. Cosmos 163 was put into an almost identical orbit on 5 June 1967.

#### Instrumentation

Identical instruments were carried on both these missions. They consisted of a scintillation gamma-ray spectrometer with a 64 channel pulse height scintillator. The detector was a 40 x 40 sq-mm NaI(Tl) crystal surrounded on all sides by a 5 mm thick plastic scintillator for charged particle rejection. The crystal was viewed by a single photomultiplier tube. The equipment aboard Cosmos 135 covered the energy range 0.4-2.5 MeV, while Cosmos 163 covered 0.3-3.7 MeV. The gamma-ray detector on Cosmos 135 was located 0.5 m from the main spacecraft body, while it was 3 m away from Cosmos 163. Spectra were obtained once every 10 minutes, with a single spectrum being accumulated for 2 minutes.

measured the spectrum and time var a-ray  
intensity. The values found were significantly different than those measured  
by its contemporaries, such as ERS-18.

#### COSMOS 428

Cosmos 428 was launched by the USSR on 24 June 1971 and recovered 6 July 1971. The orbit was apogee/perigee/inclination 208 km, 271 km, and 51.8 degrees, respectively. It was a military satellite on which X-ray astronomy experiments had been added. There was a scintillation spectrometer sensitive to X-rays >30 keV, with a 2 deg x 17 deg field of view. In addition, there was an X-ray telescope which operated in the range 2-30 keV. Though its mission was brief, it detected several X-ray sources which were correlated to already identified Uhuru point sources.

#### COSMOS 461

Cosmos 461 was put into a 500 km circular orbit on 2 December 1971. There was an omni-directional gamma-ray scintillator with a 70 x 70 mm NaI(Tl) crystal and an anti-coincidence plastic shield. The multi channel pulse height analyzer accumulated spectra once every 6 minutes for 2 minutes. It was sensitive over the range 28 keV-4.1 MeV. It was known to have seen at least 1 gamma-ray burst observed by the Vela satellites. Also, it measured the diffuse gamma-ray background. The data led to 2 conclusions: the photon spectrum in the soft region was considerably steeper than was seen by Ranger 3 and above 400 keV the power law for the energy dependence breaks down.

#### COSMOS 208,264,561,731

These Soviet satellites were all reported to have carried X-ray and/or gamma-ray experiments. The purposes of the missions, however, were unannounced, and believed to be military reconnaissance. The science instruments were carried inside special containers known as Nauka modules.

Cosmos 208	21 March-2 April 1968	apogee/perigee/inclination:207;305;65.0
Cosmos 264	23 January-5 February 1969	apogee/perigee/inclination:209;297;69.9
Cosmos 561	25 May-6 June 1973	apogee/perigee/inclination:215;317;65.4
Cosmos 731	21 May-2 June 1975	apogee/perigee/inclination:207;313;65.0

#### COSMOS 215

Cosmos 215 was launched 19 April 1968. It contained a set of 8 instruments for visible observations, 1 UV and 1 X-ray experiment. It was in a 261 x 426 km orbit, at an inclination of 48.5 degrees. The orbital period was ~ 91 minutes. It was intended primarily to perform solar studies, but did detect some non-solar X-ray events. It reentered the atmosphere on 30 June 1968.

#### COSMOS 262

Cosmos 262 was launched 26 December 1968. It was put into a 259 x 798 km, 48 degree orbit. It was primarily a military mission, but is known to have carried a scientific X-ray monitor. Cosmos 262 reentered the atmosphere on 18 July 1969.

#### COSMOS 856

Primarily a military mission, Cosmos 856 was launched on 22 September 1976. It also carried 99-2M gamma-ray spectrometers sensitive to 100-4000 MeV. It performed a survey of the diffuse gamma-ray sky. The satellite was recovered on 5 October 1976.

#### COSMOS 914

With instrumentation similar to that of Cosmos 856, Cosmos 914 was launched on 31 May 1977. It was in an orbit with apogee 210 km, perigee 327 km, at an

inclination s. mainly a low-resolution photographic  
reconnaissance satellite, it was recovered on 13 June 1977.

## COSMOS 1106

Launched on 12 June 1979, Cosmos 1106 was put into a 222 x 284 km orbit at an inclination of 81.4 degrees. Intended to perform an Earth-ice study, it also carried a gamma-ray crystal scintillation spectrometer for celestial studies.

## References

- Chupp 1976, Gamma-Ray Astronomy, p. 198.  
Davies, 1988, Satellite Astronomy: The Principles and Practice of Astronomy from Space.  
Surkov, Exploration of Terrestrial Planets from Spacecraft, pp. 183-184.  
Table of Artificial Satellites Launched Between 1957 and 1976.

