

- 1) at no time in 1950 did Sarbacher mention "Bush" or a small group. This is first introduced to Sarbacher in Steinman's numerous letters in early 1983.
- 2) Smith got the ^{Van} Bush connection thro' another source. Probably Doctor Canauld Wright, Defense Research Board Liaison Officer at Canadian Embassy Washington D.C. Wright set up the Sarbacher meeting.
- 3) Dr. Bush's name is mentioned in correspondence between Smith and the Canadian Embassy in 1951 and 1952.
- 4) The Top Secret Smith memo was discovered in Dep't of Transport files not by Friedman, but by a researcher in Hamilton, Ontario, who was filing ~~Obverse of Information~~ numerous requests for information from the Canadian Gov't. This researcher passed on the doc to Friedman.
- 5) The Dep't of Transport still exists. It is known as Transport Canada. This is because of the French situation in Canada. The Canadian Post office is for example now called Canada Post.
- 6) Sarbacher was not an "intelligence scientist." For an excellent view of Sarbacher read The Saturday Evening Post April 15, 1950. perhaps someone with a scanner can post it. It's very long.
- 7) There are actually ~~two~~ ^{THREE} Top Secret Smith memos.
- 8) Sarbacher got Bush's name from Steinman. On July 1, 96 I posted Steinman's letters to Sarbacher. It is CRITICAL the Sarbacher letter of Nov. 29, 83 be read with the letters from Steinman which include the questions Sarbacher answers on Nov. 29, 83.
- 9) "My association with the R & D Board ... was rather limited"
- 10) Walker confirmed MJ-12 existence only days after its release
1978-79 - Japan
Sarbacher → Walker.

William S. Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, Calif.
90638

Grant R. Cameron
649 Silverstone Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2V8

Aug. 17, 1987

Dear Grant:

Allow me to officially introduce myself. My name, as you know, is William "Bill" Steinman. I am a Freelance investigator into the subject pertaining to Ufology Physical evidence, Crashed/Recovered Saucers and bodies in particular, and the alliance that was eventually set up between various above-Top-Secret Intelligence groups around the world with the "Alien" beings who pilot the saucers. I recently authored a book entitled UFO Crash At Aztec, A Well Kept Secret.

During the process of researching for the above mentioned book, I spent quite a bit of my time looking into the life and research of

Wilbert B. Smith, who I consider the most informative ufologist and investigator into Saucer Technology that ever lived!!

Yes, I do have the September 15, 1950, notes that record the interview that W.B. Smith had with Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher, through Lt. Col. Bremner, at the Canadian embassy in Washington D.C.

I first heard about Dr. Sarbacher and especially that interview and the notes recording it, while reading a book by Leonard H. Stringfield entitled, Retrievals of The Third Kind, Status Report III, in October of 1982. Stringfield mentioned a letter he received from Canadian researcher Arthur Bray stating that he had proof to confirm that the Scully Story was true. This proof were those above mentioned interview notes in W.B. Smith's own hand writing. In those notes Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher stated that "the facts recorded in Scully's book were substantially correct."

This was all that I needed, I wasted no time in contacting Arthur Bray, who in turn forwarded a copy of the Smith-Sarbacher interview notes to me, which I received in April of 1983. I spent 3 weeks searching out the whereabouts of Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher. My first letter was generated to Sarbacher on May 18, 1983, I waited patiently with no response, then I called him via telephone on July 31, 1983 (during which he promised to answer my letter), I waited one more month then called him once again via telephone on August 28, 1983 (once again he told me to be patient, he would answer), Then on September 12, 1983 I mailed another letter to him, along with a xerox copy of the previous letter (May 18) plus a copy of the Smith-Sarbacher Interview notes. On October 14, 1983, I wrote one more follow-up letter to Dr. Sarbacher on October 14, 1983, asking him if there were any particular reason

he couldn't answer my letters? Then, finally, on December 5, 1983, it finally came, A letter from Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher, dated November 29, 1983.

As far as I know, this is the first and only time that Dr. Sarbacher expressed the subject matter concerning Flying Saucers (especially Crashed/recovered flying Saucers), in writing or otherwise to anybody in or out of ufological research, since his interview with W.B. Smith. (and then it wasn't in writing).

