

Lazar Questions, Round 2

An exchange on alt.conspiracy.area51

Tom Mahood posts questions for Gene Huff on Lazar's "Zeta Reticuli Corp." John Lear corrects Huff and a melee ensues.

Are any messages missing from this thread, or are any messages out of order? If so, send corrections to webmaster@ufomind.com.

Index

tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) 01/25/96
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 126L 01/25/96 @ 09:26 PM
dadams@netcom.com (Dean Adam) 28L 01/26/96 @ 08:37 AM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 110L 01/28/96 @ 11:05 AM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 8L 01/28/96 @ 01:02 PM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 64L 02/01/96 @ 10:47 AM
tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) 29L 02/01/96 @ 11:57 AM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 61L 02/01/96 @ 01:33 PM
tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) 28L 02/03/96 @ 11:47 AM
tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) 02/01/96 @ 16:27:25 GMT
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 56L 02/01/96 @ 08:47 PM
agent@netcom.com (Billy D) 22L 02/01/96 @ 09:50 PM
btbmac@ro.com (Michael W. Ma) 32L 02/02/96 @ 01:51 AM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 24L 02/02/96 @ 04:17 AM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 2 Feb 1996 07:44:31 GMT
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 52L 02/02/96 @ 10:11 AM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 112L 02/02/96 @ 10:50 AM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 22L 02/02/96 @ 11:06 AM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 2 Feb 1996 07:44:31 GMT
2 Feb 1996 17:45:04 GMT
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 45L 02/02/96 @ 08:18 PM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 42L 02/02/96 @ 08:25 PM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 66L 02/02/96 @ 09:35 PM
btbmac@ro.com (Michael W. Ma) 39L 02/03/96 @ 01:26 AM
Melinda.Leslie@msn.com (Melinda Leslie) 233L 02/03/96 @ 06:02 AM
zirdo@ramhb.co.nz (Pat Zalew) 16L 02/03/96 @ 03:52 AM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 3 Feb 1996 18:55:58 GMT
agent@netcom.com (Billy D) 22L 02/04/96 @ 06:32 PM
bethland@ix.netcom.com (: ->) 18L 02/05/96 @ 07:02 AM
johnlear@ix.netcom.com (John Lear) 4 Feb 1996 04:14:44 GMT
btbmac@ro.com (Michael W. Ma) 17L 02/04/96 @ 11:50 PM
akazero@aol.com (Aka ZERO) 13L 02/05/96 @ 01:41 PM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 14L 02/05/96 @ 08:33 PM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 13L 02/06/96 @ 01:16 PM
gufon@ix.netcom.com (Gene Huff) 16L 02/06/96 @ 01:17 PM
efrank@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu (Erik Frank) 6 Feb 1996 06:47:57 GMT

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
From: tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
Subject: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: About 25 Jan 1996

The old "Lazar Questions" thread was getting a little, shall we say "hot", so I thought I'd start a fresh one. But guys, by all means feel free to jump in and start hollering at each other...

In no particular order.....

Shortly after Lazar went public, Robert Bigelow established the Zeta Reticuli II Corporation, presumably to produce high tech products that capitalized on Lazar's insider knowledge. (I also heard from two sources that weaponry research was involved, something I wouldn't expect from a person like Bigelow) I believe you and Lazar were directors. How did this all come to be, and why did the organization seem to vaporize so quickly?

I re-read your Synopsis recently, and noticed something I thought odd.

In the entire document, John Lear's name is not mentioned once. While you've made your feelings on Lear clear before, he did play an important part in the story, as I understand it (getting you guys busted on Groom Lake Road, arranging the meeting with Lazar and Knapp, etc.). So how come the omission?

When Lazar saw the flight test of the disc, it was already out of the hangar. Any ideas on how it was moved out of the hangar? Any dollies or wheeled transporters in evidence?

According to the description by Lazar, the 3 gravity amplifiers output the Gravity A wave through the bottom shell of the craft. How do the alleged gravity waves pass through the shell and why isn't it torn apart?

I have heard several very strange rumors that a while back Lazar was working on an AIDS cure, based upon info he had come across at S-4. From some of your postings, I have the impression that you possess more than layperson level knowledge of the subject. What's the story here? Any substance to the rumors?

Tom

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 26 Jan 1996 02:21:38 GMT

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:

>
>Shortly after Lazar went public, Robert Bigelow established the Zeta
>Reticuli II Corporation,

-That's not accurate. Close, but no cigar.-

presumably to produce high tech products that capitalized on Lazar's
insider knowledge.

-Total BS.-

(I also heard from two sources that weaponry research was involved,
something I wouldn't expect from a person like Bigelow)

-You heard wrong and you must not know Bigelow.-

I believe you and Lazar were directors.

-That's odd terminology. What would make you "believe" that as opposed
to knowing whether or not it was true?-

How did this all come to be, and why did the organization seem to
vaporize so quickly?

-I hate to ruin your fishing trip, but I don't consider this to be
important or relevant and you're not close enough to the truth anyway.-

>
>I re-read your Synopsis recently, and noticed something I thought odd.
>In the entire document, John Lear's name is not mentioned once.
>While you've made your feelings on Lear clear before, he did play an
>important part in the story, as I understand it

-I don't know how you could understand that as it is not true. The
reason people like you think that is because for the first couple of
years Bob and I stayed low profile and Lear was running around the
world telling the story as seen through his eyes. You've never seen Bob
or I stating that Lear was a relevant part of the story. I'm not saying
we didn't know him, but his part looked very different to him than it
did to us.-

(getting you guys busted on Groom Lake Road,

-He has never gotten us busted on Groom Lake Road or anywhere else out
there. See what I mean?-

arranging the meeting with Lazar and Knapp, etc.).

-Bob had made the decision to go public and it seemed as though George
was the man. He had done "On the Record" programs with Lear and Cooper,

so he had to at least have a sense of humor!:) I had seen him do the noon news with Bob Walsh for a number of years and I told Bob I thought he'd be a good choice. Lear had met George so Bob thought an introduction would be better than a cold call. It's worse than you think. Unbeknownst to Bob, Lear had told George and Bob Stoddall, the former news director at KLAV, that they could only ask Yes or No questions. Or was it true or false? Either way, this was Lear's knucklehead idea and they all thought they were in the fucking twilight zone! Anyway, not much was accomplished and after that we cut Lear out and never let him back in. Bob and I would just meet with George from then on.-

So how come the omission?

-Because Lear was so lucky to be there it was unbelievable and he was so irrelevant that he has more than adequately glorified his participation. What Lear didn't know was that we thought he was the biggest asshole/lame brain we had ever met. He still is, but I don't dislike him:). Anyway, Lear had gotten to go the first week because he had an RV and we thought it would be more comfortable and, although this seems funny now, look more natural. You know, like tourists just traveling around rural Nevada? The next week, which was the best sighting by far, Jim Tagliani, a friend who worked at TTR, went with us. The next week Bob, his wife Tracy, his sister-in-law Kris, and I were all set to go. We had rented a large car for comfort and we had it packed to go. Lear called and tried to get Bob to go and Bob said he didn't think he would be going. Lear said he was going out there by himself. We discussed it and Bob thought we might as well let Lear come with us since we were bound to run into him out there anyway and he'd know we were lying to him. Bob called Lear back and said we were going and to come on over. Lear jumped in his car and came over to Bob's. Lear never questioned for one second how we could have possibly rented a car and had it packed to go in that short of a time. It didn't even dawn on him that we had lied and tried to ditch him. He is the king of knucklehead's but he has a sense of humor and he and I tolerate each other.-

>

>When Lazar saw the flight test of the disc, it was already out of the hangar. Any ideas on how it was moved out of the hangar?

-No. There was a crane above it in the hangar, but that's about it.-

Any dollies or wheeled transporters in evidence?

-No, not as far as Bob saw.-

>According the description by Lazar, the 3 gravity amplifiers output the Gravity A wave through the bottom shell of the craft. How do the >alleged gravity waves pass through the shell and why isn't it torn apart?

