

August 31, 2004 - CUFON welcomes researcher Brad Sparks to our Contributor's Section. Brad certainly has made, and continues to make, important contributions to UFOlogy (see his work on the RB-47 case in Jerome Clark's *UFO Encyclopedia*, 1998 rev. edition, cited in the 1999 French COMETA report, his refutation of Philip Corso in *Skeptical Inquirer*, etc.).

Brad contacted us regarding posting a rebuttal to Barry Greenwood's *UFO Historical Revue* No.11. After due consideration, we've decided to post Brad's rebuttal.

It has never been the policy of CUFON to let discussion become about personality, or argument for argument's sake, rather than the subject: UFO. We hope this posting will make certain issues clearer rather than just fuel the fires of argument.

- Jim Klotz
CUFON SYSOP

My methodology is to start with objective indisputable fact first before moving on to less certain matters. It is the indisputable facts that are dispositive of issues. As we will see the conclusive and most undeniable objective evidence is that of the letter spacings in the Ramey Message and a few of the easiest to read words/phrases, but regrettably Barry Greenwood ignores this evidence in his newsletter, the *UFO Historical Revue* No.11, even though many of the interpretations he is trying to attack are based on letter spacings to greater or lesser degree. The letter spacings utterly disprove his theory. Greenwood also completely ignores my research into the Ramey Message going back to 1980 even though it is cited in Karl Pflock's classic textbook and Bible of Roswell data (pp. 209-211), and in UFO UpDates in Aug 2001, etc.

As I noted back in 1980 and 1985, the easiest words to read in the Ramey Message are the **plural** words "WEATHER BALLOONS" along with words "AT FORT WORTH, TEX." and " "DISC" " (in quotes). There is really no dispute and can be no serious dispute about these words. Yet Greenwood cannot find them **all together** in any of the wire service stories he claims "matches perfectly" with the Ramey Message, and the **plural** phrase "WEATHER BALLOONS" cannot be found at all anywhere in July 8 reporting (more on this below). There also appears to be a standard postwar military-style 4-letter "NMEX" state abbreviation, which is highly unusual and not found in any known civilian news teletypes or reporting in 1947, something I did not know when I first read "NMEX" in 2000.

Until Greenwood comes up with one July 8, 1947, wire service-based article using the words "WEATHER BALLOONS" and "AT FORT WORTH" and " "DISC"

" (and can match the indisputable word-length pattern on Line 4 which I will discuss further on) his theory will remain strangely unsupported by a single shred of any actual direct relevant evidence. This is evidence that should be relatively easy to obtain, especially in view of his years of work in researching newspaper archives.

In law this is an important principle of weighing of evidence. When someone should be able to produce direct relevant evidence to prove a point but fails to do so or cannot do so for reasons other than physical disability, etc., then this casts strong doubt on the point.

Greenwood suggests that the Ramey Message is actually not even a military message at all, but a civilian news agency teletype, that is seen in General Ramey's hand in the now-famous photos of Ramey's press conference of July 8, 1947, which Ramey called in order to publicly debunk the Roswell incident. Greenwood says it may be a specific United Press (UP) wire dispatch teletype because at least part of the Ramey Message allegedly "**matches perfectly**" with the *Nevada State Journal's* UP dispatch:

Greenwood, UHR p. 8: "Exhibit Four is a section of a Nevada State Journal [UP] story about Roswell on July 9th. Note that the end of the paragraph **matches perfectly** the phrase from line 3 of the Ramey document." (Emphasis added.)

Later, after I proved that the UP dispatch has no significant "matches" let alone any "perfect matches," Greenwood has actually tried to deny that the July 9 *Nevada State Journal* article is even a UP dispatch or that he made the statement quoted above! He wrote, "I never said that the document may be a 'UP wire dispatch teletype.' " He argued it could be an AP wire or some other news service dispatch, because "there isn't enough evidence" in the Ramey Message to tell which news service's dispatch it might be (Greenwood posting to Project 1947, June 27, 2004.) Hmmm, that isn't what he said in his UHR article (see above). See the UP article for yourself and compare it to Greenwood's text, and you will see it is one and the same, it is indeed a UP wire printed in the Nevada newspaper, and he does indeed say it "matches perfectly" the phrase in Line 3 of the Ramey Message:

http://roswellproof.homestead.com/UP_NevadaSJ_July9.html

How did he get this whole idea in the first place? It is very murky and makes little coherent sense. Greenwood states that "**recently**" he watched a Roswell documentary and noticed something that seemed "familiar" about the Ramey document format, from **military** teletype messages he had seen (about 500 Army

