



### Part 2: *Inside Saucer Post ...3-0 Blue*

© 1957 by Leonard H. Stringfield (out of print)

Reprinted with permission in Earthfiles.com

© 2006 by Linda Moulton Howe

*What constitutes proof? Does a UFO have to land at the River Entrance to the Pentagon, near the Joint Chiefs of Staff offices? Or is it proof when a ground radar station detects a UFO, sends a jet to intercept it, the jet pilot sees it, and locks on with his radar, only to have the UFO streak away at a phenomenal speed?"*

- USAF Capt. Edward J. Ruppelt

Return to **Part 1**

November 28, 2006 Albuquerque, New Mexico -



An official publication of Civilian Research, Interplanetary Flying Objects (CRIFO) © 1957 by Leonard H. Stringfield.

#### 4 - "THE ONLY CERTAINTY IS THAT NOTHING IS CERTAIN"

- Pliny the Elder

Proof! The word so legalistic is so endearing when its weight is on your side, yet so crushing when it is not. Webster's Dictionary says it is "that degree of cogency, arising from evidence, which convinces the mind of any truth of fact and produces belief ."

Many readers of Orbit probably wondered many times if it could be proved that I, its editor, actually existed. One ungentle letter from a subscriber asked if I were just a figment of the imagination for I never answered his mail. Of course, I had a reason in his case. He had told me in his first letter that he *knew* saucers were the craft of Satan.

The word "proof" always bothered me. Edward Ruppelt, in his Foreword to *The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects* asks "What constitutes proof? Does a UFO have to land at the River Entrance to the Pentagon, near the Joint Chiefs of Staff offices? Or is it proof when a ground radar station detects a UFO, sends a jet to intercept it, the jet pilot sees it, and locks on with his radar, only to have the UFO streak away at a phenomenal speed? Is it proof when a jet pilot fires at a UFO and sticks to his story even under the threat of court-martial? Does this constitute proof?"

I wondered about the place of proof in man's claims to understand or interpret his anthropological or biblical past. And with even less propriety, it popped up when the

Earthfiles, news category.

subject of saucers got too hot. Musingly, spelled backwards, proof becomes "foorp" and I for one would be freshened by an official statement that would read, "We have no irrefutable physical foorp that flying saucers exist."

*Evidence!* What would be the kind of evidence that would prove that flying saucers exist?

No one is sure, for in the first place there is no general agreement - even among saucerites - as to their probable identification or source. A few have been satisfied with a belief they are merely unknown natural phenomena; a few more hold to the hope that they are earth made devices or weapons, while a lesser number think of the "changing shapes" as stratospheric protoplasms. The first to suggest this theory to the U. S. Air Force was John P. Bessor of Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1947. In 1955, I talked with an Air Force officer who related that he had talked with a pilot who claimed he saw something looking like "shapeless animals" in stratospheric flights. A growing number, however, believe the UFO is a vehicle or missile from outer space.

Flung together by circumstance, the space-minded group includes the cream of science-fiction addicts, the cultists, the objective and sometimes incommunicative scientist and the student-philosopher who professes a strong faith in his fellow man. The latter, resting his case for "evidence" in the recognition of man's virtue to report UFOs honestly and accurately, invariably refers to the very earliest incidents, now known as the "classics." Usually cited are Kenneth Arnold's "nine saucer-like things ... flying like geese in a chain-like line" near Mt. Rainier, June 24, 1947. Or Captain Chiles' and co-pilot Whitted's report of a "long rocket-like ship ... with two rows of windows" near Montgomery, Alabama, July 24, 1948. And the "dogfight" between Lt. Gorman's F-51 and a fast maneuvering orb of light near Fargo, North Dakota, October 1, 1948.

Being "honest and accurate reports," our student sees none of these incidents to be explainable as natural phenomena. There is no scientifically declared phenomena in which geese fly in a chain-like line, or have two rows of windows, or perform intricate maneuvers. Nor can any of these classic UFO events be explained as man-made machines because several reports since 1947 have described "saucer-like" objects identical to Arnold's which have *flown dangerously close to commercial airliners*.

The *Daily Sketch* in London reported in November 1954, "The pilot of a Brazilian airliner reported a fleet of 19 saucer-like objects that flew at tremendous speed, less than 300 feet from his plane. His passengers panicked. Members of the crew had to act 'most violently' to overcome their fears."

