

documents available through the Defence Research Board of Canada. (Friedman: 50+ examples dated mostly before 1957)

-Letter from Adm. R.H. Hillenkoetter to Mr. W. Nagel, dated "14 December, 1970".

In disposing of Argument #1, it becomes somewhat apparent that use of this "peculiar" date format seems to center around individuals with either U.S. Navy or British/ Canadian/ NATO military background. Bedell Smith, for example, saw long-term service in Europe, and Hillenkoetter was both a career Navy man and a former military attache in France. Granted that this is circumstantial, but it may ultimately be significant as we shall see.

Argument #2 presents a somewhat different problem. To begin with, those who maintain that the use of a zero date format was "unheard of" or "unknown" in 1952 are demonstrably in error. The fact is that such usage was relatively common, and in some cases de rigueur, in certain limited circles, most notably U.S. Naval communications and European military message traffic originating within the British/ Canadian/ NATO sphere. (NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Western allies' answer to the growing communist military menace. It was entered into on August 24, 1949 by the U.S., Canada, and 10 Western European allies, with headquarters at Brussels, Belgium.) In support of this, note the material below, which is taken from JANAP 146, a 1951 U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff military regulation entitled "Communications Instructions for Reporting Vital Intelligence Sightings from Airborne and Waterborne Sources." (JANAP stands for "Joint Army, Navy, Air Force Publication". The communications regulations therein applied to both U.S. and Canadian military forces.) Note the explicit instructions on how to write dates and times.

"(Indicate) the date and time of the sighting, expressed by the use of six digits and the time zone suffix. The first two digits denote the date, the second two digits denote the hour and the third two digits denote the minutes of the hour. Greenwich Mean Time (GMT), must be used in all instances, and shall be indicated by the use of GMT or by the addition of Z to the date time group, i.e.:

071430Z

07 = Day of month
14 = Hour expressed in
24 hour time
30 = Minutes of the
hour
Z = Indication that
GMT is being used"

In addition, two different British ex-military sources have made the following comments in letters to British researcher Timothy

Good.

(1) "You raise the query that the prefix "O" as in "02 July 1947" was not used until modern computer technology was developed. I beg most strongly to differ. Certainly my experience in wartime in the Navy was that the "O" was a vital prefix whether in the date as in "02 July" or the hour as in "0300". I should think such methods were still used in NATO."

Donald McCormick, Royal Navy (Intelligence)
during World War II under Sir Ian Fleming

(2) "NATO documents always used the "O" in front of single date figures in my day."

Admiral of the Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton,
G.C.B.; Former Chief of British Defence
Staff.

Numerous examples of official communications documents have been found which employ this style. Here is a partial listing:

- Joint Communications Office, In Message, From: A.M. London, To: FAFDEL, Communications No. AIX 6328, Cypher Message (Secret). The item is dated "080800 Aug. 1947". Also, the text of the message contains the date "16th January, 1947".
- Naval Message from Cmdr. Wheelus, Tripoli, Libya to Cmdr. 86th ATS Rhein Main, Germany, dated 13 SEP 53. Distribution list indicates number of copies to be provided to "SEC NAV" is "05".
- Message, Dept. of the Army, Staff Communications Office, Msg. No. ADOCC 16, from Pepperrell AFB NFLD, to Dir of Intell USAF. Message is dated "042355Z SEP 53".
- Dept. of the Air Force, Staff Message Division, "EMERGENCY JEPHQ JEDEN JKADC... Etc." from Comdr. 64th AD Pepperrell AFB to JEPHQ... etc. Message bears the date "05/0412Z SEP JEXC" (1953). Text contains two references to dates which are given as "04" (meaning September 4th).
- Message similar to the above, the text of which contains the date "03/0400Z SEP JEXC" (1953).
- Message from Hamilton F/S Calif to Secy. of Defense, Wash. DC. Identifiers: HQD255 KTAU99 JWPJN 2165. Message is dated "03/2207Z APR" (1954).
- Memorandum for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Gen. Matthew Ridgway, dated "9 June 1954". Paragraph "D" of the document contains the phrase "...you agreed that if you were unable to contact the authorities mentioned and get their

clearance by 051800 EDT June 1954, you would dispatch...."
Also important here is the fact that the document is stamped
"Top Secret", "Eyes Only", and is identified as "Copy #2 of
Five Copies".

-Dept. of the Army, Staff Communications Office, Confidential
Priority (Book Msg), From: COMNEACOM PEPPERRELL AFB NFLD, To:
CSUSAF (for AFOIN 2A1), Msg. Nr. NEOIN 5313. Message is dated
"081733Z JUL 55" and marked "No Unclass Reply or Ref if DTG is
Quoted" ("DTG" means "Date Time Group".)

-TWX #43411003 from Wing Intelligence, Lawson AFB, Georgia, to
Directorate of Intelligence, USAF; subj: "Interrogation of Eye
Witnesses", (Restricted Security Information). Cover sheet
(pg.1) is dated "011830 DEC 52". Text on page 2, line 2 reads:
"Georgia at approximately 2120 hours on 21 November, 1952.
When...." This message was typed and transmitted by William
H. Blankfield, 2d Lt USAF. There is also attached a "Statement"
by A/1C (Airman First Class) Allen Salisbury, which begins, "On
Friday evening, 21 November, 1952, at approximately...."

Note that in several of the above cases, the date (with zero
preceding) has been separated from the rest of the DTG by a slash
mark (ref: "03/2207 APR"). Although such separation is not
specifically required by the communications regulations, it
clearly suggests that certain individuals were psychologically
concerned with creating a clear delineation between the day and
the time and thus created the slash in response to that concern.
The fact that we find it on messages from places as far apart as
California and Newfoundland indicates it was not limited to a
single individual.

Taking that tendency one step further, Canadian defence
communication documents make an even more distinct delineation.
Reference, for example, "Canadian Dept. of National Defence
Message from Defence Research Board, Ottawa Ontario, to DREL,
Kingston Ontario, File No. 53-DRP-5-P", which is dated

"01 2123 OCT 53"

with spacing precisely as indicated.

People whose assignment it was to routinely type such messages
into teletype machines day-in and day-out could easily fall into
using such a pattern when typing letters or other memoranda,
whether official or unofficial. Assuming that the "EB" is genuine,
and given the background of Admiral Hillenkoetter and the type of
individuals who would have surrounded him, it is entirely
reasonable to assume that the individual who typed the document
was accustomed to typing dates in just such a format. Given this
likelihood, and taking into account what we have already learned
about the typist from material presented above, the following
tentative conclusion can be drawn:

-Hillenkoetter himself did not type the "EB". Rather, he dictated it (perhaps into an early wire-recorder "Dictaphone") for transcription by an aide who typed it for him. In doing so, he may have dictated dates in the same communications format he was used to from his Navy and European experiences; or perhaps the typist was a communications officer who, accustomed to the use of such format over the years, had simply incorporated it into his or her personal style. Either of these is possible and neither is highly unlikely.

The conclusion is supported by the fact that the typist misspelled "liaison", a word which Hillenkoetter, given his background in french, is unlikely to have misspelled; and also by the odd splitting of the word "resulted", which is uncharacteristic of Hillenkoetter himself. It is also strongly supported by the linguistics analyses performed by both Dr. Wescott and Prof. Pival, since a transcription from dictation would do little to change the linguistic characteristics of the person doing the dictating.

Given the above, Argument #2 must be dismissed as fallacious as well since clearly the zero before a single-digit date format was in use, and had been for some years, in 1952. Although it must be granted that the date styles exhibited as Format "A" are "unusual", it is entirely possible (and not at all unreasonable) to postulate that someone, accustomed over a period of years to using the routine military communications format of the time, quite naturally developed the unusual hybrid style as a personal habit. Since both the zero before a single-digit format and the comma after the month can be demonstrated to have existed well before November, 1952, and both were obviously employed by large numbers of people (especially of the type likely to surround Hillenkoetter), those who continue to argue that the "EB" is a "crude fabrication" based upon the question of date formats do so with a paucity of evidence. These individuals argue that such a date format cannot have been. The evidence says it can.

