

WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
ANTARES PUBLICATIONS, THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC., "FOCUS"
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505

PHONE (213) 463-0542 (10 AM - 6 PM)

**COPY FOR YOUR
INFORMATION**

23 SEP. '89

Phil Klass
404 "N" SW.
Washington, DC 20024

Dear Mr. Klass:

I have no idea why you do things the way you do, but once again you've managed to put your foot in your mouth. The Truman signatures on the alleged White House/ MJ-12 memo of September 24, 1947 and the letter to Bush of October 1, 1947 ARE NOT "identical", nor are they "suspiciously similar" as you have claimed. Bruce Maccabee and I exchanged notes over this very same question about two years ago. Let's look at the evidence:

You claim that both signatures are identical. Try superimposing them one over the other against a strong light. You will find that while the "Harry" is very similar indeed, the "Truman" is somewhat longer. I enclose copies of some measurements done during the discussions with Maccabee. Although they speak for themselves, please note the following:

(A) On the Truman-Forrestal memo ("TF"), the cross line on the "T" is 488mm long. On the Truman-Bush letter ("TB"), it is only 471mm.

(B) The "n" on Truman measures 240mm on the TF memo and 235mm on the TB.

(C) The upstroke on the "y" in Harry is thin and broken (or scratchy, considering that it was most likely a fountain pen that was used) on the TB letter, but heavy and full on the TF. In addition, the upstroke on TF extends as a thin line just slightly above the cross line on the "T" in TB, where in TF it blends into the cross line as a heavy blob.

(D) On the TB letter, the length of "ruman" from the top of the "r" to the top of the "n" is 286mm. On TF, it is 297mm.

(E) Measuring diagonally across the signatures from the top of the left arm of the "H" to the end of the "n" line, we find that the diagonal length of the signature on TB is 774mm, where on TF the length is 795mm.

(F) The most dissimilar portions of the two signatures are the letters "man", especially the positioning of the "n". This can be easily seen by superimposition against a strong light. Remember, Phil, I am working from a print of the original negative on the one hand (TF) and a first generation copy on the other (TB). In your case, your copy of TF must be at least third

generation. I do not know about your copy of TB but expect the circumstances are similar.

(G) There are other differences as well which you can see on the attached. As a control, for the purposes of determining scale, note that on BOTH items, "The White House" measures 412mm and "Washington" measures 275mm. Also, as a test for right-left distortion, note in TF that the word "this" on the right of line 1 and again on the left of line 8 both measure 9mm.

Moving on to your allegation that the "small scratch mark near the left upper part of the right-hand vertical stroke of the letter 'H'" is "accidental" and therefore "suspicious", please note similar marks at the same point on 3 other known-to-be-authentic Truman signatures dated December 23, 1946 (again Truman-Bush), September 25, 1949 (Truman-Fatterson) and August 15, 1947 (again Truman-Fatterson, but just signed "Harry").

It should also be pointed out that "Multiple photo-copying operations" generally make lines less rather than more distinct, especially in the case of lines which are thin and broken as is the upstroke line on the "y" in "Harry" in TF. See examples attached.

None of this, of course, suggests that the TF memo is authentic. The only point being made here is that your pronouncement of these two signatures as "identical" is seriously in error.

Just as an aside, had I set out to counterfeit a signature using a xerox, I would have cut a Harry from one signature and a Truman from another, or even tried piecing bits of several signatures together.

Two other things before I close. First, I expect you to circulate this letter to the same list that received your "Smoking Gun" letter of September 20th and to send me a letter certifying that you have done so; and second, your invitation for us to join with you is somewhat ill conceived. Methinks, rather tis you who should be offering to join us. After having stumbled as many times as you have with respect to claims you've made about these documents, it's high time you start looking at them from another point of view.

Yours,

September 20, 1989

"SMOKING GUN" CONFIRMS THAT MJ-12 DOCUMENTS ARE COUNTERFEIT

A person's hand-written signature is like a snowflake--no two are identical.

Before the advent of the "Xerox Era," and the "Auto-pen" machine, the very existence of two identical signatures was considered to be "very strong evidence of forgery," according to the book "Questioned Documents," authored by Albert S. Osborn, published in 1978. Osborn notes that "the fact that two signatures are very nearly alike is not alone necessarily an indication of forgery of one or both but the question is whether they are suspiciously alike." (Emphasis added.)

The MJ-12 papers that were released by William L. Moore, Jaime Shandera and Stanton T. Friedman in May, 1987, reportedly were received on 35 mm. film by Shandera on Dec. 11, 1984. The MJ-12 documents consisted of what purported to be a briefing paper for President-elect Eisenhower, seemingly written by Rear-Adm. R.H. Hillenkoetter, and a purported memorandum signed by President Harry Truman to Defense Secretary James Forrestal, dated September 24, 1947, which called for the creation of "Operation Majestic Twelve" (MJ-12).

THE "HARRY TRUMAN" SIGNATURE ON THIS MJ-12 LETTER IS IDENTICAL TO THE SIGNATURE ON AN AUTHENTIC LETTER THAT TRUMAN WROTE TO DR. VANNEVAR BUSH ON OCTOBER 1, 1947. FURTHER, THE MJ-12 SIGNATURE IS "SUSPICIOUSLY ALIKE" THE ONE OF OCTOBER 1, 1947, IN THAT BOTH HAVE A SMALL (accidental) SCRATCH MARK NEAR THE LEFT UPPER PART OF THE RIGHT-HAND VERTICAL STROKE OF THE LETTER "H".

Photo-copies of both signatures are supplied so you can superimpose them and hold them up to a light source for your own examination. The Truman signature and small "scratch mark" on the MJ-12 memo are slightly heavier than on the original Oct. 1, 1947, letter, as a result of multiple photo-copying operations used in making the hoax document.

Photo-copies of other known-to-be-authentic Truman signatures, written during the same time-period, are included so that you can make a similar comparison with the authentic Truman Oct. 1, 1947, letter-signature to substantiate that each genuine signature is unique. (Copies of the complete letters from which signatures were taken are available on request.)

--more--

Sept. 20, 1989

Because this Truman memorandum is counterfeit, clearly the ~~alleged Hillenkoetter MJ-12 briefing paper~~, contained on the same 35 mm. film, is also a counterfeit because it includes a reference to a "special classified executive order of President Truman on 24 September, 1947..." involving Bush and Forrestal. (Numerous other flaws which indicate the Hillenkoetter briefing paper is counterfeit are detailed in my two articles in The Skeptical Inquirer, [Winter 1987-88, Spring 1988.])

Today, there are signature machines, such as the "Auto-pen," manufactured by a small company near Washington D.C., used by the White House, by Congress, and others, which can create any number of identical signatures for busy executives whose signatures are needed for large numbers of outgoing letters. The first such machine made its government debut during the Truman Administration for use in the Defense Dept., according to an article in the Aug. 22, 1989, edition of The Washington Post.

