

FOIA REQUEST
CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT P 490 735 915

4 February 1986

Department of Defense
Defense Investigative Service
3452 E. Foothill Blvd., St 200
Pasadena, CA 91107

Dear Sir:

I am aware that I was/am under investigation by your agency.

This is a formal Freedom Of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) request for any and all data on me and my activities, both real and imagined, that have been collected by your agency.

To assist you in your search, my particulars are:


Lee Marvin Graham
526 West Maple
Monrovia, California 91016
Social Security Number 551-44-0616
Aerojet Identification 42689
Aerojet Department 4467, Building 200.

Sincerely,

Lee M. Graham
Lee M. Graham

State of California ss
County of Los Angeles

On the 4th day of February, 1986, before me, Norman N. Holt, the undersigned Notary Public, personally appeared Lee Marvin Graham, personally know to me to be the person who attested and swore that all the information contained in the above instrument is accurate, and acknowledge that Lee Marvin Graham executed the same for the purposes therein contained.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and official seal.



FOIA REQUEST



A-2

DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE
1900 HALF ST., S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20324-1700

8 APR 1986

Mr. Lee M. Graham
526 West Maple
Monrovia, CA 91016

Dear Mr. Graham:

On February 18, 1986, this office received your notarized form of February 4, 1986.

At the current time you are the subject of a personnel security investigation being conducted by this agency. The rules established by this Department of Defense component in implementing the Privacy Act of 1974 preclude our providing you with copies of this investigation before it is completed.

Upon completion of the investigation, the releasable contents of our file will be made available to you.

If you have any questions regarding these procedures, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dale L. Hartig", is written over the typed name.

DALE L. HARTIG
Chief, Office of Information
and Public Affairs

4 August 1987
Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) Request/Appeal
CHARLES N. WILSON
Records Manager
Department of the Air Force
Headquarters 93d Combat Support Group
Castle Air Force Base, CA
95342-5000

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Sir this letter is in response to your reply (see enclosure A); with regard to TWO copies of the "MAJESTIC-12" document that WERE "seized" from me by AFOSI agent JANICE E. HALGREN (see enclosure B) on July 10 1987, at Castle AFB.

Permit me to explain-

While on vacation my wife and I visited the Air Force Museum adjacent to Castle AFB. While at the indoor museum there, I chanced to get into a conversation with an elderly gentleman attendant about the authenticity of the "MAJESTIC-12" document. He suggested that I go next door to Castle AFB and contact the Adjutant General for he might be able to tell me if the document is genuine.

This I attempted to do but got involved with one security guard after another; higher and higher up the line until eventually I was asked to enter Castle AFB accompanied by THREE AFOSI agents.

I spent nearly THREE HOURS explaining how the "MAJESTIC-12" document came into my possession while my wife waited for me at the Air Force museum!

Upon surrendering the TWO copies of the "MAJESTIC-12" document that I had, I was given this receipt (see enclosure B) and was told that if the "MAJESTIC-12" document was a phony OR if it HAD been properly declassified; "It would be returned to me"; ostensibly with the proper declassification stamps to PROVE its authenticity.

While the AFOSI agent (Halgren) was examining some other documentation I had in my possession, from the same source as the "MAJESTIC-12" document; I was inadvertently(?) provided a copy of the regulations which bade the seizure of the "MAJESTIC-12" document from me. Upon noting that the regulations were not a part of my inspected belongings, I returned them to another of the AFOSI agents there.

When I did not receive word or the return of my documents, I called a gentleman (Maj. GARY K. HAGER) at Norton AFB, whos name HAD been given to me by one of the AFOSI agents at Castle AFB. I told him of the incident and he laughed at the idea that anyone in AFOSI at Castle AFB would seize a document ("MAJESTIC-12") that purports the crash of an object of obvious extraterrestrial origin including the cadavers of 4 "extra-terrestrial- biological-entities". I told him that I believed that I should make a FOIA for the return and AUTHENTICATION of the "MAJESTIC-12" documents and he stated that that was the proper thing to do!

I acted in good faith! My simple intention was to authenticate or repudiate the "MAJESTIC-12" document as HAD been suggested to me at the Air Force Museum. Your response (see enclosure A), however, neglects to mention ANY of the FACTS and simply implies that I am requesting a "copy of regulations" and "whether such information exists"; THAT IS NOT THE CASE! I only made a request for "YOUR" (AFOSI) regulations because I SAW THEM! "YOU" (AFOSI) used them to seize my documentation; i.e., the "MAJESTIC-12" copies that I had shown to "YOUR" people! Your letter is an OBFUSCATION and evades the WHOLE issue; I, therefore respectfully request-

1. The immediate return of my TWO "MAJESTIC-12" documents WITH THE APPROPRIATE DECLASSIFICATION STAMPS!


2. An explanation as to why ANYONE should be treated in a manner that implies that the United States Air Force MUST resort to deception and evasion to a simple question- "Can you tell me if this document is authentic?"

Sir This IS the UNITED STATES of AMERICA not the Soviet Union!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely

Lee M. Graham
Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, CA
91016



THUNDER SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION

Bennewitz
8-80

28 AUG 1980

9-2-80

MR JIM LORENSEN
APRO
3910 E KLEINDALE RD
TUCSON ARIZONA 85712

DEAR JIM,

I WAS PLEASED TO HAVE YOUR ASSISTANCE IN STRAIGHTENING OUT OUR PROBLEM WITH LEO - AS YOU THINK SO DO I - THE VICTIM IS ABSOLUTELY TOP PRIORITY.