---

Last modified: Thursday, 17-Oct-96 13:34:25 EDT  
Web page author: Jesse S. Allen

Please send comments, questions, corrections and new instruments/missions to be added to  
[ ] request@legacy.gsfc.nasa.gov

Return to the High-Energy Astrophysics Missions page

---

A service of the Laboratory for High Energy Astrophysics (LHEA) at NASA/GSFC

HEASARC Director: Dr. Nicholas E. White, white@adhoc.gsfc.nasa.gov, 301-286-8443  
Technical Rep: Sherri Calvo, sherri.calvo@gsfc.nasa.gov, 301-286-5668  
Questions/Comments/Feedback to: feedback@athena.gsfc.nasa.gov  
General astronomy pointers are available.

---

-----664267FE7A39--

## ARC Search Results: Hit #1 of 1

1 hit(s) retrieved for keywords "chester clifton" with filters applied.

[See Hierarchy](#)
[Printer-Friendly Version](#)
[Back to Search Results](#)
[Refine Search](#)
[New Search](#)

Jump to Hit

**ARC Identifier:** 192566

**Title:** Joint Chiefs of Staff meet at the LBJ Ranch, 12/22/1964



Large image (93626 Bytes)

**Creator:** [President \(1963-1969 : Johnson\). White House Photograph Office. \(1963 - 1969\)](#)  
 ( Most Recent)

**Type of Archival**

**Materials:** Photographs and other Graphic Materials

**Level of**

**Description:** Item from Collection LBJ-WHPO: White House Photo Office Collection, 11/22/1963 - 01/20/1969

**Location:** Lyndon Baines Johnson Library (NLLBJ), 2313 Red River Street, Austin, TX 78705-5702 PHONE: 512-721-0200, FAX: 512-721-0170, EMAIL: johnson.library@nara.gov

**Production Date:** 12/22/1964

**Part of:** Series: Johnson White House Photographs, 11/22/1963 - 01/20/1969

**Scope & Content**

**Note:** Location: LBJ Ranch. Depicted: Major General Chester Clifton, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, President Lyndon B. Johnson, General Curtis LeMay, General Earle Wheeler, Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, General Harold Johnson, Admiral David McDonald, General Wallace Greene.

**Access**

**Restrictions:** Unrestricted

**Use Restrictions:** Unrestricted

**Variant Control**

**Number(s):** NAIL Control Number: NLJ-WHPO-A-VN086  
 Other Identifier: W522-13a

**Copy 1**

**Copy Status:** Preservation-Reproduction

**Storage Facility:** Lyndon Baines Johnson Library (Austin, TX)

**Media**

**Media Type:** Negative

**Copy 2**

**Copy Status:** Reference

**Storage Facility:** Lyndon Baines Johnson Library (Austin, TX)

**Media**

**Media Type:** Photographic Print

**Index Terms**

**Contributors to Authorship and/or Production of the Archival Materials**

Okamoto, Yoichi, Photographer

[top of page](#)

[ARC Main Page](#) | [Research Room Main Page](#)

[Privacy & Use](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [FAQs](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Home](#)

U.S. National Archives & Records Administration  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20408 • 1-800-234-8861

## Dr. Eric Walker - Kecksburg Pa. Interview

During the investigation of the involvement of Dr. Eric Walker into the area of crashed flying saucers, we realized that Dr. Walker lived only 100 miles from the site of the Kecksburg, Penn Crash in Dec, 1965.

Dr. Walker at the time was then President of Penn. State University. Mr. Stan Gordon was contacted, the chief investigator into the Kecksburg crash. He confirmed that there was a report of someone fitting Dr. Walker's description at the crash scene.

After some discussion, it was decided that Dr. Armen Victorian would do the interview related to the Kecksburg crash with Dr Walker.

The interview was done by phone 6:15 P.M. May 30, 1991

AV -Armen Victorian  
EW -Eric Walker

AV: Hello?

EW: Hello. Yes.

AV: Dr. Walker?

EW: Yes.

AV: This is Dr. Victorian from England.

EW: Yes. How are you?

AV: Thanks Doctor. I am fine. How are you?

EW: Pretty good.

AV: Doctor. I guess last time I caught you in a bad moment.

EW: I guess you did.

AV: How about this time? Are you doing anything that I might have interrupted?

EW: No. It is OK.

