Gary: For your own file becar I can use For your own file becuz I can use this case (free expertise on this case

PHILIP J. KLASS 404 "N" ST. SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON, D. C. 20024

(202) 554-5901

December 21, 1981

Dr. Richard C. Niemtzow 532 Merchant St. Vacaville, Calif. 95688

Dear Dr. Niemtzow:

I am writing in connection with Project UFOMD and the Cash-Landrum Radiation Case, reported by John F. Schuessler in the Nov. 1981 issue of The MUFON UFO Journal.

In the event my name does not "ring a bell," I am a graduate electrical engineer turned technical journalist and for 30 years have been the senior Avionics Editor with Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine. But I hasten to emphasize that I am NOT writing in that connection.

Rather, for 15+ years my hobby has been investigating famous UFO cases. I "confess" to being a skeptic. And I have authored two books on the subject, the most recent being "UFOs Explained" (Random House, 1975).

I assume -- but this may be an incorrect assumption -- from the mention of UFOMD following the report on the Cash-Landrum incident, that you played some role in the medical examination of the principals. Am I correct?

If so, I should very much appreciate receiving a copy of any report you have written on the medical aspects of the principals.

And I am especially anxious to learn--if you were involved in this case -- of your investigation into the prior medical history of the principals

Finally, are there -- in your opinion -- any possible prosaic (non-UFO) explanations for the physical symptoms of the principals?

Very truly yours,

Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D. 166 Cannon Drive Travis AFB California 94535 H:707-437-6279 O:707-438-2140

December 30, 1981

Mr. Philip J. Klass 404 "N" ST. Southwest Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Mr. Klass:

Thank you for your letter of December 21,1981 regarding Project UFOMD and the Cash-Landrum Case as reported by Mr. John Schuessler of VISIT.

I am well acquainted with your position regarding unidentified flying objects and certainly welcome your point of view. In fact, I am sure we have mutual friends in the field.

For the record, I am a radiation oncologist with the USAF. UFOMD is my own private investigating project; hence, the reason for the independent address and telephone service. Furthermore, I have been a consultant to GEPAN for several years and had the opportunity to assist Alan Esterle with medical data collecting; specifically, my recommended tests were used in the Fontaine Case.

Project UFOMD was formed in October 1981. Such a network of physicians has been over due for a long time to investigate so-called medical injuries. Regarding the Cash-Landrum case, I never spoke to or examined the principals. I did not act as a consultant through any other physician. At the time, John Schussler and I thought that it would be better because of my entrance into the Air Force not to actively participate. UFOMD was created to permit me to operate my hobby outside the realm of the Air Force.

Dr. Peter Rank, Radiology Consultant of Madison, S.C., 309 W. Washington Ave., Madison, WI 53703 has investigated the case. I would suggest that you address further questions to this gentleman. He is a very capable physician and wishes to handle this case in the highest objective sense.

I would be most pleased to offer my comments if so requested by Dr. Rank and only after I have reviewed both the medical records and interviewed/examined the involved people.

This case is particularly important and may be one of the best studied. I doubt that there is a hoax involved. I wish to await the results of the medical report and not inject my thoughts to confuse the issue at this time.

I trust this is helpful and that you understand that it would be wasteful to offer a medical opinion based on the MUFON article when the actual medical data exisits. If I can be of further assistance please contact me.

Best wishes for the New Year!

Ruhard C. Wiemtzow, M.D.

PHILIP J. KLASS
404 "N" ST. SOUTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20024

(202) 554-5901

Jan. 2, 1982

Dr. Richard C. Niemtzow 166 Cannon Drive Travis AFB, Calif. 94535

Dear Richard: (If we may go on a first-name basis.)

Thank you for your prompt response. I shall write to Dr. Peter Rank in Madison, Wisconsin.

Further, let me assure you that I recognize that your UFO activities are completely divorced from your service in the USAF, much as I try to divorce my own UFO activities from my position as a senior editor with Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine.

Yet that is not completely possible for me, to give one example.

Undoubtedly you have heard Aviation Week referred to as "Aviation Leak," because of our publication of material that might be characterized as "sensitive."

I can assure you that during my nearly 30 years with AW&ST, we never once have heard a report that the USAF, or CIA, or U.S. Government, is holding back anything on UFOs. I cite this NOT as evidence that UFOs do not exist, but simply as reassurance to you as a USAF officer that we have never received a "leak" indicating that the U.S. Government knows anything more about UFOs than it has made public.

Based on Aviation Week's excellent sources, I can assure you that IF the principals in the Cash-Landrum incident were indeed exposed to radiation, that it did not come from any "secret weapon" of the U.S. Government, and I would think it most unlikely that any other Government would dispatch such a weapon into our central airspace.

Thus, if it can be demonstrated that the principals indeed were exposed to high doseage radiation (and that it could not possibly have come from prosaic X-ray machines), that would represent powerful evidence to support UFOs as extraterrestrial vehicles.

But my gut instincts suggest a more prosaic explanation. But I shall withhold judgement until more facts are available.