- * Attached, you will find copies of
 - ① My May 18, 1983 Letter to Sarbacher
 - ② My Sept. 12, 1983 Letter to Sarbacher
 - ③ My Octob. 14, 1983 " " "
 (Of course you have a copy of my Nov. 29, 1983 letter from Sarbacher)
 - ④ Aug. 28, 1983 Telecon with Sarbacher

The only person from the list of individuals that you mention that I corresponded with is Dr. Omond M. Solant, one time Chairman of the Canadian Defense Research Board. All of the "MJ-12" Group members

(5)

are now dead, along with John von Neumann, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Dr. Compton, and even Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher himself, who passed away in July 28, 1986.

Those typed interview notes that you have that was allegedly between myself and Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher on Aug. 5, 1985, arn't really mine. The interview was actually between Robert Bletchman and Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher, via Telephone on August 5, 1985. Robert Bletchman is an Attorney at law who is a member of C.A.U.S. (citizens Against UFO Secrecy).

* Can you do me a favor and forward a copy of those 8-5-85 interview notes to me, I don't have a copy of them.

I honestly believe that Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher didn't know any more concerning Flying Saucer recoveries then he mentioned in that 11-22-83 letter. He wasn't privy to the hard core facts, even tho he was invited to the meetings at.

Wright Patterson Air Force Base,
which he did not attend.

One person who did attend
all of the meetings, concerning
the Recovered Saucers and Bodies,
whom you mentioned, and is still
alive, is Dr. Eric A. Walker. I
wrote to Dr. Walker; but he
would not admit anything.
Stanton T. Friedman called Dr.
Walker, he still does not say
a thing concerning the Recovered
Flying Saucers.

How did you find the name
Dr. Eric A. Walker, concerning
this subject matter? I was
the person who discovered this
particular connection, and only
mentioned it to Stanton T. Friedman.

Yes, please do forward any
information that you have concerning
Wilbert B. Smith. I already have
a copy of his book The New Science,
am in contact with his wife
Muri Smith, and his son W. James
Smith.

Very Sincerely
Wm. Stearns

8-28-83

Tele-Con with
Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher
4:30 PM (P.S.T) — 7:30 P.M. (E.S.T.)
Aug. 28, 1983

- R.I.S.'son - Hello
- W.S.S. - May I speak with Dr. Sarbacher, please
- R.I.S. - Hello
- W.S.S. - Dr. Sarbacher.
- R.I.S. - Yes
- W.S.S. - This is William S. Steinman, once again.
- R.I.S. - Oh yes, I am going to answer your letters.
- W.S.S. - My main interest is that particular subject matter pertaining to the recovery of 3 flying Saucers by the U.S. military in 1948-1949, as recorded by Frank Scully in Behind The Flying Saucers.
- R.I.S. - Yes, will I fully intend to answer your questions pertaining to that Subject.
- W.S.S. - Do you remember having that conversation with Wilbert B. Smith in September of 1950, at the Canadian Embassy in Washington D.C. - and did you verify the facts, as recorded by Scully, as being Substantially Correct?

R.I.S. - Yes, I do somewhat recollect meeting with Smith there.

W.S.S. - Then, you do agree with what those notes, of that interview, states as regarding Flying Saucers?

R.I.S. - Yes, but I will write to you, I am very busy - You will probably receive an answer in a month or two - don't worry - your letters are on file, I won't forget them.

W.S.S. - Do you remember Mr. Thomas Townsend Brown?

R.I.S. - Yes, I do remember him, how is he, are you working with him, I haven't seen him for some years now?

W.S.S. - Mr. Brown is in very poor physical health; Yes I am working with him, in a way. I suppose that you probably met Mr. Brown during the war, at the dept. of Navy Research and development.

R.I.S. - No, I ran into Mr. Brown after that. Please give him my regards and tell him to stay away from Cigarettes and Smog.

Through the years I have submitted many extraordinary UFO documents to the New York Times, Los Angeles Times, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, Time, Newsweek, NBC, CBS, and ABC TV -- with no response. That's O.K. not to reply to me. But, how can one rationalize the media's failure to contact a prominent scientist like Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher? On August 5, 1985, I sent Sarbacher's letter and my cover to the media. These are the letters.