AV: Doctor. I want to ask you about something that might not have anything to do with UFOs. Would you mind asking you? ( there was a long silence and then he answered )

EW: What is that?

AV: Doctor. It is about an incident which happened in the mid 60s, on December 9, 1965, in Kecksburg. It was, one could say almost in your back garden. Could you tell me anything about it?

EW: What about it?

AV: Well. What did you find out about it?

EW: You still have not given up.

AV: Well doctor. You could say that I am like a turtle. You turn me over, to get rid of me. I struggle for a while on my shell, and eventually get back on my toes.

EW: Well , we went there...

AV: With the military?

EW: Well you could say. There were two from the military - but not on duty.

AV: How about the others?

EW: He was a fellow colleague of mine.

AV: What did you find. Was it a ...I know you are not going to like the word...but...was it a UFO?

EW: I cannot comment on that. I cannot tell you.

AV: Were you there for long?

EW: Why?

AV: Well, Curiosity. I thought maybe there was a purpose in the sense of, maybe preparing a report, or taking some notes.

EW: We did not prepare any reports.

AV: Well, Doctor, apart from everything, how are you now-a-days?

EW: I am fine.

AV: Thank-you for your time and help. Good-bye.

EW: BYE.

---

## Anomalies Zone: UFO's, Other Oddities Reported in Pennsylvania during

---

Vol. IV No. 1 Winter, 1997

# The Anomalies Zone

**Editor: Stan Gordon**

**P.O. Box 936, Greensburg, PA 15601**

**Phone/FAX 724-838-7768 An Information Exchange Newsletter**

### **The NASA FRAGOLOGY Files Destroyed or Missing? Did NASA File Contain Information on Kecksburg?**

On December 9, 1965 something reportedly fell from the sky into a wooded area near Kecksburg, Pennsylvania. For years I have been investigating the case trying to determine just what it was that dropped in on this quiet community so many years ago. Even today there exists much speculation as to what the metallic acorn shaped object was, which witnesses claim that they saw in 1965. After many years of researching the incident, my position concerning the case is that it is not a hoax. The two most likely explanations as to the source of the object is (A.) The object was a man-made space probe that had re-entry control capability. The structure design of the craft would have made it possible for it to safely return to the Earth. (B.) An Extraterrestrial spacecraft which originated from outside of the Earth. Eyewitness accounts from that night in 1965 describe military and government personnel on the scene, who took part in what apparently was a search and recovery operation of the object involved. Among the authorities that were reported to have been at the site were NASA personnel.

Even though informants have told us that they have seen the military recovery report on the Kecksburg object, no such documents have ever surfaced. But many other documents that concern Project Moondust have been released by various agencies. Project Moondust involved the government functions that dealt with the recovery of space objects that survived re-entry through the Earth's atmosphere. A 1973 State Department document released to New Mexico researcher Clifford Stone states that "The designator MOONDUST is used in cases involving the examination of non-US space objects or objects of unknown origin." Various State Department documents show that NASA

played a role in the recovery and examination of space object debris. It was always of interest, that no NASA documents were ever located concerning the Kecksburg event, even though it had been reported that a NASA representative was sent to the site of the crash and interviewed some witnesses about what they experienced that day. In October of 1994, a FOIA request was made to NASA Headquarters for information that concerned the operational guidelines that NASA personnel followed when involved with cases that dealt with the recovery and examination of space material.

Other documentation showed that NASA was involved with MOONDUST matters as well. In this request, I asked for a copy of these guidelines from the project's inception through the current date. I also requested copies of all reports that would have involved NASA in these types of events from the time span covering from January of 1960 through January of 1970. This search was to include any such event that would have occurred within the United States or at the worldwide level. In April of 1995, I received a response to this request. While I did not receive the particular material that I had requested, another document was sent that was quite interesting to say the least. The document, a records transmittal and receipt form, released by NASA's History office, discusses " NASA Fragology Files consisting of reports of space objects recovery, analysis of fragments to determine national ownership and vehicle origin." The single page paper was marked highest classification confidential, to be released only upon authorization of NASA. The document indicates that the reports were made during the years of 1962-1967. Reports contained within the document are marked such as F33-Venezuela Object. Another report is identified as Moon Dust -KATOTO Estate. The list of records begins with F1 and ends with F48. Interestingly, there are gaps in the sequencing of the reports listed in the document. It appears that a quite a number of reports that were associated with the NASA Fragology Files are not included for some reason.