THE SITUATION HERE IS SERIOUS BUT NOT OUT OF HAND - SHE IS GETTING THE BEST OF TREATMENT BY THE PATHOLOGIST AND THE DOCTOR AT NO COST TO HER, FOR AN APPARENT ALIEN BACTERIA. WE ARE TRYING TO CULTURE IT - NO LUCK AS YET; ALSO IT HAS EVADED ALL OF OUR KNOWN ANTIBIOTICS AND PENICILLIN.

SHE IS ALSO BEING BADLY BEATEN ON BY THE ALIEN WITH THEIR BEAMS - 24 HOURS A DAY. THESE BEAMS HAVE BEEN MEASURED AND WE ARE NOW GETTING A HANDLE AS TO WHAT THEY MAY BE.

FILM FOOTAGE IS PILING UP - OVER 1000 FEET NOW - SCIENTIFIC DATA AND DOCUMENTATION EXCELLENT AND PILING UP.

JIM, IF YOU COULD POSSIBLY OBSERVE THE FOLLOWING PRECAUTIONS IN ANY OF YOUR PRESENT AND FUTURE REGRESSIONS YOUR DATA WILL BE MORE ACCURATE.

- 1) USE AS MANY DIFFERENT EXPERT PSYCHOLOGISTS AS POSSIBLE.
 - 2) DO NOT REGRESS UNLESS:
 - A) THERE IS AN UNBIASED WITNESS ACQUAINTED WITH THE PROCESS - PRESENT TAKING VERBATIM NOTES IF POSSIBLE.
 - B) THE REGRESSION MUST BE DONE IN A SHIELDED ENCLOSURE. THE BEST OPTIONS I'M AWARE OF ARE:
 - 1A) AN AUTOMOBILE IN A GARAGE - USE 3 LAYERS OF HEAVY ALUMINUM (BARBEQUE TYPE) FOIL TO COVER ALL WINDOWS - GROUNDED TO THE CHROME TRIM AROUND THE WINDOWS THOROUGHLY. MASKING TAPE CAN BE USED TO HOLD IT IN PLACE.
- PRECAUTION: DO NOT GROUND THE AUTO.

IF THE ALIEN SENSES HE CANNOT GET THROUGH, HE WILL ATTEMPT TO MODULATE THE BEAM ULTRASONICALLY - ABOUT 18 TO 23 KC. THE INTENT IS TO VIBRATE THE ATMOSPHERE WITHIN, SYMPATHETICALLY, THUS REACHING THE VICTIM. CLOSED WINDOWS AND COTTON IN THE EARS WILL DEADEN THIS REASONABLY EFFECTIVELY.

- 2A) THE VERY BEST OPTION IS TO USE AN X-RAY ROOM. IT IS LEAD SHIELDED; A TWO STORY OR LARGER BUILDING WHERE THE ROOM IS TOTALLY SHIELDED. NOT A ONE STORY BUILDING BECAUSE GENERALLY THE CEILING WILL NOT BE SHIELDED. INSPECT AND MAKE CERTAIN THE ROOM IS SHIELDED.

- 3A) LAST AND LEAST BEST OPTION - A HOTEL ROOM IN A MULTI-STORY HOTEL WITH THE ROOM ON AN INSIDE CORRIDOR MIDWAY OR SO UP. ANYONE TAKEN TO THE ROOM SHOULD NOT KNOW NOR LOOK AT THE FLOOR NUMBERS OR ROOM NUMBERS. THIS TYPE OF ROOM IS OBVIOUSLY NOT SHIELDED - CONCRETE OR STONE WILL NOT WORK. THIS IS A METHOD OF "CLOAKING" BECAUSE OF THE MANY OTHER MINDS PRESENT IN THE HOTEL, THE ALIEN IS CONFUSED AND WILL HAVE DIFFICULTY SEARCHING OUT THE VICTIM.

I KNOW I DON'T NEED TO RE-EXPRESS HOW SERIOUS THIS IS. PLEASE INSTIGATE THESE PROCEDURES IF AT ALL POSSIBLE. YOUR DATA WILL BE ACCURATE, MUCH MORE DETAILED AND WITHOUT CONTAMINATIVE PROGRAMMING.

THE APPARENT PRIME INTENT OF THE ALIEN IS TO INSTILL A FEELING SUPPOSEDLY OF THEIR TRUE BENEVOLENCE THRU THE VICTIM, WHEN IN REALITY WITH THIS PARTICULAR ALIEN CULTURE, EXPLORING AND ENCOUNTERING ON EARTH, THE INTENT IS TRULY MALEVOLENT IN ITS WORST SENSE.

I WOULD SUGGEST IF YOU CAN DO IT QUIETLY, THAT YOU RELAY THESE GROUND RULES FOR REGRESSION TO OTHER UFO ORGANIZATIONS, ASKING THEM, AT LEAST AT THIS POINT NOT TO QUESTION - JUST TRY TO DO IT THIS WAY.

WE MUST TAKE A VERY SERIOUS INVESTIGATORY POSITION ON DOCUMENTING IN AS GREAT A DETAIL AS POSSIBLE. I AM BASING EVERYTHING I TELL YOU ON A SOLID, TRIED AND WORKING HYPOTHESIS, NOT ON IMAGINATION, GUESSING NOR PARANOIA. I CAN ASSURE YOU IT IS NOT A BEAUTIFUL "RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE" THAT SOME INVESTIGATORS WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE. THERE ARE ALWAYS SOME "GOOD APPLES" IN ANY BAD BASKET - HOPEFULLY SOONER OR LATER WE WILL ENCOUNTER SOME OF THOSE AND FIND SOME ALLIES.