Thus, in view of logic, secret man-made machines do not run tests in the air lanes. So in none of these incidents, including Arnold's, were the "saucers" man-made. For that matter, neither was the "rocket-like" ship which swerved to avoid collision with the airliner piloted by Chiles and Whitted; nor the object in the Fargo case which maneuvered with a military aircraft! All other explanations for the classics are ridiculous. The only logical explanation is that the objects are of extraterrestrial origin.

In the years to follow, hundreds of reliable reports have been added to the stack of evidence. Some of the best were the military sightings supported by radar. Major Donald E. Keyhoe describes several in *Flying Saucers from Outer Space*. Of further interest is the "official" slant on other cases reviewed by Edward J. Ruppelt in *The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects*. Notably here, the former head of Project Blue Book cites a UFO picked up by radar and pursued by a night fighter on May 29, 1952, over the Saginaw Bay area commented: "A lot of people I knew were absolutely convinced this report was the key - the final proof. Even if the thousands of other reports could be discarded on a technicality, this could not be. These people believed that this report in itself was proof enough to officially accept the fact UFOs were interplanetary space ships."

But even with the Saginaw Bay "evidence," the U. S. Air Force said, "There is a total lack of evidence that they (flying saucers) are interplanetary vehicles." This is a quote from a USAF letter from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense to me which was dated April 9, 1957.

While most people were content with that answer, others had equally different ideas about evidence. Some believed that Adamski's plaster of Paris mold of a space man's shoe print was good enough. Others believed the word of Dan Fry, who contended that his trip in a saucer was evidence.

Curious about what constitutes proof and evidence, I wrote to Lord Dowding, former Air Chief Marshall for the RAF, World War II, and asked for his comments on the best evidence in his country. His reply of May 21, 1957:

"In answer to the request contained in your letter of May 17, 1957, I would refer you to a book entitled, *Flying Saucer from Mars*, published by Frederick Muller Ltd., London. So far as I am aware, this is the only recorded instance of a landing in Britain, followed by a personal contact with the occupant of a

UFO. It also contains the only photograph which I have seen of a visitor claiming to be from outer space (if we exclude the 'porthole' photographs in Adamski's second book). We got Mr. Cedric Allingham (the author) to lecture to our local Flying Saucer Club, and we were all strongly impressed that he was telling the truth about his actual experiences, although we felt that he might have been mistaken in some of the conclusions which he drew from his interview. The general views which he expressed on UFOs in his book will also fail to gain universal agreement, although I am sure that they were genuinely held by him. The circumstances of the encounter were in many respects similar to those of the adventure of the two Norwegian girls picking berries in a wood with which you will doubtless be familiar. Unfortunately, Mr. Allingham died in Switzerland last year."

Proof, therefore, when applied to UFO evidence is a relative word. On this premise, the UFO can be as interplanetary or as mundane or as non-existent as the individual mind is flexible or capable of defining it.

Personally, having been pre-conditioned by my beliefs in the evolutionary prehistory of man on Earth, I found the interplanetary hypothesis not difficult to accept. Apart from an occasional exploratory or playful deviation from the theory, the sharpest thorns in my side were the bits of evidence from "reliable sources" which hinted that saucers were U. S. secret weapons. The thorns grew bigger and sharper after I began CRIFO. At one point, I suspected that I was being maneuvered into the mundane definition, for my informant was persistent with his "inside" information. But after a little personal sleuthing, I found that the maneuver lacked both depth and substance. During this pressure period, I remember another "insider" who phoned several times, suggesting that my *Newsletter* was barking up the wrong tree."

One night when he phoned, I asked him to consider three simple basic questions:

- 1) Would a secret U. S. weapon fly our commercial air lanes?
- 2) Would a secret U. S. weapon fly wantonly over foreign countries?
- 3) Would a secret U. S. weapon be tested over the U. S. capitol or over large populated cities?

Stumbling over my first question, the "insider" hung up. While it was simple to explain to my opposition that UFOs frequently violated *all three* points, it was not always wise to relate the details of my best supporting information, most of which came from confidential sources. Reliable informants were a careful lot and they spoke out only because of the intense enthusiasm they shared in the UFO mystery, or because of a disdain for what one referred to as "unmitigated censorship." Most, however, spoke hintingly and winkingly. Several with hot tips were more dramatically cautious. They said they would deny the information they gave me if it were published.