August 5, 1985

Re: crashed/retrieved UFOs

Gentlemen or Ladies:

Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher this date affirmed the contents of the enclosed letter to me and said he'd be receptive to further full journalistic inquiry.

Very truly yours,

/s/ R. Bletchman

Robert H. Bletchman

RHB/jrs

enc.

Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher [Address and phone number provided to news media. - Ed.]

To date, several UFOlogists have been in touch with Dr. Sarbacher, but no contact of Sarbacher by the media!

Out of frustration and armed with the abiding belief that the "...trash that's clogging an epoch" could be cleared away, I retained the services of Charnas Inc., a AAAA advertising agency. When I went to law school, I remember a professor shooting me down the first time I gave an opinion on a case without support of authority. I accept that principle, if we are to speak persuasively. I brought the UFO question to the best authority I could find, a top advertising agency. To be a member of a AAAA ad agency means the highest professional accredited standing. I spent two hours briefing Robert Charnas, President, and his assistant, providing them with a large quantity of UFO materials, some of which I've mentioned here today.

My concrete proposal, as prepared by Charnas Inc., dated Dec. 19, 1985, has been submitted to MUFON and I am advised that copies have been distributed to pertinent officers of the Mutual UFO Network for their consideration and approval. The proposal outlines the objectives that we wish to attain and both general and specific strategies for an advertising campaign to accomplish the specified goals. (Figure 5)

845

Sa7n

Sarbacher, Robert Irving.

Hyper and ultrahigh frequency engineering, by Robert I. Sarbacher ... and William A. Edson ... New York, J. Wiley & sons, inc.; London, Chapman & Hall, limited, 1943.

xv, 644 p. front., illus., diagra. 22^{cm}.

"Bibliographies": p. 613-632.

✓ 1. Radio, Short wave. ✓ 2. Electric waves. ✓ 1. Edson, William Alden, Joint author. II. Title.

43-1405

Library of Congress



TK6553.S26

145v3,

021.33-11324

From:mike.hofmeister@trw.com (Michael Hofmeister)
Subject:Re: Stolen UFO Technology -- Documented
Date:8 Apr 1996 19:51:42 GMT
Organization:TRW
NNTP-Posting-Host:sg035.nafb.trw.com

In article <4ipvu2\$ron@agate.berkeley.edu>, rudiak@garnet.berkeley.edu wrote:
[deletion]

-> Very shortly before his death in 1986, Sarbacher spoke with author
-> Whitley Strieber (described in Strieber's book "Breakthrough," 1995].
-> Strieber claimed Sarbacher said he not only knew about the Roswell
-> debris, but had seen it, examined it, and studied it.

Hmmm...this is a change in direction for Sarbacher's story. I assume that Strieber has all of this on tape and that the voice is authenticated as Sarbacher's. No?

-> "That fabric
-> we obtained at Roswell had molecular welds so small you couldn't even
-> identify what they were until the sixties, when the microscopes to do
-> it became available. ...What I can be certain about is that it was
-> not produced by a technology that we were aware of in 1947, or now."
-> Supposedly the technology has been adapted to make seamless coatings
-> to cover Stealth aircraft.

This contradicts itself. First, Sarbacher apparently claims the "microwelds" cannot be produced by today's technology. Next, the claim is immediately made that the "microwelds" can be produced by today's technology because they are used on "stealth" aircraft.

Also note that "stealth" aircraft were not revealed as even existing until around 1988. If Strieber claims that Sarbacher told him about it in 1986, this would be a serious security breach.

-> Wilbert Smith also claimed to have been in contact with Vannevar Bush
-> and to have handled alien artifacts. In a speech on 1/10/59 (just
-> after von Braun's alleged statement) to the Illuminating Engineering
-> Society Conference in Ottawa, Canada, he said "Various pieces of
-> [UFO] 'hardware' are known to exist, but are usually clapped into
-> security and are not available to the general public."

Right. This is the same guy who claimed to have invented a "geo-magnetic" perpetual motion machine a few years earlier.

-> In a tape-
-> recorded interview in Nov., 1961, Smith claimed to have been lent a
-> small piece of metal by a supersecret U.S. organization, the metal
-> allegedly being shot off a small saucer overflying Washington, D.C.
-> in July, 1952.

