



Part 1: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence

© June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield

With permission, reprinted in Earthfiles.com © 2005 by Linda Moulton Howe.

I don't know of anyone who has access to the (Pentagon) blue room, nor am I aware of its contents and I am not aware of anything having been relocated. ...this thing (UFOs) has gotten so highly classified, even though I will admit there is a lot of it that has been released, it is just impossible to get anything on it."

- Barry Goldwater, U. S. Senator, Arizona, 1981

UFO CRASH/RETRIEVALS: AMASSING THE EVIDENCE

Status Report III

By Leonard H. Stringfield

June 1982

"When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however, improbable, must be the truth." - Sir Arthur Conan Doyle

Earthfiles, news category.

To be more computer-friendly, the reprint has been divided into parts. Here begins **Part 1** of *Status Report III*, written in June 1982. The series of status reports, I through VII, were written by Leonard H. Stringfield from 1978 to 1994. Previous *Status Report IV* begins at **Earthfiles 021205**. Leonard Stringfield died on December 18, 1994.

"PROLOGUE: THE BIGGEST STORY EVER, NEVER TOLD"

"Ever since World War II when the first UFOs, dubbed 'foo fighters,' became officially recognized, the mystery of their origin and intent has haunted the minds of man. Most ponder the puzzlement skeptically amused; others want to believe and straddle a philosophic fence guessing for answers. As we head into the decade of the 1980s, serious research has not found the answer either, or the proof to qualify an answer. Officially, the mystery remains *ostensibly* irresolvable. To those wary and who have taken the time to probe, the official position is as mysterious as the UFO itself.

In the decade of the 1970s, it was the big flap of 1973 that got national attention. Then, even the media got emoted over the number of close encounters. But official Washington was *ostensibly* unmoved. The press cooled off and so did the public; both turned from curiosity to apathy. Research, learning from the experience, became better organized, but remained on square one, still debating the classical encounters, EM effects, MIBs and still chasing down reports of lights in the sky.

Then in the late 1970s, the stimulus of abductions in ever increasing number stirred up new controversies. Questioned was the efficacy of regressive hypnosis as a means to determine hidden events during the inevitable time lapse.

Seeking a meaning to all the seeming fantasies, research foundered with the popular extraterrestrial hypothesis and got nowhere in search for proof. Then it went off the deep end to seek more exotic explanations where it still founders. In its frustration, even the old U. S. secret weapon answer has been resurrected. Officially, Washington said nothing; *ostensibly* it was not interested. The factor of time had not provided the answer.

Whatever the 1980s bring, UFO landing *en masse* or gradual withdrawal, the past is a matter of record and the record - as most in research will agree - is hidden under an official lid of lead. For some cogent or conspiratorial reason, the real, raw facts - however they might stack up to form the answer - have not been bared. And as researchers know, they cannot be secured through the Freedom of Information Act.

I believe I know some of the real, raw facts about the hidden evidence. Each might be a piece to the puzzle. Yes, the facts, or *alleged* facts, are incredible. By human standards, maybe even ridiculous. For certain they are rooted in a legend that nags research even today and looms as myth to the rest of the world. And so, it all began as a rumor - a terse, unembellished rumor about a saucer and its crew of little men on ice at Wright-Patterson! But the notion was so improbable, it became funny. To make it funnier, some said the little critters were even green. Even research thought it was far out, so much so that it was simply unfashionable for anyone respectable in its ranks to even soberly talk about the possibility, let alone go on record to write about it. Everyone who had done their research spade work remembered Frank Scully, who in the early 1950s wrote a book about a saucer crash in 1948 in Aztec, New Mexico. The book, using some allegedly shady characters, was declared a hoax and Scully was axed into disgrace.

But the Aztec story did not die. Over the long years, new rumors about other crashes emerged. According to witnesses untraceable, UFOs have crash landed. Or, as one source avers, have even been 'shot down' by U. S. Air Force interceptors and retrieved under the highest degree of secrecy.