For example F5, F6, F9, and F10 are missing, as well as twenty others. The Kecksburg case occurred in 1965 and if NASA were involved in this investigation as stated by various witnesses, then it would be likely that this report should be listed in the NASA Fragology Files. Upon receipt of this document, I quickly sent a FOIA request to NASA Headquarters for a copy of each report listed in the document concerning the NASA Fragology Files. On the copy of the initial document I received, there was a hand written notation which stated "Still at Fed.

Records Center 9/29/94". In May, 1995, I received a response from NASA Headquarters which informed me that I had to send an advanced payment to begin fulfilling this search request from the Federal Records Center. NASA's History office informed them that the records I had requested may be contained in two boxes. I submitted the check and when many months went by with no response, I called NASA Headquarters in January of 1996 to find out the status of the records search. I left a message, and within a few days I received a response. A letter dated January 22, 1996 from NASA Headquarters states "We received your check ... for the retrieval of the two boxes that may have contained documents you were seeking from the Federal Records Center. I have been informed by the program office that the Records Center informed them that those boxes were destroyed prior to their request." Also enclosed in the letter was an apology for the mix-up and the time that this had taken to be completed. I was disturbed to learn of the destruction of this information.

Even if no information on Kecksburg existed in these files, what may well have been other important historical records related to the American and Soviet space program may have also been lost. I requested that an investigation be conducted into the destruction of the NASA Fragology File records. In an April 15, 1996 letter from NASA Headquarters, it was explained to me how the FOIA process worked. It explained that once the NASA FOIA office receives a request, they attempt to locate the appropriate program office that have control over the requested documents. It further stated "The FOIA office provides the program office with a copy of the request and the instructions to obtain a copy of the requested document and supply it to the FOIA office for direct response to the requester. If the program office has forwarded the documents to the Washington National Records Center, the program office then informs the FOIA office of that fact. The FOIA office then asks the requester for an up front payment of the cost.

The Washington National Records Center is not contacted prior to receipt of a requester's check. Upon receipt of a requester's check, the FOIA office asked the program office to have the documents retrieved from the Washington National Records Center. It was at this point in the process of your request that the program office was informed that the records had been destroyed." According to the letter, after I had asked for an inquiry into the reported destruction of the records, the Washington National Records Center attempted again to locate the records. But after searching they still were not able to locate the files.

The letter stated "They ( the National Records Center) do not know if the records were destroyed or have just been misplaced." A letter from the Washington National Records Center to the NASA Headquarters Records Manager dated March 28, 1996 stated " our records indicate that the boxes were identified as missing in 1987 and have not been located since that date." NASA had no explanation for the hand written markings on the document which indicated that the records were still at the Washington National Records Center in 1994.

In other related correspondence, NASA indicated that they could only "surmise this notation was in error." Since then, searches have been conducted at numerous NASA installations for records concerning the NASA Fragology Files. No other references to the files have surfaced so far. This appears to be a new terminology that myself and other researchers had not encountered before. How the NASA Fragology Files relates to Project Moondust and possibly to reported UFO crashes is open for speculation. It may be only coincidence, but it is interesting to note that in 1987, both the first Kecksburg eyewitness who reported seeing the object on the ground surfaced, and that as public interest in the case escalated , the files reportedly disappeared. The incident had always been a Pittsburgh area topic of discussion, since so many people remembered the incident. As the media began to focus on the story, individuals who had kept quiet about their involvement in the case for many years came forward. Even today however, many people who have talked to us about their knowledge of the case refuse to be identified, and there are many others who apparently have never come forward according to relatives and friends. Certain information has surfaced in recent years that suggests that the government does not want the information on the Kecksburg case released. Is this because we recovered a Soviet space probe to study and never returned it to that launching state as we had agreed to at the United Nations, or could we have recovered something much more unusual? The question remains, where are the NASA Fragology Files? If you have any information on this matter, I would appreciate your contacting me so that we can exchange notes.

### **Breaking News!**

As I am working on this newsletter, I have just received information on an alleged UFO incident which occurred in Northern Pennsylvania. Preliminary information indicates that several people observed a large bright green light hovering in the sky. Two separate objects broke away

from the larger light. After this, one light dropped straight down while a red light went straight up. They apparently made numerous turns and moved around the sky for sometime when the larger light just suddenly vanished. Reportedly, a short time later, much aircraft activity began to take place in the area, including the appearance of a helicopter. Reportedly, there is usually little aircraft activity in the area. As more information becomes available on this sighting It will be released.