Air Forces teletypes of July 1947 released by the National Archives to Bob Todd in Dec 2002, which I have a copy set, courtesy of Jan Aldrich of Project 1947). Right there we have a problem. How does that observation, even if totally true (and it is!), prove the Ramey Message was a **civilian newswire**???? At first glance one would think that it actually proves the **opposite** that the Ramey Message is indeed a July 1947 AAF (military) teletype! Ramey was a Brigadier General in the AAF and the message in his hand was photographed in July 1947. What are we missing here, logic maybe??? Then Greenwood admits that journalist newswires have similar formats to military teletypes of that era – so what does that actually **prove**??? Exactly nothing. It's a classic "bootstrap argument." If it was true, it would not be enough to prove his case, but if it was not true, then he would be in trouble. So by showing that he narrowly escapes disaster Greenwood tries to bootstrap that into some kind of virtue, even a proof!

If Greenwood had actually found what he kept insinuating he had found – whole sections of Ramey Message text that are identical to portions of civilian news reports – then he would not even need to make all these arcane and technical arguments about message formatting and styles, and he would have won me over immediately. He would have proved his point directly. No need to resort to roundabout complicated arguments. But of course he has found no such thing, and later on I will go over many of the actual phrases in the wire service dispatches that Greenwood cites and show there is nothing even close to the Ramey Message (and my main point will be to compare word lengths and the letter spacings of the wire dispatches and Ramey Message, and with the indisputable Ramey Message words he ignores).

Failing the direct argument Greenwood next resorts to insinuating that he had found something in the Ramey Message that could not possibly be found in a military message of July 1947, that there are styles and formats that look nothing like a July 1947 AAF message format or style (e.g., supposed use of normal-looking actual periods and commas, instead of military teletype jargon that supposedly always spells them out such as "CMA" for "comma"). Greenwood tries to convince us that these styles could only be found in a civilian newswire. If that was true then that might have been significant, but still vulnerable to his failure to study personal General-to-General informal message styles, which are different from routine military messages and even from formal messages signed off by generals. But alas it is not true (see below).

Greenwood **acts** like he is the first one to open up the possibility of a journalistic-news-teletype theory of the Ramey Message, and that if he hadn't noticed then no one would ever have been able to suggest it. Yet the main photographer at the Ramey news conference, J. Bond Johnson, had done exactly that in the early 90's, suggested it was a newswire teletype, though later rejecting the idea. If Greenwood is not the first to suggest the idea of a civilian newswire – and we

know he was not – then what exactly does Greenwood **add** to the issue? Now we know that **both** military messages and civilian wire service teletypes can use similar formats and punctuation – so what???? How does that change our understanding of the **Ramey Message** from what we knew before?

It is an absolute indisputable fact that the several words before and after the word-in-quotes "DISC" on Line 4 of the Ramey Message are short 2-4-letter words in the following pattern which I assert cannot be matched to any known press wires or stories on Roswell on July 8, 1947 (I present the same line in a longer and a shorter abbreviated version):

[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4-ltr] [4-ltr] [4-ltr] [3-ltr] [6-letter] [8-letter]
[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8]

Note especially the three 4-letter words in a row following "DISC" then the two long words. Three 4-letter words in a row after "DISC" puts an extremely tight constraint on the ordinary English words that could possibly be used, which is not as tight a constraint if odd-length military jargon is allowed, but Greenwood has foreclosed that option by choosing the fatally flawed news-service-teletype theory – no military jargon can help him now.

There are no sequences of three 4-letter words in a row anywhere in the July 8, 1947, news articles and dispatches that could fit after "DISC" or "DISC" and such words may not occur in fact anywhere in those articles regardless of whether they could fit after "DISC" or not. Also there are no 8-letter words following several words after "DISC" in actual July 8 news articles and teletypes. The only 6-letter words that are found, namely "HIGHER" or "OFFICE," obviously would make no sense after the three 4-letter words and after "ON [or IN] THE "DISC"."

Burleson and Carey have suggested "MUST" for the first of the three 4-letter words. About the only sequences of English words like that that seem to make comfortable fits are such examples as: "[something] ON [IN] THE "DISC" MUST HAVE BEEN FOR" and "[something] ON [IN] THE "DISC" MUST COME FROM THE" And then we need a 6-letter and 8-letter to follow this phrase and mean something intelligible and sensible and that fits smoothly, not awkwardly as an ad hoc force fit. This is an impossibility for Greenwood's press teletype theory, we have the teletypes and/or articles printed from them. There are no such sequences of words in the press wires or articles for July 8 and doubtless not for July 9 either.