Yeah. Supersecret organizations always allow foreigners to handle UFO debris. [Insert laugh track here.]

-> Both Sarbacher and Smith
-> implicated Vannevar Bush as heading up a supersecret UFO study group.

Smith repeated Sarbacher's story. Uh, so what? It's just another

pointless "wild and specious" urban legend that goes nowhere.

-> Oberth never made such claims, stating only that he and many of his
-> colleagues believed the saucers to be real and extraterrestrial, and
-> then made various statements about how they might work.

A visionary Hungarian school teacher makes a vague statement in his old
age. This is "strong and compelling" evidence? Not even close.

```
*****  
*****      Michael Hofmeister      *****  
*****  
** "The avoidance of taxes is the only intellectual pursuit with **  
** any reward." - John Maynard Keynes **  
*****
```

From: Brian Zeiler <bdzeiler@students.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: Final conclusion on Sarbacher
Date: Mon, 08 Apr 1996 18:01:23 -0700
Organization: University of Wisconsin
NNTP-Posting-Host: f183-141.net.wisc.edu

08049607590800001 @ 59035.natb.
trw.com.

Michael Hofmeister wrote:

- > In article <31602E6B.E82@students.wisc.edu>, Brian Zeiler
- > <bdzeiler@students.wisc.edu> wrote:
- >
- > -> Right. Details don't really matter when using the UFOlogic Blender(tm).
- > -> The conclusion is always the same regardless of any facts or rationale.
- > ->
- > -> This was an insubstantial point, and it's typical of you to try to
- > -> stereotype it as part of the "UFOlogic blender".
- >
- > Brian - And it is so typical of you to get names, dates, places, and so on
- > wrong, say it doesn't matter, then go on to dwell on some absurd
- > interpretation of the most microscopic detail as your best attempt at a
- > proof.

Fallacious overgeneralization. The fact that you are insanely harping on my little mix-up between the names of von Braun and von Neuman in details that are TOTALLY irrelevant to the main points of Sarbacher and Smith seriously undermines the strengths of your already laughable "argument".

It's always with a mixture of both derision and sympathy that I read self-styled "skeptics" like yourself fanatically cling to the most mundane of irrelevant errors, such as accidentally mixing up "Gemini 7" with "Gemini 11" because both were Oberg cases or accidentally confusing "von Braun" with "von Neuman" because both were mentioned in the same letter and both have similar names. Your continuing obsession with this idiotic detail is most illuminating of the total paucity of serious substance in your feeble, decrepit arguments.

- > -> Actually, this is insufficient. I don't know what about "the whole
- > -> thing" was made up, since the document was released by the Canadian
- > -> government. You need to be more specific, i.e., Sarbacher was mistaken
- > -> about the classification level, Smith misinterpreted what Sarbacher said,
- > -> Sarbacher was deliberately lying, etc.
- >
- > Assuming that Smith accurately reported what Sarbacher told him, we know
- > that Sarbacher was incorrect that there was anything classified higher
- > than the classified information about the hydrogen weapon. He obviously
- > made that up.

Wrong yet again. Material classified at "top secret" can also be more or less compartmentalized relative to other "top secret" materials. The degree of compartmentalization was obviously higher than that of the H-bomb, which is what Sarbacher was saying. Nice try, but you strike out yet again...

- > -> You *say* there is no "independent reason" to believe these statements,
- > -> but you can't seem to say *why*.
- >
- > Geez, Bran, here it is in simple English: There is no other reliable
- > evidence that shows that anything Sarbacher said was true. Period.

What a moronic line of reasoning. This is typical of how the lunatic debunkery fringe seems to always arbitrarily move the goal. Here we have a legitimate document representing a legitimate briefing/meeting with a legitimate government scientist with confirming evidence of the

appropriate requisite credentials to give such a briefing -- yet Hofmeister wants "other reliable evidence", as if the Smith notes and Sarbacher interviews don't represent "other reliable evidence" to corroborate the memo's contents! This is so utterly devoid of logic that you are to be congratulated on further relegating contemporary UFO debunkery yet even deeper into the dark maelstrom of pseudoscience.