### **Extraterrestrial Exposure Regulation "Reserved"**

A NASA Regulation in effect since July 16, 1969 and has been a subject of controversy, since it could possibly be interpreted that UFO abductees or witnesses who claim to have been close to a UFO could be subject to a fine of \$5,000 or imprisoned for one year if they have been "Extraterrestrially exposed" as defined by the NASA administrator in Title 14, Part 1211 of the CFR (Code of Federal Regulations).

In section 1211.102 Definitions. (b) "Extraterrestrially exposed means the state or condition of any person, property, animal, or other form of life or matter whatever, who or which has: (1) Touched directly or come within the atmospheric envelope of any other celestial body: or (2) Touched directly or been in close proximity to (or been exposed indirectly to) any person, property, animal or other form of life or matter who or which has been extraterrestrially exposed by virtue of paragraph (b) (1) of this section. Under section 1211.102-Definitions, it also states "Quarantine means the detention, examination, and decontamination of any persons, property, animal or other form of life or matter whatever that is extraterrestrially exposed, and includes apprehension or seizure of such person, property, animal or other form of life or matter whatever." The regulation indicates that those who fall under this category can be placed into a quarantine station that is under the control of armed guards. In a letter response from NASA Headquarters in 1995, It was learned that as of April 26, 1991, Title 14 CFR Part 1211, was removed from the Federal Register. Along with the letter, NASA had provided a copy of the notice of April 26, 1991 "reserving Part 1211 for future use by NASA." Pittsburgh researcher Greg McCormick recently looked into the current status of this regulation. McCormick states "I consulted several US government sources to determine the current status of Part 1211 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations which established procedures governing those who have contact with extraterrestrial lifeforms. Book 14 of the CFR is updated annually as of January 1. The January 1, 1996 CFR still listed Part 1211 as 'Reserved.' The January 1,

1997 update for Title 14 was not available. However, the LSA (List of CFR Sections Affected), which lists changes to the CFR for all parts of Title 14 from January 2, 1996 through December 31, 1996, did not show the status of Part 1211 as having been changed in any way. I also searched the Federal Register online via GPO access for the years 1995 through 1997. Included in the Federal register are Proposed Rules from Federal Agencies and Organizations. My search returned no hits relating to Title 14 CFR Part 1211, indicating no changes or rules were proposed affecting this regulation through mid-February, 1997."

## **A Major UFO encounter**

**The following article was printed in the BORU Journal, No.2, Fall 1996 published by the Butler Organization for Research of the Unexplained, 118 Beach Road, Chicora, PA. 16025.**

September 10-11, 1995-Butler, PA/ Butler Twp., PA Butler County: One of the most major UFO related events ever to occur in Western Pennsylvania, this multiple witness sighting took place in the city of Butler and around Butler Township. A chronology of this astounding event is as follows:

**8:15 PM-** The initial reports received by BORU came from 10 individuals on Main St. in Butler. The witnesses at this location report seeing a bright light which was described as a bright star or planet. After a few minutes, a large triangular-shaped object became visible. The object had five "window" structures with the largest one in the center. Bright yellow-white light was emanating from the windows. Witnesses also reported seeing an additional smaller object with the same configuration. The smaller object had the same red, blue, green and yellow flashing lights around the perimeter. Several of the eyewitnesses viewed the object through binoculars. The smaller object disappeared to the East and the larger object drifted very slowly towards the West for about 30 minutes. Next the large object abruptly shot out a beam of white light from beneath which struck the ground. The object slowly moved towards the West for about 45 minutes before disappearing behind a group of trees. The object was viewed for approximately 2 hours. The eyewitnesses notified the police at approximately 8:30 P.M.

**8:30PM-**A Pennsylvania State Constable also viewed the object while in Lyndora, PA Butler Township. What appeared at first to be a bright star took shape as a large triangular-shaped object drifting toward Butler City. The object was described as having bright white lights at each of

the corners and small red and green lights towards the front. The detailed flight pattern given by the observer denotes that the object slowly moved from the downtown Butler area to the intersection of PA 8 and McCalmont Rd. From there the object moved towards East Butler then back across Butler city towards the West. The entire duration of this sighting lasted approximately 40 minutes.

**9:05 PM**-Several eyewitnesses reported that the police had a serious interest in the object. Individuals who monitor public safety radio transmissions in and around the Butler area report to BORU that police were dispatched to the tier parking garage in Butler city to get a better look at the object. While at the garage, officers reported looking at the object through binoculars and reporting to the dispatcher. The dispatcher by her own admission over the radio reported receiving numerous phone calls concerning the object. At approximately 9:10 PM, the object shot a beam of light at the officers on the roof of the tier parking garage. The frenzied officers reported the unusual light beam back to the dispatcher.

