



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is **OPEN**

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Re: Any More News Regarding Roswell?

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Any More News Regarding Roswell?

From: KRandle993@aol.com [Kevin Randle]
Date: Tue, 2 Jun 1998 11:44:55 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 Jun 1998 16:13:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Any More News Regarding Roswell?

>Date: Mon, 1 Jun 1998 21:59:32 -0400
>From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Any More News Regarding Roswell?
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

> Regarding...

>>Date: Wed, 29 Apr 1998 22:29:55 -0400
>>From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Any More News Regarding Roswell?
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>In discussions with Kevin Randle I had written:

>"Isn't this all academic anyway as critical documents obtained
>under the FOIA confirm, as arguably does the absence of any
>heightened military alert at the time, that 'Roswell' had no
>bearing whatsoever on the perceived enigma of what 'flying
>saucers' truly were?"

>"It's understood that recently unearthed 'Top Secret' documents,
>subsequent to 'Roswell', reiterate this".

>To which Kevin had asked "What recent documents?".

>I said to Kevin that I would get back to him on this and can
>confirm the documents I was alluding to are referenced in the
>following:

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@CYBERZONE.NET>
>Subject: New Top Secret Document Revealed
>To: PROJECT-1947@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>Greetings List,

> Candy Peterson and Steve Russell assisted me in get this
>material ready for publication on the Internet. John Stepkowski,
>the Project 1947 Webmaster, has now linked most of the documents
>related the newly discovered April 1949 Top Secret "Unidentified
>Aerial Objects," a USAF Directorator of Intelligence's briefing
>for the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC). The Top Secret
>document was discovered last year at the National Archives. It
>throws new light on the release of the "Project Saucer" report,
>Sydney Shallet's Saturday Evening Post article, the printing and
>distribution of the Top Secret "Analysis of Flying Object
>Incidents in the United States," and the internal briefing of the
>USAF Operations Staff by Directorate of Intelligence personnel in

>the last few days of April and the beginning of May 1949.

>The Top Secret JIC briefing and related documents are linked in
>the footnotes of a general commentary recently published in The
>International UFO Reporter (Published by CUFOS, 2457 West
>Peterson Avenue, Chicago, IL 60659, \$25/year in the USA):

><http://www.iufog.org/project1947/fig/49docdex.htm>

>[End]

In response to this, I have said, repeatedly, that a top secret clearance does not automatically grant clearance to all documents considered top secret.

For instance:

The top secret document, dated 10 December 1948, Air Intelligence Report No. 100-203-79, entitled "Analysis of Flying Object Incidents in the U.S.," was a joint effort between the Directorate of Intelligence of the Air Force and the Office of Naval Intelligence. It is so sensitive that it contains a warning that states, "This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 U.S.C., 31 and 32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law. Reproduction of the intelligence in this publication, under the provisions of Army Regulation 380-5, is authorized for United States military agencies provided the source is indicated."

The document, then, was highly classified. It was a report created to brief high-ranking officers on the unidentified flying object situation. It would seem that the officers creating the document would have access to all the classified information needed to accurately assess the situation. The officers writing the report would not lie about the state of the situation to their superiors. They would tell their superiors everything they knew. And, if Roswell was the crash of an alien spacecraft, it should be mentioned in this report.

Or should it?

The report included an interesting paragraph about the origins of the objects. To understand the situation, that paragraph is important. It said, "THE ORIGIN of the devices is not ascertainable. There are two reasonable possibilities: (1) The objects are domestic devices, and if so, their identification or origin can be established by a survey of the launchings of airborne devices... (2) Objects are foreign, and if so, it would seem most logical to consider that they are from a Soviet source..."

The conclusions, at the bottom of page two, and marked top secret, were, "SINCE the Air Force is responsible for control of the air in the defense of the U.S., it is imperative that all other agencies cooperate in confirming or denying the possibility that these objects are of domestic origin. Otherwise, if it is firmly indicated that there is no domestic explanation, the objects are a threat and warrant more active efforts of identification and interception."