Was such a machine in use in the White House in 1947, when the Truman MJ-12 memo purportedly was written? In response to my query, the director of the Harry S. Truman Library--Dr. Benedict K. Zobrist--wrote me on July 25, 1989, to say: "My archives staff has never found in the White House files any evidence that Truman ever used a signature machine." (Emphasis added.)

Even if a signature machine had been installed in the White House in 1947, it would take less time for the President to sign the single MJ-12 memo than to call and ask his secretary to take it to the signature machine!

Others have earlier pointed out another suspicious flaw in the alleged Truman memo to Forrestal. This is the fact that the numerical portion of the date--"24, 1947"--was typed using a different machine than the one used to type "September."

The logical explanation for this is that the counterfeiter used a 30+ year old machine to make it appear that the memo was written in 1947. But the ancient-vintage machine's numerical keys were inoperative, forcing the counfeiter to type the numerical part of the date on a more modern machine and paste it in. If this were an authentic Truman memo, it would indicate that the President's secretary did not have access to a fully operable typewriter--which is unthinkable.

Stanton T. Friedman, who together with Moore and Shandera made public the MJ-12 papers in the spring of 1987, knew shortly after their release--more than two years ago--that the Truman signature on the MJ-12 memorandum was identical to the one on Truman's Oct. 1, 1947 letter to Bush.

Sept. 20, 1989

Friedman reported this fact in his article published in the Sept./Oct. 1987, issue of International UFO Reporter. But he implied that the "match" between the signature on the Oct. 1 letter to Bush and the Sept. 24 MJ-12 memo indicated that the MJ-12 document was authentic when in fact it revealed just the opposite. (I am indebted to Christopher D. Allan of the U.K. for bringing Friedman's claim to my attention, and to Joe Nickell for supplying references from the book "Questioned Documents.")

Friedman and Moore are believed to have obtained a copy of the authentic Oct. 1, 1947, Truman-Bush memorandum from the Bush collection in the Manuscript Div. of the Library of Congress at least several years before the MJ-12 papers reportedly were received. Their perusal of the Bush papers in the Library of Congress was prompted by a 1950 memorandum written by a Canadian scientist, named Wilbert B. Smith. His memo claimed that the U.S. government was conducting a highly classified investigation into "flying saucers" which was headed by Bush.

Evidence of Friedman's and Moore's research into the Bush papers can be found in Moore's mid-1982 MUFON conference proceedings paper. Moore disclosed that Bush had returned to Washington about Sept. 16, 1947, and on Sept. 24, 1947, he and Forrestal had met with Truman, and Bush had agreed to head the Pentagon's new research and development board.


Earlier this year, Friedman received a \$16,000 grant from the Fund for UFO Research for further investigation into the authenticity of the MJ-12 papers. Ironically, he already had in his possession the "smoking gun."

I INVITE MOORE, SHANDERA AND/OR FRIEDMAN TO JOIN ME IN ATTEMPTING TO DETERMINE THE PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THESE COUNTERFEIT DOCUMENTS BY RESPONDING FULLY AND CANDIDLY TO MY REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION. I remind Friedman and Moore that in their 1981 MUFON paper, they quoted Albert Einstein as follows: "The right to search for the truth implies also a duty; one must not conceal any part of what one has recognized to be the truth."

[Reproduced below is President Truman's authentic signature from his Oct. 1, 1947, letter to Dr. Vannevar Bush. Compare it with the MJ-12 signature, and with other authentic signatures reproduced on the attached page.]

October 1, 1947

Sincerely yours,



(Authentic)

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

Harry Truman

January 14, 1947

February 28, 1947

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

July 31, 1947

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

all over

April 16, 1947

Very sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

November 8, 1947

Very sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

September 26, 1947

start. It is most

I am happy to have it.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

December 23, 1946

September 24, 1947.

be my feeling that any future
to the ultimate disposition
rest solely with the Office
wing appropriate discussions
and the Director of Central

MJ-12

Harry Truman

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
4.12
2.25

October 1, 1947

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much your good
letter of September twenty-sixth and I hope
things will work out in a satisfactory manner
this coming season.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman
4.71
7.74
2.86
2.35
1.70
4.24
5.94
2.50

Dr. Vannevar Bush
Chairman
The Joint Research and Development Board
Washington 25, D. C.

TOP SECRET
EYES ONLY
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
2.75


September 24, 1947.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Dear Secretary Forrestal:

As per our recent conversation on this matter, you are hereby authorized to proceed with all due speed and caution upon your undertaking. Hereafter this matter shall be referred to only as Operation Majestic Twelve.

It continues to be my feeling that any future considerations relative to the ultimate disposition of this matter should rest solely with the Office of the President following appropriate discussions with yourself, Dr. Bush and the Director of Central Intelligence.



3.2% longer than signature on Truman-Bush.

TOP SECRET
EYES ONLY

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 26, 1949


Dear Bob:

You don't know how much I enjoyed the visit with you the other day. It was certainly a pleasure to see you and have a chance for a frank talk.

I appreciate also your letter of the twenty-second on the subject which we discussed.

I hope everything is going well with you and that your family are in good health. I also hope that you will always drop in to see me when you are in this part of the world.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Harry Truman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. Above the signature, the words "Sincerely yours," are printed. To the left of the signature, there is a circled number "11".

Honorable Robert P. Patterson
One Wall Street
New York 5, New York

*This is blue (bright blue) type on
pale green*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 23, 1946


CARNEGIE
INSTITUTION
DEC 24 1946

OF WASHINGTON

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much yours
of the nineteenth, containing the memo-
randum prepared by you and Mr. Cox on
the Presidential staff. It is most
interesting and I am happy to have it.

Sincerely yours,



Honorable Vannevar Bush
1530 P Street, Northwest
Washington 25, D.C.

via ... N ... 12/24/46 ...

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 15, 1947

Dear Bob:


I am enclosing you the letter dated July eighteenth, written on my regular stationery with the electric typewriter in nonfading ink.

We certainly miss you around here. At every Cabinet Meeting since you left somebody has remarked on your absence.

You will never know what a contribution you made to the welfare of the country during your years as Secretary of War after I became President.

Please remember me to Mrs. Patterson and all the rest of the family.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Harry S. Truman". The signature is written over the word "Sincerely yours," and extends downwards and to the left.

Honorable Robert P. Patterson
Cold Spring
New York

Harry Truman

February 28, 1947

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

January 14, 1947

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

July 31, 1947

Very sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

November 8, 1947

start. It is most

I am happy to have it.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

December 23, 1946

P.K.'s OWN
EXAMPLES!

NOTE.