I decided to dig into the rumors. In my book, *Situation Red, The UFO Siege* (Doubleday 1977), I made light mention of the UFO crash/retrieval subject. To my surprise, my first live source surfaced to tell his story. A pilot in the military reserves, he seemed sincere, had no axe to grind or money to gain and he preferred anonymity.

My new first person report and others, mostly secondhand, were included in my first paper, *Retrievals of the third Kind* which I presented as speaker at the Ninth Annual MUFON Symposium in Dayton, Ohio, July 1978. Surprisingly, my proposed paper got unusual publicity. A story released through United Press wires was picked up by ABC radio nationwide and into Canada. Just as surprisingly, after my talk: dead silence. When I checked with ABC in New York, I was told they were more interested in Pete Rose of the Cincinnati Reds, who was trying to break a hitting record. Fortunately, however, what had been aired earlier was sufficient to open the proverbial flood gates. Emerging were more incredible data from new, independent and credible first person sources, each offering a substantive clue about a military retrieval operation, or information about his observation of the craft or preserved alien cadavers. All, fearful of reprisal and/or wanting no invasion of privacy, insisted on anonymity.

Foremost of my informants during this climactic period, was a medical doctor on staff of a major medical center, who alleged by letter to me (unsigned by prearrangement), that he performed an autopsy on an alien being in the early 1950s. Another informant, through an intermediary, was a CIA employee who guardedly provided some useful data in response to my questions. He also advised some dos and don'ts for me to use as a guide.

Convinced that my pursuit into the UFO Crash/Retrieval subject was substantive - and despite the realization that I invited criticism for hearsay by not revealing the identities of my sources - I released for publication my second paper through MUFON entitled, *The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome, Status Report II*, January 1980.

My persistent probes into this strange and sensitive realm since 1980 have produced some surprisingly sobering information and expectedly, some unpleasanties and frustration. The latter, caused mainly by a series of rapid setbacks in the flow of information first became apparent at some point in time during the late summer of 1980 when some of my key first person informants, who had allegedly seen either the alien craft or the cadavers, became mysteriously unreachable by any means of communication.

By the end of October 1980, after repeated and futile probes to reach these sources, I felt convinced that my pipelines had been deliberately cut. Also, in this time frame, my two key respondents - one medical and the other the CIA employee - admitted they could no longer relate information to me. Implied was a tightening of security. Both would know, as both were still active in secret UFO projects. Even some new sources through intermediaries - who had promised information in person or by mail

- faded into sudden oblivion.

As the erosive draught of information on this subject continued through 1981, the negative noise of critics and rumor-mongers grew louder as they belittled my work or attacked my credibility. Feeling neutralized, I decided to withdraw into silence and to watch and wait. Perhaps, I reasoned, there might be just one interloper to break through the web. Or maybe, there would be a signal, for good or bad. But nothing.

Unlike the two previous productive years when I gathered information and published two monographs with only minor interference, most of my efforts in 1981 resulted in disappointment. Aborted was my plan to publish my third paper slated for that year.

Suddenly, starting in September 1981, the long silence was broken. As though somebody pressed a button to 'On,' new sources emerged - eight, in fact - all in short order to each other. Encouraged by the sudden influx of new contacts, I negotiated with each for the next move. As before, I promised anonymity and then I waited. Three promptly became good first person reports. The others, however, faltered. In time, like Cheshire cats, one by one each faded away. Soon realizing that the upsurge was not the beginning of a boom, I reclined again to re-evaluate my position and the amassing material on hand and decided to start writing *Status Report III* without delay.