-Why isn't the roof of the building you type this in torn apart when gravity comes through it?-

>

>I have heard several very strange rumors that a while back Lazar was >working on an AIDS cure, based upon info he had come across at S-4. >From some of your postings, I have the impression that you possess more than layperson level knowledge of the subject. What's the story here?

-There really isn't one.-

>Any substance to the rumors?

-I guess that remains to be seen. I know I haven't been a fountain of info here, but I don't want to mislead anyone. You've obviously heard fragmented stories and rumors about some of these subjects and they're probably more interesting when you don't know the rest of it. If I help you connect the dots, then that leads to more questions and ultimately I think it would distract people from attacking Bob and I in the manner to which we are accustomed. I wouldn't want to be responsible for that, now, would I?:) I think they've heard enough.-

From: dadams@netcom.com (Dean Adams)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Fri, 26 Jan 1996 11:55:05 GMT

Gene Huff wrote:

>-That's not accurate. Close, but no cigar.-
>
>-You heard wrong and you must not know Bigelow.-
>
>-That's odd terminology. What would make you "believe" that as opposed
>to knowing whether or not it was true?->
>
>-I hate to ruin your fishing trip, but I don't consider this to be
>important or relevant and you're not close enough to the truth anyway.-
>
>
>- I know I haven't been a fountain of info here,
> but I don't want to mislead anyone.

With the truth you mean!

> You've obviously heard fragmented stories and rumors about
> some of these subjects and they're probably more interesting
> when you don't know the rest of it.
>
> I think they've heard enough.-

Ha! Sounds like gene is on the ropes!

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 27 Jan 1996 00:23:12 GMT
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Jan 26 4:23:12 PM PST 1996

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:

>
>You're right...minor mistake. It was Zeta Reticuli 2, Incorporated.
Since it was incorporated 1/30/90, I'd put that as "shortly", although
I'll admit it's a subjective term.

-That was not what you were wrong about.-

>
>Ah, no and yes. I heard right. One of the sources was his probation
>report (it referred to "beam weapons") and the other source was George
Knapp at his talk last Monday night, who said the same thing. I found
it surprising because while I don't know Bigelow (beyond his
reputation), I do know people who do, and they seemed surprised he
would be involved with any kind of weapon development.

-Here we go again with you and your pieces of paper. In the timeline
you knew that Lazar worked at Los Alamos, yet acted dumbfounded when it
was not on his bankruptcy report. That may have made more sense when
you found out that Lazar didn't even fill out that report himself. Now
you're acting like his probation report is a good source for what
happened at ZR2. Bob Lazar treated that probation witch with disdain
and didn't feel obliged to explain anything to her. The bottom line is
don't believe everything you read. I presume that you know that many
people paraphrase or use generalities, manytimes ambiguous ones, to
convey info to those who really have no business knowing it. For
instance, do you think that everyone really tells the state they
incorporate in exactly what they're up to? Or do you think they just
use a convenient, all encompassing, sometimes ego patting, phrase to
describe their intended activities? The probation report is worthless
and George was no principal in this and never really even inquired as
to what was actually going on. He conveyed the general phrase we agreed
on, just as Bob did to the twat at probation, and now you have done the
same. Oddly enough, Bigelow never really knew what was actually going
on, either. It's a complex story. As far as you having friends who know
Bigelow and would be surprised by his participation goes, they needn't
be surprised because there was no beam weapon research going on.
However, I still don't think they know Bigelow very well, at least not
as well as Bob and I got to know him.-

>
>A quirk of mine. I only "believe" something if I'm certain it's true.
If the Secretary of State of Nevada says you were, then I believe it.
Semantics.

-No, not semantics, it's you and your affinity for paper:) If a group
of people get together and form a little company, you read it as one of
them forming it and appointing others director's, etc. That's not what

happened, but I'm sure that's how it looks to you on a piece of paper. Being a file clerk and an accountant doesn't always lead one to the truth. I know you've learned that the hard way and nowadays you no longer stop where the paper trail comes to a dead end. That's good and don't believe everything you read.-

>

>What troubles me about your statement is I don't think ANY of us knows just what is important and relevant.

-That depends on one's point of view and knowledge base. In this instance it is my call and if I were in your shoes, I'd be apprehensive about someone deciding that for me, too.-

I do know that based upon the info on the table to date,

-Maybe, but everything's not on the table and probably never will be. I'm confident the story is true and I have good reason to be. You can't share that confidence and if I were in your shoes, I couldn't, without reservations, believe me, either. Was that a sentence in English?:)-

That leaves only the details that really haven't been looked at too closely in the past.

-In addition to all that you don't know. Before you get sick of me touting my informational oneupsmanship, some of that is Bob's call and I have to respect his privacy. I may have handled things differently if it were me, but this is Bob's life and I keep that in mind.-

>I always love it when I hear "people like you"! You jump too fast to >conclusions.

-In that context, I meant someone who has done their homework and has read a great deal. Someone who's done that sees an abundance of variations of stories which generally always started from Lear's distorted viewpoint, if it wasn't something he completely fabricated to begin with. After everyone takes a turn augmenting the story to their satisfaction and it gets down the line, one could only conclude what you've concluded. But, that doesn't mean it's true. Nothing disparaging was intended. Don't jump to conclusions.-

>I was referring to a description Lazar told of Lear being the idiot who opened up the doors or trunk or whatever, and caused the light to come on.

-No that's not the story. Officer Lamoron wanted to see our I.D.s. Instead of Lear saying he didn't have one with him, he said it was in the trunk. You know, in the trunk where we had a gun and a telescope and a geiger counter and a video camera and binoculars and a camera?:) All while we're pretending we're out there doing nothing? Anyway, Lamoreaux made him get it out of the trunk and that's when he saw all of the stuff and immediately ratted us out to the security base station.-

>

>Because the walls are designed to keep it off my head at a 1 G attraction. Perhaps my understanding of the craft's operation is faulty, but the amplifiers seem capable of hundreds of Gs of attraction or repulsion.

-It appears that neither of us, nor anyone else knows enough about this to accomplish anything here. We don't know how much 1G distorts space/time, the integrity or properties of the bottom "hull" of the disc, etc.-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 27 Jan 1996 00:37:47 GMT
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Jan 26 4:37:47 PM PST 1996

In dadams@netcom.com (Dean Adams) writes:

>Ha! Sounds like gene is on the ropes!

-Deank, if it ever appears I'm on the ropes, you'd better make sure it's not a rope-a-dope before you blether. After all, I've destroyed your moronic attempts at misleading people, haven't I?:)-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 1 Feb 1996 15:43:43 GMT
X-NETCOM-Date: Thu Feb 01 7:43:43 AM PST 1996

In <4epjgb\$0s@ixnews4.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
) writes:

>
>Yes, Gene, I made the mistake of saying my ID was in the trunk, but
>they would have passed all of our SS numbers to security anyway.(April
>6, 1989.)

-Bob is the one who originally told the story about you screwing up and
opening up the trunk, not me, I just clarified what happened. I see
you're hurt because you now know that you weren't invited, we just felt
sorry for you.-

>
>As far as the Knapp, Stoldau, Lazar meeting at my house and the
>subsequent filming of Bob in shadow by channel 8 in my driveway (April
>25, 1989), you were not even in the loop at that time, I have the
video tapes to prove it.

-Bob's ex-wife and I were standing outside the KLAS truck and we only
used your parking lot because we needed a location for the satellite
link. We did you a favor, not vice versa. You have no tapes to prove
anything of the sort. That just gave you something else to lie about.
Who in the fuck do you think you're talking to, lame brain? Don't try
and jump in here with your lies and bullshit because I'll lay the truth
on the line and let everyone know what a sorry knucklehead you are. You
have no idea what was going on because you were being partonized and
still are. Bob Lazar thinks you are absolutely crazy, though that does
not mean he doesn't like you. Your friendship looks much different
through your eyes than it does his. You're like a retarded cousin that
you laugh at, but don't admit is part of the family. You would be the
last idiot in the world to know who was in and out of the loop. The
security guys wanted Lazar to tell them exactly what you knew since he
knew you personally. He met with you and told them you were a fucking
idiot. That's the truth.-

As you may or may not remember, Bob came to my house (December 6, 1988
as recorded by the test site security people for 3 hours and 41
minutes) and told me about what he had seen at S-4. It was only several
days later that Bob decided to 'let you in'. At that time Bob
considered you a 'risk' and was not going to tell you anything.
> I fully expect to get flamed, but that, in fact, is the truth.