Needless to say, I never broke a confidence. But apart from any moral aspect, a person in my "research" position had to be on constant guard when talking to strangers. "Watch for traps," I was warned by one well-informed person, when discussing the military angle. "They'll give yo a hot one, you publish it, then they'll chop your head off."

Not trusting a stranger, however, also had its negative reaction. Some, no doubt, viewed my silence or evasiveness on some confidential matters as being melodramatic. But more than a few had me marked as a spy for the Air Force. One private researcher from the West Coast, visiting my home in 1955, told me, "Let's don't kid each other - you don't trust me and I don't trust you."

One in saucers soon learns to live with all the information crisscrossing his mind daily. Sometimes he is guided by its apparent truths - like the time I advised a dabbler in the stock markets to start thinking about railroads. "They'll be back on their own soon," I said. "Saucers and airliners don't mix well."

I said it half jokingly, of course, but my reasoning was supported by the formidable stacks of mail received daily from non-joking citizenry. Most were scornful of the official silence which had enveloped the saucer problem since Captain Mantell's death chase in 1948 (Kentucky). Many raked the Air Force over the coals; others condemned "big business" and later "international bankers." A few blamed religion. Another popular notion claimed a space race had taken over the world governments and was directing our ships of state. In the saucer business, rumors were always rife and the juiciest ones always won space in some little saucerzine. One mimeo sheet went so far as to claim that Christ and his disciples were lodged on the moon and were waiting to return to earth in a fleet of saucers. While the cultists were exploiting saucers, causing many on-the-fencers to abandon their interest, the man-on-the-street still saw them as a proofless fantasy. The world of Marilyn Monroe and the scrabble board were more 3-dimensional!

## 5- THE PUZZLE OF THE MUZZLE

Popular in the minds of many saucerites is the belief that our great American news media are muzzling saucer news under a vise of censorship. Wrote one pundit in a letter to CRIF: "Our press talks glibly of the freedoms while their very own is lost. It is obvious that they have become subservient to the dictates of the military overlords who will stop at nothing to suppress flying saucer information."

I have never shared the pundit's views, for if censorship were in effect, it would have meant the suppression of *all* saucer news *local as well as national!* But as every saucerite knows, most newspapers on occasions have published reports of local UFO activity, some even on the front page. Perturbing me most, however, were not the "big" events published in the "little" town, but the big events and the *manner in which they were treated* in the big cities. Too often these accounts were chopped, garbled or made ridiculous by the local press and in almost every instance, completely neglected by the newswires. Even more suspicious was the "canned" editorial and the handling of cases involving the military.

One such canned "editorial" just happened to make the rounds during the big saucer flap of 1954. Under the heading, "Enter The Flying Saucer Season," it read in part as follows: "Air Force officials pointed out a few days ago that the 'flying saucer season' is now approaching. The meteor showers which are easily seen in the heavens in the summer, especially in July and August, always bring about a flurry of reports of 'flying saucer' sightings." According to Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York, this so-called editorial appeared in at least three national newspapers: Pomeroy, Ohio *Daily Sentinel* on June 25, 1954; the *Public Herald*, Mt. Holly, New Jersey, July 15, 1954; and the *Lake Wales News*, Florida, August 19, 1954.

In the January 1956 issue of *Orbit*, thinking I had the answer, I wrote editorially:

"While I know of no federal directive which muzzles saucer stories from print (as one editor told the writer, he "never saw an edict"), there is however valid reason to believe that a clandestine 'gentleman's agreement' has been effected. The reason is that rarely and only weakly have our truth-hunting editors challenged the agency concealing the true saucer facts. Instead, it seems that some have gone beyond any 'agreement' and for autonomous or other selfish reasons have conspired with the silence group. This is done by snuffing out local sightings and tagging sightings as screwballs. The writer's activities have frequently taken him behind scenes of the press. Here, most shrewd newsmen have a conversant respect for the saucer mystery.

"But, curiously, few since 1952 have dared write up their beliefs, even though the facts at their command should have provided the trigger. On one occasion, while tracking down an Associated Press release, this writer was told by a top staff writer and columnist of a local paper that while attending a press meeting in Washington, he learned that officials "were taking more than a casual interest" in the UFO problem.