During this period of resurgence, fortuitously news came from an unexpected source: a new letter surfaced from Barry Goldwater, U. S. Senator, Arizona. Underscoring his apparent distaste for UFO secrecy, it came in response to a letter sent by researcher, Lee Graham, of Aerojet Electric Systems, Azusa, California, who had written to him before without answers. As reminders this time, Graham had enclosed copies of three previously published letters which had appeared in *Status Report II*, all of which told of an Air Force denial to grant him access to a 'room' at Wright-Patterson which stored UFO secrets. Significantly in this letter, dated October 19, 1981, quoted below, Goldwater went a step further, making reference to the secret storage facility as the 'blue room':

October 19, 1981 Letter from U. S. Senator Barry Goldwater, (R-Arizona) to UFO Investigator, Lee Graham: 'First, let me tell you that I have long since given up acquiring access to the so-called blue room at Wright-Patterson, as I have had one long string of denials from chief after chief, so I have given up.

In answer to your questions, one is essentially correct. I don't know of anyone who has access to the blue room, nor am I aware of its contents and I am not aware of anything having been relocated. I can't answer your question six, in fact, I can't find anyone who would answer it.

To tell you the truth, Mr. Graham, this thing has gotten so highly classified, even though I will admit there is a lot of it that has been released, it is just impossible to get anything on it.

I am returning your papers because I know they are of value to you.'

Goldwater's reference to a 'blue room' at Wright-Patterson suggests a more in-depth operation concealed behind the small front office of Project Bluebook. Curiously, the color blue brings to mind the 'blue berets' (See Case A-3, *Status Report II*) and 'blue boys,' described in Case A-9 of this *Status Report III*.

THE WITNESS MODEL

The first person witness in crash/retrieval research might suddenly surface from out of Anywhere, U. S. A. Such a person, if his or her credentials are good, plays a crucial role because what he or she tells might provide a clue, or a corroborative link, to lend credibility to the greatest story ever, never told.

First person witnesses are rare. Even rarer are those allowing use of their identities. It seems there are risks in talking too much. They stress it; I sense it. When they talk for the first time, I note every word carefully. There might be no second chance.

Also noted is the witness's concern for matters of personal security. Usually in the same breath, assurances are requested for anonymity and measures to prevent the invasion of privacy. Simple requests, indeed, and I have honored them even at the expense of my own reportorial credibility. And interestingly, in most instances,

witnesses are not ufologists; curious, yes, but they do not want to be involved in the crossfire of the skeptical media or undisciplined researchers.

Paramount to the objectives of research and to me on its behalf is to establish credibility for the witness. Is the witness sincere? Is his report accurate? And if one or two are not, what of the others? Or we might ask: Are all reports perpetrated by hoaxers, the mentally sick, or by cells of manipulators peddling a package of disinformation? Investigation, even with adequate funds, cannot provide a ready answer. On this premise, I suppose, we could challenge the veracity of any or all UFO reports in reputable research files - some of which are far more outlandish than a crash landed UFO.

Sometimes in research, one can learn more about the sincerity of a person, who claims to know a secret, by what is unsaid. His or her true fidelity might reveal itself through body chemistry, a dart of an eye, the twist of a smile, a play of the hand, or the repetitive use of 'you know' to emphasize a point. But, as it is my work, the person with sensitive information is not always personally available for an eyeball-to-eyeball evaluation. Most, for reasons of security, usually prefer the shield of an intermediary. Safe and pivotal, this go-between feels fewer pressures and knows that he does not have to identify his source and can stop the dialogue at any time if the conditions of his source are not met. In this instance, I have only secondhand 'chemistry.' And if the approach is made by phone, which is the way it usually is in research, then I have only a voice and its intonations. However, most intermediaries reaching me essentially pass the on-sight or telephone tests. Most, in short time, if the conditions are right, will provide credentials for themselves and often their sources.

