Ad Astra Per Aspera

Bigelow, BAASS, the Nimitz encounters, and To The Stars Academy

Christian P. Lambright

The essence of the Nimitz encounters is well-known and can be found any number of places online, so it is presumed here that you already know the basics of the events.

"And they put together this exhaustive classified government document, and so I got access to that document. Yeah, yeah, it was great, I read over it for a couple of weeks and then I wrote the article, and then I had to give it back." (Paco C.)

The purpose of this paper is to explore questions relating to To The Stars Academy of Arts and Sciences (TTSA) and the facts of the Navy/Nimitz 'UAP' encounters of 2004. The announcement in 2017 of the founding of TTSA, followed fairly quickly by the revelation of the AATIP program, brought intense interest in the origins of both these efforts. As more information has come out about the individuals at the helm of TTSA, most with military and intelligence connections and several with direct connection to Bigelow Aerospace Advanced Space Studies (BAASS) and the early formation of the AATIP program, suspicions abound about the motives behind forming TTSA. There are definite indications of a Navy investigation prior to the BAASS/AAWSAP contract and that an exhaustive classified report was created, which leads to even more questions about why a DIA/Reid/BAASS 'black money' project was initiated. Why was there a need to gather other information secretly from other non-military sources? Why did the same people "inside" this secretive operation suddenly appear "outside" it forming TTSA? With all due respect to Tom DeLonge, suffice to say that the presence of the men seated behind him on stage when TTSA was announced, men with serious intellects and resumes to match, left virtually everyone who knows anything scratching their head.

From the first announcement of TTSA's formation, the company has used the 2004 Nimitz encounters as a cause célèbre. So how did it come to be that:

- TTSA is using a Navy incident and Navy witnesses to promote itself.
- Videos apparently released by the Navy are used as promotional material, though some presumably official Navy sources have stated they were not intended for public release.
- There have been no repercussions for Elizondo having obtained the videos then suddenly resigning and taking them to TTSA (especially if the videos were not cleared for public release).
- The Navy suddenly changed its official reporting requirements for UAP encounters, which certainly played into promoting TTSA's message.

The appearances alone could make anyone wonder if the Navy has a silent purpose in supporting TTSA.

What began to raise questions for this author was that as information came to light there were odd incongruities not just in the Nimitz events as described, but in how it was being presented to the public by TTSA. Those questions led to other questions ranging from the involvement of Bigelow Aerospace, to how AATIP continued until 2017 (and apparently continues to this day), and why some persons appeared on the TTSA 'team' while others did not. For simplicity though, we will start at the beginning of the chronology and look at questions that have risen from the TTSA presentation of the Nimitz encounters.

[For full disclosure: while my interest in TTSA is certainly not unique, I developed my own suspicion of the character and motives of those behind TTSA after seeing the presentation of certain events in episode number five of the TTSA "Unidentified" television series. I will include a short explanation at the end for anyone curious.]

∞ QUESTIONS FROM THE NIMITZ NARRATIVE

The first major incongruity came when for no clear reason Douglas Kurth was hired by Bigelow Aerospace in December of 2007. For those unfamiliar with his name, Douglas "Cheeks" Kurth is a highly qualified and experienced pilot who, as Commander of a Marine fighter squadron, was also taking part in the Nimitz exercises in November of 2004. But his role is given fleeting mention *if not completely ignored* in most accounts. His resume suggests he retired from the Marines in July of 2006, but for reasons that have never been explained, almost out of the blue Douglas Kurth reappeared in 2007 working for Bigelow Aerospace!

The most complete initial information concerning Kurth's role in the Nimitz encounters came from the excellent reporting done by Paco Chierici on Fightersweep.com. In his Mar 14, 2015 article *"There I was: The X-Files Edition"* Chierici reported that before Fravor's flight had been ordered to the location of what would be the "tic-tac" encounter:

> *"…the CO of Marine Hornet squadron VMFA-232, Lieutenant Colonel "Cheeks" Kurth, was completing a post-maintenance check flight not too far away. He was the first fast-mover contacted by* Princeton*. The communication was strange and intriguing. He was asked to investigate an unidentified airborne contact. (…) To add to the unusual communications, he was queried as to what ordinance he had on board. 'None'"*

From this narrative, Kurth had left the carrier some time earlier than Commander Fravor, and one might assume Kurth was alone.

In the 'Executive Summary', which reportedly was created circa 2010, Kurth is also said to have been doing a "functional flight check" when he was redirected to investigate an unidentified radar return. Kurth was just a few miles away and approaching the location of the "unknown" when he claims he was contacted again and told to "skip it" and return to his "operating area" as two other aircraft were being sent to investigate (presumably Fravor and his wingman.) Kurth was told to stay above 10,000' to avoid the other aircraft, and both Paco Chierici's 2015 article and the executive summary indicate Kurth saw radar returns that he believed were the two other F/A-18's approaching.

However, because Kurth was already close to the area he decided he would go ahead and fly over it to see whatever he might see. In doing so he saw *a round section of turbulent water about 50-100 meters in diameter*. Kurth's story says nothing about seeing a 'tic-tac' or any other UAPs and his story ends as he leaves the area noting that the disturbance on the ocean's surface had cleared (another account suggests that as headed back to the ship he looked back and saw that the disturbance in the water was gone.)

At this point the account by Commander Fravor comes into play. Fravor has said that he and his wingman were approaching the area at 20-24,000'. There is some support for this in an event log that indicates the UAP was initially at 25,000'. And yet, this does raise a question about why Kurth would be told to stay above 10,000' to avoid the other two aircraft. Fravor never mentions seeing Kurth on his radar as they approached, however, Fravor then reports that when he and his wingman reached "merge plot" they fairly quickly spotted the disturbance in the water. Strangely though, in Fravor's account, the disturbance clearly is said to have been more of a 'cross' shape. His description has a longer narrow aspect to it with definite impressions of sideways extensions that led him to think a commercial aircraft might have gone down. The water on the surface was breaking and perhaps bubbling, all of which gave him the impression that something large was several feet just below the surface. (Again, at odds with Kurth's description of a *round disturbance 50-100 meters in diameter*).

Nevertheless, Fravor and his wingman are circling and then almost simultaneously notice the strange 'tic-tac' object moving back and forth above the water disturbance. In a recent interview on Joe Rogan, Fravor again describes still being at nearly 20,000 feet and about two miles away laterally and able to clearly see the 'tic-tac' moving rapidly back and forth above the disturbance. *So it was visible from both aircraft in Fravor's group at that altitude and distance!*

Fravor then begins his descent, and very quickly the strange object seems to notice him and it begins to respond, rising and making a wide circle with him, at which point he announces "I'm engaged!" over the radio (reportedly heard very clearly by Kevin Day onboard ship). In fairly rapid succession, Fravor decides to turn directly toward the unknown to try to cut across and close on it, but as he crosses toward it and begins to pull up, the "tic-tac" suddenly shoots out of sight at mind numbing speed, practically vanishing! It is at that point that Fravor and his wingman circle back to see the disturbance in the water—but the disturbance is now gone and the ocean surface is smooth again.