"But I have noted that this same staff writer has not reviewed or mentioned saucers in his columns since 1952. Still another sign of cooperative agreement became evident in Lake Charles, Louisiana. While vacationing there during June of 1955, this writer visited the office of the local paper, the *American Press*. During the interview, which was set up for a possible feature story on CRIFO (tying it in with my wife having been born and reared in Lake Charles), we were told by the Managing Editor that public information officers (PIOs) from the adjacent Strategic Air Command (SAC) base had visited his office and asked that all saucer reports be directed to the base. We also noted that although the editor seemed warm to the idea of a feature story during the interview, nothing ever appeared save a notice that the Stringfields were vacationing."

Eighteen months later, like a footnote to my theme on "cooperation," the British *Flying Saucer Review* in its July-August 1957 issue wrote:

"An unidentified flaming object flew across the State of Victoria, Australia, on the evening of Sunday, May 19, 1957, and was seen by thousands of people. Telephone switchboards at Melbourne's weather bureau, police headquarters, airline and newspaper offices were jammed with calls from 5:45 p.m. until 8 p.m. It is estimated that over 23,000 sighting reports of the object came in. Times given of its sighting at places hundreds of miles apart suggest its speed at nearly 2,000 mph. Reports described the object as being silver in colour, leaving a white or blue vapour trail in the night sky. ...Radio Australia

broadcast a long report, nearly 500 words, about this sensational sighting. The B. B. C. considered it of sufficient importance to include in their 10 p.m. news bulletin on the Light Programme that evening. The news agencies wired the story from Australia. But the next morning not a single London newspaper carried it!

"*Flying Saucer Review* is positive that there is no actual censorship of flying saucer news in Britain. The Press does not like to be told what it may print and what it may not print. There is Freedom of the Press. There are no orders not to print anything in peacetime. No orders. However, there are occasions when editors are "requested" not to write about this or that. No actual order is given. It is just a written request from a certain Governmental committee. *Flying Saucer Review* is aware that such a body exists and knows its name and address.

"It may be that the B.B.C. 'beat the gun' monitoring its news straight from the Australian broadcast and giving it out in a condensed version on the Light Programme. However, a telephone call to night editors would have stopped the story receiving large publicity in the morning papers.

"Flying Saucer Review admits that there may be some other more mundane reason why the Australian sighting was not carried in the London papers the following morning. On the other hand, it was received in London and broadcast by the B. B. C. in plenty of time. It is too much of a coincidence that not one of the London dailies carried the most sensational and widely-seen UFO sighting on record, and one that had been broadcast on a B. B. C. news bulletin!

"Why should this news item be possibly frowned upon? This was a terrific sighting seen by an enormous number of people. It must be remembered that only recently there had been quite a lot of press publicity in Britain over the West Freugh R. A. F. radar sighting in Scotland, closely followed by the English Channel radar sighting. This latter one had been the subject of a question in the House of Commons. If this Australian sighting had been given the publicity it deserved in the British Press, people might well have recalled the Scottish one, and have started thinking again about the Channel affair with its unsatisfactory explanation by the Air Minister. Maybe, it was considered in 'the national interest' to preserve calm by 'killing' the story."

Continued in **Part 3** - Censorship of UFO Incidents

---

### More Information:

For further information about Leonard Stringfield's UFO Status Reports, please see reprints below from the **Earthfiles Archives**:

#### Status Reports I

- 10/25/2005 -- **Final** Part 6: Retrievals of the Third Kind - A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody
- 10/13/2005 -- Part 5: Retrievals of the Third Kind - A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody
- 10/05/2005 -- Part 4: Retrievals of the Third Kind - A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody
- 09/30/2005 -- Part 3: Retrievals of the Third Kind - A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody
- 09/26/2005 -- Part 2: Retrievals of the Third Kind - Kingman, Arizona Crash
- 09/25/2005 -- Part 1: Retrievals of the Third Kind - A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody

#### Status Reports II

- 09/19/2005 -- **Final** Part 9: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 09/17/2005 -- Part 8: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 09/14/2005 -- Part 7: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 09/06/2005 -- Part 6: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 08/22/2005 -- Part 5: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 08/17/2005 -- Part 4: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 07/20/2005 -- Part 3: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 07/14/2005 -- Part 2: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data
- 07/12/2005 -- Part 1: The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome: Status Report II - New Sources, New Data