Wm.
9/23/49

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

alloran

April 16, 1947

Very sincerely yours,

Harry Truman

September 26, 1947

September 24, 1947

It is my feeling that any future
as to the ultimate disposition
rest solely with the Office
following appropriate discussions
with the Director of Central

MJ-12

Harry Truman

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
← 2.25 →

October 1, 1947

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much your good
letter of September twenty-sixth and I hope
things will work out in a satisfactory manner
this coming season.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Truman
← 4.71 →
← 7.74 →
← 2.86 →
← 2.50 →
← 2.35 →
← 1.70 →
← 4.24 →
5.94

Dr. Vannevar Bush
Chairman
The Joint Research and Development Board
Washington 25, D. C.

GENERATION: MY COPY OF "TB" IS A XEROX OF
THE ORIGINAL. WE WILL CALL THAT A COPY OF
THE FIRST GENERATION.
THIS COPY IS: ~~②~~ ③ ○ ○

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON


October 1, 1947

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much your good
letter of September twenty-sixth and I hope
things will work out in a satisfactory manner
this coming season.

Sincerely yours


COMPARABLE



Dr. Vannevar Bush
Chairman
The Joint Research and Development Board
Washington 25, D. C.

GENERATION: MY COPY OF "TB" IS A XEROX OF
THE ORIGINAL. WE WILL CALL THAT A COPY OF
THE FIRST GENERATION.

THIS COPY IS:



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON


October 1, 1947

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much your good
letter of September twenty-sixth and I hope
things will work out in a satisfactory manner
this coming season.

Sincerely yours,


COMPAR



Dr. Vannevar Bush
Chairman
The Joint Research and Development Board
Washington 25, D. C.

GENERATION: MY COPY OF "TB" IS A XEROX OF
THE ORIGINAL. WE WILL CALL THAT A COPY OF
THE FIRST GENERATION.

THIS COPY IS:



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON


October 1, 1947

Dear Dr. Bush:

I appreciated very much your good letter of September twenty-sixth and I hope things will work out in a satisfactory manner this coming season.

Sincerely yours,


COMPAR



Dr. Vannevar Bush
Chairman
The Joint Research and Development Board
Washington 25, D. C.

GENERATION: MY COPY OF "TB" IS A XEROX OF THE ORIGINAL. WE WILL CALL THAT A COPY OF THE FIRST GENERATION.

THIS COPY IS:



RE: C.D. ALLAN

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MJ-12 FILM PACKAGE SENT TO
JAIME SHANDERA IN DECEMBER 1984

The postmark of the package containing the MJ-12 film is illustrated in the MUFON 1988 Symposium Proceedings, but with the city of origin expunged by the authors (Bill Moore & Stanton Friedman). The date is barely legible on my xerox copy, but the postmark still has interesting features.

The stamps are the common 20c 'flag over Supreme Court' stamps (Scott catalogue #1896), issued in December 1981. The versions used are the booklet stamps. That these are booklet panes is shown by the straight cuts or closely trimmed perforations on the outer vertical edges. Coil stamps have straight cut horizontal edges and perforated sides, while sheet stamps have perforations on all 4 edges. 12 stamps are used in 3 blocks of 4.

Some points arising:

1. Some have surmised that the MJ-12 papers are part of an official disinformation policy to discredit ufology or as part of some official plan to educate the public into acceptance of ETH. This idea can be discounted entirely. Mail coming from an official source is never sent out in this way. All such mail is franked; postage stamps are very rarely, if ever, used.

2. It is highly irregular for a post office clerk to fix three blocks of low value booklet pane stamps on a package. Franking is the norm, or else one or two high value stamps. This strongly implies that the sender weighed the package himself, knew the correct postage and fixed the stamps before taking it for mailing. This in turn suggests the sender was someone who sent out a lot of mail on a regular basis.

3. My conclusions are that the sender was a private individual who regularly used booklet pane stamps in blocks (instead of singly) 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 (a large such business would almost certainly use a P.O. meter), but would exclude someone who consistently used high denomination stamps.

Additional point:

The package is addressed to Jaime Shandera (without the 'Mr'). In writings on MJ-12 I have seen Shandera's first name spelt both Jaime and Jamie. Which is correct?

Christopher D. Allan
15 The Gables,
Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent
ENGLAND.

June, 1989

WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
ANTARES PUBLICATIONS; THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC.; "FOCUS"
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505

PHONE (213) 463-0542 (10 AM - 6 PM)

13 JUN. '89

Dear Mr. Allan:

Well, "C.D.", this time you've really put your foot in your mouth! In the last communication I had from you, there was at least some indication that you knew what logic and scientific method was all about. This latest piece, however, serves only to convince me that you are no better than the rest of the so-called skeptical crowd. If you would be so kind as to permit me a friendly suggestion, Mr. Allan, it is that next time before you put your mouth in gear, try obtaining the pertinent facts first! It's far less embarrassing that way. What you have written about the "MJ-12 packet postage stamp affair" makes you look like a real idiot. (Perhaps you are-- after all how would I know? I've never met you.)

In any case, if you can stop trying to make yourself look important ("Hey, look at me folks! I'm C.D. Allan and I'm skeptical about UFOs! Please notice me.) long enough to absorb a few facts, you might just want to revise your silly little "conclusions" into something more in line with the facts. And, all chiding aside, had you troubled to ask me, I would have been happy to provide them to you in a much more acceptable format than this (purposely nasty) letter.

Your letter makes two main points and then offers a conclusion. Let's review both of your points and then examine your conclusion to see if it is consistent with the facts. But first, let's keep in mind the one thing about the MJ-12 film packet that I think we can all agree upon: Whoever sent that packet wanted to remain anonymous. (Logic: It's been four and a half years since the packet was sent, and the sender has not yet identified himself.)

Your two main points break down as follows:

- (1) All official mail sent in the U.S. is franked. Postage stamps are rarely if ever used.
- (2) The postage stamps on the MJ-12 film packet consist of three

blocks of low value booklet pane stamps instead of a franked stamp or one or two high value stamps, thus implying that the sender weighed the packet himself, knew the correct postage, and applied the proper stamps before mailing it.

From these "facts", you then conclude that the sender was "a private individual who regularly used booklet pane stamps in blocks...and who was regularly involved in mailing packets." You go on to suggest that 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 P.O. meter" or have high value stamps on hand.

Such are your conclusions. Here are the facts you forgot to mention, or in your haste to throw more rocks in my direction, simply never knew in the first place:

(A) The MJ-12 film packet contains twelve stamps with a denomination of \$.20 each, making a total of \$2.40.

(B) If one substitutes a roll of undeveloped film similar to the one originally inside, and then weighs the packet, one discovers that the total weight is 2.4 U.S. ounces. The packet was mailed via First Class Mail.