> -> You purport to know exactly how
> -> classified this UFO research program was, yet you don't.
>
> Brian - No. What I am saying is that the hydrogen weapon information was
> the most highly classified information in the DoD. We know that from
> reference documents about the origins of the hydrogen weapon program. I
> can list them if it will convince you.

I need no convincing about the classification level of the hydrogen bomb. What still eludes you, however, is that programs of equivalent top secret classification can still differ sharply in their compartmentalization.

> -> You claim it
> -> was "made up", but the document and the briefing and the eventual
> -> interview with Sarbacher were obviously not made up. You're taking a
> -> typical broadbrush shotgun approach here.
>
> No. I have been very specific. Sarbacher either made up the story or was
> repeating something he was told to say.

Well, no shit he was repeating something he was told to say. Obviously he had to have some guidelines. However, his interviews 30 years later both confirm and expand upon the 1950 briefing information.

> -> > -> 1) Sarbacher had the highest level of clearance in the USA in 1950.
> -> >
> -> > This is total conjecture without any independent verification.
> -> >
> -> Wrong. You have not successfully refuted Sarbacher's contention that the
> -> UFO program was the most highly classified subject.
>
> Brian - I have told you I have a clearance. Do you really believe someone
> like me has one?

Oh, I certainly believe you have a clearance...

> The point is you don't really know and it cannot be used
> as proof of anything.

Right back at ya. You don't really know and it cannot be used as proof of anything. What we *do* know, however, is that differing compartmentalization levels of top secret materials can easily explain how the UFO program was classified more strictly than the hydrogen bomb.

> -> > -> 3) Sarbacher told the Canadian federal official Smith,
> -> >
> -> > Smith was an electrical engineer working for the Canadian government. He
> -> > was already known as a UFO believer at the time of the Sarbacher
> -> > interview. Sarbacher must have known this.
> -> >
> -> This has nothing to do with the fact that Smith was a Canadian official.
> -> >

> Brian - This logic can be used to show that Canadian Mail Carriers are all
> "high ranking officials" of the Canadian government as you cont.nd Smith
> was.

Way to avoid dealing directly with the evidence. The fact that continues

to elude you is that REGARDLESS of Smith's placement in the Canadian government, he was still given information on UFOs by Sarbacher. Sarbacher confirmed Smith's reported conversation 30 years later. End of story.

> -> > -> officially on
> -> > -> behalf of the US federal government in 1950
> -> >
> -> > There is no record that Sarbacher was there in an official capacity. If
> -> > this whole thing was so official, why wasn't someone sent by the US
> -> > Government who knew the details that Sarbacher claimed he did not know?
> ->
> -> Because Smith probably did not merit a full briefing.
>
> He did not merit any briefing. He was an inventor into pseudo-science.
> Someone at the Canandian Embassy probably knew Sarbacher personally and
> arranged for the conversation. Or, if the visit was semi-official,
> Sarbacher was probably given a story to make the Canadians happy.

That makes no sense whatsoever. The visit was obviously official or Smith would not have drawn up official documentation on the meeting. Secondly, if Sarbacher was "given a story" to tell Smith, he highly likely would not have continued this "story" 30 years later in a series of interviews.

> -> It seemed like
> -> more of a hospitable gesture to get some facts across, not a full
> -> briefing.
>
> Or to help the Canadian Embassy get rid of a pest.

Again, a "pest" can be rid without having him meet with Sarbacher to hear UFO information that was untrue. They could easily have told him to get lost or have him meet with somebody that told him there were no UFOs. Instead, he meets with Sarbacher, who tells him of the Research and Development Board -- and Sarbacher says the same things 30 years later. Your argument is watery, transparent rubbish.

> -> > Why didn't Smith demand someone else when Sarbacher said he did not know?
> ->
> -> How do you know he didn't?
>
> Don't you think that this would be in the notebook where he kept all of
> this secret information? *it was follow*

Why would Smith bother noting that requests for further briefings were denied? Besides, the notes were simply notes of his meeting with Sarbacher.