So where was Kurth during all this (and did he have a wingman)? If the disturbance in the water did not clear until during or after Fravor was engaged by the "tic-tac", and Kurth was still close enough to see the disturbance once it was gone—then he had to have been practically onsite for the entire encounter with Commander Fravor. How could he have not seen everything? The "Executive Summary" document clearly states that the crew of the E-2C "Hawkeye", which was airborne during the entire incident, heard the "merge calls" from Fravor and the other aircraft coming over the Air Defense Control (ADC) Net. Could

Kurth have missed all the radio 'chatter' everyone was listening too and not known something was happening? If some unknown vehicle—potentially a threat—had suddenly caused Fravor to yell "I'm engaged!!", does it make sense that Kurth would simply fly back to the ship and say nothing?

An astonishing statement was made in an email message from one of Kurth's fellow pilots, an email obtained during Robert Powell's impressive efforts to obtain FOIA documentation on the Nimitz encounters. After countless requests and subsequent denials, a query by Navy FOIA officials received an email reply from LtCol Rob "Dahigi" Tomlinson who had been one of the marine pilots aboard the Nimitz at the time. In his email, Rob Tomlinson stated…

> "I am definitely aware of the "flying tic-tac"! We were aboard the USS NIMITZ attached to CVW-11. The CO of VFA-41, CDR "Sex" Fravor (spelling?) had the video footage on his ATFLIR and several pilots in VMFA-232 saw the video. I personally did not see the video, but I heard all about it**. I believe our CO at the time, LtCol "Cheeks" Kurth (retired) observed the tic tac**, and I believe LtCol XXXXXX, LtCol XXXXXX (retired), LtCol XXXXXX (retired), and several others also observed the video footage. Another good reference might be RADM Dell Bull (CNATRA) as he was the VFA-41 XO at the time."

It is clear that Rob Tomlinson is not confusing Kurth, his CO, with David Fravor. Furthermore, he names several other pilots who he believes saw the video, which certainly supports the story Fravor tells of getting the video and watching it with a number of other pilots. But for some reason Tomlinson believes that Kurth did in fact see the tic-tac!

Since the end of 2017 there have been persistent reasons to question if Kurth was alone or had a wingman with him, stemming mainly from statements made by Fravor in several online interviews. In describing his schedule for that day, Fravor has stated numerous times that he and his wingman were preparing to do an air defense exercise (ADEX) with a marine group that had launched just ahead of them. Described as a "2V2", this clearly suggests there were two aircraft on each team. Also, Fravor's statements have repeatedly suggested Kurth was one of the Marine pilots and they were going to conduct a "Red air vs Blue air" exercise.

So why are there conflicting scenarios for why Kurth was out there?

According to the Executive Summary, Kurth launched from the Nimitz at 1030L ('Lima' time is a fixed timezone commonly used at sea) to do a "functional flight check of an aircraft that had recently completed significant maintenance". Thirty minutes later, at 1100L, Kurth was directed to investigate an unidentified airborne contact and soon afterward he sees the disturbance in the water. Oddly, he was directed toward something airborne at 15-25,000 feet that the radar on the Princeton had apparently been able to detect, but there is no further mention of the object or where it went even as Kurth passed over the disturbance in the water. The Princeton was reportedly able to do exactly this for Fravor, to the point of announcing "merge plot" with the "tic-tac", so where was the object Kurth had been sent to intercept? There is no mention of Kurth being low on fuel, he had only been in the air perhaps forty-five minutes, and if fuel had been a concern then it was moot at that point as he was already at the location! So again it's not at all clear why he would have been called off if he had already arrived.

More puzzling still is that the Executive Summary states that Kurth was recovered aboard the Nimitz at 1200L! According to this timeline, Kurth launched at 10:30L, at approximately 11:00L he was directed to the unidentified object, and then at 1200L he was back on the Nimitz. But Fravor has stated several times

that he and his wingman did not leave the carrier until between 1200L-1300L (noon to one in the afternoon ship-time)! Furthermore, in a September 2017 interview reportedly found on Chris Mellon's web site, Fravor's wingman, Alex Dietrich, also stated they launched from the Nimitz at "approximately 12:00 hours" (Note: it is listed as 'EST' in Dietrich's interview which is most likely a typo as EST would have converted to 6pm the following day in Lima time, or circa 9am on the west coast.) Regardless, her story does essentially support Fravor's statements that his group did not leave the Nimitz until after noon that day.

So if Kurth was back on the Nimitz by 1200L, and the ocean disturbance he saw had vanished by the time he left the area—then the logical implication is that Kurth's encounter was a separate event from the encounter Fravor and his wingman had that afternoon? The idea that Kurth and Fravor were directed to investigate the same "UNID" becomes even more problematic in light of much earlier information from 2007 and 2010.

In 2007, a link to an early copy of the FLIR video was posted on the AboveTopSecret forum. It was followed soon afterward by a second post containing a portion of a record or log of events from November 14, 2004, called an "Event Summary". It begins with "Event 3", described as an ADEX (air defense exercise) and records the aircraft launched and a description of events during the exercise. (It may or may not be significant, but while Events 4, 5, and 6 were also included…events 1 & 2 were not.) In this Event Summary, Event 3 describes fairly concisely Fravor's encounter with the "tic-tac", which is obviously why this Event Summary was being posted in the ATS forum. However, one of the first things noted under "Event 3" are the radio callsigns of the aircraft that were launched for that exercise.

In this case five aircraft are listed: "110/100, 303/305, 401"

These numbers, painted prominently on the nose of the aircraft (as well as other places), make them easily identifiable. The radio callsigns of the aircraft launched were FAST EAGLES, DEVILS, and HOBOS…in this instance "FAST EAGLE 110/100" referred to Fravor and his wingman, as can be easily discerned from the description of the encounter with the unknown. A bit of research also shows that "303/305" belonged to the "Red Devils" of Marine squadron VMFA-232, while "401" was an aircraft belonging to the "Mighty Shrikes" whose callsign is "HOBO".

Douglas Kurth was Commander of the "Red Devils" at that time, and the discrepancy this presents is that Kurth's aircraft was number "301". Images available online taken in October of 2004 show the "Red Devils" F/A-18 Hornet "301" with his name clearly visible on it! The PBS television series "Carrier" from 2005 also had segments showing this aircraft with Kurth's name on it, though at that time in 2005 another pilot is shown flying it. That certainly presents the possibility that a pilot might on occasion fly a different aircraft than the one with his name on it, and so if Kurth was doing a flight check on Nov 14 then perhaps he was not flying "301" at that time. But there is still a big question about who was in "303" and "305" at the time Fravor launched that afternoon. Even if we consider the possibility that Kurth was back on the carrier by 1200L and quickly entered one of the other aircraft and launched again immediately ahead of Fravor…why have Kurth "skip it" if he and his wingman had already reached the spot they had been directed to?