(C) In December, 1984 (when the packet was mailed), the postage requirement for a 2.4 ounce packet sent via First Class Mail was exactly \$.50 (fifty cents); which comes up to \$1.90 LESS than the amount on the packet.

Now that you know this, Mr. Allan, how, I wonder, does it square with your conclusion that the sender knew the weight of the packet and knew the correct amount of postage required to send it?

Two additional points. Remembering that the sender wanted to remain anonymous: (1) Officially franked envelopes (or packets) in the U.S. always indicate the name of the agency or the identity of the person who has been granted a franking privilege as a part of the frank; and (2) Stamps produced by means of a postage (or P.O.) meter always bear the identifying number of the meter used, which can be easily traced directly to the person or firm which owns or holds the lease on the meter.

In your haste to cast aspersions upon my integrity, Mr. Allan, you have stumbled badly. Had you asked me to assist you with this little investigation of yours, I would have been more than happy to do so. Instead, you chose to try to make yourself look important by snidely implying that I ("a small mail order

business" person, "publisher" and "editor") was responsible for having mailed the packet (and, by implication, thus created its contents). Mr. Allan-- I do not take such actions lightly! Should you elect to continue your thinly veiled attacks upon my reputation, please expect that there will be consequences. I expect nothing less than a full apology and a general retraction of your letter!

Finally, the correct spelling of Mr. Shandera's name is "Jaime".

Cordially,

W.L. Moore

P.S. I have not taken the trouble to copy this letter and send it to the same people indicated on the list at the bottom of yours. I thus leave it to you to rectify this matter in whatever way you deem fair and proper. Since you have created this unfortunate mess, it seems only reasonable that you be the one responsible for cleaning it up. How you do that will tell me a great deal about the sort of person you are and whether I want to continue meaningful correspondence with you or simply turn the matter over to my attorney. At present, my opinion is that you are an honorable man, and a badly misinformed skeptic. If I haven't received a satisfactory reply from you by the end of June, I shall reconsider my position.



WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE ST., SUITE NO 247, BURBANK, CA. 91505

WILLIAM L. MOORE
RICHARD STINGEL, LEIÇA MOORE
PHONE: (818) 506-8365

Date: 04 August, 1988

C.D. Allan
15 the Gables
Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent
England

Dear Mr. Allan

Received your letter of July 10th. Thank you for writing.

With respect to your comments about the word "Matériel", please note that it is correctly spelled either with or without the accent aigu. In that sense, Gen. Twining did not "goof". (See dictionary page encl.)

Enclosed is a copy of a 1953 document showing the date with an "Ol". The style seems to have been peculiar (at that time) to NATO and similar international communications, which strongly suggests that whoever typed the Hillenkoetter document came from that sort of background.

Those who blatantly point out alleged similarities between my peculiar style of writing and that of the MJ-12 document would do well to balance the issue by noting the obvious dissimilarities as well! For example, I have always spelled "travelling" with two "l"s, while the word in the Hillenkoetter document is spelled with only one. Equally, I do not hyphenate "extraterrestrial"—a word which is hyphenated in the H. document and which Adm. H. himself hyphenated in his own writings. Balance is the key to good research, Mr. Allan. Keep it in mind!

Finally, I would very much appreciate a copy of the UFO-Brigantia piece you did on MJ-12. I wonder if you would be kind enough to send me a copy?

I certainly will enjoy sunny California. That's why I live here.

Yours,

WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
ANTARES PUBLICATIONS, THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC., "FOCUS"
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505

PHONE (818) 506-8365 (9 AM - 5 PM)

June 29, 1988

C.D. Allan
15, the Gables
Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent
ENGLAND

Dear Mr. Allan:

Let's just suppose for a moment that I took you up on the "suggestion" you make in your letter to me of June 19th, and that a well-known group of Southern California spiritualists held a seance at which the shade of some former MJ-12 member was conjured up. Let us further suppose that this disembodied spirit was so cooperative as to confirm the existence of an MJ-12 group and affirm the accuracy of the information found in the MJ-12 documents. Would you then believe in the reality of crashed UFOs and Majestic-12? Somehow, given the nature of your past communications on the subject to myself and others, I think not!

You recently received a letter from my good friend Jerome Clark in which he made several candid observations. Your letter of June 19th does an excellent job of convincing me that he was, as usual, right on the mark.

The publication you have ordered is being sent to you under separate cover. You have been shooting off your mouth about the unlikelihood of the Roswell Incident for quite a few years now. It's about time you finally got around to actually reading some of the research on the subject. While you're at it, please permit me to strongly recommend our item #1290 entitled "Phil Klass and MJ-12: What are the Facts?" (\$7.00 + postage). You might just discover a few things friendly Phil hasn't told you about.

Cordially,

W.L. Moore

B

985 Cahill Dr. W.
Ottawa, Ont.
K1V-9H9
August 31, 1991

Mr. Grant Cameron
649 Silverstone Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T-2V8


Dear Mr. Cameron:

I recently read your's and Crain's excellent book, UFO's, MJ-12 and the Government, and would like to congratulate you for a job well done. I am a Mufon Field Investigator Trainee and have had a close working relationship with Mr. Clive Nadin, the head of the Ottawa Centre for UFO Studies, for a couple of years now. Your book prompted me to recently write a letter to Capt. Robert M. Collins, USAF retired, whom both you and Crain explicitly identify as "Condor," something that I too, accept. In my August 4 1991 letter to Collins, a copy of which is enclosed, I implicitly identified him as Condor, without actually using the term "Condor". I also asked him if he would "play ball" with me and perhaps give me some UFO information (the classified kind) that wasn't already out in the public domain. I fully realized, of course, that the chances of him cooperating in this regard were pretty slim, since he didn't even know me. But Dr. Eric Walker didn't know William Steinman when Steinman first spoke to him, and look at what Steinman allegedly found out from that first contact e.g. confirmation of the existence of MJ-12 from Dr. Walker, as stated in your book. Thus, adopting the philosophy of "nothing ventured, nothing gained," I wrote Collins. I received a response to my letter from Bill Moore, on behalf of Collins, a couple of weeks later, a copy of which is also enclosed. In it, Moore claims the statement in my letter to Collins of Collins being formerly involved in a covert capacity in UFO research and investigations for the U.S. government, had "absolutely no basis in fact," adding that "those who would repeat it are acting irresponsibly." He also claimed that my letter to Collins evidenced paranoia! My August 25 1991 response to Moore's letter is enclosed.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would comment on your's and Crain's belief that Collins is Condor. Forinstance, I assume you and Crain have established that the facts surrounding Condor--i.e. that, according to Leonard Stringfield, he was stationed at Wright-Pat in 1985 (1986 in your book), and was later assigned to the Plasma Physics Group, Sandia National Laboratory, Kirtland AFB--also apply to Collins, thus lending strong support that Condor is Collins. You also state that Linda Moulton Howe has said that in 1987, Collins had a meeting with her and John Lear in Albuquerque, NM, where he showed them a number of UFO intelligence documents and claimed that he had been working with Bill Moore for years. Did Howe indicate that

Collins identified himself as Condor at the meeting? I plan to inquire about this to Linda Howe directly, as well. Could you please give me your colleague Mr. Crain's address so I may write to him for his comments regarding Collins also? It would be deeply appreciated! Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kevin". The signature is stylized with a cursive 'K' and a simple 'evin'.