Naturally the case for the document would be stronger if a likely candidate for the typist himself (or herself) could be identified. The importance of what we have done here, however, must not be dismissed lightly; for what we have done with the above is to completely shatter the debunkers' strongest argument against the possible authenticity of the "EB". The position they took was that the zero before the single-digit date, comma after the month, format "was not in use", "did not exist" and "was completely unknown" in 1952, hence the document must be a more modern fabrication. We have shown that such practices did exist and indeed that they were relatively common in some branches of the military. The argument now descends to whether the peculiar hybrid style displayed in the "EB" could have been reasonably adopted, or even temporarily employed, by someone accustomed to the communications format of the time. Human nature being what it is, we maintain that such an assumption is neither unreasonable nor excessively contrived. The bottom line here is that any

argument against the authenticity of the "EB" which attempts to use the date format as its basis is completely untenable.

IN DEFENSE OF MOORE

As for Argument #3, the evidence against Moore's having fabricated the "EB" speaks for itself and strongly supports his denial.

Consider:

- (A) Moore does not routinely spell "traveling" with a single "l", yet it is so spelled in the document.
- (B) Moore does not routinely spell "extra-terrestrial" with a hyphen, yet it is so spelled in the document.
- (C) It is highly unlikely that Moore, with a B.A. in french and a good working knowledge of the language, would misspell "liaison".
- (D) Consider date format "B" above, which has remained unmentioned until now (ref: "19 SEP '47."). Note that the period here does not end a sentence, but rather the date stands alone with the period as part of the date. While Moore has indeed used format "A" (along with a number of other formats) in writing letters for many years, he does not use format "B". Upon that basis alone, if the strictest standards of evidence are applied to the matter, the appearance of format "A" in both the "EB" and Moore's letters is reduced to mere coincidence and as such cannot be taken as acceptable evidence of anything.

Indeed (while on the question of date formats), since certain debunkers have continued to press the point it would seem that some greater depth of discussion is in order here. Therefore:

(1) Considering the so-called MJ-12 papers as a whole ("EB", "TM" & "CT"), there are no less than four different date formats employed therein; to wit:

- <A> "22 May, 1949"; or "01 August, 1950" ("EB")
- "30 NOV '47." ("EB")
- <C> "September 24, 1947." ("TM")
- <D> "July 14, 1954" ("CT")

If, as these debunkers argue, Moore's use of the first style was so ingrained as to have become an "unconscious" habit (15), how then to explain the co-existence here of other styles which Moore does not use? (Perhaps Moore slipped up once and then corrected himself, but didn't bother to erase his initial blunder?)

In order to determine Moore's habits in dating letters over the years, an extensive survey of

literally hundreds of copies of letters written by him over the space of an entire decade (mid-1978 through mid-1987) was undertaken. The end result produced a list of nineteen different variations which are set forth below along with the date of the earliest example of each usage that was discovered:

STYLE #:	LETTER TO:	DATED:
(a)	F. Durant	20 May, 1978
(b)	J. Ward	7 August, 1978**
(c)	J. Ward	14 Aug. '79
(d)	R. Anstee	24 August, '81
(e)	Memo to file	5th October, 1981
(f)	USAF	November 10th, 1981
(g)	USAF	November 19, 1981
(h)	Dept. of State	3 August, 1982 (no space)
(i)	Memo to file	5/2/83
(j)	H. Rutledge	7th October, 1983 (no space)
(k)	R. Anstee	01 November, 1983*
(l)	Eisenhower Lib.	28 November '84
(m)	T. Brown	21 Feb. '86 (no space)
(n)	Krass	25 Feb. '86
(o)	Sherwood	4/02/86
(p)	H. Lebelson	8-20-86
(q)	L. Maltz	02-20-87
(r)	W. Verity	10 FEB 87
(s)	Klass	16 March 1987

* Indicates earliest sample found using zero-before-single-digit format.

** The most recent example found of Moore's continued use of this style was a letter to O.A. Steen dated "9 January, 1986".

What is important to note here is that of the 19 different styles enumerated above, three are found in the MJ-12 documents and two are not:

MJ-12 DOCUMENT EXAMPLE:	MOORE'S CORRESPONDING STYLE:
22 May, 1949 ("EB").....(a)	
01 August, 1950 ("EB").....(k)	
19 SEP '47. ("EB").....NONE	
September 24, 1947. ("TM")..NONE	
July 14, 1954 ("CT").....(g)	

It would appear, therefore, that those who would cast aspersions upon Moore are doing so by means of carefully selecting only that evidence which points in the direction they want to go, while quietly

ignoring that which does not! This is tantamount to saying that since some of the numbers on Moore's gun match some of the numbers on the gun which killed Cock Robin, therefore Moore must have committed the act.

(2) In May, 1990 these same debunkers came across copies of several military documents in Moore's The Mystery of the Green Fireballs (c.1983), which had been retyped for clarity due to the poor quality of the microfilmed originals. Since in the process of typing, certain dates in these documents had been transposed into style "k" above by the typist, these individuals immediately assumed that here was another piece of evidence proving that Moore used this date style unconsciously; thus "logically" suggesting that he must somehow have been involved with fabricating the "EB" due to the use of the same "peculiar" style therein.

The problem with the "logic" here is that it is based upon the erroneous assumption that Moore was the one who retyped the documents in question. He wasn't. They were typed by one Bill Duke, who Moore employed as an office assistant from December, 1983 through early 1985 (affidavit on file). As part of the preparation for the first printing of Green Fireballs, a few of the documents contained therein had to be retyped for clarity because of the poor quality of the microfilmed originals. During the printing process, however, it became clear that a number of others were not reproducing well and so Moore had Duke undertake the retyping of some of these as "busy work" during times when he wasn't working on some other more urgent task. (These gradually replaced the originals in editions printed after mid-1984.) Duke did quite a bit of typing for Moore (letters, notes, files, etc.) during this period, and most likely adopted the format "a" style of dating from Moore's own use of it on letters, and from the fact that Moore had just purchased a new computer system at about the time that Duke came to work for him which required use of the "zero" date format as part of the log-in procedure.

Indeed, the survey of Moore's own letters (see above) shows that his own use of a zero preceding a single digit date began to show up occasionally in letters etc. produced at about the same time that the computer was purchased (late 1983). Prior to that, his writings show he sometimes but not always used the single digit, month, comma, year format ("7 May, 1979"). Certainly in any case, the alleged "habit" of the zero before the single digit was not so ingrained (either in late 1983 or now) as to be part of an "unconscious" process.

(E) Prior to December of 1984 (when the "EB" arrived), Moore would have had no way of knowing that Donald Menzel, the least likely candidate for an alleged MJ-12, would have passed muster. (See Friedman's report for more on this, and also the brief section on Menzel later in this paper.)

(F) Finally, on the theory that it might prove interesting to compare the average number of words-per-sentence which appear in writing samples taken from Hillenkoetter, Moore, the text of the "EB", and some "neutral" writer selected at random, a survey was done. Although the results will most likely be attacked on the grounds that they are unscientific, or that they are based upon too small a sample to be significant, they are extremely interesting nonetheless.

With respect to Hillenkoetter, seven different writing samples were surveyed as follows:

- CIA Memo 12 Jan. '50, Subj: Chinese Nationalists, etc. (Secret) 3pp. 830 words, 26 sentences.
- CIA Memo 17 Apr. '50, Subj: Greek Political Crisis (Top Secret) 1pp. 227 words, 8 sentences.
- Memorandum 07 Jul. '50, Subj: Soviet Capabilities etc. (Top Secret) 4pp. 617 words, 25 sentences. (Note: three paragraphs omitted from survey because they consisted primarily of statistical data.)
- Letter, 9/19/63 (to Menzel). 1pp. 203 words, 10 sentences.
- Letter, 1/8/65 (to Keyhoe). 1pp. 156 words, 6 sentences.
- Letter, 10/13/70 (to Willis). 1pp. 171 words, 7 sentences.
- Letter, 12/14/70 (to Nagel). 1pp. 258 words, 13 sentences.