Regardless, the Event Summary posted on the ATS forum in 2007 clearly shows a total of five aircraft launched at that time. In his recent interview by Joe Rogan, Fravor describes even more clearly that the Marines launched first and were to go about 100 miles south of the ship, then his two flights were to go to about sixty miles south and it would be "two of us against two of them". If the Marine aircraft were

already in the air heading south and Kurth was one of them, and he was then directed to investigate the 'tic-tac' and had already reached the location well before Fravor—why waste more time and gas by calling him off and having Fravor duplicate the entire trip?

With all the questions so far, there is an even more puzzling version that first appeared in 2010 in the former *Open Minds Forum*. The poster, using the username "theseer", was eventually identified as Kevin Day himself, the USS Princeton Operation Specialist now well known. Day is author of "The See'r" (with the apostrophe), a fascinating and intriguing short story built around the Nimitz encounters and included in his book "A Sailor's Anthology". The 2010 OMF information was recovered in 2018 and posted in the AboveTopSecret forum as interest grew out of David Fravor's public accounts.

In his post on December 30, 2010 at 12:45am, "theseer" (Day) expanded on the source material for his short story, reaffirming that "the essence of my 'fictional' story is true". The information he then provided was essentially the story he has now publicly told, but in 2010 the details were significantly different. At first glance the story sounds like David Fravor's encounter, except it is not:

> *"The first intercept was conducted by the Commanding Officer of one our (sic) strike fighter squadrons (then 28-year Navy Captain, now Admiral, air hours counted in the thousands); he cried in abject fright over the air intercept control circuit. I'll never forget his words."*
>
> *"I'm engaged, I'm engaged!! Oh my god.."*
>
> *The object spun a loop around his aircraft and suddenly descended from 28,000 feet and splashed in the ocean below. The travel time was about .78 seconds.*
>
> *The captain followed the object down, saw an object just beneath the surface of the water, then climbed altitude to get a better view.*
>
> *The object suddenly shot straight back up out of the water. Again, in about .78 seconds it climbed to 28,000 feet and continued on it's merry way south, at 100 knots."*

This description is of a far more bizarre encounter with an unknown object than Fravor's account. Here the object not only engaged the pilot but then shot into the ocean. The pilot then followed it down and saw something beneath the water—after which the object reemerged and went on its way! It is certainly a factually different account, by this telling, and this unnamed pilot is described as a Captain and "now Admiral"! Kevin Day certainly was an expert in interpreting what he was seeing on radar and hearing the events at the same time. Anyone who has seen him speak of the experience can tell how it affected him, and 2010 was far closer to the events than 2019, so memories should have been even clearer then. So what could explain the differences in the account of this incident and this pilot? Was it Fravor, or Kurth, or someone else entirely?

Even considering the above, why does the Executive Summary have Kurth doing a flight check and being back on the ship presumably before Fravor or any of the other aircraft had even been launched? Why even mention Kurth? Why was Douglas Kurth the one to suddenly reappear in 2007 working at Bigelow Aerospace? Considering the interest focused today on any witness with knowledge of the Nimitz encounters—why does Douglas Kurth seem to have intentionally been dropped off the radar.

∞ QUESTIONS ON A NAVY INVESTIGATION BEHIND AAWSAP/AATIP:

David Fravor, whose character and integrity appears beyond reproach, is a very convincing witness, and his testimony has been used from the start to promote the premise and value of the TTSA efforts. Nevertheless, for some of the men on the Nimitz and Princeton to say they were told not to discuss the events, while Fravor and other pilots—the actual eyewitnesses—say they were never told not to talk, defies logic. More so, if the pilots were free to talk and BAASS/AAWSAP personnel had been interested in the incidents since 2008, why in various interviews has Fravor given the impression that no one had approached him about his experience until a matter of months before the announcement of TTSA?

John Greenewald raised this significant question in one of his articles when he questioned why David Fravor, the pilot and principle eyewitness in the encounter that named the "tic-tac", seemed to have not been interviewed about his experience until 2017! The timeline given in most accounts, including statements by Fravor himself, would lead us to believe that other pilots had been and were being interviewed before anyone ever approached him! According to Fravor himself another individual reportedly had already been interviewed several times by someone from "the Pentagon" and finally asked Fravor about it, at which point Fravor told him/her to "give 'em my name and I'll talk to them". This seems to make no sense from an investigative standpoint. So was it the whole truth that no one had talked to Fravor before 2017? There is compelling evidence that indicates otherwise.

Some very revealing information comes from an interview with Paco Chierici in June of 2018 on Ken Arciga's 'Manceptional Podcast'. Toward the end of the interview Chierici describes having known David Fravor for many years and how he came to write his mind-bending March 2015 article "There I Was: The X-Files Edition". He discusses how he had first heard the story from Fravor only a year after it occurred, and then goes on to add some very revealing information…

> …two years ago I called Dave up, and at the time I'm the editor for Fightersweep and I've always wanted to write like a great article about this incident. So I called Dave up and said, hey man, you know that story about the aliens, do you mind if Interviewed you 'cause I'm going to write this article. And he's like "Well, it's funny...your timing is amazing 'cause this government investigative agency literally just left my house and they've been doing like a year-long investigation into this incident. They interviewed everybody…they interviewed the ship, they interviewed a submarine that was in the area, and they interviewed all the aircrew that were involved…and there was even more aircrew involved than the little bit I just told you, the radar operators. They went back and interviewed everybody…

Then Chierici adds…

> *…And they put together this exhaustive classified government document, and so I got access to that document. Yeah, yeah, it was great, I read over it for a couple of weeks and then I wrote the article, and then I had to give it back*.

The idea that Chierici was provided an exhaustive classified document to help write his article, but had to return it afterward, raises major questions about who provided it to him and the motive and intent behind doing so. For someone with access to an "exhaustive classified government document" to loan it Chierici *knowing he was about to write an article on Fravor's encounter* can only be seen as helping Chierici publicize the events! To what end? According to subsequent information from Dave Beatty, Paco Chierici declined to say who passed the document to him, only suggesting "ask Fravor". So what was going on in 2015 if AATIP supposedly no longer existed and TTSA was apparently not even on the board yet?

[Author's note: An early draft of this paper was first circulated to a small group of researchers near the end of October 2019. At that time the above statements by Paco Chierici were not widely known. A new interview by Chierici, cited below, has appeared in recent days in which he expands on this.]