Kevin A. Smith

985 Cahill Dr. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1V-9H9
CANADA

Capt. Robert M. Collins, USAF (retired)
c/o Fair Witness Project, Inc.
4219 W. Olive Ave., Suite 247
Burbank, CA
91505

August 4, 1991

Dear Mr. Collins:

Allow me to introduce myself. I am a recent Focus subscriber and a Canadian UFO researcher. My primary interest in the UFO phenomenon is the U.S. military and intelligence communities involvement in investigating and researching UFO's and recovered alien craft, and the technology of said alien craft. I am aware that you were covertly involved in UFO investigations and research for the U.S. government. This is indicated by the fact that you had approached veteran researcher Leonard Stringfield a number of times in 1985 when you were stationed at Wright-Patterson AFB. To quote Stringfield, "Expressing interest in my research and sources, he claimed to know a colonel with sensitive information relative to my work, but his proposal for me to meet with this source fell through and I heard no more." (Leonard Stringfield, "UFO Crash/Retrievals: Is the Cover-Up Lifting?" in The UFO Report 1990, ed. Timothy Good [London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1989], p. 174.) Also, television producer Linda Moulton Howe stated that in November 1987 she had a meeting with you, along with UFO researcher John Lear, at which you showed them some intelligence documents relating to the subject, and that you also stated you were one of Bill Moore's intelligence contacts re. UFO's for a number of years. I was wondering if you have since then made those documents you showed Linda Howe public, and if not, your reasons for it. Political interference, perhaps? Would you be willing to relate to me the information that was contained in those documents you showed Linda Howe? Even better, of course, would be actual copies of them

To be honest with you, I would be very grateful indeed if you would be willing to "play ball" with me and disseminate to me some intelligence information concerning UFO's. Of course, I would only be interested in getting information that wasn't already out in the public domain. Naturally, I would completely respect any desire on your part for me to keep your identity confidential. Please respond to my queries, whether by mail or by phone, although mail would obviously be a lot cheaper than making a

long-distance call (although I would be willing, of course, to accept charges). If you decide to respond by mail, for your own protection do not use your actual name--something I'm sure I don't have to tell you. And in case you wish to phone me, my number is 613-733-9195.

Cordially,

Kevin A. Smith

THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC.
PEREGRINE COMMUNICATIONS (SUCCESSOR TO WM L. MOORE PUB. & RES.)
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CA 91505 USA

August 12, 1991

Kevin Smith
985 Cahill Dr. W.
Ottawa, ON K1V 9H9
CANADA

Dear Mr. Smith:

Mr. Collins has asked me to extend his thanks to you for your recent letter and to kindly inform you that he must respectfully decline your offer to "play ball." He has also asked me to correct your mistaken characterization of him as one who was "covertly involved in UFO investigations and research for the U.S. government." This statement has absolutely no basis in fact and those who would repeat it are acting irresponsibly.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to express my own concern about the level of paranoia evidenced in your letter. Paranoia has no place in meaningful UFO research and can only impede your search for truth.

Mr. Collins' articles will continue to appear as a regular feature of FOCUS. I hope you will continue to subscribe.

Yours very truly,



William L. Moore
on behalf of M. Collins

985 Cahill Dr. W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1V-9H9
CANADA
August 25, 1991

Mr. Bill Moore
4219 West Olive Ave., Suite 247
Burbank, CA
91505

Dear Mr. Moore:

With regards to your August 12, 1991 letter to me on behalf of Mr. Collins, I am touched that you are concerned about the paranoia that you perceive was in my August 4, 1991 letter to Mr. Collins and I am glad to see that you are at last showing concern for the welfare of others, such as myself. This is a refreshing change to your past stated behaviour when you showed a remarkable lack of concern over the welfare of UFO researcher Paul Bennewitz, as demonstrated by the fact that while his sanity slowly eroded away as a result of the intense disinformation campaign launched against him by the Intelligence Community some few years ago, which you knew was taking place since you were told about it by some intelligence agents for the purpose of having you monitor the efficacy of the disinformation, you didn't lift a finger to help him. (And I am painfully aware of your explanation as to why you "played their game," so please don't waste your time in recounting the details.) The fact that you don't give specific examples of what you believe constitutes paranoia in my letter indicates either that you are lazy in not providing those examples, or that you can't find any examples, in which case your statement of paranoia on my part constitutes nothing more than libel on your part, to which I would strongly suggest you refrain from in the future. However, assuming you actually did have a few examples in mind, but were too lazy to write them down, I shall attempt to deduce your "examples," Psychiatrist Moore, and provide a rebuttal as to why they are not paranoid in nature, but rather very sound and logical.

Perhaps you have in mind as one "example," my statement at the end of my letter to Collins that for his own protection, he shouldn't use his (actual) name if he decides to respond i.e. by passing on to me classified UFO information. The word "protection" can be interpreted in a number of ways, and if you consider my use of it as paranoia, then apparantly you chose to interpret it in the most heavy-handed way possible. First of all, in using that word, I did NOT mean protection from physical harm at the hands of the U.S. government! I do not think for two seconds that if the U.S. government had proof that one of their citizens was passing classified information to an unauthorized person, whether UFO-related or not, that they in any way would physically harm that person, despite shadowy and unsubstantiated rumours to the contrary that have been floating around the rumour mills for a long time now. What I did mean by using the word "protection" was protection for Collins from possible prosecution by the U.S. government

should he reveal classified data to an unauthorized person such as myself. And that is a very real possibility if the government had incontrovertible proof of such, such as a signed letter from Collins revealing classified data to me. But, you may object, how would the government know about such a letter if I kept it confidential? The fact of the matter is that just because one says to a potential source of classified information, that they can be trusted to keep their identity confidential, doesn't mean they will! Thus, even though I said to Collins that I would "completely respect" any desire that he had for me to keep his identity confidential (which I would), I can completely understand it if Collins didn't believe me wholeheartedly because of the fact that he doesn't know me (and someone's word when you don't know that person isn't much to go on . . .). So when I said to Collins that if he decided to respond by mail, then for his own protection he shouldn't use his name, all I meant to do was to simply reassure him that I would understand if he didn't completely trust me to keep a letter he sent me confidential. Hence, I would understand if he wrote me back a "no-name" response. There is nothing "paranoid" about that, Mr. Moore