You can prove the word lengths to yourself by getting out a piece of paper and use the edge to line up the letters on your computer screen or on a printout of the

Ramey Message. The only real dispute about word length is on the 8-letter word at the end of the line which does not really matter and I mention it only for completeness but I contend is absolutely certain by simple alignment methods as I have described. However I am willing to forego argument here on the 8-letter-word's exact length, because it is clearly a **very long word** at the end of that line.

Here for example are the few rare appearances of "DISK" or "DISC" in quotes in July 8-9 reporting, which come from the **morning** edition of the *Ft Worth Star-Telegram* on July 9, 1947, (**afternoon** does not count unless it can be shown to be based on July 8 afternoon teletype reporting) plus Greenwood's own examples from UP (United Press) dispatches in *Nevada State Journal*, and for comparison some appearances of "disc" NOT in quotes (on the theory an editor could have taken the quotes out before going to press):

As soon as the "disk" was brought into General Ramey's office....

AS THE "DISK" [3] [7] [4] [7] [7] [6]

...ordered to fly the "disk" there immediately for observation.

[3] THE "DISK" [5] [11] [3] [11] [period]

... say the "disc" was flown in a Superfortress to....

[3] THE "DISC" [3] [5] [2] [1] [13] [2]

... possession of the "disc" through the cooperation of an unidentified

OF THE "DISC" [7] [3] [11] [2] [2] [12]

He said the disc had been forwarded to higher headquarters....

[4] THE DISC [3] [4] [9] [2] [6] [12]

... finding the disc until the day before yesterday.

[7] THE DISC [5] [3] [3] [6] [9] [period]

...described the disc as about as large as a safe....

[9] THE DISC [2] [5] [2] [5] [2] [1]

[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] [RAMEY MESSAGE]

Notice there is nothing even close to the Ramey Message.

This newest argument against the Ramey Message, that it is possibly a UP press wire teletype not an AAF military teletype, is completely demolished in this rebuttal. I have checked the same batch of 500 or so AAF teletypes from July

1947 that Barry Greenwood checked plus 10,000's more from other periods and his thesis is dead wrong about the format, punctuation, style, etc., as I will prove conclusively. Among many points that could be made the most devastating is the use of a very unusual if not unique postwar Army/AAF military-style 4-letter abbreviation for the States of the Union which appears in the Ramey Message as "NMEX." on line 5. That clinches the civil vs. military argument as I am unable to find any news agencies then that used that odd 4-letter abbreviation style but it was widely used in AAF messages in July 1947.

If one does not study General-to-General personal messages, which is what this Ramey Message to the higher command is, one cannot generalize from routine lower-level formal messages about what kind of style a general uses in writing to another general. The brass do not use the formal military jargon with each other in personal messages, such as tedious punctuation with "PD" (for period) and "CMA" (for comma) partially spelled out or "ABLE BAKER CHARLIE" for ABC, etc. When aides draft messages for the general's signature they typically lapse into military jargon, unless the aide knows what kind of personal style the general wants to see. But when generals personally write messages they generally do not bother cluttering up the text with formalities.

This needless demolition could have been avoided entirely if Greenwood had simply checked with people knowledgeable about the Ramey Message (like me) first. I have been posting about some of my research privately and on UFO UpDates since 2000 (see for example: Aug. 30, 2001, posting at: <http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2001/aug/m30-050.shtml>) I do not understand why he did not simply pick up the phone and call or email first before launching this ill-founded proposed interpretation, he knows me, we have been in touch before, chatted on the phone quite cordially. Was it supposed to be a surprise attack on the Ramey Message?

As the original and first Roswell skeptic going back to early 1978 and preceding Phil Klass, it can hardly be claimed I'm pushing some pro-ETH agenda. That is such a tired, worn-out ad hominem rhetorical strategy anyway. Pro- and anti-UFOlogy alike cannot stand the idea of an objective investigator who can arrive at findings and conclusions contrary to his own beliefs or ideas (or theirs for that matter).