-I'm sure it's the truth in your head, just not in the real world. At
this late point in the game you obviously know that I was the one who
knew what was going on and it hurts you deeply. Bob was patronizing
you, while laughing at you, and telling you I was a risk. Do you
honestly think he didn't know that was the case with you? You have
video tapes which prove what? That I wasn't in the loop? Let's see
them. Your 3 hour and 41 minute conversation is complete bullshit and
Bob Lazar will verify that. Your lies are over so don't try and distort
things here. I notice you don't have that ever important 3 hours and 41
minutes on tape, but almost everything else you've ever done is
recorded. Shall we call you Richard Millhouse Lear? Keep lying and
we'll start discussing why you were disinherited, why you could never
work for a commercial air carrier to carry passengers, Lars Hansen, why
you actually got fired from American TransAir, etc. You'll also have to
explain why Bob Lazar and I are friends and business partners and he
agrees with me about what happened, not you. Do you know why? Because
you've replayed those stories through your empty head and when they
come out, you're the central figure. Sometimes I think you're actually
going to cut Bob out of the story. I know you're sincere because you
honestly believe you were a central part of the story and you've gone
around the world claiming that. I won't perpetuate your BS, but I'll
let you go this time. Let me know if you want to proceed.-

From: tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Thu, 1 Feb 1996 16:27:25 GMT
Lines: 28

John Lear (johnlear@ix.netcom.com) wrote:

: As far as the Knapp, Stoldau, Lazar meeting at my house and the

: subsequent filming of Bob in shadow by channel 8 in my driveway (April
: 25, 1989), you were not even in the loop at that time, I have the video
: tapes to prove it. As you may or may not remember, Bob came to my
: house (December 6, 1988 as recorded by the test site security people for
: 3 hours and 41 minutes) and told me about what he had seen at S-4.
: It was only several days later that Bob decided to 'let you in'. At that
: time Bob considered you a 'risk' and was not going to tell you anything.

Well, THIS is certainly interesting, if it's an accurate rendition.

Lazar supposedly began work at S-4 in December of 1988. Yet according to Gene's synopsis, some time passed before Lazar started telling others about his work. But here we have Lear saying Lazar was talking to him on December 6. This would have had to be just after Lazar comes down the JANET ramp after his first day on the job (Oh all right, a slight exaggeration on my part...).

Some folks hold to the theory that Lazar was used directly or indirectly to convey disinformation to John Lear and others. While I always thought it a tad farfetched idea, Lear's statement, if accurate, would tend to support that theory somewhat.

Tom

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 1 Feb 1996 18:25:26 GMT
Lines: 60
X-NETCOM-Date: Thu Feb 01 10:25:26 AM PST 1996

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) writes:

>
>John Lear (johnlear@ix.netcom.com) wrote:
>
>: As far as the Knapp, Stoldau, Lazar meeting at my house and the
>: subsequent filming of Bob in shadow by channel 8 in my driveway
>: (April
>: 25, 1989), you were not even in the loop at that time, I have the
>: video
>: tapes to prove it. As you may or may not remember, Bob came to
>: my
>: house (December 6, 1988 as recorded by the test site security people
>: for
>: 3 hours and 41 minutes) and told me about what he had seen at
>: S-4.
>: It was only several days later that Bob decided to 'let you in'. At
>: that
>: time Bob considered you a 'risk' and was not going to tell you
>: anything.
>
>Well, THIS is certainly interesting, if it's an accurate rendition.
>
>Lazar supposedly began work at S-4 in December of 1988. Yet
>according to
>Gene's synopsis, some time passed before Lazar started telling others
>about
>his work. But here we have Lear saying Lazar was talking to him on
>December
>6. This would have had to be just after Lazar comes down the JANET
>ramp
>after his first day on the job (Oh all right, a slight exaggeration on my
>part...).

>
>Some folks hold to the theory that Lazar was used directly or indirectly
>to
>convey disinformation to John Lear and others. While I always thought
>it a
>tad farfetched idea, Lear's statement, if accurate, would tend to support
>that theory somewhat.

>
>Tom
>
>I stand by the 3 hour and 41 minute on December 6 and that Gene
>knew nothing at the time. Security came to Bob's house after he left

mine and asked what he was doing at Lear's house for 3:41. Bob told them he was getting Tracy's logbook signed for the dual I had given her and they asked how that could take 3 hours and 41 minutes?

Yes it could have been disinformation but it sure was interesting, and based on what I've heard since then from others who work at the test site (not S-4) I still believe it.

I stand corrected about Gene being in my driveway at the time of the channel 8 filming.

I agree that you've never been flamed until you've been flamed by Gene.

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
From: tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Fri, 2 Feb 1996 01:16:48 GMT
Lines: 27

Gene Huff (gufon@ix.netcom.com) wrote:
[A whole bunch of stuff blasting John Lear]

AND....

John Lear (johnlear@ix.netcom.com) wrote:
[A modest amount of stuff taking issue with Gene Huff]

It seems to me as a somewhat objective observer (if anything, I tend to lean towards Gene...he's louder.), that what it comes down to is two guys each saying "Believe me, the other is wrong!" Both are "associates" of Lazar, although to differing degrees. Both have apparently been privy to some of the inner workings of the Lazar story. How are we, the twisted readers of alt.conspiracy.area51, supposed to figure out the "truth"?

Gene, I'll ask you this: You've repeated again and again that Lear is crazy, among other derogatory things, but never backed it up with anything of substance. It's just your opinion. Yet Lear seems to have a differing recollection of events, yet hasn't attacked you. I suppose he gets points for politeness anyway. You also know I'm not a big supporter of Lear's stories. They don't match with my version of reality.

The point I'm fumbling around trying to make is that to the rest of us, you guys probably have about equal standing in the whole affair. Why is your rendition the absolute correct one and Lear completely full of shit?

Tom

From: tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Thu, 1 Feb 1996 16:27:25 GMT

John Lear (johnlear@ix.netcom.com) wrote:

: As far as the Knapp, Stoldau, Lazar meeting at my house and the
: subsequent filming of Bob in shadow by channel 8 in my driveway (April
: 25, 1989), you were not even in the loop at that time, I have the video
: tapes to prove it. As you may or may not remember, Bob came to my
: house (December 6, 1988 as recorded by the test site security people for
: 3 hours and 41 minutes) and told me about what he had seen at S-4.
: It was only several days later that Bob decided to 'let you in'. At that
: time Bob considered you a 'risk' and was not going to tell you anything.

Well, THIS is certainly interesting, if it's an accurate rendition.

Lazar supposedly began work at S-4 in December of 1988. Yet according to Gene's synopsis, some time passed before Lazar started telling others about his work. But here we have Lear saying Lazar was talking to him on December 6. This would have had to be just after Lazar comes down the JANET ramp after his first day on the job (Oh all right, a slight exaggeration on my part...).

Some folks hold to the theory that Lazar was used directly or indirectly to convey disinformation to John Lear and others. While I always thought it a tad farfetched idea, Lear's statement, if accurate, would tend to support that theory somewhat.

Tom

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 01:45:20 GMT
X-NETCOM-Date: Thu Feb 01 5:45:20 PM PST 1996

>we'll start discussing why you could never
>work for a commercial air carrier to carry passengers,

Gene, you will recall that when you called Bob this afternoon I was over there and asked you why you said I could never work for a commercial air carrier to carry passengers. You said that I had told you several years ago that I had flunked an I.Q. test. In fact Gene, the test was not an I.Q. test but a preference and aptitude test evaluation called the Stanine and was used then by many airlines in evaluating pilot candidates. I didn't flunk it but according to United Airlines to whom I had applied in the summer of 1967, I did not meet their standards. The test is no longer in use because over the years it became obvious that just because a pilot candidate knew which perfume was the most expensive in the world or preferred an opera to a ballgame didn't mean he would be a better pilot.