What we observe in this document, however, is not the all-knowing, access to every classified report. Instead, we find the authors speculating that the flying objects might be a domestic project and their suggestion that any such project be revealed to the Air Force because of its responsibility for air defense. In other words, the authors of the top-secret report did NOT have complete access to everything. They admitted that there were areas they were not allowed to examine.

The fact that these events are left out of the Air Intelligence Report, then, are not significant. The authors admitted, subtly, that they did not have all privileged information. The report, then, does not prove that Roswell didn't happen, or that these officers were lying to their superiors if it did. They didn't know about Roswell, didn't have access to that highly restricted information and therefore, couldn't include it because they didn't know about it.

The point is that no mention of the Roswell case, and a high

classification does not lead to the conclusion that nothing happened. SCI rears its ugly head here and we must make allowances for it.

>I had also asked of Kevin:

>"Is it fair to say that following the exposure of fundamental
>flaws in previously accepted and crucial witness testimony from
>such as Gerald Anderson, Jim Ragsdale and Glenn Dennis, that you
>would now consider Frank Kaufmann as a central 'Roswell'
>witness?".

>To which Kevin had responded, "No".

>My follow-up query, "Do you currently consider him to be a
>credible witness?", I didn't detect a reply to, however, I
>noticed that in the United Kingdom UFO Network's 11th April 1998
>IRC chat, Kevin stated, "I find Frank Kaufmann to be credible
>because, to this point no one has demonstrated that he has lied
>about anything".

>Which answers the question.

>Remaining unanswered are the following:

>There were two points about Kaufmann's claimed copy of his
>original 'Top Secret' report.

>The first was why he had a copy at all, did he routinely make
>duplicates of 'secret' documents for his own files?

A very good question and I have suggested that it be asked of Frank Kaufmann. I intend to ask it on the first opportunity I have to speak to Frank in person.

>Secondly, how was he was able to make what seems allegedly to be
>an exact copy, complete with letter-heading bearing the name and
>address of 'Headquarters, Roswell Army Air Field', a typed
>reference [S1CP/JAM/sfm] and partly typed, partly hand-written
>date [only the typed '1947' is clear].

>Although there were no photocopiers available in 1947 (the
>electro-photographic process wasn't publicly demonstrated until
>22 October 1948), he could indeed have photographed the
>document.

>What did he do then though, send the film to Kodak for
>processing?

I notice in reading about spying in the Civil War that messages to be taken to Richmond were routinely taken to Washington for copying by the Union before they were taken on to the 'Confederate capital. I mention this only to suggest that copying of documents was accomplished long before 1947.

>I had mentioned Kaufmann's report previously and remained unsure
>if these questions had ever been asked of him and answered.

>Also unclear was whether the 'report' had ever been published.
>The only time I've seen the document, which seems to consist of
>only this one page containing sketches of the 'craft' and
>'aliens', is in the UK Channel 4 'Incident at Roswell'
>documentary.

>What about the possibility of clarifying these issues with Frank
>Kaufmann and also querying why, if the copy letter-heading
>relates to a document he sent (rather than a letter he might have
>received), the reference doesn't contain FK's initials?

I have suggested that these questions would be more appropriately addressed to Frank Kaufmann. He will have the answers for them.

>During the 50th anniversary 'celebrations', the 'Albuquerque
>Journal' published the following article:

>Kaufmann, a native of New York, was a noncommissioned officer in
>charge at the Roswell Air Field until Oct. 31, 1945, when he
>separated from the Army Air Forces. He resumed the same duties as
>a civilian the next day, and served for three more years.

>Kaufmann was assigned to an intelligence unit, S1.

All verified through documentation available except for the assignment to intelligence. If it was as he claimed, there would be no documentation easily available to confirm it. When looking at Frank's testimony, that fact should be kept in mind.

>In early July, he was called to the White Sands Proving Ground
>(now the White Sands Missile Range) to monitor unusual activity
>being picked up by radar.

>"They were getting these blips and they didn't think too much
>about it. There was no such thing as UFOs, it didn't exist. But
>what brought it to their attention was these erratic movements
>and the repeated rapid movements. That's when they alerted us to
>find out what the hell was going on.