In a November 28, 2019 video for "Aircrew Interview", Chierici again discussed how he came to write his 2015 article. Again he says (several times) that the report resulted from an ONI investigation, saying that eleven years after the incident "they have just completed the very first investigation…thorough, detail, big packet of data, investigation." It seems fair to wonder why it would take eleven years to complete an investigation and yet wait until the very end to speak to Fravor, the principal eyewitness. Chierici then says he obtained the ONI investigation through "circuitous means", before he finally suggests that he now believes it has since been revealed to be "an AATIP investigation"! While I have no doubt Chierici is being earnest in his conveying the story as he knows it, the public has repeatedly been told that AATIP terminated in 2013 and, as will be discussed below, this contradicts statements by Eric Davis that ONI *was* the investigating agency!

Even more suggestive was the initial Washington Post article dated Dec 18, 2017 that reported Fravor as saying he had in fact been approached eight years earlier in:

> *"…2009 when a government official he declined to name contacted him while doing "an unofficial investigation*."

So who was investigating in 2009?

Contrary to impressions left elsewhere, David Fravor stated in a January 2, 2019 online interview with Vincent Aiello that he was contacted by Douglas "Cheeks" Kurth who said "we have a customer that likes to investigate stuff like this…can we do it? (39:26)" (one wonders who the "customer" was if Kurth was working for BAASS at the time). In the same podcast interview Fravor goes on to say that about a month later he "got a call from a guy who said hey we're going to investigate this thing" and "they actually did." He then refers to a report released recently by Harry Reid, presumably the "Executive Summary" George Knapp's I-Team obtained. Fravor calls it the "unofficial/official report" which, taken together with other information since then, certainly implies there is an 'official' report somewhere. Finally, referring to how much time had passed between 2004 and when the investigation had been done, he says "at the time it was five years after the event". That also places the time frame of this initial investigation as being 2009-2010, if not earlier.

Supporting all the above is a May, 2018 online I-Team Exclusive article by George Knapp. In this article Knapp details how he received the "Executive Summary" and states the initial analysis was compiled in

2009. Furthermore, Knapp's article concludes with the definitive statement that "***Another highly classified version was also written but is unlikely to ever be released***."

Though 2009-2010 was within the period of the AAWSAP contract, there is information attributed to Eric Davis that clearly indicates this early investigation was done by someone other than BAASS or AATIP, and was the source of the redacted summary provided to BAASS circa 2009-2010.

Linda Howe reports in a January 2018 Earthfiles video that Eric Davis explained to her that the Nimitz investigation had been "authorized by somebody other than Luis Elizondo" and the individual who wrote the analysis was "at that time a "GS-15 working in Naval Intelligence"(10:00). A small but seemingly significant detail was also mentioned in the above conversation when it was specifically stated that the report was intentionally not written on "***Navy*** or DoD stationery…"! Not "*DIA* or DoD" stationery—but *Navy*!

Considering Eric Davis's insider position with BAASS and the other principals involved, the reliability of this is hard to contest. It seems that Naval Intelligence was conducting or had already conducted an investigation and produced a classified report. The DIA AAWSAP program manager *was obviously aware of this* since he had to facilitate the unclassified "summary" to give to BAASS for analysis. Perhaps it was this Naval Intelligence investigator who spoke to Fravor in the 2009 timeframe after Kurth called and it was this classified Naval Intelligence report that was provided to Paco Chierici in early 2015.

With all this evidence of an early classified investigation, there is a nagging question that must be asked. If an exhaustive classified report had been done circa 2009-2010 that involved investigating and interviewing everyone from pilots to submarine personnel to radar operators—was everyone interviewed ***except*** the witnesses speaking out today (Day, Voorhees, et al)? Considering his very significant role in both the radar observations as well as intercepts of the unidentified objects, how can any complete investigation *not have included speaking to Kevin Day*? If, as some have reported, unknown people came aboard the ships and confiscated the radar data and recordings, then it would seem even more important to have interviewed Day, if not the others as well. In fairness however, not speaking to these individuals could actually be evidence that the investigators already do have the radar data, making it unnecessary to interview Day and the others.

Nevertheless, there is a major logical disconnect here.

If an investigation had already been done in the 2009 as part of the BAASS AAWSAP/AATIP program—why would Elizondo have needed to do an investigation and interview with Fravor in 2017? More so, If the exhaustive classified government investigation Paco Chierici was allowed to see in early 2015 was an investigation done by AATIP—why again would Elizondo and AATIP have been actively interviewing Fravor (or anyone else) in 2017 before the TTSA launch and the newspaper articles revealing AATIP?

These facts clearly indicate a Navy/ONI investigation had been conducted as far back as 2009 (if not earlier) and that it generated an "exhaustive" report of the results. That investigation and report were classified, a fact clearly supported by George Knapp's 2018 article, by Paco Chierici's statements, and statements that BAASS personnel eventually were provided a declassified "executive summary" version. For some reason, in early 2015 Chierici was passed a copy of this classified report to help him with his

article about Fravor's encounter, and yet, whoever controlled access to that 'classified' report seems to have chosen to not provide it to AATIP/BAASS personnel. Furthermore, for some reason the AATIP/TTSA team conducted their own investigation and interviews (early to mid-2017, getting it done quietly before AATIP was 'exposed' as the secret Pentagon UFO program. Why a second investigation pre-TTSA?

If a classified Navy/ONI investigation had already been conducted on the Nimitz encounters, then what possible reason was there for the $22mil BAASS/AAWSAP project? From its founding and through the coordinated newspaper revelation of AATIP's existence, TTSA has created its own narrative of how it came to know of and use the Nimitz encounters, a narrative with only one secret Pentagon "AATIP" program directed by Elizondo that ended when he 'resigned' and joined them. So if TTSA is a standalone public corporation--why would Elizondo tell Fravor that "they had "gotten approval to announce that this program existed inside the U.S. government. (20:37)"?

Whose approval is necessary for TTSA to make decisions?

Again the question remains why, in December of 2007, Douglas Kurth was brought in at Bigelow Aerospace ostensibly leading a program on "novel and emerging space technologies" and managing a team of 40 scientists, engineers, analysts and researchers? The name BAASS LLC was registered the following month (a coincidence?) but it would be 8 more months before the AAWSAP contract was put out for bids. According to the storyline fostered by people who were involved from BAASS to TTSA, everything began with the AAWSAP/Reid $22M contract in 2008. So who brought Kurth to Bigelow Aerospace to 'manage' a team of scientists almost a year before the AAWSAP contract even went out and before BAASS was even registered? Who was paying for Kurth's salary at that time? Was Kurth representing an overall operation that began in 2007 at Bigelow Aerospace (as BAASS), and AAWSAP/AATIP was merely an adjunct operation for information gathering that was started in August 2008? In the 2009-2010 timeframe Eric Davis reportedly analyzed the "Executive Summary" of the Nimitz/Tic-tac encounter and Hal Puthoff requested dozens of papers to be written on the state of scientific advances looking ahead 40 years or so. There is virtually no documentation about what other actual work was produced from BAASS in Las Vegas in the years before the AAWSAP funds purportedly ran out.