In point of fact I have been employed as an airline captain under CFR 14 FAR 121 both Flag, Domestic, Supplemental and Commercial Operator passenger and cargo for the past 28 years. I am currently employed by American International Airways as a Captain/Check Airman on the Lockheed L-1011 flying cargo world wide. I find it more interesting to "non-sked" which is pilot slang for moving around to different non-scheduled airlines, flying many different places than being with one carrier for an entire career.

What I'm pointing out here is that this is only one of many areas where you have misrepresented the facts in spite of the evidence. When I talked to you on the phone from Bob's house and confronted you with these facts you asked if I was going to "continue" which we both knew meant "try and establish the truth" about our involvement with Bob Lazar. You seem to take great offense when I don't "remember" things the way you do. Its basically because you have no life without Bob Lazar and I do. Bob Lazar is your life and you want to rewrite what happened to him and me and you during those interesting times between the summer of 1988 when you introduced me to Bob and appraised my house in exchange for UFO video tapes and material and the fall of 1991 when my wife Marilee went over to Bob's house with her .45 automatic to shoot his Corvette in retaliation for his dumping dye marker in my pool which was in retaliation for me tying a Pepsi can under his Corvette.

It would be nice if you could respond without your usual personal attacks and filthy language but I know that that is out of the question.

Bob and you have been very close for the past few years and I have been out of the loop. But it wasn't always like that. You and I and Bob went through some incredible times whether you want to remember it like that or not. Its the truth. We both know what Bob said happened is the truth. I wasn't the central character, Bob was. I was just lucky to have been his friend. And don't put words in Bob's mouth. He said I was crazy not a moron. And I am the first to admit that some of the things I think are true and talk about are crazy.

I'm sure you will continue your tirade but since I survived "The Affidavit" (<http://www.cris.com/~psyspy/area51>) which was 50% B.S. also, I'll probably survive your current flame jobs.

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
From: agent@netcom.com (Billy D)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Fri, 2 Feb 1996 02:14:40 GMT

In article tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) writes:

>The point I'm fumbling around trying to make is that to the rest of us, you
>guys probably have about equal standing in the whole affair. Why is your
>rendition the absolute correct one and Lear completely full of shit?

>

Because John is kinda like a still partially functioning Bill Cooper?
Justa guess...

Gene has a Rap(tm). His Rap(tm) is consistent, unmutated, and very Gene. Lear has a Legacy(tm), too. A crazy psychotic stranger-every-time-it's-told Legacy(tm). This is not Gene's style. Lear's campfire style is that the next time it's told it's stanger than before. Gene has, at the least, been consistent.

Where my UFO-convention dollars go, I gotta go wif the Gene. It's just prudent.

But, Tom, you knew this to begin with. What are you getting at? Are you looking for a matter-anti-matter Gene-John annihilation?

From: btbmag@ro.com (Michael W. Malone)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Fri, 02 Feb 1996 00:36:57 -0500

In article <4erqbg\$ga6@cloner4.netcom.com>, johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear) wrote:

> You seem to take great offense when I don't "remember" things
> the way you do. Its basically because you have no life without Bob
> Lazar and I do. Bob Lazar is your life and you want to rewrite what
> happened to him and me and you during those interesting times between
> the summer of 1988 when you introduced me to Bob and appraised my
> house in exchange for UFO video tapes and material and the fall of 1991
> when my wife Marilee went over to Bob's house with her .45 automatic to
> shoot his Corvette in retaliation for his dumping dye marker in my pool
> which was in retaliation for me tieing a Pepsi can under his Corvette.

This does not sound like a healthy relationship here. Basically, to this uncultured redneck, it sounds like all of these people are irrational and untrustworthy. Guns and the practical joke? I had trouble with the Lazar before, this simply confirms my gut feeling.

> It would be nice if you could respond without your usual personal attacks
> and filthy language but I know that that is out of the question.

Well, Mr. Lear, I have to give you that one. Every message I've seen from you has been polite, a claim your opponent can't make.

But this infighting and confessions of violence does little to bolster either claimant.

<http://ro.com/~btbmag>
<http://ro.com/~btbmag/ufo/photo.html>
These opinions can float large blimps.

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 18:07:33 GMT

>-Yes, that's convenient considering the fact that you weren't able to
>get a job flying people because of your past antics.

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. American International Airways is certificated for both passenger and cargo. The 747's fly the passengers but since I already had 2000 hours command time in the L-1011 I was assinged to it. It is presently strictly cargo but we have bid on several combi's for a DOD contact on the Pacific rim.

We all know that
>all pilots with 28 years experience strive to fly long boring cargo
>schedules.

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. There are a lot of anvantages to flying boxes. Boxes don't care if you're late or if you have to hold for weather or complain if you have to go to the alternate. You dont have to make them sit down in turbulence. You don't have to find 362 hotel rooms if you have a mechanical. Of course you have to make your own coffee but what the hey...and excitement...wellllllll...just the other day my number 2 DME went out. You talk about excitement!

Don't worry, everyone believes you! Many astronauts and

>other seasoned pilots try and become cargo pilots near the end of their
>careers just for the excitement!:-)

Gene, now lets get the facts straight. I really don't care if anyone
believes me, that should be pretty obvious even to you.

>>
>>>-You mean when Bob told you that if you kept lying he was going
to come
>on here and say so?

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. What Bob said was that if either
of us put words in his mouth he was going to blast us both.

>
>-Yes it was, you just weren't bright enough to know it. Bob told you
>that yesterday, but what do Bob and I know?:)-

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight...see above as to what Bob said.

>
> >-Well, since you're such a survivor, do you mind if I send a copy of
>Lars affidavit to your wife?:)

Now Gene, my 25th wedding anniversary is May 22, could you wait until
after then? Thanks.

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 07:44:31 GMT

I>This does not sound like a healthy relationship here. Basically, to this
>uncultured redneck, it sounds like all of these people are irrational and
>untrustworthy. Guns and the practical joke? I had trouble with the
>Lazar
>before, this simply confirms my gut feeling.

>
>> It would be nice if you could respond without your usual personal
attacks
>> and filthy language but I know that that is out of the question.

>
>Well, Mr. Lear, I have to give you that one. Every message I've seen
from
>you has been polite, a claim your opponent can't make.

>
>But this infighting and confessions of violence does little to bolster
either
>claimant.

>
I agree.
><http://ro.com/~btbmag>
><http://ro.com/~btbmag/ufo/photo.html>
>These opinions can float large blimps.

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 15:09:02 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 51
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Feb 02 7:09:02 AM PST 1996

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:

>
>>The point I'm fumbling around trying to make is that to the rest of
us, you guys probably have about equal standing in the whole affair.

-Not according to Bob Lazar and quite frankly you're the first one I've
ever heard that said Lear and I had equal standing in the whole affair.
Maybe that's my misperception, but don't the things I say seem to make
even a little more sense to you than the things John says? If not, I've
underestimated how lost the public is regarding these things and you're
infinitely better informed than the general public.-

Why is your rendition the absolute correct one and Lear completely
full of shit?

-Funny you should ask that. Why do Bob and I think Lear is crazy and why should you agree? I won't go into all of the old reasons which you are aware of so let's examine some new ones. What would you think of a person who presently is firmly CONVINCED that:

-There are "reptilian" type aliens (Grey, reptile looking, winged) working side by side with other workers out on the Nevada Test Site. They've been coming around for a long time, so long that these creatures were historically misperceived as dragons.

-The moon and Venus both have survivable atmosphere's and right this moment, Venus is a nice place to live.

Shall I go on?