Anyway, why should Barry get all these kudos and high praises for making "an observation" or two on the Ramey Message in only three pages of text based on a few hours of research???? You'd have thought he had made some fantastic discovery after years of backbreaking research (like I've done). Something is out of kilter here. I don't see the need for all the glowing praise, and in fact don't even see the need for an article. This could have been discussed first on the lists where it would have been thrashed out before announcing a hardened public

PR position that might be more difficult to change now it's emblazoned in the last or maybe second-to-last issue of *UFO Historical Revue*.

Despite the big buildup Barry's whole case is simply that Gen. Ramey *may* be holding a UP wire dispatch teletype instead of a military teletype in his hand, possibly similar to dispatches in the Nevada State Journal of July 9 and 10, 1947 (and to the original Haut 509th press release in such papers as the Oxnard Press-Courier July 8 among others). Why? Just because the phrases "at Fort Worth, Tex." and "disc" in quote marks are used in these UP wires, and just because of some mistaken notions about military teletype style in July 1947 which he has universalized into rigid unwavering rules, which are completely erroneous factually, provable from July 1947 examples I will show you.

Had Karl Pflock's "Bible" of Roswellology been checked, my work on deciphering the Ramey Message – and it is a military teletype message apparently written by Ramey himself – going back to 1980 could have been consulted in brief there (pp. 209-211). Or a check of UFO UpDates with a Google search (e.g., my Aug. 30, 2001, posting). An email or phone call could have brought forth even more info. Instead Barry writes:

"For a number of years, Roswell researchers in favor of the extraterrestrial explanation have tried to interpret the text of the Ramey document by enlarging and enhancing the photograph."

Are all of the Ramey Message researchers actually pro-ETH Roswell researchers??? What about me??? No mention of me, long-time Roswell skeptic and long-time critic of ETH who has rejected ETH since the 70's, though open to credible evidence of ETH, and who was the first to read any part of the Ramey Message, back in 1980 and been in the forefront of research on the message for the last four years since decrypting essentially the entire message.

If you check there in Karl's book you will see that I had read the clearest words "FORT WORTH, TEX." and "DISC" and "WEATHER BALLOONS" way back in 1985 – which immediately tells you the entire message concerns the Roswell incident and not the base barbecue or softball league (the words appear spread over both main paragraphs above and below the fold). Most people can see these words and there is very little dispute and can be no serious dispute on these readings, except by those wanting to engage in frivolous time-wasting argument for sake of creating trouble (in internet lingo they're called "trolls" those who do that sort of thing). Furthermore the line spacings allow no other possibility whatsoever than *plural* of "WEATHER BALLOONS." Catch that? Got it? Now think about it.

Again, check my Aug 30, 2001, posting.

After checking hundreds of press reports and teletypes for July 1947 I have found **no** wire service dispatches saying the plural words "WEATHER BALLOONS" (with words "AT FORT WORTH, TEX." and " DISC" " elsewhere in the same article) on July 8, 1947 (July 9 and later do NOT count unless transmitted originally on July 8). If you can point one out to me fine. I contend on the basis of my research, and the failure of Barry and others to point out anything to the contrary, that no such Roswell-related "WEATHER BALLOONS" articles exist on July 8, 1947, that also say "AT FORT WORTH, TEX." and "DISC" " in some kind of connected context (I say all that because I don't want any smartass coming back with some kind of unrelated non-Roswell-related puff-piece story on some date in the Summer of 1947 talking about meteorology research or forecasting or some such that just happens to mention the use of "weather balloons" but nothing about Fort Worth or "disc" " or for that matter nothing about Roswell).

Worse still are the results of my decryption of the entire message at varying degrees of confidence. At high confidence level I read the phrase on Line 7 as "WEATHER BALLOONS FOUND NEAR" and then continuing onto the next line I can effectively read the text underneath Ramey's thumb as "ROSWELL." with the ending in a period, but reading the word only at about medium confidence level. Thus the phrase would be "WEATHER BALLOONS FOUND NEAR ROSWELL." Find that in some UP newswire!

The Ramey Message has the following text which makes is certain that it all relates to the Roswell incident and not the base picnic or barbecue:

Line 3 has "FORT WORTH, TEX."

Line 4 has "THE "DISC" "

Line 5 has "ROSWELL, NMEX."

Line 7 has "WEATHER BALLOONS FOUND NEAR"

Line 8 has "ROSWELL."