While much can be debated about witness integrity, the model by which it is presented for public review can also be debated. In this matter, I have had all degrees of criticism from pockets of research. There is no argument against constructive criticism. I favor it. But, hurrah to the day when this subject can be fully aired. Or when the Pied Piper can lead very witness to the point of signing an affidavit or appear on TV without a stocking stretched over his face. But as one 'insider' told me: even those steps would NOT be proof. To help clarify my position, Dr. Peter Rank, Chief of the Department of Radiology, Methodist Hospital, Madison, Wisconsin, who had heard all the complaints, explains his views in a letter published in the *MUFON UFO Journal* (March 1982) as follows:

March 1982, Peter Rank, M. D., Radiologist: 'I would like to comment on the reliability of information and method of presentation surrounding the paper, The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome, made public by Leonard Stringfield in January 1980. There has been some controversy about the reliability of Stringfield's data with special reference to his reluctance to go public with the names of his witnesses and informants. His failure to identify the sources of information has been sued to cause some doubt upon the reliability of his data. This seems to be unfair. Perhaps the following explanation will help.

For a generation now, ufologists have been unconsciously assuming that the Journalistic Model of reporting is the one which demands the most credence. Information published in the media demands that such stories reveal the who, what, where, when and why of the incident reported. It is assumed that such complete disclosure lends authenticity to the story involved and indeed is a requirement for believability. Most ufologists have adhered to this principle whenever possible. Such full disclosure according to the Journalistic Model has been counter-productive. In many cases, foreknowledge that their names would be published in the popular media has driven away UFO witnesses and certainly has driven away any informants who cared to comment anonymously about the Crash/Retrieval Syndrome.

It should now be clear to all dedicated ufologists more than a generation after Kenneth Arnold's sighting, that a different manner of reporting UFO information than the Journalistic Model is required. Perhaps another alternative should be adopted, specifically the Medical Model of reporting scientific information, and do so in accordance with case history technique. Medical literature frequently has need of describing objective and very personal information about patients. The literature is replete with such case histories. In all cases the patient's anonymity is respected and the patient identified only by initials. These case histories are never challenged on the grounds that the patient's full name is not disclosed, and the underlying integrity of reporting is assumed as a matter of fact.

Might it not be useful for us to adopt a similar approach? Both witnesses and informants would thereby be protected. Witnesses could then report all their data to serious researchers with the clear knowledge that they and their families would never be identified in any publication which might provoke the popular media to descend upon them like locusts at a feast. Informants, many of whom are discussing information that is highly classified, perhaps several levels above the well known 'Top Secret' category, may then feel free to 'go public' with their information without fear of retribution. This would encourage others to come out of the closet and allow considerably more information to develop about the Crash/Retrieval Syndrome.

There is obvious journalistic precedent for this practice. Journalists are, and always have been, very protective of their sources and have insisted in courts of law that their sources remain anonymous. Legal attempts to force journalists to reveal sources of their information have failed. This guaranteed anonymity has served as a mighty bulwark of a free journalism. It could also serve as a mighty bulwark for a more liberated investigative ufology.

I do not think that the criticisms by Stanton Friedman and William Moore have merit. Their criticisms of Stringfield's desire to protect the anonymity and safety of his sources stands outside the bounds of all reasonableness for a variety of reasons. Let me be clear that I respect their work. Still, I have personally talked to a UFO witness, a CE-III subject, and several military types, and most seek to guard their privacy. It is quite clear that our first responsibility is to consider these people as 'patients' who first of all need our assistance and support, and who second of all, need our guarantee that their privacy and good faith will not be abused."

Continued in **Part 2** - Classified "A" Report and Hangar 18, Roswell, New Mexico

Credits

**Copyright © 1999 - 2009 by Linda Moulton Howe.
All Rights Reserved.
www.earthfiles.com
earthfiles@earthfiles.com**

Republication and dissemination of the contents of this screen or any part of this website are expressly prohibited without prior Earthfiles.com written consent.

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms & Conditions](#)
[Refund Policy](#)

Copyright © 1999 - 2009, Earthfiles.com / DigitalEyeCandy.ca
All rights reserved.