>"The first or second of July, the radar screen lit up. Then the
>radar started to act normal again. We had trained radar people
>that were assigned to our group that told us that something went
>down east, where we didn't know. What drew our attention to the
>site was that people driving on 285 ... saw this flame UFO Crash
>going down, they saw this glow. And it was common at that time to
>call the base and say, 'We saw something.' That's how we knew how
>to locate it."

Which is consistent with what he had told me about that aspect of the case. There are other who have suggested that the site of the crash was in the location identified by Frank.

>The base called Kaufmann and his colleagues back to Roswell, they
>met with base intelligence officer Jesse Marcel and base
>commander Col.
>William Blanchard, and a search crew was dispatched.

>"It was pitch black. It was a thunderstorm, by the way. Off the
>highway we could see this kind of glow. The terrain was very
>rough and it was very wet. It was full of caliche out there. It
>was like driving on ice. We had to cut the wire fence and I think
>maybe we got 200 to 300 yards from it and it looked like it
>wasn't a plane or a missile or anything like that. So we radioed
>in for a special group, the chemical boys, to inspect the area.
>When they told us it was all right to go in is when we saw the
>debris field".

>"We were there just dumbfounded. We didn't know what to think.
>And we didn't know how anybody else would react if we told them
>what we saw.
>They would probably wonder what we had been drinking".

>The aliens "didn't have any of these big eyes or horns or
>anything else or spiny fingers. They were very good-looking
>people, ash-colored faces and skin. About 5 feet 4, 5 feet 5.
>Eyes a little more pronounced, a little bit larger. Small ears,
>small nose. Fine features. Hairless. There were five. They had a
>very tight, almost a wetsuit, silver colored. I just saw two of
>them. One was thrown out of the craft itself. And one was half in
>and half out. They were all dead".

The creatures described by Frank have grown a little bit over the years, but when we remember that we're talking about events that are over 50 years old, a few minor changes should be expected, especially when we remember all the reporting that was done last year. For clarification, I might suggest a look at the work done by Elizabeth Loftus and Richard Ofshe.

>"I didn't go near the craft itself. I just took a quick look
>because we were too busy trying to get a flatbed out there and
>trucks to get rid of everything before daylight set in. The craft
>itself, I'd say it must have been 20, 22 feet long and maybe 10,
>12 feet in width. It wasn't too big. It was split in two. The
>Stealth bomber is the spitting image of what the craft looked
>like. There was no dome. The interesting thing is, the craft
>carried no fuel. Underneath the craft was a series of cells,
>octagon-shaped cells".

>"One of our boys noticed that deterioration was setting in on the
>skin. So we radioed in to have some body bags. They were put in
>body bags. They took them on the jeep to the highway because we
>couldn't get too many trucks in there. The bodies were the first
>to go, then the craft next."

>Kaufmann does not remember the date of the operation, but he
>believes it was the early morning of July 5. Once back on the
>base, he did not have any further contact with the craft or the
>bodies. He and the other members of the team were told to never
>talk about the crash. He began to tell his story in the 1990s
>after other witnesses began releasing information".

>Perhaps more than anyone, Kevin is capable of playing "spot the
>glaring 'Roswell' anomaly" and might offer an explanation for all
>of the ones patently evident here.

What we must remember is that there has been a lot of material
published about the Roswell case that is inaccurate. I think of
the stories told by Gerald Anderson and even J. Bond Johnson.
Johnson, who told me originally that General Ramey had told him
it was a weather balloon now claims that Ramey didn't tell him
that.

The point is that we are left with a mass of mud that must be
searched to find the truth. We must weed out that which is
uncorroborated or horribly altered and eliminate it. The
conclusion comes when we try to force everything to fit into a
single mold.

We must realize that, given the fact we are relying on memory
that is 50 years old, we are going to get discrepancies. When we
begin to deal with a situation that has produced a number of
claims that are false, the issue is going to be confused.

When we begin to deal with a situation that has a huge monetary
stake, such as that that now surrounds Roswell, the situation is
going to become even more confused. All we can do is attempt to
wade through this, expose the hoaxes as we find them, and
continue to work.

KRandle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).