Sincerely,

4)

Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D. 166 Cannon Drive Travis A.F.B., Ca., 94535

January 10, 1982

Mr. Philip J. Klass 404 "N" St. Southwest Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Philip,

Thank you for your letter of January 2nd. I trust that you have received information from Dr. Rank.

I feel that a committee should meet and evaluate the Cash-Landrum incident for its scientific and medical merit. The entire case should absolutely be reviewed and if warranted a public statement or position paper should be issued. There is enough data for this activity. Other UFO cases with a paucity of information have been labiled as legitimate evidence for the exisitence of UFOs. This case may not, even after such a review, support any conclusions; but, so what? John has done an excellent job and certainly has demonstrated a very professional approach.

Would you help me organise a pannel of scientists that would be willing to evaluate the case report at their own expense? A weekend meeting no doubt. Let's put all the facts together and take a position on the case. If there is not enough information to draw a conclusion so much the better than calling it a UFO encounter. As previously stated, let the case ride on its own merits.

Hope to hear from you rapidly. I would be happy to do as much work as possible to put this meeting together. What is your opinion?

Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D.

Tetas UFO tion "radiation" PHILIP J. KLASS
404 "N" ST. SOUTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20024

(202) 554-5901

Jan. 23, 1982

Dr. Richard C. Niemtzow 166 Cannon Drive Travis AFB, Calif. 94535

Dear Richard:

Arrived home last night after midnight after a tiring trip back from Aspen vacation--especially tiring because my wife and I had acquired bad colds, because the Aspen airport was closed by snowstorm, forcing us to drive five hours to Denver, arriving too late to catch our scheduled flight, but catching a delayed late flight which brought us to Washington in midstd of another heavy snowstorm. Fortunately your letter of Jan. 10 was near the top of a pile of some 200 pieces of mail and since you asked for a quick response, here it is.

I like your proposal of a panel of specialists to consider the Cash-Landrum "UFO-radiation" incident, and would be delighted to participate. But I strongly believe that most of the "horsework" can best be done by mail --unless you know a source of many \$\$\$\$ who could fund travel to, say, Hawaii or the Caribbean, for many panel meetings!!!

My 15+ years in UFOlogy indicate that questions arise from repeated study, investigation to answer those questions, which prompt new questions, etc. etc. Sometimes these questions come to mind in the shower--or nearby. And sometimes it takes many weeks to dig out the asswers.

I would propose that you set up a panel of perhaps 6-8 members, that full reports/data be circulated among members. That each then raise questions/issues that require further investigation. These would be circulated among panelists who would then volunteer (or be drafted) to conduct the necessary investigations and report findings to the panel. After, perhaps, three to four such iterations then, perhaps, there might be need to convene, although I'm not sure that even then it would be necessary (unless you havefound a rich "angel" to underwrite travel costs.)

This would be a unique experiment in UFOlogy--to my knowledge--if you were to include several skeptics on the panel. Naturally I should like to be included. Other candidates I would propose would include: Robert Sheaffer, of San Jose, vice-chairman of CSICOP's UFO Subcommittee (of which I am chairman), and Dr. Gary Posner, M.D., a young doctor now practicing in St. Petersburg, Fla., who is a member of our UFO Subcommittee. The choice of the "pro-UFO" panel members we would leave up to you.

I wrote to John Schuessler on Dec. 20, seeking a more detailed report on the case than the one published by MUFON, but todate have received no reply. I have not yet found time to write to Dr. Rank because as a "leper" in the field of UFOlogy, I wanted to take time to phrase my letter carefully so as to enlist his full cooperation. (If you proceed with the panel, I would await receiving his report through this channel.)

not

I would be less than candid if I did express one concern about participating in such a panel--UNLESS you agreed to limit panel size to six (6) members total of which half (3) were skeptics-by-orientation. That is that if there were, say, nine members total, with only three skeptics aboard, that the panel's conclusions might be expected to be preordained.

Yet I would not wish to limit the panel to only six members IF there were other "pro-UFO" members who were interested in participating and could make useful contributions in an active manner. (Clearly you, Rank and Scheussler should be panel members because of your prior interest.)

In expressing these concerns I am well aware that probably you, Dr. Rank and Scheussler may well claim simply to be "neutral" on the UFO issue. And I would prefer not to waste time In the semantics of "neutrality". I believe that at least you and Scheussler would acknowledge being inclined to hope or believe that there is an extraordinary phenomenon at the root of the UFO mystery.

Thus, if the suggested panel is formed, it should be agreed in advance that any report subsequently issued in the name of the panel should include full coverage of both a dissenting/minority view and a majority conclusion.

Despite this concern, I think that your suggestion has merit and that all parties involved, as well as the field of UFOlogy, could benefit from its implementation.

Now I look forward to your reactions to my suggestions.

Cordially,

Philip J. Klass

cc: Robert Sheaffer Dr. Gary Posner

SHEAFFER'S ADDRESS: 1341 Poe Lane, San Jose, Calif. 95130
POSNER'S ADDRESS: 6219 Palma Del Mar Blvd. (Apt. #210), St. Petersburg, Fla. 33715