Total sample: 7 items, 2462 words, 95 sentences. Average number of words-per-sentence = 25.92.

With respect to the "EB", the four principal pages of text (pp. 2,3,4,5) contain a total of 1056 words (omitting the list of names on pg. 2) written in 43 sentences. This provides an average of 24.56 words-per-sentence.

With respect to Moore, since the "EB" first surfaced in December of 1984, his paper Crashed UFOs: Evidence in the Search for Proof (written between March and May, 1985) was selected for the survey. From this paper, pages 4,5,6,8,28 and 51 were chosen without regard to any other criteria than the fact that they are reasonably representative of his work during the mid 1980s and do not contain lengthy quotations etc. which would tend to contaminate the sample. The total number of words in these six pages is 2273, contained in 71 sentences. The average is thus 32.01 words-per-sentence.

With respect to the "neutral" sample, the work which was

selected "off the shelf" (quite literally at random) turned out to be Donald E. Keyhoe's classic work The Flying Saucers are Real from 1950. A total of six pages was surveyed, once again without regard to any criteria except that they be representative of Keyhoe's style and that they not contain any lengthy quotations. These six pages (pp. 28,40,41,60,130 and 146) were found to contain a total of 2046 words in 110 sentences, for an average of 18.60 words-per-sentence.

Thus, a summary of the results produces the following:

SAMPLE SURVEYED:	#WORDS	#SENTENCES	AVG: W/S
Eisenhower Document	1056	43	24.56
Hillenkoetter /7 items	2462	95	25.92
Moore /6 pages	2273	71	32.01
Keyhoe /6 pages	2046	110	18.60

Those who would make a case against Moore as a "forger" do so on the basis of small points taken out of context. When the entire picture is examined, it becomes readily apparent that any case against the man can be founded in only the flimsiest of circumstantial evidence. Those readers who encounter such rubbish are cautioned to carefully examine the motives of the individuals behind it in order to better understand why such allegations are made.

(5) CAVEATS, STAMPINGS, MINUTIAE:

There are only two types of caveats on the "EB": Those which were typed on it as part of the original preparation of the document (original caveats), and those which were stamped thereon by rubber stamp at some later time (added caveats). The original caveats are as follows:

ORIGINAL CAVEATS

"TOP SECRET" is typed at both top and bottom of all pages. In addition, the words "National Security Information" are typed in caps at the very top of page one only. These practices are routine for all official documents of the same era.

"EYES ONLY" is also typed top and bottom on the left side of all pages, and once again, this is usual for such documents. As has already been demonstrated, copies of "TOP SECRET - EYES ONLY" documents can be found in government files, even though they are not particularly common. Any argument to the contrary is entirely without foundation.

"COPY ONE OF ONE." appears once on each page at the upper right. Such documents do exist in government files, and the format used here is completely consistent with them. (See, for example, (A): "OSI-CIA Nuclear Energy Branch Report 'Status of the U.S.S.R. Atomic Energy Project'", Report # OSI/SR-10/49, 1 July

1949, Copy #1 of 2 ("Top Secret" & signed by Hillenkoetter); (B): "Memorandum for the Record" from Gen. Thomas D. White USAF re: sharing nuclear data with England, 2 September 1954. ("Top Secret - Eyes Only, Copy #2 of 5 Copies"); (C): "Memorandum for: C/S USA (Gen. M.B. Ridgway) etc.", ref: "self explanatory". ("Top Secret - Eyes Only <typed as well as stamped>, Copy 4 of Five").

"T52-EXEMPT (E)" appears at the bottom right of each page. The designation has to do with Top Secret control registers. Normally in the place where the word "exempt" appears, there would be a number which would correspond to the document's registry number on the control list. "T-52" is consistent for the latter part of 1952. "Exempt" indicates a level of classification exempt from routine control registries. Some "exempt" category documents, such as the one listed as reference "(A)" in the paragraph above, simply omit the registry code entirely.

-The mandatory "WARNING!" notice which appears at the bottom of page one (the cover page) is proper and consistent with the era. Note the quaint reference to "mechanically transcribed notes" which has long since been replaced by a phrase about photocopying.

-More modern documents of this sort would carry mandatory classification indicators in parentheses at the beginning of each and every paragraph (ex: "(TS)", or "(S)", or even "(TS/MAJIC)"). This practice, however, was not in use as early as 1952 and its absence from the "EB" is entirely consistent with the era.

ADDED CAVEATS

Only two of these are displayed on the "EB": The first being the addition by over stamping of the words "TOP SECRET/MAJIC EYES ONLY" at top and bottom of each page, and the second being the addition of page numbers with some sort of mechanical numbering device at the top and bottom right of each page, beginning with "001" and going through "008" on the "TM" document.

With respect to the first of these, it must be noted that the style is much more in keeping with relatively modern documents than with those of the "EB"'s vintage. This is the sort of thing one finds on SCI (Sensitive Compartmented Information) documents beginning in the late 1960s, and not on early '50s material. Its appearance on the "EB" is by no means a discrepancy, however, since the caveat could have been added to the original document at any time after its initial creation; right up to moments before the film containing its image was exposed to it in 1984. Examination shows that the stamp was created from a common set (or kit) of movable rubber type which has been commercially available from office supply outlets since at least 1967 (16), and probably much earlier.

In early 1990, certain critics observed that this set is very similar to one used by Moore on his return address stamps, and used it to raise more questions about his possible complicity

in the alleged fabrication of the document. Since the movable-type set is a very common one and has been on the market for many years (Moore keeps his in a cigar box and believes he first got it perhaps as early as 1958), the question here once again is not whether Moore has a similar set, but rather whether anyone in the government uses such a set to stamp their official documents.

As it turns out, a survey of government documents shows that the practice of using movable rubber type to create caveat stamps goes back a long way-- the earliest document located being an FBI document from 1938 bearing the stamp "Confidential" in movable type. (See Appendix J for examples.) With respect to the particular caveat stamp in question here, a fascinating discovery was made by researcher Lee Graham in May of 1990 when the Department of the Air Force released a document to him under FOIA bearing not one but two different caveats, both of which display styles of movable rubber type seemingly identical to those used by Moore to create his controversial return address stamp! Copies of these caveats as well as examples of Moore's address stamps are also reproduced in Appendix J. Even more revealing is the fact that the office of primary responsibility (OPR) for this document is the very same office which is responsible for maintaining the security on many of the DoD's most sensitive "Black Projects" (including, perhaps, MJ-12?).

As for the style of type used on the page numbers of the "EB", this can be traced in government use all the way back into the mid-19th century when similar mechanical numbering devices were used to stamp serial numbers on currency. See Appendix J-1 for examples. The only observation to be made here is that, as in the case of the "TOP SECRET/ MAJIC" stamp above, there is no way of knowing whether the page numbers were added to the document immediately after it was typed, or at some possibly much later date.

TYPEFACE ANALYSIS:

In attempting to identify the typeface displayed on the "EB", and through it to determine the make and model of the typewriter used to produce the document, one once again very quickly runs up against the fact that photographs are not best evidence. The Kodak Tri-X film used to photograph the document is fast (i.e. sensitive to light, thus requiring a very short exposure time and providing good depth of field), but it is not particularly adaptable to a high degree of enlargement. Even when a top quality fine grain developer is used (as it was in this case), the problem of "grain" remains significant with this particular film. This manifests itself by causing what appear to be fine lines under low magnification to break down into a matrix of fuzzy globs under increasingly greater degrees of enlargement. In the case of the "EB", film grain quickly begins to affect the resolution of minute details of individual letters when the degree of

magnification much exceeds the 8 1/2" x 11" format required to portray the documents in their original size. In certain cases, differentiation between two or more typefaces which closely resemble one-another is dependent upon being able to distinguish minute differences in the serifs of certain letters. In the "EB" photographs, some of these distinctions are impossible to make with certainty due to the fact that the characteristics in question lie within the "gray zone" which constitutes an area just at or slightly beyond the upper limit of resolution possible with these photographs. Fortunately, however, in the case of the "EB" this turns out to be only a partially limiting factor.