AGAIN - TO LEND CREDIBILITY WHEN FINAL GOVERNMENT ACCESS IS GAINED - NONE OF WHAT I'VE DISCUSSED MUST GET TO THE MEDIA. LEO'S IDEA OF VIDEO TAPING FOR TV AND PUBLICATION WILL ONLY CREATE PROPAGANDA FOR THE ALIEN - IT IS SELF DEFEATING. WHEN THE FINAL ABSOLUTELY PROVEABLE FACTS ARE GLEANED, WE MUST CAREFULLY CONTROL THEIR PRESENTATION TO THE PROPER AUTHORITIES.

I WILL APPRECIATE ANY FEEDBACK YOU CAN GIVE ME CONCERNING THE NEW REGRESSIONS YOU MENTIONED, METHODS, ETC. WHEN YOU HAVE THE DATA FOR CORRELATIVE PROCEDURES.

BEST REGARDS,



PAUL F BENNEWITZ
1413 WAGONTRAIN DR SE
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87123
505-298-1609

P.S. ONE LAST THING - A MUST IF THE HOTEL ROOM IS USED. PLACE AN EKG ELECTRODE (WITH RUBBER STRAP) ON THE RIGHT INSIDE MID FOREARM. PRIOR TO APPLICATION - WET THE CONTACT AREA WITH SALIVA OR SALINE SOLUTION. OUR MOST RECENT REGRESSION TAPES INDICATE NO ALIEN INTERFERENCE USING THIS METHOD IN A HOTEL ROOM.

USE A BANANA PLUG AND HEAVY WIRE TO GROUND TO ROOM OUTLET HOTEL GROUND SYSTEM.

26 June 1989

Mr. GRANT R. CAMERON
649 Silverstone Ave.
Winnipeg Man R3T 2U8
Canada

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Sir, as I have stated in my letter (see enclosure A) to your colleague Mr. T. SCOTT CRAIN, I wish also to state to you-

Thank you Sir for recognizing my efforts to attempt to authenticate the MJ-12 Briefing document and the Project Aquarius document.

I am, however, curious about something. In Mr. CRAIN's response (see enclosure B) he states-

"Your Hastings/Klass data is quite interesting, and no, Klass has not shared all the enclosures you have forwarded to us for inspection. However, Cameron has recently been corresponding with him."

Mr. CAMERON, Sir, I just received this letter (see enclosure C) from Mr. PHILIP J. KLASS, in which his questions would seem to indicate that you have provided him with the material that I had sent to you.

While I have NO problem with ANYONE obtaining the facts (including Mr. KLASS), I do have reservations as to how Mr. KLASS intends to use the material I have provided you. Those reservations are based upon the fact that Mr. KLASS does NOT report things in the manner that they occur. Rather, he selects pieces that support his own hypothesis in which he sees himself as some sort of UFO expert, the laurels of which no one else has a right to challenge.

I am prepared to accept the fact that the documents that I have been provided (i. e., the BRIEFING DOCUMENT OPERATION MAJESTIC 12 and the PROJECT AQUARIUS document) may be phoney. I HAVE in public challenged Mr. KLASS to go the FBI, the NSC, the AFOSI, etc., whomever he chooses, whom he feels is capable of Officially (I repeat OFFICIALLY) repudiating these documents but he will not do it. Instead, he uses (I repeat USES) bits and pieces of information in which he weaves a

kind of scenario suggesting to his audience that they would be stupid if they accepted these documents as authentic.

It is my personal opinion that the man is not honest!

I, however, will permit you to decide for yourself-

Here (see enclosure D) is a letter dated "18 September 1986" that I wrote to Mr. KLASS. In it I state-

"On several occasions I have asked you to confirm the existence of a Mach 6 aircraft I have alleged to be the deployed/operational replacement to the USAF/Lockheed SR-71 Blackbird."

Mr. CAMERON, Sir, I am assured that the United States Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) knows that I know that such an aircraft exists. I have made numerous Freedom of Information Act requests as to the existence of this aircraft and HAVE reported the fact that I have made such requests to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I BELIEVE in my COUNTRY and our right to deploy such an aircraft to protect our liberty! And, while as an aircraft buff, I would love to have a photograph (suitable for framing) of this aircraft, if ANYONE (including Mr. KLASS) provided me with an unauthorized copy of same, I would turn him in to the authorities.

Thus, so saying, I ask you Mr. CAMERON to ask Mr. KLASS the following SPECIFIC questions-

1. Does the Mach 6 aircraft exist?
2. If you have knowledge that it does, will you apologize to Mr. Graham for making fun of him?

Thank you for your time Mr. CAMERON.

Sincerely



Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, CA
91016

24 August 1987
Mr. Lee Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, Ca.
91016

Dear Mr. Graham,

Thank-you so much for the stuff you sent along. After a brief review I have put together a couple of items that you might or might not have. I hope I can provide you with quality material like you have provided me. Here however the renewed search for documents has only recently been restarted after a couple of years silence. The MJ-12 stuff, authentic or not has provided a number of new leads.

I will provide material to you as I come across it, because at present I am under piles of mostly unfiled material.

Most of what I am involved with at present deals with the Bush reference in the 1950 Smith memo, and with trying to find out what material was passed to the Canadians through the military/scientific liason that had been set up.

1) Enclosed you will find the Sarbacher material that I have at the present time. I have only been collecting this for a couple of weeks, so there will be more. There is a document missing as in the interview with Smith, Sarbacher does not mention Bush, and in the correspondence with William S. Steinman and Robert Bletchman he does not state that Bush was the "head of a small group". I am at present trying to find out where Smith got this info.

2) Enclosed some of the material I have establishing the liason between MacKenzie and Bush, and between J. Tuzo Wilson (who worked with Smith on Project Magnet) and Lloyd Berkner. Wilson, if you read the Smith memo again was one of the "specialized personnel" provided by the National Resesrch Council of which MacKenzie was the head.