A comment by Hal Puthoff during his 2018 presentation at the SSE/IRVA Conference appears to suggest that whatever led to the AAWSAP program actually began in June of 2007, a fairly specific timeframe to be sure? That was certainly supported by the original Dec 16, 2017 New York Times newspaper article announcing the "shadowy program began in 2007"! If that is true, then there was obviously something underway long before the DIA "AAWSAP" contract. Numerous accounts have reported that Elizondo took over the AATIP program in 2010 (from an unnamed predecessor), certainly giving the impression he was not involved prior to that. So why in a recent interview with George Knapp did Elizondo at one point say, "…in the ten years I worked the program…" (1:42), which counting back from his claimed resignation in 2017 would mean he had also been involved since 2007. If June of 2007 is even close to accurate then there was a larger overall program underway, and AAWSAP was simply something that came later for a purpose.

From the start Elizondo was presented as the director of AATIP, a secret Pentagon UFO study program. But as recently as Oct 21, 2019, Susan L. Gough of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Pentagon), is reported to have said in no uncertain terms that Elizondo was an intelligence specialist at the office of the undersecretary of defense for intelligence from 2008 until 2017 when he resigned.

> "It makes no change to previous statements. Mr. Elizondo had no assigned responsibilities for AATIP while he was in OUSD(I). DIA [Defense Intelligence Agency] administered AATIP, and Elizondo was never assigned to DIA. Elizondo did interact with the DIA office managing the program while the program was still ongoing, but he did not lead it."

(Interestingly, a month earlier on September 20, 2019, in an email exchange concerning Navy and USAF handling of inquiries about UAS/UAP issues and guidelines, the same Susan Gough states that OSD will now be taking the lead for such queries. Coincidentally, *OSD also turns out to be a participating party in the recently announced CRADA between TTSA and the US Army* (discussed in the next section).

So is it possible these OSD statements regarding Elizondo's role are accurate but Elizondo's own claims are also accurate, if seen in context? For that matter, if he had no responsibilities with "AATIP" and was not with the DIA in any way, then how did he become involved at all? Though news stories certainly gave the impression that funding for Elizondo's role came through the AAWSAP contract, his actual position as the Director, National Programs Special Management Staff at OUSD(I) seems much deeper than that.

Examining available information more closely does suggest a far more important role for Luis Elizondo, and much more significant than simply AATIP. The original newspaper stories from 2017 presented him as someone at the Pentagon with the job of culling UFO reports (under AATIP). But later, when the AAWSAP contract was revealed, it was Hal Puthoff who stated that AATIP had only been a "nickname", implying it was not the actual program name. A point worth noting is that all DoD Special Access Programs are actually *assigned a nickname*, so Puthoff's statement may actually be corroboration that "AATIP" was not an actual program in itself! Could approval to reveal AATIP have simply been approval to reveal the nickname and use that in the early news stories to present Elizondo and AATIP as a one-man stand-alone program? It served the purposes of TTSA at that time, but also avoided revealing both AAWSAP and that Elizondo was, in fact, highly placed in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.

In his purported resignation letter, Luis Elizondo is shown as the Director, National Programs Special Management Staff, OUSD(I)". Searching online finds virtually no information about exactly what this position does, though where it is located clearly makes it a significant responsibility. As one of the Staff Directorates under OUSD(I), "national programs" appear to fall under the "Sensitive Activities Directorate", which is responsible in part for ensuring that only proper personnel have clearance to Special Access Programs. If Luis Elizondo was the Director of a staff of personnel responsible for this level of security, not to mention whatever would require "national programs *special* management", he was undoubtedly in a high-level position responsible for top-down security. His position in the Nimitz-BAASS-TTSA story must have been far more significant than simply someone at "the Pentagon" gathering UFO/UAP reports at the behest of someone at BAASS.

It is especially curious that in the initial NY Times newspaper article of December 16, 2017, Elizondo is on record saying that he continued working "***with officials from the Navy and the C.I.A.***" That should have raised far more questions than it has. In looking at the entire tale from Nimitz to TTSA, the Navy is a common thread throughout. So how did they happen to be working with Elizondo through 2017? The same should be asked about the CIA—especially now considering how prominent CIA connections are among the team members of TTSA. Add the information from Eric Davis that someone working for Naval Intelligence had already done an investigation and produced a classified report, which was then reworked to be shown to Puthoff and Davis as an "Executive Summary", and all things point to the Navy having a central if not controlling position in this, one much earlier than and outside of the AAWSAP contract.

∞ DELONGE – LOCKHEED – TTSA:

Tom DeLonge's role in the position of (interim) CEO certainly confused most people. The release of the 2015-2016 Wikileaks emails to and from John Podesta did show that DeLonge had been talking with Rob Weiss (Lockheed), Neil McCasland (USAF), and Michael Carey (USAF), all very significant individuals. But DeLonge has mentioned having as many as ten (10) advisors, and so if the above men were three of them—have any of the others been identified? Were those three even part of the ten?

A significant question to this writer is how and why Tom DeLonge's contact with Rob Weiss led to being connected to AF Major General Neil McCasland as an advisor. McCasland does not appear to have been the next contact in line after Weiss (more on that shortly), but McCasland was a significant contact named in the Podesta emails. Weiss knowing McCasland may not be much of a mystery if they had connections through the Air Force Research Lab or at Sandia. But in 2015 Neil McCasland was no longer in the USAF—he had retired as Commander of AFRL in 2013. So why go to him? Michael Carey had also retired in 2014, so he was no longer in the Air Force. *Why connect DeLonge to men no longer in the Air Force?*

Interestingly, on his retirement McCasland went to work for ATA Corp, an Albuquerque company with lucrative contracts with his former agency, AFRL (which includes the Space Vehicles Directorate and Directed Energy Directorate at Kirtland AFB), as well as with NASA. McCasland is also now involved with the Space Enterprise Consortium, an organization helping its members compete for federally-funded space-related projects. Rob Weiss, who retired from Lockheed in 2018, is also consulting with industry. Very interestingly he is also on the board of Catalyze Dallas, a company that "partners with the world's most respected defense contractors and leading industrial companies to unleash value from their intellectual property". (In some ways that does bring to mind the professed aims of TTSA.) Nevertheless, in 2015-2016 why lead Tom DeLonge to retired Air Force personnel?

Perhaps more important for the moment is the question of how Tom DeLonge and the above three men named in the Podesta emails turned into TTSA with Puthoff, Semivan, Kelleher and others? There is no obvious connection or evolution, so how that came about is not at all clear. Elizondo was part of the BAASS/DIA contract through AAWSAP, and Puthoff, Kelleher, and others knew and worked with him through BAASS. But it has only been the presence of Tom DeLonge himself that has driven the assumption that DeLonge/Weiss/McCasland/Carey combined with vestiges of BAASS (Puthoff/Kelleher/Elizondo) and evolved into TTSA. So why are Weiss/McCasland/Carey not mentioned at all now?

