

The Philadelphia Inquirer
Fri. Nov. 1, 1985
By FRANK ROSSI



An open mind about UFOs

Unless you're an apostle of UFOs, you probably missed the latest tidbit. For years, ufologists, amateur, professional and irrational, have accused the government of hiding a crashed UFO and its charbroiled occupants in a warehouse somewhere.

This is a good story, and in a minute I'll tell you why Temple University history professor David Jacobs, a real expert in the field, thinks it is make-believe. But first the tidbit.

Robert Sarbacher was educated at Princeton and Harvard. He is former graduate dean of Georgia Institute of Technology. After World War II, Sarbacher served as a dollar-a-year man for the government — he was a science consultant for the Defense Department's Joint Research and Development Board.

These days, Sarbacher is head of the Washington Institute of Technology. Recently, Sarbacher confirmed that he was one of several scientists invited in the '50s to a meeting at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base outside Dayton, Ohio, to discuss what were thought to be crashed spacecrafts from another solar system.

Stayed away

Sarbacher didn't attend. He says he had other responsibilities, and he apparently is not the least bit impressed by the whole thing. He says, however, that he was told that the objects were made of an "extremely light and tough" material.

End of tidbit. Except for one point.

In 1948 an object crashed in Roswell, N.M. Lots of people saw it crash. The Air Force came, picked up the pieces and supposedly sent them to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The Air Force also picked up a man Jacobs identifies as William Brazel, who had collected the pieces. It questioned him for five days and told him to keep his mouth shut. He did.

The thing that crashed in New Mexico was described as incredibly tough and light, something like aluminum, only a lot better.

Maybe what crashed in Roswell was a UFO. Jacobs, however, is in-

Air Force study

For 20 years the government operated Project Blue Book. The Air Force always led Americans to believe that Blue Book was a massive study of UFO phenomena. It wasn't, says Jacobs. There were seldom more than three or four Air Force personnel assigned to the investigation, he says.

If there had been a crashed alien ship, Jacobs reasons, the Air Force would have investigated UFOs a lot more seriously. At the same time, the Air Force says it no longer accepts UFO reports. Jacobs says he has information that it does. It has to, he says, because that's the job of the Air Force — to know what's going on in the sky.

As Jacobs notes in his book, *The UFO Controversy*, all of the above is irrelevant anyway.

If the government did possess a crashed UFO or a few quick-fried aliens, news would have escaped long ago. Suppose an alien ship had crashed. Dozens of scientists — aeronautical engineers, metallurgists, biologists, astronomers, and on and on — would have to be called in. As the years passed those scientists would retire or die or move on, and others would replace them.

In the end, hundreds of people would be involved. In America, that many people can't keep a secret.

So why the book?

Which brings us to why David Jacobs, a history teacher, had to write the book on UFOs. Few scientists want anything to do with UFOs. The main thing a scientist markets is his mind. That would be questioned if he started talking seriously of UFOs.

Although he hasn't seen any, David Jacobs nevertheless believes in UFOs, and his philosophy is simple:

In their arrogance, many scientists believe that if we didn't invent something, it can't exist. They reason that light travels at a speed of 186,000 miles per second. Even if we could drive that fast, it would take us 100,000 years to cross our galaxy alone.

Interesting argument. But if you look at the past of the human race, we are nothing more than a pore on the face of history. The bulk of our scientific advance has come since World War II. Forty years.

In a universe that is billions of years old, suppose another breed of people formed somewhere out there and they were a tad ahead of us — say a thousand years. Isn't it conceivable that they would have solved problems we haven't yet thought of?

That is David Jacobs' argument. And even that argument is irrelevant, he says.

At least 10 percent of the UFO reports are unsolved. The real question is this: Are people describing accurately what they see? Think about that next time you look at the sky.

A growing part of the United States defense budget is being shunted to what the Pentagon calls its "black budget." But national security laws prevent public debate on this budget, much to the chagrin of critics. Tim Weiner reveals some of the questionable projects that are being carried out under the veil of secrecy.

In a sense, this series began five years ago in a dusty file room at the county courthouse in Camden, New Jersey. I was beginning to get my hands on a story that involved scores of real-estate hustlers, sleazy state and federal officials, crooked mortgage bankers and the like. I knew I was on to something, but I wasn't sure of what.

I went to see one of the old-time courthouse apparatchiks, a cigar-chomping gnome named Sal. I told Sal what I was looking at and what I thought the scam might entail.

"Listen, sweetheart," he said. "You are opening up a real Panorama box here."

Sal's malaprop expressed perfectly the way I think of the complicated assignments my newspaper, *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, loves its reporters to undertake. Inside the "Panorama box" is a broad vista filled with extraordinary details, encompassing a vision few people ordinarily see. Ideally, *The Inquirer's* investigations take the lid off the box and let people look inside at the works.

My training was as a federal courthouse and white-collar crime reporter. Dig up the documents. Follow the dollars. Get the records and see what they say. The people you talk to may equivocate. The document, as the lawyers say, speaks for itself.

So when *The Inquirer* decided it wanted a long look at what was happening to the Pentagon's budget under the Reagan administration, there wasn't much question of where to start, or how to go about the work. Welcome back, I thought, to the box.

I returned from four months in the Philippines in April 1986. I rented a tiny apartment in Washington, plugged in a portable com-

books from 1981 through 1987. Many had to be purchased from the National Technical Information Service at hundreds of dollars per armful. For the better part of three months, I read through those technical papers on nuclear war-fighting strategies and the state of the military arts in the 1980s.