**9:15 PM**-Several witnesses report seeing a triangular object shoot beams of light toward the ground. The event was witnessed from a parking lot at a shopping center near the intersection of PA 356 and PA 68.

**12:00 AM**-At this time, the police interest is immense. The object suddenly reappears and is spotted by several individuals including police officers at the intersection of PA 356 and North Duffy Rd. Witnesses report that the object moved toward the West and disappeared over the Moraine State Park area.

**3:00 AM**-The object reappeared a third time and approximately 25 individuals viewed the object from a restaurant on PA 356. Reports from several of the witnesses state that the triangular-shaped object had bright white lights at each corner and periodically moved slowly and hovered as it moved from a SW to NE direction. The sighting lasted approximately 30 minutes.

**Sept 11, 1995-Butler Twp, PA Butler County:** An individual reported seeing an object hover over his neighbor's house for several minutes. The description of the object was identical to the object seen the previous night. The sighting occurred at **2:35 A.M.** and the witness reported the sighting to the police shortly afterward.

## **Fireball with Sound Reported**

On the evening of January 31, 1997, there were numerous reports of a bright fireball seen crossing the sky in the vicinity of Williamsport, PA, in Lycoming County. The sighting was accompanied by one or more loud explosive sounds. Observations were reported over a large area. More information will be forthcoming.

## **Lights in sky only flares**

During the early morning hours of February 2, 1997, a bright green glow was reported in the sky in Indiana County. A check around the area soon made it apparent that the observation was localized, and a short time later it was determined that the source of the odd lights were from flares being fired during a military exercise being conducted by a local unit.

## **Looking back**

August 8, 1987-At approximately 9 PM, two people in a car are driving near Tylersburg in Northern Clarion County. The driver observed a bright glowing orange object that looked at first like a giant kite. She yelled to her passenger to look at the strange object, who later stated that the object was rising up from the ground, about 50 feet in the air, and about 75 yards from the car. The object when first seen appeared to be made up of a massive amount of electricity as bright flashes from all over the object similar to arc welding was present. But as the object rose, it changed into a different physical form. The object changed from an irregular shape into an elliptical shaped object, still maintaining its orange color. The object hovered, then moved forward in a slow manner. At times when the object appeared to be flying just above the tree tops, the trees never showed any motion, and there was no sound or wind observed. The object was keeping pace with the car, and the witnesses followed the object for a couple of miles. It was as though they were both watching each other. When the car turned left, the object moved over a field and could be seen above the trees. Suddenly the object shot straight up into the sky and moved so quickly that it looked like a big orange dot within seconds. The witnesses believed that it was likely that the object had landed before they first saw it, as the craft was rising when they first observed it. Over the next couple of hours, they heard the sound of jet aircraft flying overhead .

## **About the Anomalies Zone**

**The Anomalies Zone newsletter is published on an irregular basis. This publication serves as an information exchange source for researchers and investigators of unexplained events and UFO related matters. Information from this newsletter may be used by other sources if credit is given to the Anomalies Zone and Stan Gordon. However, in cases where the Anomalies Zone credits other sources for the information, than that source should be contacted for permission to use their material.**

**Keep coming back for periodic updates**

[Kecksburg: The Untold Story](#) | [Report](#) | [Newsletters](#) |  
[Stan's Lecture Info](#)  
[Recent Sightings](#) | [Links](#) | [E-mail](#) | [About Stan](#)  
[HOME](#)

Date: Sun, 24 Nov 1996 02:09:27 -0600  
From: Grant Robert Cameron <gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA>  
To: gcameron@cc.UManitoba.CA  
Subject: Deja News Retrieved Document

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----232D7CAE41D5  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

[http://xp9.dejanews.com/getdoc.xp?recnum=%3c573fna\\$v5@sjx-ixn3.ix.netcom.com%3e&ser](http://xp9.dejanews.com/getdoc.xp?recnum=%3c573fna$v5@sjx-ixn3.ix.netcom.com%3e&server=dnsrver.db96q4&CONTEXT=848822628.30137&hitnum=0)  
ver=dnsrver.db96q4&CONTEXT=848822628.30137&hitnum=0

-----232D7CAE41D5  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="getdoc.xp"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="getdoc.xp"

[Previous] [Next] [Hitlist] [Get Thread] [Author Profile] [Post]  
[Post] [Reply]