In Tom DeLonge's story of how this developed for him, it began at a Lockheed party and within a matter of weeks he had held two meetings with a top Lockheed "bossman". This is presumably Rob Weiss though I have not seen that specifically stated. Nevertheless, after his second meeting with this Lockheed individual DeLonge was directed to be at a location near to the Pentagon in another two weeks to meet a very important person. This appears to have been the second person in DeLonge's chronology, a person DeLonge has stated was a CIA person.

Judging by the dates and other comments in the DeLonge/Podesta emails, the above meeting likely took place in mid to late August of 2015—and this meeting with the 'CIA' individual seems to have had a strong impact on DeLonge. In the Foreward to his book "Sekret Machines" DeLonge describes going to this meeting location, somewhere with a wooden table in the back, and finding his Lockheed contact already there with this other person. This individual looked "straight out of a spy movie", with squinty eyes, a beard, a suit "tired from a full day's work", and a look of confidence (sitting with one hand gripping his adjacent wrist.) So who was this CIA person?

It may be helpful at this point to note that although DeLonge has referred to some of his advisors by their military ranks (e.g. "the General"), the persons who have been named were already retired. That also seems to be the case with several members of TTSA who were either individuals already long retired from their positions or who retired almost immediately before joining TTSA. The point being that it might not be a surprise if this "CIA" person was in fact ex-CIA at the time of DeLonge's meeting.

How DeLonge went from Rob Weiss to meeting his co-founders at TTSA has never been clearly spelled out, but now I think the identity of this CIA person may answer that as well. Considering DeLonge's description, which fits him almost perfectly, and with the benefit of hindsight, I strongly suspect this "CIA" individual was Dr. Kit Green.

Not long after meeting this CIA person, in September 2015 DeLonge emailed John Podesta again and included a comment that he was soon going to Texas to meet "some more 'private' individuals". I'd somehow completely missed the connection until a person I was communicating with pointed out that going to Texas almost certainly meant meeting with Hal Puthoff! Kit Green began with the CIA in 1969, and has known Hal Puthoff for decades, notably beginning with Remote Viewing research in the mid-1970's. There also seems to be little reason to doubt Green was aware of the BAASS operations. An email message, posted on Facebook, from 2010 discussing BAASS matters and Project Medea was apparently written by Eric Davis and sent to Colm Kelleher, Hal Puthoff, Jacques Vallee, and Christopher 'Kit' Green. Only the first page of the message was released, but it has not been disavowed. Green also authored one of the DIRD papers for Hal Puthoff and BAASS, and Green's area of interest and expertise correlates directly to subject areas of expressed interest to TTSA. Perhaps not so coincidentally, Kit Green reportedly took his intriguing work on the physiological effects on witnesses to anomalous events into a more 'operational' role in 2007!

And so, if the CIA person DeLonge met was in fact Kit Green then it seems very plausible that it was Green who connected DeLonge to Hal Puthoff. With his history at the CIA and interest in highly unusual subjects, perhaps he also has a connection to Jim Semivan's role in TTSA. Whatever the case, at the end of his meeting with this CIA person, Delonge was told something he said he would never forget, something that certainly held ominous overtones and that perhaps none of us should forget. He was told:

> "Things like this do not happen at the White House, they do not happen on The Hill. They happen at places like this, at tables like this, where a few men get together and decide to push the ball down the field." (*Sekret Machines*, Foreword pg XV)

This still leaves the question of how others came to be members of TTSA. Stephen Justice coming from Lockheed may or may not have some connection to Rob Weiss. (An interesting side note about Rob Weiss that may be only curiously coincidental—or not—is that prior to his work for Lockheed, Weiss served eight years as a Navy carrier-based S-3 Viking jet pilot, and afterward continued in the Navy Reserve until 2000 retiring as a Captain.) Nevertheless, why Stephen Justice would suddenly retire after decades at Lockheed *the month before joining TTSA* onstage in October 2017 is at least curious. His name shows no obvious prior connection if not through Rob Weiss at Lockheed, and he was not mentioned in the Podesta emails. So why Justice and not Weiss?

Colm Kelleher had worked for Robert Bigelow back in the days of NIDS, then returned to work as an administrator for BAASS from 2008-2012. His work history shows that from 2013 to the present he has worked for Bigelow Aerospace—although when TTSA was founded he was also shown on their site as a 'biotech consultant'. As of recently, his photo and information no longer appears in the Advisory Panel section of the TTSA website.

Other members of TTSA have backgrounds almost all of which show CIA and DoD connections. An interesting exception was Dr. Garry Nolan, a Stanford professor and geneticist, was also a member of the TTSA team at the start. His information has since been removed, but Garry Nolan and Kit Green are known to have worked closely in the past on matters that do seem to related to TTSA's interests. Perhaps Kit Green was also influential in Nolan's participation with TTSA, which might again point to Kit Green's influence being not insignificant. Regardless, Kit Green's name has never been directly linked to TTSA, even as merely an advisor or consultant.

∞ WHY A 'TO THE STARS ACADEMY'?

What might have been the motivating factors in 2015 that compelled Rob Weiss to listen to Tom DeLonge? The idea of changing young people's negative attitudes about working inside the black world of military/industrial tech, as opposed to working for Google or SpaceX, had its merits. But has TTSA accomplished that? Why come out of the decades spent in the black world of intelligence and classified contracts and suddenly go full mainstream pronouncing 'UAPs' represent an advanced technology that is unknown to us—and then form an entertainment, science, and aerospace company?

TTSA is a startup venture, and all startups I've ever been aware of do not start up until they already have at least enough of a product to demonstrate it is doable and a marketing plan to show angel investors and loan officers how they propose to repay those startup costs. With all the hard-earned reputations being staked on TTSA, what do they already have or know that has convinced Congress and the corporate partners they are acquiring to take seriously a company proclaiming "ufo tech"?

For my part, I suspect they already have something, some technological capability that they need ownership of by being able to claim they built it themselves. That might also be the only way to own the patents on something they would otherwise be unable to patent or would not be able to admit where it

came from. TTSA recently announced a cooperative research and development agreement (CRADA) with the U.S. Army. You have to wonder what TTSA has to offer at this point that the Army would be willing to provide "laboratories, expertise, support, and resources" toward. TTSA technology 'solutions' supposedly included developments in material science, space-time metric engineering, quantum physics, beamed energy propulsion, and "active camouflage". I have not seen one image of such a product on their web site (and when did they demonstrate "active camouflage" capability in their repertoire?) So what do they have, or what could they have shown the Army that was convincing enough that the Army would provide all those resources for nothing? Perhaps this small section from the above CRADA points to something much deeper:

> C.2. Other Participants
> The other contributors for this effort are:
> 1) The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) can share historical reports of findings and origin of material solutions in the possession of the Collaborator.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is included as a participant specifically to share "*historical reports of findings and origin of material solutions*" now in possession of TTSA? This should have immediately raised demands for explanation. First, it clearly implies that the OSD has information not only on prior findings but also has information on the origin of material(s) being used by TTSA! And, it definitely indicates that TTSA has some type of special arrangement sanctioned by OSD, who may have given 'material' to TTSA. Does that sound like a startup company with no behind-the-curtain government ties?