I interviewed members of Congress who had never even heard of the black budget. But they were learning. A small stink was being raised in Congress over waste and fraud on so-called black projects. I traveled to California to interview workers at companies deeply involved in black military programs. They (and their past and present colleagues at other companies in other states) painted a far more frightening picture than did the congressional investigators.

All demanded anonymity, and I was uncomfortable using unnamed sources, so three weeks' work essentially resulted in three paragraphs' worth of print. But the interviews strongly reinforced my sense of what underlay the numbers on the Pentagon computer printouts.

A picture began to emerge.

The Reagan administration's passion for secrecy had profoundly altered the size and scope of classified spending within the Pentagon, for the black budget was growing some six times faster than overall Pentagon outlays. The nature of the secret spending was something new, as well: two dominant themes within the black budget were the administration's vision of winning a prolonged nuclear war, and of creating secret Pentagon units that would function as a high-tech hybrid of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Green Berets.

Something was coming unraveled in Washington in the summer and fall of 1986. Members of Congress and congressional staffers I talked to had a strong feeling that they were being lied to about even mundane military and intelligence matters. Many felt that, in the constant tug-of-war between secrecy and democracy in such matters, secrecy was winning, and winning ugly. They felt the administration regarded them as a threat, as the enemy, and that disinformation and misinformation were being used as weapons in this struggle.

In late November, in the Philippines, it looked as if Corazon C. Aquino's government might fall, and *The Inquirer* sent me back to Manila. A few days later, in a small town on the island of Mindanao, I heard an unbelievable story on the BBC's World Service report about

Oliver L. North, Iran, the contras and a whole lot of money. I came back to Washington the next week.

Ultimately, as former CIA director Stansfield Turner said in one of our telephone conversations, it all boils down to truth-telling. Many stories had been written before about the black budget and related topics. Many, I hope, will be written in the future, because governments lie, and lie with zest and impunity. I tried in this series to tell our readers, in the simplest and most direct way I could, that secrecy within President Reagan's Pentagon was spinning out of control, with scary consequences for years to come.

—Tim Weiner

The Philadelphia Inquirer

June 12, 88

Dear Mr. Ross,

I have written regarding an editorial you wrote Nov. 1, 1985 entitled "An open mind about UFOs." In this article you discuss the ~~Alb~~ claims made by the late Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher.

I don't wish to discuss that article but ask your assistance in "checking" further information that has surfaced since you wrote that article.

My US. associate T. Scott Crain, P.O. Box 11, Port Matilda PA 16802 contacted your newspaper with further much more definite evidence related. ^{to your article.} The person contacted was Tim Weiner, who wrote the series of articles related to the U.S. Dept of Defense Black Budget. He was contacted for one reason his article tended to indicate he had access to very high level sources within the U.S. military.

On Sept 15, 1980 Dr. Robert I Sarbacher told William B. Smith, the Canadian govt UFO director, about the fact that the Americans had a recovered saucer, but more importantly added "it is classified two points higher even than the H-bomb. In fact it is the most highly classified subject in the ^{U.S. govt at the present time.} It therefore makes sense, assuming Sarbacher was right, that a reporter with Weiner's sources would be needed to confirm or deny all the accusations.

T. Scott Crain has sent two packets of very sensitive material, both which either didn't arrive or weren't acknowledged. Six phone calls have not been returned, even tho' ^{did} state some interest

I would ask as you are somewhat familiar with the American crashed saucer rumor, to find out whether or not the Phil. Inquirer intends to check the subsequent material. If not we would like to know

as time so short, and we do intend to check the information we are in possession of.

The material includes five cryptic comments made by President Reagan, and one by George Bush. Also included are three classified contracts just awarded to Penn. State University, three interviews and two letters from a very prominent Pennsylvania citizen.

Hope you will appreciate the clear copy your papers position on this matter for me.

Sincerely

DP

August 26, 87

The Editor
Winnipeg Free Press

Dear Sir,

Trying to counter the damage done by an article after it is written is quite difficult, but I shall try to give the other side to the wire story in your August 25, 87 edition titled Saucer Papers 'Bogus'.

Enclosed is enclosure A, dated August 11, 1987. This is the National Archives Report on the Twining memo, which is the main document in question. It however is only a supporting document to the MJ-12 documents which are also enclosed. Enclosure C. Klass in your article makes it sound like he did some big investigation, but you will find everything he discovered to have actually been discovered by Jo Ann Williamson. (see enclosure A)

Please note question is referring to the Smith memo as a supporting document. You have a copy of this as any other

If the Twining Document is a plant, the question is who put it there. One explanation which is just as good is that the Twining memo could have been a plant to discredit the MJ-12 material that Moore and Friedman had had for a couple of years already. One supporting document for this theory is enclosure B, a letter from the C.I.A. dated July 16, 1987. Note also that the article sent as an attachment to the C.I.A. letter is from "Aviation Week and Space Technology" whose editor is curiously PHILLIP KLASS.

The point I think is clear. If Mr. Strickland disinformation warning is true. Newspapers as well as researchers should check their facts carefully before speaking. You have Mr. Moore, Friedman and Shandera to contact now, as I have provided you their numbers. If it is possible I would like any information that you get from them relayed to me. Good, the British researcher featured in your first article on this subject, got his MJ-12 documents from a different source. Moore does not know who fed Good his material.

The next story that will be coming across the wire services will be the Sarbacher documents. I have provided you with copies (probably one of the most complete sets in the world) so that when the book is published and the stories start you will have all the facts. Klass will have a much harder time with these documents, as these tie in with the 1950 Smith memo that I have already sent you. There is even a lead here if you read Steinmann's letter to me carefully, as one of these scientists is still alive.

There is no question as to its authenticity. The Sarbacher document explains where he got the "flying saucer" information that had been passed to Dr. Schmidt.