Line 9 has "RAMEY" or "RRAMEY"

There simply cannot possibly be any reasonable question that this entire message **all** has to do with the Roswell incident. Enough of the first lines can be read to be sure that it too refers to the same subject matter and isn't switching from base cookouts and aircraft maintenance schedules or what-have-you to suddenly discussing the Roswell incident. After the standard military electronic addressing that always appears at the very top there just isn't enough room on this short message to discuss anything else but the subject of what is clearly the bulk of the message – the Roswell "disc."

Here are some specific claims Barry makes that are completely unfounded when made into rigid universalized rules of military message style, punctuation, etc. –

and it is only by such inflexibly comprehensive argument can his argument even be made. If his rule on punctuation, format, etc., is good only on say 75% of the messages then how can that possibly prove his case that the Ramey Message is a non-military UP newswire??? It could be one of the 25% military messages that do have normal punctuation, commas, etc. Or whatever percent (%) figure you want to choose. Only if Barry's military message style rules hold good for 100% of all AAF military messages in July 1947 can he even begin to have a case – and then he has to prove the rule somehow applies to General-to-General AAF/Army personal communications. Of course that is factually false anyway.

GREENWOOD:

"Exhibit Two: Pages four and five show examples of military teletype. Note the lack of punctuation that is typical of such messages. Note also that the source of the message precedes the body of the message. They are not "signed" as has been suggested by some researchers." (p. 4)

"In a legitimate military teletype, Ramey's name or other designation would have appeared in the address line preceding the body of the message, not after where the time/date line appears. In fact of hundreds of messages checked not one was signed off as an individual, like "Ramey." " (p. 8)

Well here are some legitimate "SIGNED" military teletypes from that same packet of 500 AAF incoming Air Staff messages of July 1947 at the Pentagon that Bob Todd obtained in Dec 2000, that Barry is using, with my quote marks to indicate quotes I am making (not to indicate there were quote marks in the message, you'll see that example later). I cannot print the entire messages here for reasons of length, tediousness, scanner problems, typing, etc. Some use the word "SIGNED" at the end of the message, some use "SGD" abbreviation, some omit the word entirely and just print the name, usually the last name, sometimes a combination of initials and date-time group, sometimes just initials alone, etc. etc.

1. Operational Priority message from Commanding Officer, Smoky Hill Army Air Field, Salina, Kansas, to Commanding General AAF, info CG of SAC and CG of 15th AF, July 8, 1947, 2300Z:

"SIGNED LEE"

2. Teletype message from CO Smoky Hill AAF, Salina, KANS (note the military style of 4-letter abbreviations of states), to CG ATC, etc., July 9, 1947, 0045Z:

"SIGNED LT COL WHIDDEN CO HARKEN DETACHMENT END"

3. Teletype message from Greenland to AAF Exec Asst, Military Personnel Division, July 18, 1947, 1410Z:

"SIGNED GORTON"

4. Teletype from the CO of 1455th AAF Base Unit, Great Falls, MONT (note again the military style of 4-letter abbreviations of states), to CG AAF, PIO Division, July 16, 1947, 1544Z-1553Z, to request info and to coordinate having AAF officials particularly from SAC attend a Forest Service forest fire water bombing demonstration in Great Falls – a minor public relations matter that we see here coordinated with the Air Staff in the Pentagon instead of doing it directly themselves (hint hint about the cherished debunker myth that a lowly Lt. Haut would ever in a million years have sent out that Roswell captured-saucer press release on his own near-zero authority, not even Col. Blanchard would have either on such a matter of prime nationwide publicity and acute daily embarrassment to the AAF):

"SGD CHENNAULT"

5. Teletype from Squadron R, 130th AAF Base Unit, Topeka Army Air Field, Topeka, Kansas, to CG 2nd AF, AAF, ADC, etc., air accident report, July 9, 1947, 2120Z:

[indented about 17 spaces] "KINZIE"

6. Teletype from Col. Paul Helmick, CO of Alamogordo Army Air Field, Alamogordo, NMEX (note the identical 4-letter "NMEX" abbreviation in the Ramey Message line 5) to CG AAF, July 30, 1947, 1530Z-1612Z, signed with initials "HEP" for HELmick Paul then the Date-Time Group:

[indented about 42 spaces] "HEP/301612Z"

7. Teletype from Hodes signed by J. D. Coulter, Deputy Army Comdr, 4th Army, Ft Sam Houston, Texas, to Dept of Army, Plans & Operations and Intelligence, Oct. 13, 1947, 0137Z, which I will present in full farther down, signed "jdc"

[indented about 66 spaces] "jdc"