3) Regarding the Project Aquarius material. We can probably help each other here, as there is one aspect of this that I have been after for a number of years. It regards what is listed in your document as project SIGMA. There is a case that follows the description given. I will relate the story as it was told to me.

a) Enclosed a newspaper article outlining a top secret project to contact aliens. Keyhoe also relates this affair, and states that USAF intelligence knew about it. (I have never heard of anyone filing a FOIA request on this). After figuring what might have actually happened, I checked my version with Mrs. Smith who confirmed it. Wilbert B Smith was in contact with AFFA. Somehow he convinced the Canadian government that AFFA would land if the Air force would not try to shoot it down. Arrangements were made. The C.A.F. and the R.C.M.P. agreed to allow the craft to land, with no interference. Smith relayed this to AFFA, who then wanted a guarantee that he would be allowed to take off once the communication had taken place. The R.C.M.P. agreed, but after a long meeting the Defence people of whoever was handling the other end, would not give the needed guarantee. AFFA called the whole thing off. The government is now able to tell a fairly accurate account. Nothing ever landed.

At the same time a Mrs. Swan was in contact with AFFA. Smith spent many years traveling to interview Mrs. Swan. (see enclosures) I will have a more complete version of what happened with Mrs. Swan as I have an interview with Mr. Buchanan in a couple weeks.

Through Admiral Knowles Navy Intelligence and the C.I.A. become involved. W. Todd Zechel tells his version of the story (see encl.) The year is 1959. I wrote Zechel telling him that there was more to the story than he had written, but I did not get a response. Lundahl who fed the story to Zechel also was involved in the 1952 Washington piece that came to Canada for Smith to analyse. Zechel has some good documentation on that as well. (Again I don't think a FOIA request was ever filed to obtain material on the Swan case. There is the rumor that they are still in contact with her.

The Defence people here have now unofficially denied the landing base affair. I have enclosed the request I made last week for records.

4) With regard to the Stealth Fighter I enclose a document that came from a radar file. I always knew these documents would interest someone.

5) Lastly a couple of hours ago I showed your documents to my father who related that a U-2 had crashed here in Canada between 1957-1961 in the area of Meadow Lake or Lake la Ronge in Northern Saskatchewan. The Americans closed off the area with armed guards and would not even allow the Canadian Accident Investigator near the sight. The investigator sent a cable to Ottawa, and was told to back off. I didn't push the whole thing as my father is not too anxious to become involved in any of this nonsense. Have you heard anything of the Blue Beret types in Canada. I don't even know how they knew it was a U-2.



P.S. regarding Sarbacher documents & Steinman's letter. Dr. Eric Walker's name was obtained from Friedman request for info to Canadian Defense.



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS
BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, DC 20332-6001

AUG 17 1987

Mr Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia CA 91016

Dear Mr Graham

This is in response to your 20 July 1987 request for information which was referred to us by Headquarters 93D Combat Support Group, Castle Air Force Base (AFB), California. We received your request on 5 August 1987.

The documents you relinquished to SA Janice Halgren, AFOSI Detachment 1902, Castle AFB on 10 July 1987 were forwarded to HQ AFOSI for review as Detachment 1902 was concerned about the possible compromise of classified information and could not assess the authenticity of the documents. Following receipt of the documents at this HQ, it was discovered that the documents in question have apparently been widely circulated among the news media as well as other UFO enthusiasts. Based on this apparent wide dissemination and the fact that the documents are not purported to have originated within the USAF or AFOSI, no attempt was made to determine their authenticity. Since at the time, we were not aware that SA Halgren had provided you a receipt for the documents and we no longer had a need for those documents, as they were duplicates of documents previously furnished by you as well as others, they were destroyed. Personnel at Detachment 1902 advised they did not retain a copy of the documents.

We regret that the documents you released to Detachment 1902 cannot be returned; however, as stated above, we are in possession of the copy of the documents you previously provided to us as attachments to your 21 June 1987 letter to HQ AFOSI/DADF. If you desire the return of those documents, please advise us.

Air Force Regulation 205-1, chapter 6, paragraph 102b governs the actions that were taken at the time the documents were obtained from you. You may obtain a copy of this regulation from the Publication Distribution Office (PDO) of any Air Force Installation.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Cecil W. Fry", is positioned above the typed name.

CECIL W. FRY, SA
Chief, Information Release Division
Directorate of Administration

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12356 OF NATIONAL
SECURITY INFORMATION

(April 1, 1982, 47 F.R. 14874)

This Order prescribes a uniform system for classifying, declassifying, and safeguarding national security information. It recognizes that it is essential that the public be informed concerning the activities of its Government, but that the interests of the United States and its citizens require that certain information concerning the national defense and foreign relations be protected against unauthorized disclosure. Information may not be classified under this Order unless its disclosure reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security.

NOW, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Part 1

Original Classification

Section 1.1 *Classification Levels.*

(a) National security information (hereinafter "classified information") shall be classified at one of the following three levels:

(1) "Top Secret" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause exceptionally grave damage to the national security.

(2) "Secret" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause serious damage to the national security.

(3) "Confidential" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by statute, no other terms shall be used to identify classified information.

(c) If there is reasonable doubt about the need to classify information, it shall be safeguarded as if it were classified pending a determination by an original classification authority, who shall make this determination within thirty (30) days. If there is reasonable doubt about the appropriate level of classification, it shall be safeguarded at the higher level of classification pending a determination by an original classification authority, who shall make this determination within thirty (30) days.

Sec. 1.2 *Classification Authority.*

(a) *Top Secret.* The authority to classify information originally as Top Secret may be exercised only by:

(1) the President;

(2) agency heads and officials designated by the President in the Federal Register; and

(3) officials delegated this authority pursuant to Section 1.2(d).