The principal limitation caused by the problem of film grain is the ability to determine beyond reasonable doubt which of several extremely similar typefaces is actually the one displayed by the "EB". Since all were in use before 1952, however, the only matter open to question is the specific manufacturer of the actual machine involved. It is important to know this in order to assure ourselves that the typewriter involved is of a kind likely to have been used to type a classified government document. (If, for example, the machine turned out to be a 1948 Franconia or Hacheco, the questions raised would be obvious!) However, based upon readily apparent factors in the typeface, no such problem is presented. The machine involved was manufactured by one of six companies: R.C. Allen, Smith-Corona, Jaguar (Japan), Singer (France) Hermes (Switzerland), and Royal. All of these produced machines prior to 1952 which used typefaces manufactured either by Ransmayer-Rodrian of West Germany or Setag of Switzerland which are either identical or indistinguishably similar to one another and to the typeface characteristics displayed in the "EB". Moreover, R.C. Allen, Smith-Corona, Royal and Hermes are all machines either common or respected enough to have been used by whoever typed the document.

Of the four questioned-documents experts consulted, two were comfortable with identifying the typeface as having come from an R.C. Allen Standard (one had initially said Hermes and then changed his mind), the other two essentially left the matter open to question as indicated above. All agreed that original documents and not photographs are essential to specific identification in cases where the quality of the negatives upon enlargement is insufficient to enable necessary distinction of minute differences.

One other matter which is important here is the question of whether we are dealing with photographs of photocopies, or photographs of original typed documents. Since both edge-sharpness and internal contrast factors are significantly affected by each successive photocopying of a document, and since a distortion factor caused by certain copiers sometimes shows up at the outer edges of a photocopy, it should be possible by examining both factors to determine whether the photographs are of actual documents or of photocopies. Accordingly, an examination was undertaken with the following results:

(A) The edge-sharpness of the images on the photographs of the "EB" is entirely consistent with photographs of original typed documents. Photographs of photocopies produce images which appear more "blotchy" under magnification (especially where fine or low-contrast lines are involved) and exhibit a stronger contrast demarcation between the blackness of the typeface images and the whiteness of the paper.

(B) The internal contrasts readily visible on the negatives and in first-generation photos (but largely lost on the photocopies which appear in the appendices) can be taken to indicate that the originals were typed on a manual rather than an electric machine. This is also consistent with the typewriter possibilities outlined above, all of which are manual machines.

(C) Measurements of the "EB" text at several places on each of the various pages produces a distortion factor of $>0.5\%$, a figure consistent with that expected from the combined effects of the lens of the original camera, the angle of the camera (which was slightly off the perpendicular), and the lens of the enlarger used to make the prints. It is not, however, consistent with the sort of optical distortion produced by certain photocopiers.

Based upon the above, it is logical to conclude that the photographs portray original typed documents which were composed on a manual typewriter. They are not photographs of photocopies. It can also be said that they were photographed carefully by someone who knew what he (or she) was doing.

CONTENT:

Since Stanton Friedman's independently published report is devoted primarily to the actual content of the "EB", and this one is supposed to be limited to forensics, this section is included only to bring forward a few important points which aren't covered elsewhere.

DONALD MENZEL AS MJ-12?

The first of these is the issue of Dr. Donald Menzel as a possible member of MJ-12. Although Friedman's work must be considered a major contribution to this particular area of the MJ-12 controversy, there are two important details which should be added to those already on record: (1) According to Col. Robert Friend, ex-chief of Project Blue Book, Dr. Menzel had access to the then classified Blue Book files and would periodically arrive to go through them "in search of data" which Friend says he always

assumed "was to be used for his books." (2) According to evidence uncovered by Dr. Bruce Maccabee in the early '80s, Menzel deliberately falsified and misrepresented data in his books in order to "explain" certain otherwise seemingly inexplicable UFO cases. (17) Furthermore, at the time he did so, Menzel was fully aware that no one without access to the classified Blue Book files would be able to refute his data, and that those with access would hardly be interested in doing so. In any case, what we have here is irrefutable evidence that Menzel was deliberately and knowingly engaged in the spreading of disinformation. All that remains in question is his motive for doing so.

THE EL INDIO-GUERRERO CRASH

On the matter of the alleged crash of a UFO near the El Indio - Guerrero area of the Texas-Mexico border on December 6, 1950 which is mentioned on page 5 of the "EB", there are three points to be made:

(1) Aside from the FBI "immediate high alert for any data whatsoever concerning flying saucers" document cited by Friedman (18), several press stories which appeared at about the same time have been put forward by other researchers (most notably Zechel and Hastings) as evidence that a UFO had indeed crashed. The FBI document is certainly authentic and does mention flying saucers as the reason for the "alert". The press stories, on the other hand speak only of the establishment of an "alert" status for U.S. Army troops in Alaska and the cancellation of a planned ten-day Christmas furlough for soldiers in training camps nationwide. (19) Further research indicates that these actions were more likely related to the heating up of the Korean War than anything related to UFOs (see, for example, the New York Times front page for December 8, 1950, where it was reported that President Truman was seriously considering a general "all-out mobilization and emergency executive orders.")

(2) Up through September of 1987, no one had done much to try to validate the alleged December 6, 1950 event. Beginning in that month, Friedman and Moore undertook an effort to see what, if anything, might be uncovered short of an actual visit to the remote Texas-Mexico border area mentioned in the document. As a result, a number of interesting items were discovered although it remains unclear what their relationship to the Tex-Mex event might be, if any. These are as follows:

-Two paragraphs which appeared in former Secretary of State Dean Acheson's biography Present at the Creation (NY: W. W. Norton), pages 479-480:

"On the third morning of (British Prime Minister Clement Atlee's) visit, December 6, (1950) soon after my arrival at the Department, Deputy Secretary of Defense Lovett telephoned a report and an instruction from the President. Our early-warning radar system in Canada had picked up formations of unidentified objects, presumably aircraft, headed southeast on a course that could

bring them over Washington in two or three hours. All interception and defense forces were alerted. I was to inform but not advise the Prime Minister. The Pentagon telephones would be closed for all but emergency defense purposes and he could not talk again. Before he hung up, I asked whether he believed that the objects that were picked up were Russian bombers. He said that he did not.

"Getting Oliver Franks on the telephone, I repeated the message. He asked whether the President had canceled the eleven-thirty meeting with Atlee, and was told that he had not. We agreed to meet there. Before ending the talk, he wondered about the purpose of my message. I suggested fair warning and an opportunity for prayer. As we finished, one of our senior officials burst into the room. How he had picked up the rumor I do not know, perhaps from the Pentagon. He wanted to telephone his wife to get out of town, and to have important files moved to the basement. I refused to permit him to do either and gave him the choice of a word-of-honor commitment not to mention the matter to anyone or being put under security detention. He wisely cooled off and chose the former. When we reached the White House, Lovett told us that the unidentified objects had disappeared. His guess was that they had been geese."

Note the key points here. According to Acheson's account, the event occurred on the morning of December 6, 1950, before 11:30AM. He refers to "formations of unidentified objects, presumably aircraft, headed southeast." Subsequently, Lovett reportedly tells him that "the unidentified objects had disappeared" and that Lovett guessed they had been geese. If Acheson's account were the only one, it could easily be dismissed as nothing more than a humorous anecdote. The problem here, however, is that aside from Acheson's version, there are four other accounts of this event on record, and they are all different!