Perhaps you think it is "paranoid" for me to raise the possibility that the reason Collins hadn't released the documents he showed Linda Moulton Howe and John Lear in a meeting he had with them in November 1987, which I discussed in my letter to Collins, was because of political interference. Raising this as a possibility hardly constitutes "paranoia" on my part, as political interference has resulted in the suspension of more than one attempt on the part of the U.S. government to indoctrinate the public about UFO's. Timothy Good discusses a number of these government attempts-that-failed in his book Alien Liason. For example, in early 1973, film producers Robert Emenegger and Allan Sandler were promised film by high-ranking USAF personnel at the Pentagon of the Holloman AFB incident, as well as film of other UFO material, for use in a UFO documentary they were asked to produce by the USAF. But permission to use the film was suddenly withdrawn by Col. Coleman, who had been involved with Project Blue Book. It was explained that the timing was politically inappropriate due to the Watergate scandal.

In sum, Mr. Moore, your allegation of "paranoia" in my letter to Collins is totally unfounded and groundless, and by making such a false and unsubstantiated allegation, you yourself are displaying a level of paranoia, not to mention unprofessionalism, that has me concerned. You say in your letter that "paranoia has no meaningful place in UFO research and can only impede your search for truth." Well said, Mr. Moore, I couldn't agree more (no pun intended). So is the case with making unsubstantiated allegations, so perhaps you should stop practicing both

This brings me to my next point, namely, your claim that my statement about Mr. Collins being "covertly involved in UFO investigations and research for the U.S. government" is an unsubstantiated allegation. To use your own words, my statement "has absolutely no basis in fact and those who would repeat it are acting irresponsibly." Your claim, not mine, seems to have "absolutely no basis in fact" what with the account I gave in my letter to Collins, partially recounted above, of credible UFO researcher Linda Moulton Howe saying that back in 1987, he showed her and John Lear a number of UFO intelligence documents and said that he was one of your intelligence

contacts for years. Given that this is true, your statement that Collins wasn't involved in UFO investigations and research is a flat out-and-out lie. And you will have to forgive me and other UFO researchers, Mr. Moore, when we act "irresponsibly" by continuing to investigate this matter concerning Collins' past involvement in the government UFO scene. For instance, Grant Cameron and T. Scott Crain state outright in their book UFO's, MJ-12 and the Government that Robert M. Collins was Condor. I implied the same in my letter to Collins, although I never actually used the term "Condor," by quoting Leonard Stringfield commenting on Condor and implicitly equating Collins with Condor. I am sure Cameron and Crain would be very interested to see your comments implying otherwise, and your comments do imply otherwise. For in the television documentary "UFO Cover-up? Live," it was stated that Condor was in a need-to-know position for government information on UFO's. Thus, given that this is true, by saying that Collins wasn't involved in UFO investigations and research for the U.S. government, you are saying that Collins isn't Condor, Q.E.D. Being the objective UFO researcher that you portray yourself to be, I know you will be delighted to learn that I am sending Cameron and Crain a copy of 1) my August 4, 1991 letter to Collins, 2) your response on behalf of Mr. Collins, and 3) this letter to you, for their remarks.

In pursuit of truth,



Kevin A. Smith

20 May 1989

Mr. T. SCOTT CRAIN, Jr.
P.O. Box 11
Port Matilda, PA 16870

Dear Mr. Crain:

Sir, I just received your letter dated "May 16, 1989", Thank you!

I shall try and answer some of your questions. Remember, however, that I can ONLY speak for myself. I can NOT speak for someone else, unless they have SPECIFICALLY given me permission to do so.

1. Mr. WILLIAM L. MOORE has SPECIFICALLY given me permission to state that Mr. Richard C. Doty is NOT "FALCON"!

Why do I trust Mr. Moore and not the others? Since 1983 my wife and I have had dinner engagements with Mr. Moore on the average of about one every two months and they last about 2 hours per session. That is equal to about 28 hours of time with Mr. Moore.

I have never met Doty, nor Linda Howe, so I can not speak for them. I have met Mr. William Steinman and he has called me on the telephone on several occasions. His last telephone call was a very bad experience! He tried to convince me that I had misrepresented the facts about Mr. Moore which I shall attempt to rectify. I do not like Mr. William Steinman, simply because he has misrepresented me, and because he has never taken the opportunity to ask me for some time to spend with Mr. Moore to correct his statements.

2. I LEE MARVIN GRAHAM BELIEVE that Mr. WILLIAM L. MOORE works WITH (I reiterate WITH) some agency of the United States Government that wants the American Public to believe that the "BRIEFING DOCUMENT: OPERATION MAJESTIC 12" is authentic. I would like to believe that I am doing a service for my Country not simply feeding the public disinformation.

I have met Mr. Philip J. Klass on two occasions. I met him

on FEB 14, 1986 (see enclosure A-1 and A-2) and on 17 MAY 1989 (see enclosure B). On this occasion (see enclosure B) I publicly confronted Mr. Klass because he had made inaccurate allegations with regard to Mr. WILLIAM L. MOORE and myself. Try and get a copy of the tape. I would welcome the opportunity for Mr. MOORE to publicly confront Mr. KLASS!

3. I do NOT trust Mr. Klass and believe that he would tell any lie if it served his purpose!

I met Hastings twice (I believe). I am still trying to get him to correct the statements he has made.

Please correct me if I am mistaken, but Mr. Hastings has never met Mr. Moore or does he claim so? Mr. Moore DID try and meet with Mr. Hastings to have him correct the inaccuracies he (Hastings) made. I was personally involved in trying to get the two of them together! I welcome the opportunity for them to talk to one another; first in private, and then in public.

4. Mr. Crain, Sir, it is a FACT of my own experience that it is Hastings that is on Mr. Moore's back, not the other way around! This was my first experience of seeing Mr. Moore deeply hurt. He said to me- "Lee, I didn't deserve that!"

As to the friendship between Mr. Moore and Mr. Graham; that was very hard to come by. Mr. Moore and I were not friends when he asked me to be on the Board of Directors of the FAIR WITNESS PROJECT. Mr. Moore and I have had some very serious differences of opinion and we have fought with one another far harder than any other individuals in the UFO community. We have learned to respect each other because we are after the same thing; i. e., the authentication or refutation of the MJ-12 material.