(b) *Secret.* The authority to classify information originally as Secret may be exercised only by:

(1) agency heads and officials designated by the President in the Federal Register;

(2) officials with original Top Secret classification authority; and

(3) officials delegated such authority pursuant to Section 1.2(d).

(c) *Confidential*. The authority to classify information originally as Confidential may be exercised only by:

- (1) agency heads and officials designated by the President in the Federal Register;
- (2) officials with original Top Secret or Secret classification authority; and
- (3) officials delegated such authority pursuant to Section 1.2(d).

(d) *Delegation of Original Classification Authority*.

(1) Delegations of original classification authority shall be limited to the minimum required to administer this Order. Agency heads are responsible for ensuring that designated subordinate officials have a demonstrable and continuing need to exercise this authority.

(2) Original Top Secret classification authority may be delegated only by the President; an agency head or official designated pursuant to Section 1.2(a)(2); and the senior official designated under Section 5.3(a)(1), provided that official has been delegated original Top Secret classification authority by the agency head.

(3) Original Secret classification authority may be delegated only by the President; an agency head or official designated pursuant to Sections 1.2(a)(2) and 1.2(b)(1); an official with original Top Secret classification authority; and the senior official designated under Section 5.3(a)(1), provided that official has been delegated original Secret classification authority by the agency head.

(4) Original Confidential classification authority may be delegated only by the President; an agency head or official designated pursuant to Sections 1.2(a)(2), 1.2(b)(1) and 1.2(c)(1); an official with original Top Secret classification authority; and the senior official designated under Section 5.3(a)(1), provided that official has been delegated original classification authority by the agency head.

(5) Each delegation of original classification authority shall be in writing and the authority shall not be redelegated except as provided in this Order. It shall identify the official delegated the authority by name or position title. Delegated classification authority includes the authority to classify information at the level granted and lower levels of classification.

(e) *Exceptional Cases*. When an employee, contractor, licensee, or grantee of an agency that does not have original classification authority originates information believed by that person to require classification, the information shall be protected in a manner consistent with this Order and its implementing directives. The information shall be transmitted promptly as provided under this Order or its implementing directives to the agency that has appropriate subject matter interest and classification authority with respect to this information. That agency shall decide within thirty (30) days whether to classify this information. If it is not clear which agency has classification responsibility for this information, it shall be sent to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office. The Director shall determine the agency having primary subject matter interest and forward the information, with appropriate recommendations, to that agency for a classification determination.

Sec. 1.3 Classification Categories.

(a) Information shall be considered for classification if it concerns:

- (1) military plans, weapons, or operations;
- (2) the vulnerabilities or capabilities of systems, installations, projects, or plans relating to the national security;

- (3) foreign government information;
 - (4) intelligence activities (including special activities), or intelligence sources or methods;
 - (5) foreign relations or foreign activities of the United States;
 - (6) scientific, technological, or economic matters relating to the national security;
 - (7) United States Government programs for safeguarding nuclear materials or facilities;
 - (8) cryptology;
 - (9) a confidential source; or
 - (10) other categories of information that are related to the national security and that require protection against unauthorized disclosure as determined by the President or by agency heads or other officials who have been delegated original classification authority by the President. Any determination made under this subsection shall be reported promptly to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office.
- (b) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be classified when an original classification authority also determines that its unauthorized disclosure, either by itself or in the context of other information, reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security.
- (c) Unauthorized disclosure of foreign government information, the identity of a confidential foreign source, or intelligence sources or methods is presumed to cause damage to the national security.
- (d) Information classified in accordance with Section 1.3 shall not be declassified automatically as a result of any unofficial publication or inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure in the United States or abroad of identical or similar information.

Sec. 1.4 Duration of Classification.

- (a) Information shall be classified as long as required by national security considerations. When it can be determined, a specific date or event for declassification shall be set by the original classification authority at the time the information is originally classified.
- (b) Automatic declassification determinations under predecessor orders shall remain valid unless the classification is extended by an authorized official of the originating agency. These extensions may be by individual documents or categories of information. The agency shall be responsible for notifying holders of the information of such extensions.
- (c) Information classified under predecessor orders and marked for declassification review shall remain classified until reviewed for declassification under the provisions of this Order.

Sec. 1.5 Identification and Markings.

- (a) At the time of original classification, the following information shall be shown on the face of all classified documents, or clearly associated with other forms of classified information in a manner appropriate to the medium involved, unless this information itself would reveal a confidential source or relationship not otherwise evident in the document or information:

- (1) one of the three classification levels defined in Section 1.1;

- (2) the level of classification, and the authority whose name is associated with the classification;
 - (3) the agency or agencies to which the information pertains;
 - (4) the date of the original classification determination.
- (b) Each document shall be marked in portions to indicate the portions that may be declassified, and the portions that may not be declassified. The portions that may be declassified shall be marked with the word "FOUO" (For Official Use Only) and the portions that may not be declassified shall be marked with the word "TOP SECRET".
- (c) Markings shall be made in accordance with the following directives:
- (d) Foreign government information, the identity of a confidential foreign source, or intelligence sources or methods shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (e) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (f) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (g) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (h) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (i) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (j) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (k) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (l) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (m) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (n) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (o) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (p) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (q) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (r) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (s) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (t) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (u) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (v) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (w) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (x) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (y) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".
 - (z) Information that is determined to concern one or more of the categories in Section 1.3(a) shall be marked "TOP SECRET".

Part 2

Derivative Classification

Sec. 2.1 Use of

- (a) Derivative classification is the process of marking information with classification markings that are already used on the same information.

(2) the identity of the original classification authority if other than the person whose name appears as the approving or signing official;

(3) the agency and office of origin; and

(4) the date or event for declassification, or the notation "Originating Agency's Determination Required."