GREENWOOD:

"Periods, quotation marks and commas are items relatively alien to military teletypes, hardly used at all except when quoting other

messages. But they are quite common to journalistic teletypes (see Exhibit Three)." (p. 6)

"... in both of the quoted examples above, punctuation exists in the form of quotation marks, a comma and a period. Such liberal use of punctuation is far more typical of a journalistic teletype." (p. 6)

"The most significant difference is that while newspapers used civilian time formats (AM, PM), the military used "Zulu" or Universal 24-hour time for their endings." (p. 6)

Really???? What about this normal-punctuation message from the Commanding Officer of the Detachment at Camp Luna, Las Vegas, New Mexico, on July 11, 1947, with dispatch times given as local time 1:15 PM and 4:11 PM not in Z time????

ET

WB23

5)

WOV V WAR NRW128/22 GOVT PD

LAS VEGAS NMEX JUL 11 -115P

COMMANDING GENERAL

HQDS WASHDC

ATTN DIRECTOR OF MILITARY PERSONNEL ATCRC 269. REFERENCE SPECIAL ORDERS 139 PARA 3 YOUR HEADQUARTERS REGARDING PCS MAJOR LELAND R TOZIER 0226493. REQUEST ADVICE BY TWX WHETHER 25 DAYS DELAY ENROUTE AS REQUESTED IS AUTHORIZED SUBJECT OFFICER TO VISIT ILL MOTHER IN CARLSBAD CALIFORNIA. NO LEAVE GRANTED SINCE DEC 1945. IF 25 DAYS CANNOT BE GRANTED REQUEST 10IGR 15 DAYS. END

CO 1100-31K DET CAMP LUNA NEW MEXICO

411P

ATCRC 269 139 3IPCS 0226493 25 1945 25 10 15 1100-31K.

I see periods at the end of sentences and not spelled as "PD." I see no "CMA" or "CLN" etc. Barry's own two military message examples on page 4 of his article also do not use the word "END" to end the messages, so the presence or absence of that means nothing.

Here is another punctuated message I have already cited, complete with commas, periods, a colon, dashes, and precious **quote marks** (I've deleted distribution list notes added by the message center as these were not in the original incoming message):

WAR DEPARTMENT
CLASSIFIED MESSAGE CENTER
INCOMING CLEAR MESSAGE

COPY

From: Fourth Army Ft Sam Houston, Texas from Hodes sgd
Coulter Deputy Army Comdr

TO: Dept of Army attn Directors P and O and Intelligence
Wash DC

DTG: 130137Z

13 October 1947

The following message received from Gen Homer commanding Ft Bliss Texas via telephone 2400Z hours is quoted: "This is a report of a minor and unusual incident not of national interest. It is alleged that as of 1530Z an aerial object landed in Mexico near the towns of Cassetta- Reforma - Guadalupe all opposite Fabens, Texas. Object approximately one meter long traveling east to west, blue or silver in color with flames in the rear. No smoke, object alleged to have detonated with explosion beyond horizon in Mexico. I, Gen Homer have made recon of area and have interviewed available witnesses. American consul has transmitted the foregoing to American Embassy in Mexico. There are no military activities at Biggs Field, White Sands Proving Ground, or Ft Bliss, that could have caused this incident on this date. Army Ground Forces will be notified by me. The press and radio locally and New York Times representative from Los Angeles now checking the incident. No action required by higher headquarters. Available information at this time is not adequate to estimate cause of the incident. End." Additional information when and if available will be forwarded.

End

jdc

Lastly, the argument is made:

GREENWOOD (p. 8):

"Two interpretations of the document (Rudiak, Carey/Schmitt) have the message being held by Ramey as ending with the teletype signature "Ramey." If the document is a teletype, how is it that Ramey received the message from himself?"

Every blasted military message that goes out has **file copies!!!** Generals will check the outgoing high-level personal messages to see if they were done correctly and don't have some monumental gaffe in them (you can see many errors and attempted corrections of errors in the July 1947 messages). Generals might check before or after transmission, or both, because a clerk typist can type up a message and need to be checked before sending, but that won't guarantee that the teletype operator won't goof it up after sending it, so it might need to be checked again. Moreover Ramey might have wanted the message in front of him even though he had no intention whatsoever of disclosing it, just so he would be reminded of its contents. In any case, Ramey was apparently confronted with the teletype by an aide as he came in from the bright sunlight in the hot Texas summer outdoors, as he still held his sunglasses in the same hand that was holding the teletype message (my thanks to Mary Castner for noticing the sunglasses).