The second account appears in Isaacson and Thomas' book The Wise Men (NY: Simon & Schuster, 1986), pp. 544-545:

"For a moment on the morning of December 6, (Acheson) thought his nightmare had come true. At 10:30 A.M. Bob Lovett called him from the Pentagon and abruptly informed him in his laconic voice: 'When I finish talking to you, you cannot reach me again. All incoming calls will be stopped. A national emergency is about to be proclaimed. We are informed that there is flying over Alaska at the present moment a formation of Russian planes heading southeast. The President wishes the British ambassador to be informed of this and told

that Mr. Atlee should take whatever measures are proper for Mr. Atlee's safety. Now I've finished my message and I'm about to ring off.' Acheson cut in. 'Now wait a minute, Bob, do you believe this?' 'No,' Lovett replied, and hung up. Acheson sat in his office and waited. The Air Force scrambled. A senior official burst in asking permission to telephone his wife to get out of town and wondering if he should begin moving files to the basement. Acheson tried to soothe him. A few minutes later Lovett clamly called back. The radar blips were not Soviet bombers after all. They were flocks of geese."

The differences between the Isaacson-Thomas account and Acheson's own are glaringly obvious; yet the source for the Isaacson-Thomas material was also Acheson! Note, however, that both versions have the objects/bombers moving in a southeasterly direction-- an assertion strongly contradicted by the other three accounts which tell quite a different story. Here, for example, is a translation (from the spanish) of a press account of the incident which moved on International News Service wires later in the day on December 6th (El Excelsior, Mexico City, Dec, 7, 1950, p.36):

"FALSE ALARM IN THE U.S. CAPITAL"

"Washington, 6 December (INS): A warning of an impending air attack resulted in a false alarm in this capital city today. No air raid alarms were sounded, but functionaries charged with the Civil Air Defense of Washington were alerted that an unidentified aircraft had been detected off the coast of the State of Maine at mid-day. Later, a spokesman for the Air Force stated that interceptor aircraft had been dispatched, and that the object in question had been identified shortly thereafter as a North American C-47 aircraft which was approaching the continent from Goose Bay, Labrador. The warning was said to have been useful in verifying the efficiency of the Washington Civil Defense system. Civil Defense officials declined to comment on the incident."

Note that the "formation of unidentified objects" have now been reduced to a single object, and that it's direction of approach is now given as towards the coast of Maine from Goose Bay, Labrador-- a southwesterly direction 90° around from the "over Alaska... heading southeast" given by Isaacson-Thomas, and the "headed southeast" stated by Acheson. Also, the "geese" seem to have been magically transformed into a C-47.

Next comes an account of the event which appeared in the official transcript of the minutes of the meeting

between Truman and Atlee as obtained by researcher Brian Parks (assisting Moore) from the files of the Truman Library:

"(At this point, Mr. Connelly entered the room and handed the President a report from Deputy Secretary of Defense Lovett. Mr. Lovett was reporting that the 'alert' that had reached the President an hour earlier when it was thought that a large number of unidentified airplanes were approaching the northeast coast of the United States, had now been due to erroneous interpretation of atmospheric conditions. The President informed the Prime Minister that the report of planes was all in error. The Prime Minister expressed relief and gratification.)" (20)

Formations of unidentified objects? Russian bombers? Geese? A single C-47? Erroneous interpretation of atmospheric conditions? Southeasterly direction? Southwesterly direction? Alaska? Labrador? As if all that isn't enough, there's still one more account. This one is contained in an official Department of the Air Force Memorandum to the Secretary of Defense from Col. Charles Winkle, Asst. Executive, Directorate of Plans; Subject: Air Alert - 1030 Hours, 6 December 1950. The memo (originally classified Confidential) is also dated December 6, and reads as follows:

"1. The ConAC Air Defense Controller notified the Headquarters USAF Command Post that at 1030 hours a number of unidentified aircraft were approaching the northeast area of the United States and that there was no reason to believe the aircraft were friendly.

"2. This information was further amplified at 1040 hours as follows. By radar contact it was determined that approximately 40 aircraft were in the flight, at 32,000 feet, on a course of 200 degrees, in the vicinity of Limestone, Maine.

"3. The emergency alert procedure went into effect immediately.

"4. The office of the President was notified. Brigadier General Landry returned the call and stated that the President had been notified and that:

- a. All information on this matter was to be released by the Department of the Air Force.
- b. Office of the President would release no information.
- c. The substance of a and b above was to be passed to the Secretary of Defense.

"5. At 1104 hours the ConAC Air Defense Controller stated that the original track had faded out and it appears that the flight as originally identified is

a friendly flight.

"6. ConAC took immediate action to dispatch interceptors on the initial contact."

Which of the above is the correct version, if any? Clearly, the direction of travel does seem to have been northeast to southwest; and the date of the event was certainly the morning of December 6th, which would make it during daylight hours. (Remember that there are only eight or nine hours of daylight at that particular time of the year.)

A course of 200° from Limestone (near Caribou), Maine is a line which extends roughly from Goose Bay through Limestone, almost directly over Washington, D.C., and on to roughly Jacksonville, Florida. Yet, if the flight, or object, or whatever, was detected "in the area of Limestone, Maine" as indicated above, and was approaching the continental U.S., it seems curious that its track would just "fade out", friendly flight or otherwise. (Limestone, Maine, by the way is almost 150 miles inland from the nearest coastline to the northeast, which is the Gulf of the St. Lawrence.)

How could there be any possible connection between this odd incident and an alleged UFO crash the same day on the Texas-Mexico border? There are two things here which are interesting. The first is that a slight alteration from the 200° southwesterly course to one of only about 225° would bring the extended line of trajectory directly over the El Indio-Guerrero area. (This would certainly be a "long trajectory" as described in the "EB".) The second is the fact that we are dealing with a daylight incident here at a time of year when there is daylight only about one-third of the time.

(3) The thing that makes all of the above potentially significant is the results of a preliminary investigation conducted in the El Indio-Guerrero area by Dennis Stacy and Tom Deuley in March, 1990. Since Stacy has asked that his material be kept confidential until he can publish at some later date, all that can be said here is that some confirmation was found that what the locals called a "fireball" had crashed in the daytime during the time-frame in question, and that the Mexican military had arrived on the scene to take control of it. (21)

THE TERM "EBE"

According to the "EB", the term "EBE" for our alleged alien visitors was "suggested" by the medical research team supposedly headed by Dr. Detlev Bronk. The document states that the term was coined as an acronym for the phrase "Extra-terrestrial Biological Entities". Without making any assessment as to whether this is accurate or not, it must be noted here that on this point, the

"EB" is in direct contradiction with the so-called Carter document ("CD"), which alleges that EBE is the term the aliens use to refer to themselves. Obviously if either version is true, then the other automatically is not (unless, of course, one wants to stretch the point to its absolute limit by arguing that the aliens could have adopted Dr. Bronk's term as a convenient way of referring to themselves). Since the evidence in hand at this point is insufficient to allow any further conclusions to be drawn, the matter remains moot.

Curiously, although the term "Eben" now circulates freely amongst both UFO buffs and members of the public-at-large (it has even been used in a national TV commercial), it was generally unknown before the Moore/Shandera/Friedman (MSF) and Timothy Good release of the MJ-12 documents to the public in the spring of 1987. Perhaps it is significant that the first time any of the MSF team heard the term used outside of their own tight circle was when author Whitley Strieber (Communion, etc.) came up with it apparently quite on his own in January of that year. Whitley told Moore that he had heard the term used by "two contacts in the government" whom he had met with while writing Communion.

TIMOTHY GOOD'S RELEASE

One of the more confusing pieces of the MJ-12 controversy is the role of British author Timothy Good. Good was in the final stages of preparing the manuscript for his bestseller Above Top Secret when, in the latter part of March, 1987, he was contacted by a person who he says he was convinced "was connected to the American intelligence community." Good had made contact with a number of such people on both sides of the Atlantic during the course of researching his book, and so such an approach was not particularly surprising to him. This one, however, informed him that he should expect "something" which would be of assistance to him in his project. Shortly thereafter, a packet arrived containing "sanitized" (i.e. the caveat stampings were crossed out) photocopies of the "E.B." and the "T.M.". Good immediately recognized their potential significance, and made a decision to include them in his book manuscript even though there had been little time for investigation.