> -> > -> and documented by the
> -> > -> Canadian government
> -> >
> -> > Documented by Smith working in some unknown capacity.
> ->
> -> You just said he was an electrical engineer who was also a Canadian
> -> official, which is well known. *it was till*
>
> He was an electrical engineer by vacation, but his role in chasing UFO
> legends was probably not in his job description. He probably did it for

> his own curiosity.

You have no idea and you're parading your speculative nonsense as fact.

> -> > There are many possible reasons for Sarbacher telling Smith this tale.

> -> > The least likely explanation is that it was the truth.

> ->

> -> If you *wish* to believe this, go ahead, but you have no supporting
> -> evidence.

>
> Brian - I guess common sense and logic mean nothing when confronted with a
> good story.

All of your "many possible reasons" have been thoroughly explained by me in this post as being total hogwash for relying on totally unsubstantiated assumptions, wild suppositions, and idiotic inferences. You still don't grasp that compartmentalizations in top secret projects can vary across projects, and you further fail to realize that if Sarbacher was told to "tell a story" to Smith, he would highly likely not have given interviewers the same story 30 years later. In other words, the evidence is totally consistent with Sarbacher giving Smith a UFO briefing with facts, but it is totally INCONSISTENT with your creative inferences about Sarbacher being ordered to spin a wild fable to get rid of that Smith pest. No evidence, no logic -- that's your UFO debunkery.

> -> > Or his mission was to send Smith on a wild goose chase or he liked to make

> -> > up Science Fiction stories. And so on. He had no reason to tell Smith
> -> > anything.

> ->
> -> You have no evidence that it was a "wild goose chase" or a "science
> -> fiction story". First of all, Sarbacher would have given explicit false
> -> details for a wild goose chase, but his vague approach seemed like more
> -> of a restrained briefing. ~~~~~

> Brian - What do you know about briefings?

What do *you* know about briefings? Please, fill me in.

> If Sarbacher had given more
> details, Smith might have chased them down. *he did*

Right, that's why he *didn't* give more details, and I just *said* that it seemed like a restrained briefing!

> As it was, there was nothing
> substantial to pursue. Sarbacher knew that Smith could go nowhere with
> the story he was fed. *documents*

Except for the "small group headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush".

> -> As for science fiction stories, somebody at
> -> the embassy directed Smith to Sarbacher for a reason, not to spin
> -> "science fiction".

>
> Their reasons are unclear. They may have wanted to get rid of the > pest.

More illogical idiocy. They could get rid of him without fabricating UFO evidence!! Furthermore, your little hypothesis chokes again when Sarbacher divulges more information 30 years later in several interviews! Use your head for once.

> Sarbacher was down the street. Sarbacher's reasons are also subject to
> speculation. However, we do know that if the Canadian government wanted
> an official briefing on UFOs, they would not send Smith, and the U. S.

> would not send Sarbacher. *it wasn't briefing*

More unsubstantiated proclamations.

- > -> This was a genuine government-to-government
- > -> information exchange, not a bar conversation.
- >
- > The latter is correct.

Yet even more unsubstantiated proclamations... I should just copy and past that phrase from now on.

- > Read this carefully: Top Secret information is not discussed around the
- > water cooler like a baseball score. Until recently, it was guarded so
- > closely that TWO people were required for ONE to read a Top Secret
- > report. Since Sarbacher never claimed to be involved in the program he
- > alluded to, it is very unlikely that he would have been told anything if
- > anything did happen. The story that they just chatted about it is absurd.

no No, it's not. He was a consultant to the Research and Development Board and had SOME limited participation -- that destroys your feeble argument. And your "water cooler" analogy is more nonsense because he personally met with the R&DB at WPAFB, not at the "water cooler". Typical Hofmeister distortion tactic.

- > Brian - Since you have never worked in a secure environment, your
- > statement is nothing more than the idle speculation of a college student.

Mike - since you highly likely work in an inky-black secure environment, you're obviously bullshitting when you say that classified material cannot be kept in an area in which only the generating or receiving party can have access.

- > Unless you work in a vault, the material is secured in a safe when not
- > observed directly.

Right, a "safe" like a locked office drawer.

- > When people leave for good, the classified material is
- > accounted for and returned to a central file. You don't just walk away
- > because if something comes up missing, someone might go to prison.