Greenwood's response was to deny he had written the following in his own UHR article (my emphasis added):

Greenwood UHR article (p. 8):

"Two interpretations of the document (Rudiak, Carey/Schmitt) have the message being held by Ramey as **ending** with the teletype signature "Ramey." ... In a legitimate military teletype, Ramey's name or other designation would have appeared in the address line preceding the body of the message, **not** after where the time/date line appears. In fact of **hundreds** of messages checked **not one** was signed off as an individual, like "Ramey."

Greenwood's denial of his own article stated the following (June 28, 2004, posting to Project 1947):

"Sparks says I discussed military type styles 'which he (me) has universalized into rigid unwavering rules.' When did I say that? I said with regard to the endings of military teletype messages 'a great majority of such teletype messages ended this way.' I didn't say 'all' messages ended this way."

The UHR article obviously stated a rigid universalized rule about military messaging in July 1947 – which I refuted by giving actual examples from the same set of July 1947 AAF messages that he looked at and apparently missed:

"SIGNED LEE"

"SIGNED LT COL WHIDDEN CO HARKEN DETACHMENT END"

"SIGNED GORTON"

"SGD CHENNAULT"

[indented about 17 spaces] "KINZIE"

[signed with initials "HEP" for HELmick Paul then the Date-Time Group:]

[indented about 42 spaces] "HEP/301612Z"

[indented about 66 spaces] "jdc"

Greenwood can support his UP-teletype theory with **objective evidence** by finding a sequence of words from July 8, 1947, teletypes and news stories on Roswell that contain this sequence that I have pointed out multiple times (surrounding the word "DISC" on Line 4):

[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4-ltr] [4-ltr] [4-ltr] [3-ltr] [6-letter] [8-letter]
[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8]

I have already presented evidence of actual phrases in the July 8 news reporting showing that a match to the Ramey Message looks quite impossible.

Here are some more demonstrations. Looking at Greenwood's UHR article, in the UP dispatch in the *Nevada State Journal*, there is actually a rare sequence of three 4-letter words and then a 3-letter. But alas the words before and after that do not include "DISC" or any 6- or 8-letter words and thus cannot possibly fit the Ramey Message:

Nevada State Journal, UP dispatch, front page headline story, July 9, 1947:

"Helium balloons HAVE BEEN USED FOR weather recording for the past seven or eight years."

[6-letters] [8-ltrs] [4] [4] [4] [3] [7] [9] etc.

[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] [RAMEY MESSAGE]

Does not match the Ramey Message, and there is no way to modify the wording even to come close, since one still has to somehow insert the words "ON THE DISC ." Here's another one from the same article, that at least has "disc" in it already but the three 4-letter words and the 3-letter word are before "disc" not after it, and obviously cannot be switched (my CAPS added of course):

Nevada State Journal, UP dispatch, front page headline story, July 9, 1947:
"Brizell told the sheriff he didn't KNOW JUST WHAT THE DISC was, but that at first...."

[4] [4] [4] THE DISC [3] [comma] [3] [4] etc.
[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] [RAMEY MESSAGE]

Nope, doesn't work.

Now let's try to find a passage from elsewhere in the same article and edit it a bit to see if that might help. Let's try taking "flying" out of "flying disc" so we have a larger database of rare occurrences of one-word "disc" references:

Nevada State Journal, UP dispatch, front page headline story, July 9, 1947:
"... purported "flying disc" found on a New Mexico ranch had been identified as...."

DELETE "flying" AND CHANGE TO:
"... purported "DISC" FOUND ON A NEW MEXICO RANCH had been identified as...."

[9-letters] "DISC" [5] [2] [1] [3] [6] [5] etc.
[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] [RAMEY MESSAGE]

Aw shucks that don't work either.