-----  
Article 1 of 38

Subject: Re: Kecksburg crash  
From: thx1138@ix.netcom.com (Michael Hofmeister)  
Date: 1996/11/22  
Message-Id: <573fna\$v5@sjx-ixn3.ix.netcom.com>  
References: <56ubd9\$6b6@dfw-ixnews5.ix.netcom.com>  
<848558888.21190@dejanews.com>  
Organization: Acme Rocket Works  
X-Netcom-Date: Thu Nov 21 10:03:22 PM PST 1996  
Reply-To: thx1138@ix.netcom.com  
Newsgroups: alt.alien.visitors

On Thu, 21 Nov 1996 02:01:04 -0600, in <848558888.21190@dejanews.com>, gcameron@cc.umanitoba.ca wrote:

->In article <56ubd9\$6b6@dfw-ixnews5.ix.netcom.com>,  
-> thx1138@ix.netcom.com (Michael Hofmeister) wrote:  
->> Since no one has officially stated what it was, everything is speculation  
->> and guess work.  
->Unbelievable!! Only two weeks ago I discussed two OFFICIAL explanations of  
->the Kecksburg crash. Has it been that long Michael? The Air Force made an  
->official statement that nothing was found in 1965. The USAF project Blue Book  
->made an official statement that Kecksburg was caused by a meteorite.

Well, I have to admit you are right about that. Some official explanations were made that seemingly contradict each other. Therefore, I think our only recourse is speculation based on eyewitness accounts and reference to the laws of Physics.

->> ->It does not involve  
->> ->any interviews with anyone involved, and no documents.  
->> I use whatever you present here. If you have something more substantial,  
->> please let us know. I fill in the details with my knowledge of Physics.

✓ ->Sorry son. That's not how the game is going to be played. I do the work and  
->present evidence, while you sit back and make comments.

You also write books and get paid for your wild and specious theories,

->I am not interested

James Oberg whose Cosmos-96 you are scrambling to defend also writes books for money.

Oberg first proposed the Cosmos-96 theory in an Omni article - for which Sean guarantee he was paid much more - than Dawes were paid for "VFOO ms-12 and the Gov't"

As for my "wild and specious theories": All my claims are backed up by interviews with qualified people, <sup>and/or</sup> documents.

NONE of your theories are backed by any interviews with any qualified people or any documents

->in your opinion.

Then why bother responding? I guess you're afraid most people believe my scientific and logical explanation rather than your wild and specious blather.

*none are scientific*

*religious and illogical*

->There are 30 million other people on the Internet with an opinion. I am really starting to wonder if you have any post secondary education, or whether you won your degree in a poker game.

Naw. I sent away for it with a coupon I found on the back of a box of Coco-Puffs with two box tops.

->How many marks was  
->your opinion worth on the physics final?

None.

*Exactly the same number of marks I will award you for your Cosmos-96. argument*

->You produce a witness that says Kecksburg was caused by Cosmos-96 and I'll produce two. You produce a document that says Kecksburg was caused by Cosmos-96 and I'll produce two.

*one witness -> 2 one document -> two*

Uh, two WHAT? Try to be specific next time.

->" I will fill in the details with my knowledge of physics." Who the hell do you think you are?

Gonzo Skeptic. FEF

*Dr. Fef.*

->> ->As to my " original point " I stated that based on review of a whole series of letters and interviews with Dr. Eric Walker that I believed he would have been at the Kecksburg crash recovery. One of my associates ( who has his Ph.D. in physics) phoned Dr. Walker and asked if he had been there. Dr. Walker stated that yes he, two military people , who he stated were off duty at the time, and an associate of his were at the Kecksburg site. Did you miss this posting???

->> No. But I missed your point. Walker went to a crash site with some of his buddies. So what? I had no comments about that. My comments were related to your wild and specious interpretation that - based on the eyewitness information you posted - the object could not have been made on this Earth. When Oberg correctly pointed out that this was the Cosmos 96 vehicle, you rejected his expert opinion. When I pointed out that everything YOU posted was also consistent with a man-made space vehicle, you abruptly went on an hysterical rant that avoided the original point implied in your first post. QED.

->Michael primary means one- first. The comments I made about Cosmos-96 was secondary - that means two - second.

Uh, so what (still)? Why is a trip in the Pennsylvania woods significant?

->" Oberg correctly pointed out that this was the Cosmos-96 " Is this an official statement, a cover story, or his wild and specious interpretation." Has he any eyewitnesses or documents? Who is his source? Or is this his opinion???

Give him  
->10 marks?

presented any info that contradict

interpretation. The burden of proof is on you.

5

*Not how game is played.*

->Did Cosmos -96 come down on the evening of the 9th or in the morning?