(b) Each classified document shall, by marking or other means, indicate which portions are classified, with the applicable classification level, and which portions are not classified. Agency heads may, for good cause, grant and revoke waivers of this requirement for specified classes of documents or information. The Director of the Information Security Oversight Office shall be notified of any waivers.

(c) Marking designations implementing the provisions of this Order, including abbreviations, shall conform to the standards prescribed in implementing directives issued by the Information Security Oversight Office.

(d) Foreign government information shall either retain its original classification or be assigned a United States classification that shall ensure a degree of protection at least equivalent to that required by the entity that furnished the information.

(e) Information assigned a level of classification under predecessor orders shall be considered as classified at that level of classification despite the omission of other required markings. Omitted markings may be inserted on a document by the officials specified in Section 3.1(b).

Sec. 1.6 Limitations on Classification.

(a) In no case shall information be classified in order to conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error; to prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency; to restrain competition; or to prevent or delay the release of information that does not require protection in the interest of national security.

(b) Basic scientific research information not clearly related to the national security may not be classified.

(c) The President or an agency head or official designated under Sections 1.2(a)(2), 1.2(b)(1), or 1.2(c)(1) may reclassify information previously declassified and disclosed if it is determined in writing that (1) the information requires protection in the interest of national security; and (2) the information may reasonably be recovered. These reclassification actions shall be reported promptly to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office.

(d) Information may be classified or reclassified after an agency has received a request for it under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) or the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), or the mandatory review provisions of this Order (Section 3.4) if such classification meets the requirements of this Order and is accomplished personally and on a document-by-document basis by the agency head, the deputy agency head, the senior agency official designated under Section 5.3(a)(1), or an official with original Top Secret classification authority.

Part 2

Derivative Classification

Sec. 2.1 Use of Derivative Classification.

(a) Derivative classification is (1) the determination that information is in substance the same as information currently classified, and (2) the application of the same classification markings. Persons who only reproduce, extract, or

NOTE!

National Archives



Washington, DC 20408

APR 20 1989

Honorable Alan Cranston
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Cranston:

This is in response to your inquiry of April 4, 1989, on behalf of Mr. Lee Graham concerning MJ12 documents.

The National Archives has received several inquiries concerning documents identified as "MJ12" and "Briefing Document: Operation Majestic 12." We have made extensive searches among the records in our custody of the U.S. Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to identify these documents. The Truman and Eisenhower Libraries have also searched their holdings for any references to, or copies of, the documents. In addition, the records of the National Security Council (NSC) for the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations are in the custody of the National Archives. A search was made of the indexes to the NSC's Policy Paper and Meeting Minute Files under the subjects MJ-12, majestic, unidentified flying objects, UFO, flying saucers, extraterrestrial biological entities and Aquarius. These searches were all negative with the exception of a "Memorandum for General Twining", from Robert Cutler, Special Assistant to the President, subject: "NSC/MJ12 Special Studies Project," dated July 14, 1954. The memorandum, one page, refers to a briefing to take place on July 16. The memorandum does not identify MJ12 or the purpose of the briefing.

We are returning the enclosure forwarded with your inquiry, as requested.

We hope this information is of assistance. If there are any further questions, the staff of our Military Reference Branch would be pleased to help. Your constituent may contact them by writing to the Military Reference Branch (NNRM), National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408. The telephone number is (202) 523-3340.

Sincerely,

Trudy Muskamp Peterson
TRUDY MUSKAMP PETERSON
Assistant Archivist
for the National Archives
(202) 523-3130

Enclosure

5 May 1987
DALE L. HARTIG
Chief, Office of Information
and Public Affairs
Defense Investigative Service
1900 Half St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20324-1700

Dear Dear Mr. Hartig:

Sir I am writing to you because of your statement- "If you have any questions regarding the contents of your file or the information released to you, please feel free to contact my office." (see enclosure A para. 8).

On Saturday May 2, 1987 I received THIS documentation (see enclosure B-B5) from my good friend William L. Moore. I am on the Board of Directors of the "Fair-Witness Project".

Please note enclosure B3; especially the names on page 002. This is the MJ-12 document that I related to your agents Alex Naval and James Kirk; I was briefly allowed to read a copy of the VERY SAME night that I was given a copy of this (another document (see enclosure D)).

It is this document (see enclosure D) that caused my security to alert you (see enclosure A3) AFTER I made a request to them to authenticate or repudiate it (see enclosure A2). Document D is one page of document B5.

On Monday morning May 4, 1987 I gave a copy of this material (see enclosure B-B6) to my security officer (Mr. Raymond J. Bader for reference. As I indicated, I had earlier reported the existence of this document (see enclosure B3) to Mr. Kirk and Mr. Naval. They had indicated that I should notify my security office or your office upon receipt thereof. I was interviewed by Mr. Kirk and Mr. Naval on 5/10/86 (see enclosure A2). I again reported the existence of this documentation to your agents Joe Moussiaux and Mat Bartellini on the 18th of Sept. 1986 (see enclosure E2 page 1 para. 4) when they interviewed Mr. Ron Regehr. Mr. Regehr and myself are both trying to authenticate or repudiate this material.

If you note the names found in this document (see enclosure B3 page 002) you will see that they are the same as those found in my letter to Barry Greenwood of 5 Oct. 1985 (see enclosure F page 3 para. 4).


