

# ALLEN CATES

February 2, 2004

**Mr. James D. Johnston**  
Executive Secretary  
DoD Civilian /Military Service Review Board  
SAF Personnel Council  
1535 Command Dr., EE Wing, 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl.  
Andrews AFB, MD 20762-7002

Dear Mr. Johnston:

This letter is a follow up on my last letter to you, and includes documents received from Dr. Joe Leeker that he obtained from files held at the University of Texas at Dallas to assist me in presenting my proof of claim. I have also included some emails I received from people who were eyewitnesses to AAM/Military activity.

As promised I am sending you a copy of the latest Air America Association LOG.

Apparently, after my father passed away, one of my sisters had collected and held in her possession some letters that I wrote to my father when I was with Air America. She sent them to me last week. The letters themselves do not provide evidence of AAM/Military activity, but what is interesting were the envelopes showing the APO address assigned to us by the U.S. Military. I scanned one of the envelopes and including the scan with this letter. This particular address was for Udom, Thailand. It was a different APO address in Saigon.

Dr. Leeker also sent me a letter written by Colonel Haden Curry, USAF Air Attaché. The letter is self-explanatory and does not exactly indicate AAM support to the Air Force as a matter of course, but the interesting part is that all of the aircraft mentioned in the letter were actually U.S. Military aircraft on loan to Air America. The proof of that statement can be found in Dr. Leeker's collection of information about AAM aircraft that was previously sent to you. This letter corroborates my claim that AAM employees were assigned to SAR activity in Laos using U.S. Military aircraft for the purpose of saving U.S. Aircrews shot down over Laos.

One page from Dr. Leeker's collection is attached and labeled **Attachment A**. This page describes C-123 57-6293. According to his report this was a USAF aircraft that was transferred to Air America and assigned to contract AID-439-713. This page also

describes how the aircraft was destroyed, where the flight originated and what it was carrying. **Attachment B, 1 thru 5** is a partial preliminary accident report concerning 57-6293. One of the crewmember's names has been blacked out, but it is shown in attachment A. I don't know why it was blacked out, but the name is foreign and he was not an American. These attachments are telling. The aircraft was definitely a USAF aircraft. No other civilian aviation company used U.S. Military aircraft other than Air America that I am aware of. The AID assignment would seem to indicate that the operational intent was not military in nature. The fact it was a USAF aircraft that was carrying ammunition that was loaded by U.S. military personnel at a designated U.S. Military loading area would appear to prove that the mission was not AID. The undeniable fact and only explanation is that this aircraft was on a U.S. Military mission and operated by a civilian crew due to restraints contained in the 1962 Geneva Accords. Prima facie proof of support by AAM to the U.S. Military could be ascertained if the ammunition was being air freighted to U.S. military troops, but in my opinion this aspect is a matter of semantics. The obvious conclusion is that Air America was conducting U.S. Military operations most of the time with various methods used to disguise the operation that included, but was not limited to the wording on the contracts.

I am respectfully submitting this letter and the attachments to support my claim that CAT/Air America employees conducted operations in South East Asia that justifies eligibility for veteran status in accordance with the spirit intended by Congress in public law 95-202 and DoD Directive 1000.20.

Yours truly,

  
Allen Cates