

MILITEC-1[®]

MILITEC INCORPORATED

11828 Pika Drive, Waldorf, Maryland 20602 USA

Phone (301) 893-3910 Fax: (301) 893-8354

Internet: www.militec-1.com

November 19, 2006

To: MG Nadeau, Commander, RDECOM-APG

From: Bradley Paul Giordani, President

Subj: Your response to Representative Hoyer's letter of June 16th.

Dear General Nadeau,

The delayed response of October 23rd strongly stated that MILITEC-1 Weapons Lubricant did not meet the requirements for a General Purpose Lubricant, (GPL), and lacked lubricating qualities for a weapons lubricant called CLP – Cleaner- Lubricant-Preservative. CLP provides three functions, where MILITEC-1 provides dry lubrication.

I have sent you several documents over the past year citing overwhelming evidence from our warfighters, federal agencies, including DIA, DCIS, NCIS, DEA, FBI, MDW, NDW and a host of others. Even military approved gun companies purchase, use and recommend MILITEC-1; however, they do not purchase, use or recommend the use of MilSpec CLP. The failure of CLP is also demonstrated by the **thousands of requisitions for MILITEC-1** through the Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) and **no demand for CLP**. Your people have now directed DSCR to tell our warfighters, including the Coast Guard, to order CLP when they requisition MILITEC-1 for their weapons. This is dangerous advice for our troops and demonstrates unethical conduct.

The reason you remain silent on real-world evidence and specific questions by members of Congress is because you base your entire argument on a series of wet-oil laboratory testing engineered by the same group at Picatinny-TACOM under your current command. **This same group gave birth to CLP back in the late 1970's is why it's still funded.**

1. You said in your Oct 23rd letter "MILITEC-1 **has never been approved** by the Army as a weapons lubricant". You are mistaken and below are the facts:
2. 18 September 1995 - DLA established three (3) new National Stock Numbers (NSN's) for MILITEC-1 in the 9150 Federal Supply Class (FSC). These new NSN's were established specifically for Weapons and Machine Shop Applications. Since 1993, MILITEC-1 was also listed in the FSC of 6150. Maurice LePera, the former executive head of Fuels and Lubes allowed these new NSN's for MILITEC-1 to be **created for two specific applications** as a weapons and machine shop lubricant only. I have current evidence from a DSCR FOIA where the Army refers to and buys millions of dollars worth of MILITEC-1 as a weapons lubricant. Our packaging is also specific and **not general purpose**.
3. You also wrote, "we are confident in the performance of CLP weapons lubricants approved by the Army for use in a desert environment" The facts are: **CLP has never been tested in a real-word desert environment**, Aberdeen Proving Ground tested and failed CLP back in 1983, plus there is **no demand for CLP**.
4. The other problem your labs have is the simulated testing using silica mesh 140 grade flour to simulate real sand. This is a necessary control feature your folks use to predict the outcome in their controlled environment. **Troops in combat do not get their weapons exposed to lab flour-they get exposed to real-world sand.**

5. I understand your command feels the only reason we get so many emails (and your command does not) from our troops is because we provide a free service. Did you know Soldiers get CLP for free? The Army provides this particle-containing oil that must be shaken like a cocktail. Troops have ordered from us every day since OEF, because **MILITEC-1 works, and not because it's free.**
6. The bottom line is this: For CLP to be effective in the desert it must be used wet. Your specifications require CLP to be present (wet oil on an M-16) for the proper performance of weapons in a desert environment. If you do this, **as you stated at the Pentagon on May 19, 2006** you must **“clean your weapon up to eight (8) times a day”**, even though you have never fired a shot. When MILITEC-1 is used, weapons do not require daily cleaning. Also, disassembling a perfectly good weapon up to 8 times a day **is an impossible standard to meet**, plus it's dangerous to have so many weapons out of operation that have not been used, but may be needed at a moment's notice.

Weapons must be carried dry and covered when not in use. The wet oil on gunmetal makes this impossible because it holds dust and sand to gunmetal at friction points.

Weapons manuals that establish the proper application of CLP to gunmetal in a desert environment **have not been published for our troops.** This is due to the following reasons:

- (A) CLP and all other MilSpec Lubricants cannot be used wet in a desert environment (they trap dust and sand).
- (B) If all excess oil is removed (dry weapon), CLP is ineffective (lack of lubrication).
- (C) This “Catch-22” situation (wet weapons don't work, but CLP can't be used dry) means there cannot be a proper way to apply CLP in the desert.

In desert combat environments weapons must be capable of firing thousands of rounds between disassembly and cleaning in order to survive sustained gun-fights.

If AMC-RDECOM has any evidence on CLP or GPL working in Iraq and/or Afghanistan or evidence that it's preferred (requisitions and orders) by our warfighters, please share this with us so we can get off this subject of whether or not CLP really works in a real-world desert environment and not just in a laboratory environment controlled by your down line.

As you know, what works in the field (user acceptance) is the final proving ground for all new-product acceptance. MILITEC-1 works in the field, but fails your wet-oil lab-flour **closed-door testing.** CLP passes your lab tests, however, flunks in the field. This is the reality, so what do you do when there is overwhelming field evidence that does not correlate to wet-oil testing results inside a laboratory? Do you send troops into battle with a product that has only been tested in a laboratory? Or do you send troops into battle with a product that has passed the test of time in combat by Army divisions?

We are looking forward to **any evidence on the use of CLP in the field.** CLP has been the “Army standard” for 26 years, so there should be (1) ample email evidence from theater (2) after-action reports favoring CLP, (3) federal agency or weapons manufacturers' endorsements (4) favorable field reports on CLP.