Regardless, other reports of agreements that TTSA has made with Lockheed, Boeing, and others certainly makes TTSA look like another government contractor or affiliated business in the making, but with inside channels.

TTSA is advertised as a public benefit corporation asking the public, you, to invest your money, presumably to benefit us all. But you already have! At the end of the day, whatever knowledge or expertise the members of TTSA have to be able to engineer products allegedly based on UFO/UAP tech came from working with agencies and companies that profited from and often survived on government funding—funding paid for with taxpayer dollars.

∞ FINAL THOUGHTS

Ultimately, we're left to wonder what is the true agenda for forming TTSA? I have noticed several articles in the 2013-2015 timeframe that reveal funding concerns in military and military-industrial areas. Lockheed apparently was facing growing competition from other more 'commercial' business who could provide services and compete for funding. Politics itself seems to always be tightening budgets all around, and even Elizondo claimed higher-ups had taken AAWSAP or AATIP funds and reallocated their use. Perhaps the simple frustration of working inside the world of black projects and not being able to explain enough to avoid having your funding cut simply reached its limit. Everyone has had enough, resigns, starts

their own company, and 'goes public'. To be fair, perhaps those in TTSA are actually trying to do something for all of us, and this was the only way to do it.

Still, the same 'perceived threat' perspective pushed by TTSA could apply *to* TTSA. If you don't know what it's true agenda is and it is beyond your understanding and control…it is a tacit threat. From the outset TTSA framed itself in the context of "UFO phenomena are real and we're going to study it to produce technological breakthroughs" (putting it in layman terms.) But they could have formed a company to do research on strange materials and engineer products and left the UFO phenomena completely out of the picture? Hal Puthoff has had Earthtech for years, why not simply expand that? Why position yourself as a "UFO company" and blast the news to the far corners of the earth with an amazing military UFO case and eye witnesses in-hand to serve as promoters, all the while also pushing the concept that the phenomenon needs to be seen as a potential threat. But the community of researchers who have been wanting serious public research for years are essentially excluded. The 'ufo community' is used to create buzz and offer up information, but that same community is not included in any meaningful way.

The work done by those in the 'ufo community' is seen as a database to be culled through and used toward TTSA's ends, now with The Vault, also through Bigelow's purchase of MUFON data over the last ten years, if not longer. It would be interesting to know what other databases, public or private, were 'acquired' under BAASS as well. It seems ironic that MUFON's data was secretly purchased, and now TTSA seems to be setting itself up as a for-profit version of MUFON with its own database (presumably it will include all the previous MUFON data as well). But to date, little to no data has gone back the other way. "Meta-materials" are gathered from those in the community who have them, or from the public, but the purpose is to build products to the benefit of the company and its customers (hopefully investors will be happy too.) So even if TTSA owes the "ufo community" nothing…why not be inclusive of those who have studied and researched and looked for answers much of their lives? The simple answer seems to be to control the narrative and not promote any other sources. In business, you want to convince others that they need what you are selling, and they can only get it from you!

The fact is that TTSA is a private venture meant to make money, so any publicity is good publicity and hopefully generates investors. The fastest way to generate profit early (other than investors) was to create a television series from the information readily available. That certainly was an easy sell considering how many networks are already running "ufos & aliens" programming. It is also a good way to frame the conversation again in terms of the threat potential and plant that idea in the mind of anyone who has a television. I suspect the big money TTSA plans to pull in to fund their projects is the main reason for it, and for talking to Congress. It will likely again be public taxpayer money but it will come through military and industry contracts. Maybe the public will eventually see some benefit from it…but as for the patents and profits generated?

That's their business…not ours.

~~~~~~~~~~~ END ~~~~~~~~~~~
~~~~~~~~~~~

∞ WHY THIS MATTERS TO ME (AND SHOULD TO ALL OF US)

Whatever the reasons for TTSA, there are clearly the usual suspicions about the agenda and the motives behind the parties involved. Even so, that suspicion has generally been tempered with curiosity and hope, hope that once and for all the truth will come out, that all of us who have so much vested in getting to the truth will have some vindication, that those who have suffered ridicule and worse will finally have their day, that maybe through TTSA some honest men have decided to stand up for, if not stand beside, us.

For me, that hope dimmed considerably after the episode of "Unidentified" featuring incidents of unknown vehicles intruding near sensitive weapons facilities. It was clear that the purpose of the episode was to reinforce the idea that these unknown vehicles represented a potential threat. That line of thinking is not particularly new, but TTSA chose to take this approach. In this instance the cases they selected were a 2003 incident in McClusky, North Dakota, the 1980 Rendlesham Forest, England case, and the 1980 Kirtland AFB (Albuquerque, New Mexico) events.

The first segment, the 2003 case, featured an eyewitness interview and a visual CGI recreation of the unknown vehicle arriving and departing. The location of the sighting and direction being near Minot AFB played into the narrative. It certainly fit the premise of the episode. The second segment, the Rendlesham Forest incident, also featured CGI graphics and recreations, and had interviews with principle witnesses. In this instance they also raised the issue of residual health effects. The visuals and the interviews all helped bolster the idea that these unknown vehicles posed a threat not to just national security but potentially to the long-term health of witnesses! This segment even focused on how Senator John McCain had aided in getting one witness the health benefits he deserved, obviously emphasizing the moral value and imperative of helping those who may have suffered, especially our veterans.

The third segment they chose to focus on was the 1980 incident(s) at Kirtland AFB. I had no foreknowledge this would be a featured segment and only learned of it the day before. But I know a thing or two about this set of events and the circumstances involved. The core story is of unknown vehicles filmed and photographed coming and going from inside the electrified perimeter fence of the Manzano Mountains area. They landings were essentially right next to the bunkers and could have been visually impressive to recreate, all of which could have made for an impressive segment.

Instead, from the outset the stress was on Kirtland as a location of black projects, a "new arms race" with the Soviets, and emphasizing how Kirtland was one of Americas most classified weapons testing facilities (specifically mentioning "stealth jets and unmanned drones"). The first mention of anything unusual began simply with, "One local man began documenting the strange lights flying above the base and started recording the Air Force's radio communications." That is an inherently misleading suggestion of how things developed. The narrative immediately shifted to emphasizing "he" was listening to radio transmissions from the base, which is intentionally misleading if not a blatant falsehood. Greg Bishop is then shown on camera as he dismissively says, "He calls up the Air Force and says 'do you know you guys have these lights flying around the base'?" My reaction to that can't be printed here.