Slightly over two months later, Good's publisher, as part of promotional publicity for the forthcoming book, provided material to the press which included copies of the documents. The respectable London Daily Observer was immediately interested and ran a feature story on them in its May 31, 1987 edition. This appears to have been the first major news coverage of the subject.

Meanwhile, unaware of the above situation, Moore and Shandera were at the same time making plans for a limited release of information about their own research and experiences in preparation for the upcoming 24th annual National UFO Conference which Moore and the

Fair-Witness Project were hosting in Burbank, California on June 12-14. Their intention was to make the first release of information in an issue of the Fair-Witness FOCUS newsletter. Even though no final decision had been made concerning precisely which material would be released, Moore prepared a short general statement on April 30th which he composed as page one of what was subsequently to become the FOCUS issue of the same date. With preparations in full swing for the upcoming conference it was a hectic time, and a couple of weeks went by with nothing more being done on the newsletter except the completion of an editorial message for page 2. In mid-month, things were picked up again and plans were laid for completion and mailing by month's end.

Roughly a week later, Moore received an enigmatic phone call from an individual who informed him that a major story about MJ-12 was about to break "in Europe" and that if he (Moore) wanted any credit for having researched the subject as well, he should "go public before the end of the week." No further information or advice was offered, leaving M/S in something of a quandry as to precisely what action, if any, they should take. Obviously a reassessment of their plans and position was in order and time was of the essence.

The situation posed a problem since there was no way of knowing whether it was a set-up designed to force their hand. Once complete copies of documents were made public, all controls were off and there was nothing to prevent some enterprising opportunist from coming along and fabricating stories about them to reporters eager for more information. Knowing that such things had happened before in the UFO field, some sort of precaution had to be taken which allowed the release of some material while continuing to protect the integrity of an investigation-in-progress. The precaution decided upon was to release heavily expurgated copies of some of the pages-- just enough material to prove that M/S had had the goods in hand prior to whatever might come out in Europe, and also just enough to provide any other UFOlogist who might have copies in hand as well the opportunity to prove it by being able to supply the missing material. At that time, M/S had no way of knowing whether their copies of the documents were unique, or whether others might quietly be working on the same material as well. They also did not know which documents were to be involved in the forthcoming European release, or even whether there would actually be such a release.

Such is the story behind M/S' release of portions of the MJ-12 and related material in FOCUS. Although the issue bore the date of April 30, 1987, the first copies actually hit the mail-stream on May 27th, with a subsequent mailing on the 29th. It was on the 29th (Friday) that Martin Bailey, the reporter working on the Timothy Good story for the London Daily Observer, called Moore stating that he had been informed that Moore was working on the government cover-up aspect of UFOs and asking if he had any information about something called MJ-12. At once, the warning about Europe became a reality and the cat was out of the bag. The

Observer's feature story ran on the front page of the Sunday, May 31, 1987 edition, and was picked up by other media around the world.

Since the appearance of Good's book, questions have persisted about how and from whom he obtained the documents. Like all good journalists, he has consistently refused to disclose what he regards as confidential information. When certain individuals suggested that perhaps Good had obtained his documents from Moore, both gentlemen denied it. This, however, did not stop one group of debunkers from publishing a white paper early in 1990 setting forth certain "conclusions" which they offered in support of their belief that Good had in fact received his documents from Moore in spite of denials. (22) Their argument was founded on three points which they claim to have discovered by comparing the documents released by Good with the partially expurgated versions released by M/S in FOCUS:

(1) "The ink deletions of the security markings... reveals that while the deletions are not identical there is a marked similarity. They are slash-type deletions, probably done with one stroke in most cases. In neither case do the deletions completely obliterate the security markings.... One sees no significant difference between the Moore and Good versions in the way the security markings were applied."

(2) Copies of both Good's and Moore's versions of the documents contain visible "vertical ridges" allegedly produced by use of a dirty copier. As in the case above, these are not "identical" on both versions, only "similar". Nonetheless, this "suggests" that the same machine was used to copy both.

(3) What is described as an anomolous "fingerprint" (it is actually two short smudged scratches) appears on a couple of Good's pages, and a somewhat similar "but not absolutely identical" mark appears (at different places) on a couple of Moore's pages. This "forces" the belief that both were copied on the same machine.

Clearly the "evidence" presented here is circumstantial, speculative and highly contrived so as to appear to be much more important than it actually is (this, no doubt, due to the fact that those responsible for it have been critical of the M/S/F effort from the very beginning). In any case, the facts are as follows:

(A) To say that there is "no significant difference between the Moore and Good versions" is to completely overlook the fact that the markings on Moore's version were clearly made by a left-handed person (which Moore is), and the markings on Good's version were clearly made by a right-handed person, which Moore is not!

(B) On Good's documents, there is evidence of no less than fifteen narrow vertical ridges on page one! On page two, there are sixteen such ridges (still narrow in format), and on page three, there are seven (which appear on the left-half of the

page only). On Moore's versions, there is evidence of seven wider and less-defined ridges on page one, perhaps five on page two (which are so ill-defined that it is difficult to call them ridges), and five again on page three (all in the center). From such evidence it is possible to conclude that both versions were produced on copiers which were dirty. No further conclusion is possible.

(C) While certain examples of the so-called fingerprint do bear some similarity with others, it is possible to find just as many dissimilarities among them. As in the case above, when strict standards of evidence are applied, the only conclusion which can be sustained is that there are marks. If, as the debunkers contend, such marks are the result of deteriorating rollers, then one might just as easily argue that rollers in similar machines deteriorate in similar fashion thus producing similar marks.

MISCELLANEOUS:

35mm FILM DATED

Although it is impossible to determine when the photos of the "EB" and "TM" on the 35mm Kodak Tri-X film were actually taken, logic tells us that the photographing can only have taken place some time after the manufacture date of the film itself. On the theory that such information might be potentially useful, Moore undertook to investigate the question in April of 1988. Since all commercial film carries manufacturing codes and emulsion numbers at periodic intervals along the edges of the film, it required only examination under magnification to disclose "Kodak Safety Film #5063 - 831-77F".

With this information, Moore contacted Mr. Richard Johnson of the Technical Information Division of Eastman Kodak in Rochester, N.Y. who researched Kodak's records and informed Moore that the emulsion coating was made in August of 1983 and that the expiration date of the batch was probably September or October of 1985. Once the emulsion is placed on the film, the product is marketed as quickly as possible thereafter due to the roughly two-year shelf life.

Based upon this, it is possible to conclude that the film was exposed sometime between perhaps September of 1983 at the earliest and December 9, 1984 when it was mailed to Shandera.

WRAPPER & POSTMARK:

Since a description of the appearance of the packet containing the film was provided earlier in this Report, there is no need to repeat it here. There are, however, several other observations which are worthy of mention:

(1) An comparison of the typeface on the address label with faces employed on all of the other documents mentioned in this Report as well as some additional material (letters from Doty, Christmas cards from a couple of others, etc.) revealed that only one item-- the so-called Hilltop Document-- was typed on a similar machine. Because of the fact that the three lines of type on the address label provides such a small sample, and because the machine involved was electric, it is not possible to determine whether both were done on the same machine. Differences evident in the alignment of certain upper case letters suggest that this is unlikely, but the sample involved is really too small to permit a definitive conclusion.

(2) Perhaps the most incompetent argument leveled against the documents during the entire controversy was that offered by one C.D. ("Seedy") Allan of England. On June 5, 1989 Allan circulated an open letter in which he made the following assertions:

- (A) Any argument that the MJ-12 documents might be official disinformation can be "discounted entirely" on the grounds that the packet containing the film had stamps affixed, whereas "all" mail coming from an official source in the U.S. is franked.
- (B) Since there are twelve stamps of the 20¢ variety (three blocks of four stamps each, taken from booklet panes) on the packet, instead of a franked stamp or one or two high value stamps, this "strongly implies" that the sender weighed the packet himself, knew the correct postage and affixed the stamps himself.
- (C) From this it can be concluded that the sender was "a private individual who regularly used booklet pane stamps in blocks... and who was regularly involved in mailing packets." Such a person would "likely be either a magazine/book editor or publisher, or someone with a small mail-order business" because a larger such business would "almost certainly use a (postage) meter" or have high value stamps on hand.