-The New Year's eve before last, Sherlock Lear had calculated that if there was ever a night the "boys" would test and ET disc, it would be New Year's eve. He went somewhere out in Nevada by himself, freezing his buns off, set up his 8 inch Celestron telescope and proceeded to look for discs. Lo and behold he started seeing lights all over the place and saw the most breathtaking airshow ever displayed. Unfortunately, soon even this dolt figured out that he had forgotten that the image in the telescope was inverted and the whole time he was looking at car lights from the nearby highway!:))

Shall I go on?

I could, but I won't, at least not now. John Lear is so deep in this BS that unless he tries to defend it he'll be dismissed for what he is. Don't worry, if he persists, Bob is going to post the facts. This would destroy Lear and his ego simultaneously. John has no level of skepticism, no problem solving capability, and no memory. He commands respect because he's a pilot and he's Bill Lear's son. Bill and Moya were so impressed with his antics that they disinherited him. What type of personality can alienate their parents to that degree? John.-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 15:37:55 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 111
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Feb 02 7:37:55 AM PST 1996

In <4erqbg\$ga6@cloner4.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear) writes:

>
You said that I had told you several years ago that I had flunked an I.Q. test. In fact Gene, the test was not an I.Q. test but a preference and aptitude test evaluation called the Stanine and was used then by many airlines in evaluating pilot candidates. I didn't flunk it but according to United Airlines to whom I had applied in the summer of 1967, I did not meet their standards.

-The term "I.Q." was your term a few years ago, not mine. Considering the rest of your obvious intellectual shortcomings, I had no reason to doubt that it was an I.Q. test. Apparently it was a combination I.Q./sanity test which makes even more sense. Of course, you didn't fail the test, you just didn't meet their standards. Other people suffer similar circumstances everyday when they don't meet the standards of the DMV regarding the driving test.:)-

I find it more interesting to "non-sked" which is pilot slang for moving around to different non-scheduled airlines, flying many different places than being with one carrier for an entire career.

-Yes, that's convenient considering the fact that you weren't able to get a job flying people because of your past antics. We all know that all pilots with 28 years experience strive to fly long boring cargo schedules. Don't worry, everyone believes you! Many astronauts and other seasoned pilots try and become cargo pilots near the end of their careers just for the excitement!:))-

>
>What I'm pointing out here is that this is only one of many areas where you have misrepresented the facts in spite of the evidence.

-Everyone, quick, insert this in your dictionary as THE definition of irony!:))-

When I talked to you on the phone from Bob's house and confronted you with these facts you asked if I was going to "continue" which we both knew meant "try and establish the truth" about our involvement with Bob >Lazar.

-You mean when Bob told you that if you kept lying he was going to come on here and say so? Yes, I do seem to remember that. BTW, to anyone reading this, this was John's ploy to yet again mention that Bob allowed him on the premises. Truth doesn't have to be established, just accurately conveyed. I don't doubt that you're sincere, that's why I'm being so nice to you. The bottom line is that sincerity doesn't replace accuracy, sanity, memory, and a host of other things that you don't possess.-

Its basically because you have no life without Bob Lazar and I do. Bob Lazar is your life and you want to rewrite what happened to him and me and you during those interesting times between the summer of 1988 when you introduced me to Bob and appraised my house in exchange for UFO video tapes and material and the fall of 1991 when my wife Marilee went over to Bob's house with her .45 automatic to >shoot his Corvette in retaliation for his dumping dye marker in my pool which was in retaliation for me tying a Pepsi can under his Corvette.

-John, you really need a psychiatrist. Bob and I knew each other and had established a friendship before you even knew who he was. I'm one of the few people who doesn't kiss his ass and we have a mutual respect. Considering Bob's public comments, do you think he respects you? The bottom line is that since I destroyed serious ufology by making the tragic error of introducing you to Bob, Bob could never stop abruptly without having to have your head surgically removed from his ass. I don't rewrite what happened at any point in time, ever. The above statement by you simply reflects the truth about you. You've gone around the world telling stories about you and Bob when in actuality the stories were about Bob and I and you substituted your name for mine to help gain some attention. Those events you cited are an exception and let me tell you they are really impressive. Boy, that story about the dye in the pool was really enchanting. The bottom line is that you've spent years in ufology and deserve an E for effort. However, you're not really involved in the Lazar story, but we'll continue to let you tag along so you don't take yourself out sooner than someone like you normally does.-

>

>Bob and you have been very close for the past few years and I have >been out of the loop. But it wasn't always like that.

-Yes it was, you just weren't bright enough to know it. Bob told you that yesterday, but what do Bob and I know?:)-

I was just lucky to have been his friend.

-If you change that to have been his dog, I'll agree. You and Bob's late dog Countach had more in common than you and I.-

And don't put words in Bob's mouth. He said I was >crazy not a moron. And I am the first to admit that some of the things I think are true and talk about are crazy.

-I didn't put words in Bob's mouth, he thinks you're a crazy moron and he's stated that publicly on numerous occasions. Anyway, thanks for admitting that your thoughts are crazy. It wasn't really necessary as it's always been obvious.-

>

>I'm sure you will continue your tirade but since I survived "The Affidavit" which was 50% B.S. also, I'll probably survive your current flame jobs.

-Well, since you're such a survivor, do you mind if I send a copy of Lars affidavit to your wife?:) We helped you bury it lame brain. The bottom line is that Bob, George Knapp, and I all remember things the way they were and you remember them however your ego needs to remember them at the time. Some of it's misperception on your part, the rest is lack of memory, intelligence and sanity. However, I don't hold that against you and you deserve a measure of credit for being able to laugh at yourself. However, Bob's story is critical to a lot of people and it's more important to convey it accurately than to patronize a mental outpatient such as yourself.:)-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 15:41:34 GMT

In btbmag@ro.com (Michael W. Malone) writes:

>
>>This does not sound like a healthy relationship here. Basically, to this uncultured redneck, it sounds like all of these people are irrational and untrustworthy. Guns and the practical joke? I had trouble with the Lazar before, this simply confirms my gut feeling.

-Hey Bufon, did I tell you this or what?-

>
>>Well, Mr. Lear, I have to give you that one. Every message I've seen from you has been polite, a claim your opponent can't make.

-It's the Prozac.-

But this infighting and confessions of violence does little to bolster either claimant.

-I rest my case!:)

>

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 2 Feb 1996 17:45:04 GMT

>-Not according to Bob Lazar and quite frankly you're the first one I've ever heard that said Lear and I had equal standing in the whole affair. >Maybe that's my misperception, but don't the things I say seem to make

How come we only hear about what Bob thinks and says from your mouth?

>person who presently is firmly CONVINCED that:

>
>-There are "reptilian" type aliens (Grey, reptile looking, winged) >working side by side with other workers out on the Nevada Test Site. >They've been coming around for a long time, so long that these >creatures were historically misperceived as dragons.

OK now Gene, lets not make it anymore ridiculous than it is (if thats possible). The reptilians are green not grey and they are not winged. Something has to account for all the dragon stories from many different countries up to about 400 years ago. I only hypothesized that it may have been the reptilians whoever and whatever they are. Sure it sounds ridiculous but what the hey...Bob told us that we were crazy thinking that flying discs were alien craft.

>
>-The moon and Venus both have survivable atmosphere's and right this

>moment, Venus is a nice place to live.

>
>Shall I go on?

Before we go on Gene let me point out that since neither of us has been to the moon or Venus so we really don't know for sure, as Neil Amrstrong once said about his trip to the moon, "We saw a lot of things we couldn't explain." Or maybe you think that NASA has given us the straight scoop on everything.

>
>-The New Year's eve before last, Sherlock Lear had calculated that if >there was ever a night the "boys" would test and ET disc, it would be >New Year's eve. He went somewhere out in Nevada by himself, freezing >his buns off, set up his 8 inch Celestron telescope and proceeded to >look for discs. Lo and behold he started seeing lights all over the >place and saw the most breathtaking airshow ever displayed. >Unfortunately, soon even this dolt figured out that he had forgotten >that the image in the telescope was inverted and the whole time he was >looking at car lights from the nearby highway!:)

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. I didn't go looking for discs. I went to the Tonapah Test Range to look for the F-19 and no, not the F-117A. Yes I froze my buns off and didn't see anything. When I set up

the scope I saw an odd shape which turned out to be the inverted image of the airports lighted wind tee. The whole scenario which you relate as a breath taking airshow lasted about 5 seconds which was what it took my somewhat slow and lame brain to figure out. I had the scope pointed southwest to the runway and there was no highway and no cars.