What about this? This fits the word length sequence nicely, though grammatically and semantically it's nonsense:

GREMLINS ON THE "DISC" HAVE BEEN USED FOR SNEAKY DEBUNKER
[8] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8]
[ON or IN] [THE] "DISC" [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] [RAMEY MESSAGE]

Instead of the **objective** evidence of hard data, I find it rather curious that Greenwood cites for support the highly **subjective** "consensus" of Ramey Message interpreters agreeing or not on a given reading when Greenwood does not even like their pro-ETH bias in the first place and tends to dismiss their readings anyway. If he does not think they are any kind of respected authorities on the reading of the message then why pretend that they are? (Interestingly, Regehr, Burluson and Carey have previously read "NMEX" or variants in the Ramey Message, which would support my reading of "NMEX" as a unique 1947 **military** abbreviation not to be found in any civilian newswire. But Greenwood does not mention their "NMEX" readings.) Does Greenwood accept their other universal "consensus" readings such as Line 2 where they claim to read

"VICTIMS OF THE WRECK YOU FORWARDED"??? (Which is of course interpreted as meaning alien bodies – forwarded like the US Mail! That is not my reading by the way, not even close.)

It is also strange that Greenwood resorts to the indirect **hearsay** evidence of J. Bond Johnson's faltering inconsistent 50-year-old recollections as to the content of the Ramey teletype message (that it is a civilian newswire). Even there Greenwood does the very thing he wrongly criticizes me of doing, relying on speculation to choose the recollection he personally likes (he speculates that Johnson changed his story because of pro-ETH influence of RPIT; when Johnson is already well known to simply have memory difficulties, as witness his strange and bitter dispute with Kevin Randle over a tape).

This criticism of me is fatuous and invalid because my research identifying the message as signed by Ramey, etc., is not speculation but based on optical analysis, content analysis, and cryptanalysis. Greenwood uses speculation, hearsay, and faulty logic, whereas I presented an **objective method** of settling some key issues on the Ramey Message by determining the **letter spacings** that are conclusively certain, using a ruler or piece of paper as straight edge. As for publishing my work, if I was ready to publish my work I would have submitted it for publication. Like most scholars who can take years to thoroughly research a subject I am likewise doing the same with the Ramey Message, and that is my right.

Johnson's erroneous recollection of the hot-off-the-newswire teletype is all the more devastatingly self-refuting because if it was actually true then it narrows the location and time-date so that there should **easily** be found a copy of either (a) his own Ft. Worth Star-Telegram newspaper's article with the words "WEATHER BALLOONS" and "AT FORT WORTH, TEX." and " DISC" " in it or (b) some other Texas newspaper with those words in the article from such a hypothesized news service teletype from around 4-5 PM CST on July 8, 1947.

We have the Ft. Worth Star-Telegram articles on Roswell and there is **nothing** like those words in them. Isn't that rather strange???? The July 9 Star-Telegram talking at length with Irving Newton is the best shot at finding a lot of talk in the papers about "WEATHER BALLOONS" yet even there the plural phrase is **never** once used. Instead Newton and the media are at pains to emphasize that it was **not** a mere rubber "WEATHER BALLOON" but rather a "kite balloon" or "balloon kite" or "Rawin device."

I highly recommend to you Dave Rudiak's website with exhaustive analysis of Roswell news coverage, even if you don't agree with his pro-ETH pro-Roswell views. His analysis of the Ft. Worth Star-Telegram article is at:

http://roswellproof.homestead.com/FortWorthST_July9.html

Truth is not determined by vote, as I say get out your straight edge and prove me wrong with objective evidence not endless clashes of mere opinion. Find the actual July 8 news article text that actually matches the Ramey Message. It's called "intersubjective testability" in science and is a fundamental element of the scientific method. Also if Greenwood does not agree with my reading of the "NMEX" postwar military-style abbreviation in the Ramey Message then he should propose a better one.

I went into all the ways Greenwood could objectively support his UP-teletype theory of the Ramey Message using indisputable evidence of the words "AT FORT FORTH, TEX." and "DISC" " and "WEATHER BALLOONS" and using the indisputable word spacings and sentence structure around "DISC" " (the ON or IN THE "DISC [4] [4] [4] [3] [6] [8] word length pattern). But he does not deal with this **strongest** and most **objective** evidence in the Ramey Message. All he needs to do is find the news article based on a July 8, 1947, news agency teletype with the indisputable words and word patterns and he will prove his case! It's as simple as that. He can support his UP-wire-teletype theory and respond to my strongest arguments **objectively** by simply finding a news story on July 8, 1947, with the **indisputable** occurrence of the words and phrases in the Ramey Message – "AT FORT WORTH, TEX." and "DISC" " and "WEATHER BALLOONS."

The Ramey Message is not a UP or wire service teletype, it is a **military message**, this UP teletype notion is a false trail, a dead-end, and all this new argument about format of newswires versus military is incapable of deciding between the two options so that we are left right where we started, that it is a **military message**.

Brad Sparks