This man's name was Paul F. Bennewitz—but for this segment the producers made sure his name is not mentioned once! Why?

What Paul saw and filmed is not even described. There are no CGI recreations as was done with the first two segments, no eyewitness accounts or even names of anyone, and certainly no images of Paul himself, let alone actual images of what he filmed! These vehicles were seen over several nights, landing there for several hours before departing. Paul was not the only witness, and more than just films, Paul had film and still images taken with high quality camera equipment. These were not helicopters with lights on them as some have tried to suggest, or simply "little lights" flying around the base, to quote Bishop's friend, Bill Moore.

To add insult to injury, the series producers then featured Richard Doty as someone with dignity enough to speak about his and AFOSI's treatment of Paul Bennewitz—but without enough dignity to mention Paul's name as they discredited him. That should be considered a slap in the face to the American people. This is the Richard Doty who appeared in "Mirage Men" smugly referring to Paul Bennewitz as a WW2 veteran who was very patriotic before saying "those type of people" you can convince to keep quiet, presumably while Doty and AFOSI pushed him over the edge. Both Bishop and Doty diminish Paul and his credibility, and the entire segment is essentially an exhibit for how our own military actively mislead an American citizen and encouraged his paranoia. Clearly the earlier segment focused on helping a veteran with his health did not extend to Paul, a veteran and patriot who had seen something the Air Force wanted to bury. In so many words, it was better to bury Paul, by Doty's account of the Air Force's role. Who at TTSA made the decision to condone this!

Before this segment, Luis Elizondo is presented solemnly making the statement…

> *"There have been sins in the past that the American government has been guilty of committing against the American people. No wonder people don't trust the government."*

Christopher Mellon himself is then featured stating…

> *"It's actually against the law to conduct a covert action against our own people!"*

So how can these statements, presented to represent Elizondo and Mellon as moral men with good intentions and purpose at heart, be balanced in any way with the representations made about the treatment of Paul Bennewitz moments before? Their words ring hollow following behind Richard Doty and anyone supporting his words. For my part, from what I have seen I do feel Elizondo and Mellon are honorable men and mean what they say…so are they unaware of the record? Why would they stand by and do nothing?

Why do they not stand up for Paul? Who do they see as "our own people"?

Strictly speaking, there was no real reason to even address the Kirtland AFB incidents in this segment. Why they did is still a question in my mind. They featured no UFO's in the segment, no recreations, no eyewitness testimony, and no presentation of unknown vehicles posing a threat to nuclear weapons or weapons stockpiles. I know of several other excellent instances of unknowns seen over nuclear missile silos that would have been intense and compelling, and yielded great visual recreations. So why was it necessary to address Kirtland AFB and throw Paul under the bus, again, and use a Richard Doty tag team to do it?

That said, other recent information that Doty actually worked with Hal Puthoff for a time up until 2006 is troubling. Other information concerning Kit Green and others who had some association with Doty during the 'Serpo' hoax certainly suggests Doty was someone they were willing to work with, no matter his history and reputation. Statements made in 2008 by Kit Green suggest he has regrets about the association and his involvement, to his credit. So after this known history with Richard Doty, how could Hal Puthoff or anyone associated with TTSA have condoned Doty representing their cause in this television series.

For what it's worth, the only connection I can see between TTSA and Kirtland AFB comes back to Neil McCasland. He still has close ties to Kirtland AFB and in 2015-2016 was an early and important Tom DeLonge advisor. But why it was necessary for TTSA to misrepresent Paul Bennewitz again in this way is unconscionable to me. It remains a question without an answer.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Links applicable to the above, basically in order of appearance.

1. There I Was: The X-Files Edition (fightersweep.com podcast) 2015 article
2. Kurth told to stay above 10,000 feet
3. Round section of turbulent water described by Kurth
4. Event log information supporting UAP was at 25,000'
5. Executive Summary (from LasVegasNow.com web site)
6. Rob Tomlinson email message (presented in SCU report on Nimitz encounters)
7. LIMA time zone information
8. F/A-18 number 301 (VMFA-232) - photos with Douglas "cheeks" Kurth name visible
9. Kevin Day - 2010 –theseer- posts with early description of pilot encounter
10. John Greenewald article raising question of why no one spoke to Fravor before 2017
11. (ibid) Greenewald article with Fravor quote to "give 'em my name"
12. Ken Arciga "Manceptional Podcast" on Youtube
13. There I Was: The X-Files Edition – 2015 Paco Chierici article
14. Air Crew interview with Paco Chierici (Nov 28, 2019)
15. Washington Post 2017 article with Fravor stating he had been approached in 2009
16. Fravor 2019 interview with statement he was contacted by Kurth saying "we have a customer…"
17. I-Team Exclusive article by George Knapp (2018) re Executive Summary
18. Linda Howe Earthfiles video with info on Eric Davis claiming GS-15 in Naval Intel wrote analysis
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

19. Fravor statement that Elizondo said had “gotten approval to reveal…” (on Fighter Pilot Podcast)
20. Hal Puthoff 2018 SSE presentation
21. Susan L. Gough statements re Elizondo working at OUSD(I) and no responsibilities at AATIP
22. Susan Gough statements about OSD will be taking lead for UAP queries to Navy/USAF
23. Puthoff statement that AATIP was a ‘nickname’
24. Information from FAS web site on SAP programs given ‘nicknames’
25. Information on ‘national programs’ falling under Sensitive Activities Directorate
26. Information related to NPSMS responsibility for ensuring proper SAP clearances (lawflareblog)
27. NY Times article with Elizondo statement of working with Navy and CIA
28. Catalyze Dallas – company using Rob Weiss as a consultant
29. TheDrive article with DeLonge “Origin Story” and mention that his contact was a CIA person
30. Green comments about work on physiological effects taken more ‘operational’ in 2007
31. Side note about Rob Weiss having been Navy carrier-based pilot prior to Lockheed
32. Stephen Justice lecture Jan 2018 – introduction says he just retired in September (2017)
33. Information on Garry Nolan and Kit Green working together prior to TTSA
34. TTSA announcement of CRADA agreement with Army
35. Copy of ARMY-TTSA CRADA agreement (blackvault.com)
36. 2008 article with Kit Green comments re past involvement with Doty/Serpo

---

F/A-18 assigned to Douglas “Cheeks” Kurth during Nimitz exercises

F/A-18C - VMFA-232 "Red Devils" - Side #301 BuNo 164975 - Miramar MCAS, CA - 10/15/2004 - This Hornet was the lead ship of the Red Devils at the time of this photo, and based at Miramar MCAS, CA.