>
>>Don't worry, if he persists, Bob is going to post the facts.

That would be amazing Gene because Bob told me yesterday he wasn't going to get into this argument because he didn't want anybody to find out his E-Mail address. Maybe he'll come over to your house and use your E-Mail and say "This is Bob Lazar writing on Gufons computer."

He commands
>respect because he's a pilot and he's Bill Lear's son. Bill and Moya
>were so impressed with his antics that they disinherited him.

Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. My mother is still alive and she hasn't disinherited me. My father disinherited me because I was critical of the design of the LearFan. I felt there were a number of major design flaws and I told him so. He died in 1978 and the LearFan Corporation filed bankruptcy in 1984 with debts totaling 492 million dollars. It was the largest failure including civilian and military aircraft in the history of aviation, and it was predictable.

What type
>of personality can alienate their parents to that degree? John.-

If you're only interest is the size of your inheritance then I would have to say that brutal honesty may not be the best policy.

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 3 Feb 1996 01:12:15 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 44
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Feb 02 5:12:15 PM PST 1996

In <4etij0\$t7t@cloner2.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear) writes:

>
>>How come we only hear about what Bob thinks and says from your
>mouth?

-Because he doesn't want to go out of his way to hurt your feelings. However, if you keep lying, he said he'd have to.-

>
>Yes I froze my buns off and didn't see anything. When I set up
>the scope I saw an odd shape which turned out to be the inverted image
>of the airports lighted wind tee. The whole scenario which you relate
as a breath taking airshow lasted about 5 seconds which was what it took my somewhat slow and lame brain to figure out.

-That may be, but that's not what you told Bob when it happened. You're trying to buffer it now so you don't look so bad. In fact, you asked Bob not to tell anyone about it, an odd thing to ask if your current story is true.-

>That would be amazing Gene because Bob told me yesterday he wasn't
>going to get into this argument because he didn't want anybody to find
>out his E-Mail address. Maybe he'll come over to your house and use
>your E-Mail and say "This is Bob Lazar writing on Gufons computer."

-No, he found a way to alter his screen name. I guess it doesn't take much to amaze you. Maybe he wasn't going to tell you so he could toy with you some more.-

>
>Now Gene, lets get the facts straight. My mother is still alive and she hasn't disinherited me.

-Ha! Yes, I guess your right. "Torturing you" would be more appropriate. The question about disinheriting you remains to be seen.-

My father disinherited me because I was critical of the design of the LearFan.

-John, this might be working for those who are reading this but remember who you're talking to. Don't you think the fact that you're one of the biggest clown/dickheads in the world had something to do with it?:)-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 3 Feb 1996 01:20:10 GMT

In <4etjt5\$oea@cloner3.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear) writes:

>
>>Now Gene, lets get the facts straight.

-I think you've said that enough times now to last us the rest of our lives. Try a new phrase. Although, I gotta tell ya, when that one comes out of your mouth, I can't help but laugh!:-)

>Now Gene, lets get the facts straight.

-What did I tell you about that?:)-

>Gene, now lets get the facts straight.

-Do you cut and paste that or type it every time?:)-

I really don't care if anyone believes me, that should be pretty obvious even to you.

-That should work out well then.-

>Now Gene, lets get the facts straight.

-I'm surprised your dad only disinherited you instead of killing you!-

What Bob said was that if either of us put words in his mouth he was going to blast us both.

-And? He knows I never do that so who do you think he was talking to? I'll give you a hint: He's a lame brain, he's wacky, and he's always staring at you in your mirror.-

>>
>>Now Gene, my 25th wedding anniversary is May 22, could you wait until after then? Thanks.

-Don't worry, I want you to stay married to Merrilee. That's punishment enough!:-)

>
>

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 3 Feb 1996 02:27:45 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 65
X-NETCOM-Date: Fri Feb 02 6:27:45 PM PST 1996

> Yes I froze my buns off and didn't see anything. When I set up
>>the scope I saw an odd shape which turned out to be the inverted
image
>>of the airports lighted wind tee. The whole scenario which you relate
>as a breath taking airshow lasted about 5 seconds which was what it
>took my somewhat slow and lame brain to figure out.

>
>-That may be, but that's not what you told Bob when it happened.

You're
>trying to buffer it now so you don't look so bad. In fact, you asked
>Bob not to tell anyone about it, an odd thing to ask if your current
>story is true.-

OK, OK...it took me a minute, I admit it. But in no case longer than an hour. Or even 12 hours...hey I was only there 10 hours. Telling Bob not to tell anybody something would be like telling you not to use such foul language.

>
>>That would be amazing Gene because Bob told me yesterday he
wasn't
>>going to get into this argument because he didn't want anybody to
find
>>out his E-Mail address. Maybe he'll come over to your house and
use
>>your E-Mail and say "This is Bob Lazar writing on Gufons computer."

>
>-No, he found a way to alter his screen name. I guess it doesn't take
>much to amaze you. Maybe he wasn't going to tell you so he could toy
>with you some more.-

No, he told me at lunch. He allowed me on his property yet another
time....

>>
>> My father disinherited me because I was critical of the design of the
>LearFan.

>
>-John, this might be working for those who are reading this but
>remember who you're talking to. Don't you think the fact that you're
>one of the biggest clown/dickheads in the world had something to do
>with it?:)-

Obviously I could have used more tact but my areas of concern were:

1. Using a belt drive to link the 2 PT-6's. (Later changed to a gearbox.)
2. The engines were imbedded in the aft fuselage with no access except by removing the upper half of the fuselage. (Later access doors were added but it was still cumbersome to check the oil, and essentially defeated the laminar flow.)
3. The use of composite material for the entire structure. (This was when composite material had no strength in shear)
4. The use of the Avro tank engine for the powerplant. (Later changed to the PT-6.)

I told my father about these concerns on Thanksgiving Day 1977 and that
was essentially the day I was disinherited. Dickhead yes, clown no. In
the end I was correct but a penniless dickhead.

>
>

Path: newsbf01.news.aol.com!newstf01.news.aol.com!news-
ela.megaweb.com!howland.reston.ans.net!newsfeed.internetmci.com!news.ro.com!tslp10.ro.com!user
From: btbmag@ro.com (Michael W. Malone)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Sat, 03 Feb 1996 00:02:58 -0500
Organization: Business To Business Magazine
Lines: 38
Message-ID:
References: <4e9dri\$jld@ixnews4.ix.netcom.com> <4ebr9g\$jmt@ixnews4.ix.netcom.com>
<4epjgb\$p0s@ixnews4.ix.netcom.com> <4eqn3f\$gge@ixnews2.ix.netcom.com>
<4erqbg\$ga6@cloner4.netcom.com> <4etbbe\$dbc@cloner4.netcom.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: tslp10.ro.com

In article <4etbbe\$dbc@cloner4.netcom.com>, gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
wrote:

> In btbmag@ro.com (Michael W.
> Malone) writes:
> >
> >>This does not sound like a healthy relationship here. Basically, to
> this uncultured redneck, it sounds like all of these people are
> irrational and untrustworthy. Guns and the practical joke? I had
> trouble with the Lazar before, this simply confirms my gut feeling.
>
> -Hey Bufon, did I tell you this or what?-

I never suggested that you told ME anything. I was clearly responding to
Mr. Lear, and not to you, Mr. Huff. I assume that you read this post,
since you responded, but it makes me wonder exactly who failed what kind

of test.

> >>Well, Mr. Lear, I have to give you that one. Every message I've seen
> from you has been polite, a claim your opponent can't make.
>
> -It's the Prozac.-

Perhaps, but politeness, even prozac induced, is preferable to name calling,
meaningless accusations, and pointless ramblings, don't you agree?