I trust Mr. Moore because I have had to lay my security clearance on the line for him. I am an electronic technician, I am not a Ufologist. My wife and I have had many very REAL fears (and still do) about if what I am doing is right; i. e., openly attacking the UFO cover-up about MJ-12 with the FOIA. I know of no other individual in the UFO community who has laid their job/career on the line believing that Mr. Moore is working WITH some element of the United States Government in trying to tell the truth. You are the very first person that I know of that has stated that

Graham is "...a highly respected researcher in the UFO community...". Ask Mr. Klass if Mr. Graham is highly respected. He stated publicly (on 17 MAY 1989) that I was "the most gullible individual he had ever met", and that simply because I challenged him to go to the National Security Council or the FBI if he believed that I or Mr. Moore were doing anything wrong in circulating the MJ-12 documents.

As to who first circulated the MJ-12 document, I offer in evidence a letter (see enclosure C-8) dated "23 September 1985". I respectfully request to know if you can provide me with any document that has an earlier date.

Before Mr. Moore went public with the MJ-12 document, in late May 1987, he gave me a week or two grace period to circulate the document among my friends. I began that circulation on May 2, 1987. Do you have anyone with an earlier date?


I called Mr. Moore just before I publicly confronted Mr. Klass (see enclosure B) and was given permission to state-

5. "FALCON" told Mr. Moore to find some individual through whom the MJ-12 document could be leaked to the public, there were several people who had been looked at to do the job. "FALCON" asked Mr. Moore who he chose, Mr. Moore indicated that they should "go with Graham."

Why was I picked? Perhaps there is something in my background that would reveal the why. You are most welcome to research and publish the why.

Thank you for your time, Sir.

Sincerely,



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

WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
ANTARES PUBLICATIONS; THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC.; "FOCUS"
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505

PHONE (213) 463-0542 (10 AM - 6 PM)

14 SEP. '89

T. Scott Crain
POBX 11
Port Matilda, PA 16870

Dear Scott:

Nice talking with you today. The conversation left me with the very positive feeling that some of the air had cleared between us.

With respect to Bill Steinman, you certainly must have a copy of the "Sarbacher Letter" around. Pull it out and read it once again before you continue with this letter. Get a feeling for exactly what it says and does not say. Now, turn the page and read Bill Steinman's interpretation of it as communicated to Gray Barker in March of '84-- well before the Sarbacher Letter found its way into the public domain. If, at this point, you find yourself in a position of having to reconsider Steinman's credibility, then you're in excellent company. It was precisely over this issue that I broke off relations with Steinman five years ago.

Just as icing on the cake, I've also included some correspondence between Steinman and Jerry Clark which speaks for itself.

Steinman's refusal to release the tape of his alleged conversation with Walker suggests that there might be some chicanery there too. Whether taping phone conversations is illegal or not seems moot here since I am informed that the statute of limitations on such an offense is only three years.

Will reply to your letter when I receive same. Meanwhile,

Best regards,



cc: Cameron ✓

" The truth is only arrived at by the painstaking process of eliminating the untrue."

Sherlock Holmes as quoted by Bill Moore

In a Sept. 14, 1989 letter to myself and T. Scott Crain, William L. Moore sent us a copy of the April 84, Issue #21 Steinman-Gray Barker letter. We were asked to consider Steinman's credibility in light of this letter. Bill Moore stated, " It was precisely over this issue that I broke off relations with Steinman five years ago."

Bill Steinman, it appears, has taken much criticism over this letter from many circles: In an August 6, 1985 letter from Jerome Clark to Bill Steinman, Clark stated he was glad that the Sarbacher letter had gotten wide distribution, " otherwise, we'd have nothing but your lurid fantasies about it (such as your science-fictional version described in GRAY BARKER'S NEWSLETTER awhile back.)"

In a May 25, 84 letter from Stanton Friedman to William Steinman, Friedman also hints at this letter. " I must express my strong concern about not going past the data...as was the case with Sarbacher."

I was most concerned , related to the Steinman-Barker letter, about why Steinman would say that Sarbacher had attended the WPAFB meeting when Steinman knew quite clearly that he had not. Fortunately, before Steinman had the chance to write me and point out my lack of checking and verifying, I discovered the answer for myself. Had others checked, they too, would have discovered the fact that Gray Barker made significant and damaging changes to the letter.

Here are the FACTS

The Steinman-Gray letter referred to by all researchers is a rewritten distorted extrapolation of the original Dec 24, 1983 letter. Steinman in his book UFO CRASH AT AZTEC refers to it as " a somewhat distorted version." (P.334) I have enclosed the original which Steinman provided in his book for comparison.

Why did Steinman state Sarbacher had attended the WPAFB meeting when he hadn't? Steinman didn't. Barker added the words (which he attended.) A quick check of the enclosed original will show that these words were not in the original.

Steinman has frequently extrapolated on the known data to present his impression of what that data means. In the Dec. 24, 83 letter to Barker he does so and clearly states this. " My speculations are," writes Steinman, " that the purposes of those meetings were..."

Barker in his rewriting of this sentence, however, leaves out the "my speculationss are" thus making it appear that Steinman is claiming that this information related to the purposes of the WP meetings was given him by Sarbacher. Steinman is saying no such thing.

As to the outcome of the meetings, Steinman states " I believe that the outcome of the meetings..." Barker once again leaves out the " I believe" thus creating the impression that

Steinman is claiming this information came from Sarbacher. Once again this is not true.

As to the diversionary measures Steinman clearly states " I believe the following diversionary measures..." Barker again leaves out the " I believe " in his retelling to make it appear Sarbacher related this information.

Barker even goes as far as to extend the uunderlining under "did recover" to "did recover. three flying saucers." He also capitolized all the words which is not done in the original.

It appearss therefore that Barker is the one that is guilty of lurid fantacies and science fiction versions. Steinman Dec.24,83 letter to Barker was based upon the Sarbacher letter which he received, and on the Smith-Sarbacher notes which he assumed had not yet been released. A re-reading will I think show that Steinman letter was very accurate based on what Sarbacher material he had.

cc William L. Moore
Jerry Clark
William Steinman
Walt Andus
Tom Mickus
T. Scott Crain
Len Stringfield

WILLIAM L. MOORE PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH
ANTARES PUBLICATIONS; THE FAIR-WITNESS PROJECT, INC.; "FOCUS"
SPECIALIZING IN UFOs, NEW AGE, METAPHYSICAL & OCCULT RESEARCH
4219 WEST OLIVE AVE., SUITE #247, BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505

PHONE (213) 463-0542 (10 AM - 6 PM)

6th NOV.'89

Grant Cameron
649 Silverstone Ave.
Winnipeg, MB. R3T0R1

T. Scott Crain
POBX 11
Port Matilda, PA 16870

Dear Grant & Scott:

With respect to Grant's letter of November 2nd regarding the Steinman/Sarbacher/Barker letter, permit me to suggest another scenario: The alleged Steinman letter of December 24th, 1983 which appears in Steinman's book is an after-the-fact fabrication by Steinman! There is strong reason to believe that Steinman's letter to Barker was exactly as quoted by Barker, and that Steinman later rewrote the letter during the process of publishing his book in order to absolve himself and avoid further criticism. Why do I say this?