Of all the barbs aimed at Moore throughout this affair, this one is by far the most nonsensical and outrageous! Here are the facts:

- (1) The MJ-12 film packet contains 12 x 20¢ stamps for a total of \$2.40 in postage.
- (2) If a roll of undeveloped film similar to the one originally inside is substituted and the packet then weighed, the total weight is 2.4 ounces. The packet was mailed via First Class mail.
- (3) In December, 1984, the postage requirement for a 2.4 ounce, First Class packet was exactly 50¢-- \$1.90 less than the amount affixed.

So much for the argument that the sender knew all about mailing packets! But there are two additional points to be made here:

- (4) Officially franked mail in the U.S. always indicates the name of the agency or the identity of the person using the privilege. The assertion that anyone wanting to remain

anonymous would use officially franked mail is patently illogical.

- (5) Postage meters in the U.S. all bear an identifying number on their slugs (dies) which is imprinted along with the denomination, city and date on all mail thus stamped. This number traces directly to the person or firm which owns or holds the lease on the meter. Once again, it is highly illogical that a person wishing to remain anonymous would employ such a device.

Based upon the above, plus the Albuquerque postmark, several observations are possible:

(A) Based upon the manila-style envelopes used and the way tape was used to seal the packets (external & internal), the sender was someone familiar with security procedures used in the preparation of certain types of official mail.

(B) The type of stamps used and the amount of postage affixed, combined with "A" above, suggests a person accustomed to placing sensitive material in envelopes and sealing same, and then passing it to a secretary or clerk who did the weighing, stamping and mailing. This, in turn, suggests someone in an executive or command level position.

(C) Suggestions that Richard Doty is the person behind the documents can be dismissed as circumstantial. One point which speaks against this is the fact that documents and letters typed by Doty during his years at Kirtland show he was accustomed to using one of three typewriters, two at the base and one at home. The typeface on the address label is completely unlike any of these three.

(THE TRUMAN-FORRESTAL MEMORANDUM)

There are two reasons why the analysis of the Truman Memorandum ("TM") has been treated as a separate issue from that of the "EB":

(1) If authentic, it was created more than five years before the "EB" and for a completely different purpose. If phoney, then it is extremely well done. In either case, as a separate but presumably attached document, it exhibits characteristics which are worthy of independent investigation.

(2) The only two things which purport to connect it to the "EB" are the identification of "Attachment A" as being "Special Classified Executive Order #092447" ("EB", page 6), and the fact that the "TM" document bears a mechanically stamped number ("008") which is in proper sequence with the rest of the pages. Assuming for a moment that the "EB" is genuine, neither of these points constitutes sufficient grounds upon which to base an automatic assumption that the "TM" must therefore

also be genuine. Consider:

(A) The page numbers which have been mechanically stamped on each page were clearly added at some point after the document itself was created. Since there is no way of knowing precisely when these were added, the fact that they exist and that the "TM" bears a number in correct sequence cannot be taken as proof that the page we have in hand is the same page that was part of the original document.

(B) Equally, there is no way of knowing whether the document referred to as "Special Classified Executive Order" in the "Enumeration of Attachments" on page 6 is in fact the same document as the "TM" which occupies that position in the copy at hand.

In other words, the possibility that the present Truman-Forrestal Memorandum is a fabrication which has been substituted for the document which originally held that position must be seriously considered. Remember that these documents were almost certainly supplied by someone with strong connections to the U.S. intelligence community. It is not, therefore, out of the question that the individual or individuals responsible could have planted a "ringer" alongside a good document so as to provide a means of discrediting or backing away from the whole package should the need suddenly arise at some future point. (See the final paragraph of the section on the Kirtland documents herein for discussion of a similar possibility.)

Of course, in the process of considering the above equal weight must also be given to its antitheses-- the possibilities that both the "TM" and the "EB" may be genuine, or that the "TM" may be genuine and the "EB" a "ringer".

All things being considered, the only valid course of action in an investigation such as this is to consider all elements separately and to derive conclusions based solely upon the evidence presented by each case.

FORM AND STYLE:

(1). PHYSICAL APPEARANCE:

A comparison of the physical appearance of the "TM" with numerous other White House documents generated during the same era produces no specific reason to question its authenticity. There are, however, a couple of observations which need to be made here, and following that, several questions to be considered.

(1) Given the information at hand (and assuming for the sake of discussion that the memorandum is authentic), there is no way of knowing whether Truman himself or one of his secretaries may have prepared the memorandum, or

whether it might have been prepared for his signature by one of the other two principals involved or, perhaps, one of their secretaries.

(2) Once again, the fact that "TM" exists only as a photograph and not an original is a limiting factor in that photographs are not best evidence.

With that in mind, consider the following:

(A) Given that a survey of White House documents generated between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Eisenhower administration revealed a wide variety of styles and formats in acceptable use at the time, there is no particular reason to consider any specific point of the style and format of the "TM" as being sufficiently out of the ordinary so as to constitute a meaningful case against its authenticity.

(B) While it is "usual" to find the recipient's name and often his (or her) address as well typed in the lower left corner of letters and memoranda generated by Truman's office during this time frame, the absence of such should not be taken as evidence against authenticity on two grounds:

(a) Such absence is typical of letters and memoranda generated by Dr. Vannevar Bush, and

(b) it is also typical of memoranda and some letters generated by Secretary James Forrestal.

Both of these bits of information lend additional weight to the possibility that the "TM" may have been typed by one of these two principals (or an appropriate secretary) and presented to Truman for his signature. (Certainly, as Friedman has pointed out <23>, there was a White House meeting among the three on September 24, 1947.) Furthermore, it cannot be said, at least in Forrestal's case, that preparation of a memorandum for Truman's signature was entirely unknown, since a copy of one such undated, unsigned draft was found in the President's Secretary's File at the Truman Library. The memo, obviously prepared by Forrestal about himself because the typewriter used matches one on which other memos out of Forrestal's office were frequently typed, bears the date (in the upper right) "____ June 1948", is captioned "MEMORANDUM TO HONORABLE JAMES FORRESTAL, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE", and incorporates a blank space at the bottom left for the presidential signature. (Its subject has to do with plans to organize the armed forces reserves.)

One unusual thing about this unquestionably genuine draft memorandum is that the word "respected" in the second paragraph thereof is illegally split as "res- pected". (See preceding section on the "EB", for discussion of a similar illegal split which appears in that document.)

(C) Use of 8½" x 11" White House letterhead stationery (as opposed to 8" x 10") does not hold up as a point against "TM" either,

because other examples of such do exist. (See for example, "MEMORANDUM" from Cutler to Lay, Stephens & Simmons dated May 25, 1953 noting the President's invitation to Drs. Bush and Oppenheimer to appear at the the NSC meeting of May 27th; or Memo from Cutler to the President dated July 21, 1954 conveying personal respects and esteem from a list of dignitaries.)

Also, the particular style and format of the letterhead ("THE WHITE HOUSE" centered at top, with "WASHINGTON" in smaller type offset to the right underneath) matches that which appears on known-to-be-authentic documents from 1947.

(2) WRITING STYLE AND FORMAT:

Since the body of the text contains two short paragraphs comprising only 75 words, and since the wording is essentially the sort of "officialese" typical of government memoranda, the derivation of any meaningful information from such a small and essentially bland sample is impossible.

Simply as a matter of contrast, it should be noted that whoever typed the "TM" employed a five-space indentation at the beginning of each paragraph, whereas the typist of the "EB" used a "block" style which employed no indentation at all. This suggests two different typists (as would be expected if both documents were authentic), but of course does not prove such.

With respect to the question of indentation, a survey of documents originating from the offices of Truman, Forrestal and Bush during this era was undertaken to determine whether there was any consistency to the process, or whether the same sort of inconsistencies existed here as with other elements of style and format. The results were these:

(A) For "Truman" documents: Examples were found bearing indentations of 0, 5, 10 and 13 spaces.