> But this infighting and confessions of violence does little to bolster
> either claimant.

>
> -I rest my case!:)

What? That neither you, Mr. Huff, or Mr. Lear has any case at all?

<http://ro.com/~btbmag>
<http://ro.com/~btbmag/ufo/photo.html>
These opinions can float large blimps.

From: Melinda_Leslie@msn.com (Melinda Leslie)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 3 Feb 96 10:38:07 -0800
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Lines: 232

John,

It's you! Long time since I've heard anything from you. How are you?
And what the heck are you doing? Respond back to this and let me
know. Or e-mail me directly. It's good to hear from you.

Melinda Leslie

e-mail: Melinda_Leslie@MSN.com

Thought you might find this interesting. Let me know what you think.

A Federal Investigation begins to look into the military and
governments involvement in abduction, mind control, and harassment
of alien abduction experiencers

January 25, 1996

The attached letter, below, from Kathy Kasten, an experiencer, is an
explanation of what she has done to lodge a formal complaint with the
Department of Health and Human Services of the Federal Government
regarding the human, civilian, governments or militarys apparent
involvement in the alien abduction scenario.

I support Kathys brave and courageous efforts and have chosen to
help in both participating by responding as part of the investigation
due to my own experiences of this nature and in doing all that I can
to inform other experiencers and researchers of our efforts. I have
become involved because I strongly feel that to take action is to
start the healing process and that in doing so it is a way to regain
some control in our lives.

Those of you who have had the human element of involvement in your
abduction experiences may know how difficult it is to live with. You
may agree with me that those people conducting such activities as
harassment, surveillance, interrogations, implanting, medical
procedures and mind control experiments on abduction experiencers
must be shown that we are not going to just do nothing and continue
to let these activities go on. The infringements on our rights and
liberties can not be dismissed and that those who are conducting
these activities must be stopped and held accountable.

I realize that many may say this cant be done, but whats our
choice, to do nothing? Besides, the Dept. of Health and Human
Services has responded with interest and this open door must be taken
advantage of. We have a responsibility not only to our selves but to

anyone else who may be experiencing such intrusion in their lives. Those of us willing to participate will be speaking for the many who can not.

The Dept. has responded after Kathys discussions with them by requesting further information regarding what is taking place with those involved. At this point Kathy has already mailed off the first set of responses from those experiencers who have participated thus far. While the Dept. of Health and Human Services has received these at this time, they have made no comments as of yet. We await further response from them and are sure that this is only due to the recent government shutdown. After all, Kathy was sending the information at their request.

If you have any of the related activities such as, but not limited to, harassment, surveillance, abducted by humans, uniformed personnel present during abductions, interrogations, implants by humans, medical procedures, drugged and mind control experiments then please write a brief description of your experiences for us. Try to include the forms of evidence mentioned in the questions in Kathys letter as much as possible, but if you are not able to then at least describe the event as best you can, i.e. what did the people look like, what were they wearing, what did the environment look like, how were the procedures performed, what was said and what was the effects of any of this on you? Any contribution of experiences you can make will assist us.

Our plans are to submit the next group of responses in early March, 1996. I encourage you to participate and send us what you are able to by then. If you can answer any of the questions in the letter to any degree it will be of great help. We already have the attention of the Dept. of Health and Human Services who have said that they are interested in going forward with the investigation. The more we can submit to them as evidence, the greater that investigation will be. As well as it will help to make it impossible for them to ignore us for any reason.

Please do not hesitate to call or e-mail me if you have any questions or concerns. You may also write to either Kathy or myself. Thank you so much for any assistance you are able to give us.

In loving memory of researcher Karla Turner whos pioneering work in this area helped pave the way for those of us with these types of experiences. She helped us all to be able to come forward and gave me much courage to do so. She will be greatly missed.

Sincerely,

Melinda Leslie
504 Marigold
Corona Del Mar, CA 92625
e-mail: Melinda_Leslie@MSN.Com

January 25, 1996

Dear Researchers and Abductees/Experiencers:

I have been in contact with Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services, in an effort to persuade her to begin an investigation of the covert research involving abductees/experiencers. The reason I did this is because Federal regulations, mandated in 1974, require that all human subjects involved in research must sign an Informed Consent Form (ICF). The ICF is a legal document which states who is performing the research, the duration of the study period, the reason the research/study is being done, the procedures to be performed, the possible risks/side effects of the procedures, certain required statements - such as, informing the subject that they are free to refuse to participate in the research at any time, and requires the subjects signature. In the case of children 12 years old and under, a parents signature is required and a simplified form of the ICF is given to the child. As far as I know, I did not sign an ICF; therefore, I know that the research involving abductees/ experiencers is illegal/covert, and so stated this fact to the Secretary.

In order to proceed with the investigation, Lana R. Skirboll, Ph.D., Director, Office of Science Policy and Program Planning, one of the

people from NIH assigned by the Secretary to contact me, informed me by letter (dated August 29, 1994) that she needs certain information from the individuals involved in the covert research project. This is the reason for contacting you. I realize the effort it will take to put the information together in a coherent manner, in a way which can be understood by someone not involved in dealing with abductees/experiences, but it is a good cause. That cause being to call for a government agency to undertake an investigation into the covert research and to stop it until Federal regulations are met. Once that happens and the research is brought under this agency scrutiny, the research can proceed, individuals will then be cognizant of what they are participating in and be apprised of their rights under Federal regulations.

Instead of going directly to the public, I thought that it would be better to ask you to contact clients you think are creditable and wish to participate to answer Dr. Skirboll questions. Creditability is a sensitive issue, because we are dealing with a government agency who does not even acknowledge the phenomena of abduction. The answers need to provide specific information to allow the Secretary's office to begin an investigation.

Please ask anyone you consider to be a reliable witness (i.e., someone having some type of physical proof of an abduction) the following questions:

1. Can you name the institution to which you were taken? Where the research was conducted? Can you name/describe the contact point? How were you transported? (If it you know the name of the building or the address, provide it. If military personnel were present, state which service.)

2. Can you describe the investigator performing the procedures? Did s/he state their name? (If the researchers looked human, then so state. Try to look beyond the paradoxical answers usually given, to an event that caused to think that maybe you were, in fact, dealing with humans.)

3. In order to help determine where funding for the research might have come from, can you remember whether the investigators wore uniforms/white coats with any patches or identifying markings? Did the investigator tell you who s/he worked for? (To help answer this question, provide information on signage you might have seen in the hallways, clinical areas where the procedures took place.)

4. In as few words as possible, describe the procedures? (If you know the clinical terms, please utilize them.)

5. Did the investigator/researcher tell you the name of the research project? (Again, look past the paradoxical answers usually given. Perhaps, there was a moment when one of the researcher said something to a co-worker when they thought you were not paying attention.)

It will be necessary to provide specific information to Dr. Skirboll, such as name and address, so that she can verify the where and who is performing the research. Remember, I contacted NIH; they did not contact me. There is no way to go forward with an investigation into the covert research projects without providing this information. It is the policy of the agency to keep all information confidential. I understand the hesitation, but the agency is bound by an oath of confidentiality. And, the only way to stop the abduction from happening is to bring everything out into the open.

If we can provide verifiable information to Dr. Skirboll, I have been assured that the matter will be pursued. I think it is time for this covert research to be stopped and brought to light so that the research can be brought under federal regulations. Then, if anyone wishes to participate they will be able to sign an informed consent form, as described at the beginning of this letter. Please help me in this worthwhile effort.

Thank you,

Kathy Kasten
1093 Broxton #607
Los Angeles, CA 90024

As of 2-3-96

Well, there's a quick up-date to this now.