->Does Oberg have an example of a satellite that came down in one piece with no

->dents or noticeable damage.

As I have explained, if Cosmos-96 was hogged out of a solid piece of metal, it could have withstood the re-entry quite well. The velocity on impact would have been relatively low (depending on the drag coefficient and other factors). Indeed, if you want to see an example of a manned satellite that survived re-entry relatively intact, go look at a Mercury, Gemini, or Appolo capsule. They look pretty good, considering.

*comparing Dashed for example of unmanned satellite not manned capsule*  
->Canada is famous for a couple things, such as having the fastest man in the world. We are also famous for being the only country to have proof of recovering

->a Cosmos satellite. Cosmos 956 - Jan 24, 1978

->Did it come down undamaged and in one piece?

->No. It came down in thousands of pieces spread over 124,000 square kilometers.

->Only 65 kg. of the object were recovered. That's the way satellites are built.

->There are not meant to re-enter and be recovered by the enemy.

*giving religious speculation - lacking any statements by knowledgeable people or documents*  
You have not demonstrated that 956 was similar to 96. 96 probably had a different mission, and was built with different levels of sophistication. *same*

*same*  
If the designers wanted it to withstand re-entry, they could have easily done so. *same* In fact, we might consider that early satellites were made to withstand re-entry so that once they had used up all their film cisters, they could be re-entered for re-use. *same.*

->Did authorities flip it on a truck and drive out with it the same night, as in ->Kecksburg?

->No. The recovery went on for over 8 months with 200 people involved. It cost ->the Canadian government 15 million dollars to clean up the mess.

Is that \$15 M Canadian or American? *another assumption about Canada*

->Did the authorities hide it like at Kecksburg?

->No they offered it back to the Soviets. Once it's been seen and photographed

->why keep it? *(check to see if edited)*

Which explains the tight security and false cover stories surrounding Cosmos 96.

->> ->The original point was that after reviewing a series of interviews and letters

->> ->from Dr. Eric Walker I believed that Dr. Walker had been at the Kecksburg crash

->> ->etc. etc. Did you miss the original posting???

->> Since he came out and said it, I guess there isn't a lot of controversy on ->> that point; however, you continually imply that something other than a ->> man-made object was found. You have YET to present one small scrap of ->> evidence that supports your implication to the exclusion of any other ->> possibilities.

->Walker in fact implies it's UFO related. Read it again.

Baloney. Here is what is related:

\*\*\*\* Quote On \*\*\*\*

Interviewer: ...was it a UFO?

Walker: I cannot comment on that.

\*\*\*\* Quote Off \*\*\*\*

*typical FET argument which is only so good so facts you wish to leave out*

whoa: You really have to re-interpret the lines to come up with that interpretation.

Only using SaucerLogic does one conclude that "No Comment" means "it was an alien spacecraft piloted by extraterrestrials."

*Why using SET religious dogma does not comment become,*

- >Having evidence about how a Cosmos satellite responds during re-entry we can
- >see that on every point the two objects reacted very differently.

The Soviets called just about everything they launched Cosmos. The re-entry behavior of Cosmos 958 tells us nothing about another Cosmos satellite.

*The re-entry and recovery of 958 is the only documented case of a cosmos satellite returning to earth*

- >Eyewitnesses
- >differ with a Cosmos conclusion.

Uh, such as what?

*hieroglyphic type writing housed*



- >Documents differ with a Cosmos conclusion.

Uh, do you mean those documents designed for disinformation purposes?

*It is illegal to disseminate disinformation*

- >Oberg's silence and failure to produce a source or government document further
- >confirm it wasn't Cosmos-96.

Just because Oberg has grown sick of your wild and specious carnival barking does not make you right. You have the burden of proof, Grant. Produce something that confirms it was not a man-made object.

*Burden of proof is on you.*

- >> At the very least, you owe Oberg an apology for your being so G-darn
- >> ignorant of reality.

- >Oberg owes me an apology for wasting my precious time with yet another
- >transparent cover story.

If it is so transparent as a cover story, why can't you adequately refute it?

~~Sounds like Oberg is once again correct and you are wrong (again).~~

Michael Hofmeister

-----

[Previous] [Next] [Hitlist] [Get Thread] [Author Profile] [Post]  
 [Post] [Reply]

-----

Home Power Search Post to Usenet Ask DN Wizard Help  
 Why use DN? ; Advertising Info ; New Features! ; Policy  
 Stuff

Copyright c 1996 Deja News, Inc. All rights reserved.

-----232D7CAE41D5--

*Res...*