(B) For "Forrestal" documents: Examples were found bearing indentations of 0, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 spaces.

(C) For "Bush" documents: Examples were found bearing indentations of 5, 8 and 11 spaces.

In addition, it was noted during this survey that short (1, 2 & 3 paragraph) Truman letters and memoranda often exhibit the characteristic of long single sentences being set off as separate paragraphs. This same characteristic is also evident in paragraph two of the "TM".

(3) GRAMMAR, SPELLING & WORD USAGE:

No errors or peculiarities are evident. Use of capital letters in such phrases as "Operation Majestic Twelve", "Office of the President", and "Director of Central Intelligence" is consistent

with other similar memoranda.

(4) DATE STYLE:

As was the case with the "EB", a somewhat unusual style of writing dates is evident here-- this time incorporating the use of a period following the year. However, after a survey produced examples of this style on documents from the offices of Truman, Vannevar Bush, Secretary of War Patterson, and A.F. Gen. Alfred Maxwell, it was decided to abandon further efforts on the grounds that this was sufficient precedent to establish the validity of the style.

(5) CAVEATS & STAMPINGS:

The use of "TOP SECRET" and "EYES ONLY" stamps at both top and bottom center is consistent with other documents of the period. There are, however, a number of points to be made here:

(A) Contrast visible on the photographs (but less visible on the printed copies herein) suggest several things:

(1) On the "TOP SECRET" caveats, the stamping at the top is somewhat darker (more dense) than the one at the bottom, which suggests that the person who stamped it on the documents did so in the typical way of inking the stamp once on an ink pad and then applying the stamp first to the top and then to the bottom of the page without re-inking in between. Furthermore, from the density produced, it would appear that the stamp pad used was either new or had been recently re-inked, and that the color was most likely black or dark blue.

(2) The "EYES ONLY" caveats are considerably lighter and appear to be of equal density on both top and bottom. This suggests that they were of a different color (possibly red) on the original, and that the ink pad used was relatively dry, hence the need to re-ink in between each application. This also suggests the possibility that the "EYES ONLY" caveats may have been applied at a different time, although there seems no way of knowing this for certain.

(3) Both of the above points taken together would seem to speak against a fabrication since it seems unlikely a fabricator would go to the trouble of employing two different ink pads (one well-inked and one not, one black and the other probably red), knowing that all would come out in shades of gray on a black-and-white photograph, and knowing that black stampings of equal density would pass

just as well as any other upon subsequent examination.

In other words, IF the "TM" is a forgery, then it would seem the person responsible went out of his (or her) way to create a point of issue here when there was absolutely no need to create one--especially since, had the document borne black stampings of equal density, no one would have questioned them anyway.

(B) The similarity between the "TOP SECRET" stamp which appears on the "TM" and one which appeared in some of Moore's advertising in 1985 is explained by the fact that Moore cut the caveat from xerox copies of the "TM" and pasted it on his ads, which were then reduced in size for printing. Debunkers who have suggested that Moore's use of the stamp is evidence that he fabricated the document should be questioned with respect to their motives in making such an allegation, and with respect to the degree of competence evident in their thought processes. (Unfortunately, such thinking is typical of many self-anointed, high school educated researchers who have little or no grasp of accepted standards of evidence or of how to apply the principles of logic to simple problems.)

(C) For further comparisons of various caveat stampings, see Appendix J.

TYPEFACE ANALYSIS:

As in the case of the "EB", photographs are not best evidence, and in attempting to identify typefaces from them, one quickly runs up against the limitations imposed by the film grain. Nonetheless, an analysis of the typeface was undertaken and produced the following results:

(A) The typefaces on the machine which produced this document appear to have been recently cleaned and aligned, as evidenced by the "crisp" nature of the letters and the relatively straight alignment of the lines of type. However, the machine seems to have been poorly adjusted with respect to the pressure transferred to the faces, in that the lower case letters consistently strike the page to produce heavier, denser impressions than do the upper case letters. This manifests itself throughout the document and is readily visible on the photographs. Indeed, it is precisely this peculiarity which causes the caption, which is typed in all caps, to appear somewhat lighter than the body of the text itself which is composed mostly of lower case letters. An examination of the upper case letters in the body of the text, however, reveals that they too exhibit this same characteristic. This should be taken as evidence that the machine involved was a manual rather

than an electric.

(B) Further examination of the document reveals that there are really two different typefaces, and hence two different machines involved here. (Note difference in lower case "t" in Illus. C & D.) The first (machine #1) was used to produce the entire caption and body of the text, plus the word "September" in the date at the top right. The second (machine #2) was used to complete the date by typing in only the numerals "24, 1947" and the period after the "7". This characteristic is quite consistent with a genuine document wherein the body was typed first and the date was added at another time and place (perhaps upon signing), but constitutes a very curious anomaly indeed if the document is a fabrication, as we shall see later.

(C) With respect to machine #1, the typeface appears to be an Underwood UP3A, which was manufactured between 1933 and 1946. There has been some controversy about this, however, since one expert identified the face as being a Smith-Corona P1C2-- a type face used only on S-C electric machines manufactured after 1966; and a second expert thought it might be a Ransmayer & Rodrian 664 face which was also used on S-C electrics but of unspecified manufacture dates. Since these three faces are extremely similar, careful examination must be undertaken to tell the difference. Essentially, the distinctions are these:

- The difference between RaRo 664 and both of the other two faces is that the RaRo lower case "k" has an unbalanced upper right serif whereas on the other two the serif is balanced. Since the "TM" contains only one letter "k" (lower case), and since the characteristics of the serif cannot be determined with 100% accuracy due to the problem of grain, the situation devolves to one of "appearance". Upon close examination under magnification, therefore, it appears that the serif is balanced, thus casting doubt upon RaRo 664 as a viable option.
 - This leaves Underwood UP3A and S-C P1C2, the primary differences between which are a prominent upward hook on the tail of the lower case "a" on the S-C face (as opposed to a considerably diminished hook on the Underwood face), and the fact that the S-C face overall has a finer, more sculpted or chiseled look which produces almost print-quality letters. It is upon these differences that the opinion of an Underwood is based (See Illustrations) even though the crossbar on the lower case "t" displays a slightly longer leftward extension than is usually found on that face and in fact does more closely resemble the S-C style. (One cannot rule out, however, the possibility that it was replaced during the cleaning and repair process).
- (Just for the record, the lower case "a" used by RaRo 664 is identical to that of the S-C face, thus

further ruling it out of the picture.)

An effort was made to determine whether the particular typewriter used to produce the "TM" could be identified through comparison of the typeface with that of various machines used to produce documents in the offices of Truman, Bush, Forrestal and Hillenkoetter during this time frame, but it was unsuccessful. One document, however, was discovered which appears to have been typed on a typewriter employing the same typeface. This is a very poor quality (perhaps third generation) carbon copy of a "MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT" dated (with rubber stamp) 6 AUG 1948, from Hillenkoetter having to do with the Berlin Crisis. Although it appears to be the same typeface, the poor quality of the carbon makes further comparison impossible.

(D) With respect to machine #2, the face on the numbers is virtually identical with the Remington P4-style numbers found on the typewriter frequently used by Dr. Vannevar Bush at the time. Indeed, compare the numbers from the date on the "TM" with those which appear on a memorandum typed by Bush on the very same day:
(24)

Here we have precisely the sort of situation one might expect to find if the document is genuine and was typed beforehand by someone in Bush, Truman or Forrestal's office (or perhaps even in Hillenkoetter's office since he is obliquely referred to in the text as "the Director of Central Intelligence"), and then dated and signed in another place or at a later date. The typist, for example, may have known that the document would be signed shortly after typing, thus including the month ("September"), but leaving a blank space for the exact date to be typed in later. The fact that the typeface appears identical to the one on Dr. Bush's personal typewriter suggests that he may have been the one to