Lana Skirboll has left the Dept. of Health and Human Services for a teaching position. Her assistant, Andrea Baruichin, Ph.D., Assoc. Director of Sci. Policy and Program Planing has now taken over this project. She has told us that she will review this with Donna S. and determine how this new investigation can best be handled and through which channels it should be handled. At this time they have received 8 detailed case responses from us and we are in the process of collecting more then that now to send off in the 2nd batch. Andrea is currently reviewing all we have sent to them. We are waiting to hear what their next move is. Also, the response we have had from those with experiences, who wish to participate, is overwhelming and these are all good solid cases with a lot of evidence to support them.

Well John, what do you think?

Melinda Leslie

From: zirido@ramhb.co.nz (Pat Zalewski)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Sun, 04 Feb 96 01:50:11 GMT

Talking of questions,

I have one for both Bob and John. The underground bases at Dulce, were said to have been quite large. Some posts have hinted they were man made by us or them ,and others have stated that the Govt. actually stumbled on these caverns which were already excavated with pre European cities etc. in them . If this is the case then they, the Govt. are sitting on some very important archaeological finds. If these bases were constructed by us then someone who made something that big would talk. The questions are who made the bases and how big are they? I am putting this to both of you as from what I have read both of you have different sources. If only a fraction of what we hear is true then the nightmare far outstrips the boys in black in germany did in the last war.

pat zalewski

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
From: agent@netcom.com (Billy D)
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Sun, 4 Feb 1996 22:48:08 GMT
Lines: 21
Sender: agent@netcom4.netcom.com

In article tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood) writes:
>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great, or what???
>

Well, I git the feeling that somebody ain't gonna be gittin'
somebody else's Bud Light.

I gotta hand it to John Lear, though. FOr the amount of abuse that man puts up with, he's pretty mellow. And Gene is still in fine form. I had erroneously perceived Gene as a (gawd I am gonna HATE myself for using this stoopit word, but there isn't another one handy), a, "noobee", but Gene has taught moi a thing or two about flaming. For one thing, his special style of punctuating words about feces with smileys is really neat! I tried that with some catholics but they weren't as smiley-aware as we are. So screw 'em. :)

It took me the better part of a year to decypher Gene's newsreader's quoting/response grammar, but I think I've finally got it figured out.

From: bethland@ix.netcom.com(:->)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2

Date: 5 Feb 1996 01:09:58 GMT
Lines: 17
X-NETCOM-Date: Sun Feb 04 5:09:58 PM PST 1996

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:

>
>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great,
>or what???
>
>Tom

YES!!!

The accusations, the innuendoes, the grand, ego inflating lies, all
culminating in glorious flames!

I LOVE this place!!

Dave B

From: btbmag@ro.com (Michael W. Malone)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: Sun, 04 Feb 1996 22:17:02 -0500
Lines: 16

In article , tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
wrote:

> Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great, or
>what???
>
> Tom

Tom,

It's interesting. However, is it possibly pointless?

<http://ro.com/~btbmag>
<http://ro.com/~btbmag/ufo/photo.html>
These opinions can float large blimps.

From: akazero@aol.com (Aka ZERO)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 5 Feb 1996 13:36:19 -0500
Lines: 12

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:

>>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great,
>>or what???

Need you ask?

Some of the best exchange since the "Lazar Flaws Series".

Jim

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 3 Feb 1996 18:55:58 GMT

In <4euh71\$900@reader2.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
) writes:

>
>I told my father about these concerns on Thanksgiving Day 1977 and
>that was essentially the day I was disinherited. Dickhead yes, clown
no. In the end I was correct but a penniless dickhead.

-John, I'm not really concerned with this as I just wanted to clarify things about the Lazar part of this. Since you've now admitted that you're a dickhead and that some of your thoughts are crazy, I'm perfectly satisfied!:) However, it would be disingenuous for you to contend that that was the absolute reason your father did that to you. I think you two had some other history. How about the time he sent you your tuition money and instead of paying for school you lost it on the stock market?:) Correct that if I didn't relay that story accurately, but I think that's what you told me or I read in a book or something. Either way, I think there were probably other grounds that cumulatively caused his decision. Don't you? Clown, yes!:-

From: johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 4 Feb 1996 04:14:44 GMT

In <4f0b3u\$puu@ixnews4.ix.netcom.com> gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff) writes:

>
>In <4euh7l\$900@reader2.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear

>) writes:

>>
>>I told my father about these concerns on Thanksgiving Day 1977 and
>>that was essentially the day I was disinherited. Dickhead yes, clown
>no. In the end I was correct but a penniless dickhead.

>
>-John, I'm not really concerned with this as I just wanted to clarify
>things about the Lazar part of this. Since you've now admitted that
>you're a dickhead and that some of your thoughts are crazy, I'm
>perfectly satisfied!:) However, it would be disingenuous for you to
>contend that that was the absolute reason your father did that to you.
>I think you two had some other history. How about the time he sent
>you
>your tuition money and instead of paying for school you lost it on the
>stock market?:) Correct that if I didn't relay that story accurately,
>but I think that's what you told me or I read in a book or something.
>Either way, I think there were probably other grounds that cumulatively
>caused his decision. Don't you? Clown, yes!:-

OK Gene, clown, yes!...whatever floats your boat. The Book was Stormy Genius and was about my Dad. And yes, that was the absolute reason because I was in for 20% of the previous will which was rewritten after the Thanksgiving day misunderstanding. My 20% was split up with 15% going to my children and 5% to my mothers sister. Or maybe you know more about my families' personal business than I do. Where are we going with this Gene? The Pennyless Dickhead, Clown and whatever...

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 6 Feb 1996 01:26:35 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 13
X-NETCOM-Date: Mon Feb 05 5:26:35 PM PST 1996

In <4f1brk\$1pg@reader2.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear) writes:

>
> And yes, that was the absolute reason because I was in for 20% of the previous will which was rewritten after the Thanksgiving day misunderstanding. My 20% was split up with 15% going to my children and 5% to my mothers sister. Or maybe you know more about my families' personal business than I do.

-I guess I must because from what I've heard your mother disagrees. The fact that you may have been in the will up until that point has no bearing on whether or not that it was a cumulative problem with that being the last straw. But, really, who gives a shit?-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2

Date: 6 Feb 1996 01:28:27 GMT
Organization: Netcom
Lines: 12
X-NETCOM-Date: Mon Feb 05 5:28:27 PM PST 1996

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:
>
>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great,
or what???
>
>Tom

-Not as great as it could be:) I'm biting my tongue not to give you
more vintage Lear stories. However, as I don't really dislike John, I'm
trying to be kind!:) After all, you guys know what a sweetheart I
am!:-)

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 6 Feb 1996 01:30:56 GMT

In <4f3ld6\$sef@cloner2.ix.netcom.com> bethland@ix.netcom.com(:->)
writes:
>
>In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
>writes:
>>
>>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great,
>or what???
>>
>The accusations, the innuendoes, the grand, ego inflating lies, all
>culminating in glorious flames!
>
>I LOVE this place!!
>
>-Thankyouverymuch!:(a la "the king"):)-

From: gufon@ix.netcom.com(Gene Huff)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2
Date: 6 Feb 1996 01:28:27 GMT

In tmahood@netcom.com (Tom Mahood)
writes:
>
>Fellow denizens of alt.conspiracy.area51, I ask you...Is this great,
or what???
>
>Tom

-Not as great as it could be:) I'm biting my tongue not to give you
more vintage Lear stories. However, as I don't really dislike John, I'm
trying to be kind!:) After all, you guys know what a sweetheart I
am!:-)

From: efrank@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu (Erik Frank)
Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area51
Subject: Re: Lazar Questions, Round 2 (this is ridiculous)
Date: 6 Feb 1996 06:47:57 GMT
Organization: The University of Texas at Austin

In article <4f6aob\$5dk@reader2.ix.netcom.com>, gufon@ix.netcom.co says...
>
>In <4f1brk\$1pg@reader2.ix.netcom.com> johnlear@ix.netcom.com(John Lear
>
>-I guess I must because from what I've heard your mother disagrees. The
>fact that you may have been in the will up until that point has no
>bearing on whether or not that it was a cumulative problem with that
>being the last straw. But, really, who gives a shit?-

Gene,

