



BOMBARDIERS

INCORPORATED

500 Jackson St., No. 1407
Daphne, AL 36526-7029

205/626-3920
Number the need for Factory
after voice check-in



John T. Correll
Don Rehl
W. Burr Bennett, Jr

Ben Nicks
Bill Rooney

2 June 1994
Frank Rabbitt
BGen Paul Tibbetts

First let me say to those who have been keeping me informed with copies of articles and/or letter exchanges--THANKS!

I hope that I am not intruding on a private circuit of exchange of information but felt that you would like to learn results of my meeting with A&SM employees. Note that I say "employees" as I believe this to be more applicable than "officials" or "authorities" with whom I had hoped to meet. In fact, the individual who invited me to visit with him, Tom Crouch, suddenly remembered that he had a planned family excursion and was unable to fulfill his appointment. A copy of Mr. Crouch's note, handed me as I arrived for the meeting, is appended. I have no way of knowing what happened to the promised possibility that Dr. Harwit would take a moment to meet me.

At 10AM on Friday, 27 May 1994, I, accompanied by my brother-in-law, Richard P. Szymanski, with whom I was staying, began a meeting with Joanne Gernstein, Tom Dietz and Mike Neufeld. The atmosphere was hostile and defensive from the beginning.

I explained my purpose in accepting Mr. Crouch's invitation was to have discussed, face-to-face, what I had editorialized to that time in *Crosshairs*, the newsmagazine of BOMBARDIERS, Inc.

Without going through the gory details of the slightly over one-hour session, which accomplished absolutely nothing, suffice to summarize as follows:

A). Every opinion point I advanced, relating to the fractured and unrestored status of Enola Gay or disputed aspects of the forthcoming display, was doggedly contradicted and their position unswervingly and emphatically defended. The only indication that they were 'listening' to an opinion, other than their own, surfaced with a somewhat pointed question to me of "how would you do it?"

B) In contrast to this 'firm and no-listen posture', dominant during our meeting, were frequent references by Mr. Neufeld to other revisions made to date. He alluded to information contained in Mr. Crouch's note to me which said A&SM was "...making some carefully considered alterations to the draft script", after meeting with "...representatives of the military service history programs". I was provided a copy of a layout sketch of the display dated 28 March 1994 and entitled "Rev. 25", copy enclosed.

C) Mr. Neufeld made an unwarranted verbal assault upon the character, qualifications and professional capability of Air Force magazine editor-in-chief, John T. Correll.

Upon hearing Mr. Neufeld bitterly assail and demean the qualifications of Editor Correll to write as he recently did, I asked Mr. Neufeld if he had discussed with or otherwise



apprised, Editor Correll of the challenges and accusations he was now making. After a pregnant and somewhat embarrassing silence, Mr. Neufeld softly replied "No".

I advised him that I took personal affront with his character assassination of Mr. Correll in view of the latter's established position of respect, proven qualifications and the esteem in which I hold him as a fellow member of the Air Force Association, and did I have his permission to pass on to Mr. Correll his words? He again replied "no".

At this juncture I stated that I saw no further need for us to continue the meeting and prepared to depart. I advised them to cancel our appointment to go to the Garber building to see the carcass of the Enola Gay. As we were escorted from the meeting site, Ms. Gernstein offered me her personal apologies for the "militant tone" used by her. Mr. Neufeld then advised me that "I could convey to Mr. Correll what he had said about him.", which I now offer should there be interest by Mr. Correll.

That's my story. Enclosed find a copy of their handout showing changes incorporated in their display plans and a copy of the memo relating to Crouch's absence which was handed me as we met at the A&SM. I intend to editorialize further on the overall subject.

Some fall-out odds and ends:

1) Neufeld estimates that the Enola Gay won't be assembled and installed in its projected 'home' at Dulles, until 2000 or later;

2) Neufeld ridiculed my suggestion to put famous warbirds (aircraft) on the National Register. His position: Who can provide better 'protection' than the A&SM? Appears to me (I have passed this thought separately to Bill Rooney who indicated he would dig out salient factors) that action seeking to place the Enola Gay on the Register might superimpose some now-absent authority over the A&SM which would result in directed completion of restoration for the now dissected bird!

3) My gut feeling is that constituent appeal to congressmen is the best way to divert interest and support on the subject of the Enola Gay back to, first, complete restoration; and, second, then talk about its proper permanent display as a national monument of sorts. It is crystal clear that pressures to restore have been side-tracked in deference to the controversial display planned. Taking the Enola Gay out of its dissected status should become a prioritized requirement!

4) As I watch the myriad of television coverage of events memorializing the 50th anniversary of D-Day I am struck by the difference of adulation given the fallen enemy in Europe against that planned for the defeated enemy in the Pacific! One could easily conclude that visitors to the A&SM display ['The Crossroads': The Enola Gay Exhibit in 1995-96] will be required to leave their shoes at the door!

Best Wishes To Each of You,

Ned Humphreys

Ned Humphreys
Col. E.C., Jr. USAF Ret.