Since I have made a concerted effort to inform you of my activities (see enclosure E-E3) and you have NOT asked me to

desist; I MUST presume that I have your permission to seek the authenticity of this documentation. Indeed; your letter (see enclosure A para. 7) states..."it is suggested you contact the agency that initially provided you with this document." This is AFTER I reported to your agents the identity of the source of the document (see enclosure A5 page 2). Noting these facts I would like to ask the following-

1. Are there governmental rules that require the removal of an alleged Top Secret document from circulation if such a document is suspected of being a phony?
2. Are there governmental rules that require the removal of an alleged Top Secret document from circulation if such a document has not been properly declassified?
3. Does the circulation of ANY of this material (see enclosure B1-B5, C, and D) violate any of the above rules?
4. Do you for ANY reason believe that this material (see enclosure B1-B5, C, and D) is not authentic?
5. Do Mr. Regehr and myself have the right to continue to attempt to authenticate this material (see enclosure B1-B5, C, and D); i. e., are we breaking any of the above rules?

Thank you for your time Sir.

Sincerely


Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, CA
91016

NOTE!



DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE
1900 HALF ST., S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20324-1700

(202) 475-1062

Mr. Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, CA 91016

MAY 29 1987

Dear Mr. Graham:

This is response to your letter of May 5, 1987, seeking information regarding rules pertaining to the classification and declassification of government documents, and information regarding a document in your possession.

The security offices in appropriate agencies maintain rules pertaining to the classification and declassification of documents containing sensitive information.

For your information, the Defense Investigative Service (DIS) is authorized to conduct personnel security investigations for the Department of Defense (DoD) components and other U.S. government agencies when authorized by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. Therefore, there is no reason for us to maintain information concerning aircraft and/or UFOs. In addition, you would not obtain permission from this agency to verify the authenticity of the documents you were provided.

As we explained to you previously in our letter of January 30, 1987, the document of concern to you did not originate with DIS. It is suggested you address your questions to the provider of the document or the U.S. Air Force.

We regret that we can be of no assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely,


DALE L. HARTIG
Chief, Office of Information
and Public Affairs

WILLIAM
L.
MOORE



26 March 1988

OPEN LETTER!!!

Mr. BARRY GREENWOOD
P.O. Box 218
Coventry, Conn. 06238

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

Sir, I just received my March 1988 copy of JUST CAUSE on Saturday 26 March 1988 and am responding with this "OPEN LETTER".

Why on earth do you bother to banter over details?

Sir, you are an intelligent individual!

I sent you an unexpurgated (I learned the word from Bill Moore) copy of the MJ-12 document on 17 March 1988 in all of its glory; i.e., it has "TOP SECRET" stamped all over it.

You know the rules; i. e., DoD 5200.1-R; I sent them to you on 17 March 1988.


Here is the telephone number (202-395-5756) of NANCY V. MENAN, Director, FOI/Mandatory Review Office, National Security Council; so turn me in for giving you a "TOP SECRET" document!

Here is the telephone number (202-475-1062) of DALE L. HARTIG, Chief, Office of Information and Public Affairs, Defense Investigative Service; so turn me in for giving you an as yet "UNCLASSIFIED" document!

Here is the telephone number (202-695-9495) of Col. BARRY HENNESSEY, Director, Special Projects, HQAFOSI; so turn me in for intentionally providing you with a copy of a "PHONEY/UNCLASSIFIED/TOP SECRET" document!

Sir, stop feeding your readers "BULL SHIT"! STOP SCREWING AROUND! DO SOMETHING OR GET OUT OF THE WAY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

YES, you can expect a copy of this letter to be sent to EVERYONE!

Lee M. Graham

526 W. Maple
Monrovia, CA 91016

3/29/88

BARRY J. GREENWOOD
6 W. HANCOCK ST.
STONEHAM, MASS. 02180

Dear Mr. Graham,

I am in receipt of your letter, with enclosures, of 17 March 88. I am still going through them and will comment soon. I have also received your exceptionally nasty letter (open) commenting on the March 88, Just Cause. Please circulate the open letter as you wish. You will have to answer for it's contents. My response is contained in issues of Just Cause / CAUS Bulletin since June 1987.

One preliminary comment - You interpret the following

MS quote: "When SUBJECT was asked how he obtained an unclassified document, formerly designated TOP SECRET, concerning Project Snowbird - - - " You believe this states the authenticity of the

Aquarius document. However, I believe they are simply describing the appearance of the document, stamped "TOP SECRET" with an "Unclassified" stamp as well. There was no release authority indicated on or with the document so how could the MS know where it came from? This is affirmed in their letter of 30 Jan 87 to you (your D1), it is fact their paragraph 7 refers to the Aquarius document.

Also you state that George Bush is the head of NT-12 while you have no more authority for this than Fate Magazine. And you proceeded to state this as fact to several government agencies. If I went to press with this "fact," I would surely be given the "bum's rush" as editors by a majority of CAUS readers.

I will have further remarks.

Regards
Barry Greenwood

P.S. Please comment on the enclosed paper

8 March 1988

LINDA MOULTON HOWE
3208 East Fremont Drive
Littleton CO 80122

Hi Linda:

Here (see enclosure A) is the document I promised you. Sorry about the poor quality. It was given to me by my good friend Ron Regehr.

This is Ron Regehr (see enclosure B). At work Ron is a Specifications Writer and I am an Electronic Systems Research Technician. Off of work Ron and I are a research team trying to authenticate or repudiate the documentation that Bill gave me. We have been working together for about 10+ years. We used to teach (at work) a Bible class together back when I was a "Fundamentalist" (see enclosure C-1).

Here is Mr. Philip J. Klass (see enclosure D-4). I was introduced to him once by Mr. Floyd Brown (Aerojet's Director of Public Communications, see enclosure D-5) on 14 Sep. 1986.

I have had a lot of correspondence with Mr. Klass (see examples D-6 through D-29); trying to get him to "OFFICIALLY" authenticate or repudiate the AQUARIUS/SNOWBIRD/MJ-12 documentation.

Here is my file (see enclosure E-1 through E-17). I believe that Mr. Klass is source A found in (see enclosure E-10 and E-11).