#### Status Reports III

- 07/05/2005 -- **Final** Part 15: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 06/20/2005 -- Part 14: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 06/17/2005 -- Part 13: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 05/10/2005 -- Part 12: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 05/04/2005 -- Part 11: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 04/19/2005 -- Part 10: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by

Leonard H. Stringfield

- 04/18/2005 -- Part 9: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 04/05/2005 -- Part 8: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 03/28/2005 -- Part 7: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/24/2005 -- Part 6: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 03/22/2005 -- Part 5: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/13/2005 -- Part 4: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 03/07/2005 -- Part 3: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence
- 03/03/2005 -- Part 2: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/01/2005 -- Part 1: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report III - Amassing The Evidence © June 1982 by Leonard H. Stringfield

#### Status Reports IV

- 02/23/2005 -- **Final** Part 4: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report IV - Fatal Encounter At Ft. Dix-McGuire
- 02/19/2005 -- Part 3: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report IV - Fatal Encounter At Ft. Dix-McGuire
- 02/14/2005 -- Part 2: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report IV - Fatal Encounter At Ft. Dix-McGuire
- 02/13/2005 -- Part 1: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report IV - Fatal Encounter At Ft. Dix-McGuire

#### Status Reports V

- 02/07/2005 -- **Final** Part 3: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report V - Is The Cover-Up Lid Lifting?
- ++• 02/04/2005 -- Part 2: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report V - Is The Cover-Up Lid Lifting?
- 01/30/2005 -- Part 1: UFO Crash/Retrievals: Status Report V - Is The Cover-Up Lid Lifting?

#### Status Reports VI

- 01/26/2005 -- **Final** Part 28: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 01/17/2005 -- Part 27: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 01/15/2005 -- Part 26: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 01/11/2005 -- Part 25: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 01/06/2005 -- Part 24: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 01/04/2005 -- Part 23: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 12/28/2004 -- Part 22: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 12/19/2004 -- Part 21: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 11/26/2004 -- Part 20: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 11/17/2004 -- Part 19: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 09/30/2004 -- Part 18: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 09/10/2004 -- Part 17: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 08/30/2004 -- Part 16: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 08/13/2004 -- Part 15: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 08/05/2004 -- Part 14: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 07/28/2004 -- Part 13: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 07/27/2004 -- Part 12: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 07/02/2004 -- Part 11: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 06/27/2004 -- Part 10: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 06/05/2004 -- Part 9: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 05/16/2004 -- Part 8: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 04/13/2004 -- Part 7: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/31/2004 -- Part 6: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/14/2004 -- Part 5: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/08/2004 -- Part 4: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 03/01/2004 -- Part 3: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 02/25/2004 -- Part 2: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield
- 02/24/2004 -- Part 1: UFO Crash/Retrievals: The Inner Sanctum - Status Report VI © July 1991 by Leonard H. Stringfield

#### Status Reports VII

- 02/16/2004 -- **Final** Part 15: UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield

- 02/13/2004 -- Part 14 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 02/12/2004 -- Part 13 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 02/07/2004 -- Part 12 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 02/02/2004 -- Part 11 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 02/01/2004 -- Part 10 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 01/27/2004 -- Part 9 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 01/21/2004 -- Part 8 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 01/18/2004 -- Part 7 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 01/11/2004 -- Part 6 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 12/29/2003 -- Part 5 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 12/21/2003 -- Part 4 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 12/19/2003 -- Part 3 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 12/17/2003 -- Part 2 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
  - 12/15/2003 -- Part 1 - UFO Crash/Retrievals, Status Report VII by Len Stringfield
- 

## **Websites:**

**Majestic-12 Documents:** <http://www.majesticdocuments.com>

**American Presidential Knowledge:** <http://www.presidentialufo.com>

**Stanton Friedman:** <http://www.stantonfriedman.com>

## **Credits**

**Copyright © 1999 - 2009 by Linda Moulton Howe.  
All Rights Reserved.  
[www.earthfiles.com](http://www.earthfiles.com)  
[earthfiles@earthfiles.com](mailto: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.**