More crap. This destroys the notion of "compartmentalization" if all classified documents are stored in a big "central file" where everybody can see what everybody else is doing. It's no stretch to think Sarbacher could lock his documents in his drawer and then lock his office when he left the locked, guarded, patrolled, heavily secured Pentagon.

- > -> > -> He also said that he was "sure" that von Braun would have been
- > -> > -> invited as well
- > -> >
- > -> > Another obvious choice.
- > ->
- > -> Point being? You seem to be saying that it be more compelling if
- > -> Sarbacher implicated Pons and Fleischmann?
- >
- > Point being that Sarbacher mentions people who would logically be chosen,
- > thereby providing no information other than what a bright high school
- > student could guess anyway.

Nice logic. If Sarbacher provided names that were consistent with these people working in the project, he's just mentioning people that "would logically be chosen". But if he gave inconsistent names, he would surely be wrong. Either way, in the Hofmeister Course on Critical Reasoning, Sarbacher **must** have fabricated the involvement of von Braun.

> -> > -> As the above facts
> -> >
> -> > Now we'll need to redefine a fact as "a wild and specious conjecture that
> -> > cannot be verified."

> ->
> -> Heh. Actually, YOUR conjectures are wild, specious, unsubstantiated, and
> -> simply wrong.

>
> Brian - Since your idea of a fact is anything that you read between the
> lines, I stand by my comment that you redefine a fact as "a wild and
> specious conjecture that cannot be verified."

As anybody who has read this post can tell, you have offered nothing but
wholly unsubstantiated suppositions that directly contradict known facts,
logic, and the rules of critical reasoning.

--
Brian Zeiler



William S. Steinma
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, Calif.
90638

Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher
c/o 150 Australian Ave.
Palm Beach, Florida
33480

Sept. 12, 1983

Dear Dr. Sarbacher:

This is a follow-up to my letters and Telephone conversations to you, dated 5-18-83, 6-15-83, 7-31-83(Tek) 8-10-83, and 8-28-83(Tele). During that last telephone conversation to you on 8-28-83, you asked me just exactly ^{what} did I want pertaining to those recovered flying Saucer cases.

Dr. Sarbacher, as I stated in my first letter on 5-18-83, I need the following information from you, if at all possible:

① relate your own experience as pertaining to your own involvement with these recovered Flying Saucers - Description o

Saucers, occupants, names of others involved, places of recoveries, dates of recoveries, etc.

② Verification that the persons listed, were involved.

- Ⓐ Thomas Townsend Brown
- Ⓑ Dr. Weisberg
- Ⓒ Hellmut Schmidt
- Ⓓ Dr. Robert H. Kent
- * Ⓔ Dr. John Von Neuman
- * Ⓕ Dr. Wernher Von Braun
- Ⓖ Dr. Francis Bitter
- Ⓗ Dr. Leo A. Ge Baver
- * Ⓘ Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer
- ⓵ Dr. Eric Henry Wang
- * Ⓚ Dr. Vannevar Bush.

③ A copy of the official Govt. report pertaining to the Aztec, New Mexico recovery, or any other that you might have access to.

④ Copies of the Photographs of the recovered Flying Saucers both at the "Crash-Site" and

at the laboratory, and Photograph
of the occupants of these
Flying Saucers-

- ⑤ Copies of the Official Analysis
reports both on the Saucers
and the occupants.

Please review the previous letters
and get in touch with me as
soon as you possibly can on this
very important matter.

Very Sincerely Yours
Wm Steinhilber

William S. Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, Calif.
90638

Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher
c/o 150 Australian Ave
Palm Beach, Florida
33480

October 14, 1983

Dear Dr. Sarbacher:

This is a follow-up to my letters and Telephone Conversations, To you, dated 5-18-83, 6-15-83, 7-31-83 (Tele.), 8-10-83, 8-28-83 (Tele.), and 9-12-83, Copies Attached.

Is there any particular reason that you feel that you shouldn't and/or couldn't answer my questions, as asked in the letters, dated 5-18-83 and 9-12-83? If so, please explain why; and if not then please answer the questions to the best of your ability and please supply the requested reports and photographs.

Thank you very much for your help in this very important matter-

Very Sincerely Yours
Wm Steinman