Bill Moore (see enclosure F) has told me that he has seen a letter from Mr. Klass to the Defense Investigative Service (DIS) that figures in the investigation that was conducted on me. Bill has promised that he will attempt to obtain a copy of this letter. I have already challenged the DIS about Mr. Klass's involvement (see enclosure G-16) but they have refused to respond to my request.

My proof that the "SNOWBIRD" document is authentic lies in the fact that the DIS closed my file (see enclosure E-1) AFTER they had made a determination (see enclosure E-15) that the "SNOWBIRD" document (see enclosure E-5) had been declassified. There are rules! They had to obey them!

This is why I am peeved at Mr. Barry Greenwood (see enclosure H-1 through H-7). He has the intelligence to realize the

above fact, but instead of publishing the information I gave him (as he did with you); he demurred and started worrying about his "credibility" rather than the truth.

One does not have to be a "specialist on govt. documents" (see enclosure H-6) to test the authenticity of the MJ-12 document. Just make a test like this one (see enclosure I-1 through I-14). AFOSI does not tolerate the circulation of phoney documents!

I do not know what Mr. Moore has told Mr. Greenwood about me or vice ver-sa, but Mr. Greenwood's 22 page vendetta against Mr. Moore did nothing to authenticate or repudiate the MJ-12 document. The American public simply lost a number of months time and we are still seeking the man with the "smoking gun".

I do believe that you should contact this individual (see enclosure C-1); tell him your story and repudiate this (see enclosure A) claim.

Awaiting a response.

Sincerely,

Lee M. Graham

Lee M. Graham

526 W. Maple

Monrovia, CA 91016

*NO
response!!!*

MUFON Mutual UFO Network, Inc.

WALTER H. ANDRUS, JR.
International Director

103 OLDTOWNE ROAD
SEGUIN, TEXAS 78155 U.S.A.
A Texas Non Profit Corporation

Telephone:
(512) 379 9216

THEODORE SCOTT CRAIN, JR.
State Section Director

June 7, 1989

Please Address Reply To:
T. SCOTT CRAIN, JR.

P.O. BOX 11
FORT MATILDA, PA 16870

Mr. Lee M. Graham
526 W. Maple
Monrovia, California 91016

Dear Mr. Graham:

Many thanks for your enclosures of May 20, May 21, 1989, and follow-up packets that were undated. Your persistence in attempting to authenticate the MJ-12 Briefing document as well as Project Aquarius document is to be admired.

Our paper on MJ-12 and the Government was near completion, until Grant Cameron gave me a call last week, telling me that William Moore has been in contact with him regarding the true story about the FALCON and Richard Doty. Grant and I have suspected for a couple of weeks now that Richard Doty, who was given the code name "FALCON" by William Moore, may be one of two FALCON'S.

Richard Doty may be a front man, as was Oliver North. Doty takes the heat while protecting the identity of the other one, who is the real Intelligence source. This would explain why Moore says Doty is not the real FALCON. Doty's position does not seem to correlate with him having access to highly sensitive military secrets, within the intelligence community. In any case, all this is speculative until we learn what revelations Bill Moore would like us to review before releasing our paper.

Now, to answer your questions in your May 21, 1989 letter. Yes, I am aware there are two different Aquarius documents circulating in the field. The Aquarius Telex is a one page document that Hastings referred to as the "Aquarius Document" is the one Moore retyped for clarity. Hastings may have been a little harsh with his perspective of Moore doing a cut and paste job, when in fact, as I understand it, it was only retyped. Have you ever asked Moore why he retyped it without presenting it that way, and does he or will he send you a copy of the original? Has he ever told you how he obtained this document? If you do discuss this matter with Moore, ask him if he changed parts of the document. For instance, rumor has it that the term "NASA" used in the document originally was "NSA." As I understand it, Moore made changes to avoid legal entanglements for circulating classified papers. I questioned Richard Hall about the letter appearing in Hastings report, who, by the way, was very upset that it was published without his permission, and he indicated that he didn't believe Moore actually created or reconstructed a document, but retyped one to make it more readable.

I have no evidence to refute your statement that you were the first to circulate to MJ-12 Briefing document, and no, I was not aware of your dinner meeting with Bill Moore and Timothy Good.

I was not previously aware of our government strategy to release sensitive materials in foreign country's first, and I did not know that Timothy Good and Al Frickey were friends. Obviously, Frickey is not his real name (or is it?) and his knowledge of aircraft is certainly interesting. Who is this Frickey and what are his credentials? Tell me more about him if you can.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

The Monthly Magazine of the Mutual UFO Network
DEDICATED TO THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

-2-

Your Hastings/Klass data is quite interesting, and no, Klass has not shared all the enclosures you have forwarded to us for inspection. However, Cameron has recently been corresponding with him.

In answering question 11, I would be hesitant to ask Hastings to meet with Moore, after all that has happened. Are you aware Moore phoned Hastings several times a day for several days and even showed up at Hastings house on March 15, 1989, uninvited and unexpected. Hastings would not let him in. Moore continued to call Hastings and threatened him with legal action. Hastings has already spoken to his lawyer about Moore's possible suit and reportedly will sue Moore in return, if the situation warrants it. Obviously, the atmosphere between these two researchers is not favorable for a meeting in the near future. Things will have to cool down first.


I appreciate your data on classification of classified data, and plan to mention it in our paper. Any other enclosures you have which you feel may be useful in our paper would be appreciated.

For your information, Mr. Graham, we are using some of your information in our paper which you forwarded to us. You are credited for the data used. I, personally, plan to mail you a free copy of our paper upon publication.

Thank you for your assistance.

Hope to hear from you again, soon.

Sincerely,



T. Scott Crain, Jr.