(1) One of the principal reasons I broke off relations with Steinman was over his letter to Barker. I had quite a row with Bill at the time over that matter, and the only defense he offered was that the contents of the letter to Barker represented what he "believed to be true." He could have easily placated me and avoided the entire situation by pointing out that Barker had altered his letter and by producing a copy of his original to Barker to prove it, but he did not do so; nor did he even try to allege that Barker had altered his text. Why?

(2) Subsequent to my argument with Steinman, I asked Gray Barker (whom I knew quite well) whether he had printed the entire text of Bill's letter or whether he had simply excerpted from it. Barker was always straight forward and up-front with me, although sometimes he would swear me to confidence on things. On this particular occasion he told me that he had printed the letter exactly as received, and seemed quite surprised when I told him what Sarbacher had really said. I suggested to him that he might want to check with me before printing any further letters from Steinman on the Sarbacher matter, and he agreed that it would be a good idea.

(3) Steinman could easily have defended himself to both Clark and Friedman by supplying them with copies of his original letter and pointing out that Barker had altered it, but once again he did not do so. Why?

(4) Following the barrage of criticism on this matter, Steinman could easily have written to Barker and demanded that Barker set the matter straight either by publishing a correction or by supplying Bill with a letter stating that he (Barker) had altered the original text, but he did not do so. Why?

(5) Steinman's book on Aztec came out in 1987-- more than three years after Barker had published his letter. Since Steinman's letter was handwritten; and since (insofar as I can tell) Steinman had never made copies of his original available to anyone in the interval; and since Barker had died, his publications inventory sold off at auction and his files dumped by Sharon Stump (his executrix); would it not have been easy for Steinman to simply "rewrite" his letter (keeping as close to the original text as possible) and publish it in his book? Based upon the above, I strongly suspect, but of course cannot prove, that this is exactly what happened. Perhaps it only occurred to him to do so as he was putting material together for his book.

In closing, I can only offer my personal belief that this is precisely what occurred. Otherwise, how to explain Steinman's total failure to provide this letter earlier on and thus easily vindicate himself? Certainly the confrontation I had with him over this matter was rather heated. If cold water was so readily available, why wasn't it used? Then, of course, there's Gray Barker's statement to contend with. Gray may have been something of a flake with definite leanings toward the sensational and the exaggerated, but I knew him well. He was always candid with me on matters of this sort, and (although I often double-checked) never once did I ever catch him in a lie.

Although your letter on this matter has quite a distribution list, I am sending this to only the two of you. Following your consideration of same, you may distribute as you see fit.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "B" and a trailing flourish.



PHONE:

(818) 506-8365

4219 West Olive St., Suite No. 247, Burbank, CA 91505

Bill Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, CA 90638

12 July, 1984

Dear Bill:

It has now been more than two weeks since you broke off contact with me after I read you out for having cavalierly broken what I considered a commitment of confidentiality on your part. Having committed such a breach of trust and ethics is, of course, serious enough in its own right. Even more unconscionable, however, was the arrogant, irresponsible, "so-what" attitude you expressed concerning it.

I had delayed writing this letter because I knew that you had been on vacation and I had hoped that the rest would somehow bring you to the realization that you had acted badly and that an apology was due. It appears I was mistaken. Your recent, similar experience with another researcher (who shall remain nameless at this point) should have served to teach you a lesson. I had tried to advise you in that instance as to the right thing to do. Apparently you learned nothing therefrom.

I have tried to explain to you that, in this business, credibility is everything. I speak from experience. There have been times when I have had to learn this lesson the hard way. Yet you do not seem to be able to comprehend even this simple fact. Rather, your attitude seems to be that lies, deceit, misrepresentation, distortions of fact and breaches of trust and ethics are all somehow excusable if they serve to advance you toward your final "goal" of discovering the true nature of UFOs.

Yet you are wrong. Like the boy who cried "Wolf" once too often, you are wrong! For in leaving such a legacy of lies and misrepresentations behind you in the pursuit of your goal, you serve only to destroy the very thing you will ultimately need most to make your case— credibility. Who will believe truth from the mouth (or pen) of a man whose entire investigative career has spawned one lie after another? Worse, you, like Zechel before you, will leave such a trail or wreckage in your wake that any legitimate researcher who may try to follow you will literally have to shovel the debris aside to have any hope of success at all. As I've said before, if a job can't be done right, it is better not done at all than to be ruined for all time. Bulls in china shops are only capable of breaking treasures, not preserving them for posterity. Once they are destroyed, gluing them back together is at best a difficult, and often an impossible task. Consider what Zechel has done to the Texas-Mexico border case of 1949 as an example in point. His involvement with that affair has done absolutely nothing to help resolve it and virtually everything to destroy any potential it might have had for a legitimate researcher.

No doubt in your self-righteousness you will claim that you are not Zechel. And indeed you are not. But you did write a letter to Gray Barker, a letter which was published and which was read by God knows how many impressionable people, which was almost 100% lies. LIES! And with your name and address under them!

I can't imagine in my wildest dreams what would lead you to do such a thing, Bill. Are you a fool? An unthinking, incompetent idiot!? A power-hungry, recognition starved maniac? If there's a shred of truth in that entire letter it's perhaps that you managed to spell Gray's name correctly. Consider the following:

- (1) You claim to have received a letter from "a currently prominent and very active scientist, who presides over a major American university".

FACT: The man is not "currently prominent and very active" at all. He is well into his seventies and lives in retirement. He has never "presid(ed) over" any American university, "major", or otherwise. Indeed, he is a scientist of some reputation who once travelled in high circles, but he is hardly what you make him out to be.

I would go so far as to wager a bet that if this man could see your letter about him, he would be horrified.

- (2) You say that "This scientist acknowledged that the United States Government DID RECOVER THREE FLYING SAUCERS between 1947-50" (emphasis yours).

FACT: He has never acknowledged any such thing, either in the letter he sent you, or in the lengthy interview he did with Stan Friedman (which you have a cassette tape copy of). Nowhere in his letter is there any mention of the dates "1947-50" or of "three flying saucers". Such a statement is a total and an outrageous fabrication on your part!

- (3) Your second paragraph states that "He named names, gave descriptions, told dates and places of meetings (which he attended) pertaining to these recovered flying saucers". You then go on to state that "The purposes of these meetings were to determine" what was recovered, who made them, where they came from, and how much the public should be told.

FACT: In the letter you cite, the scientist in question points out quite distinctly that he was not personally involved in any crashed saucer recovery operation. Indeed, to quote him directly, he states as follows:

"Relating to my own experience regarding recovered flying saucers, I had no association with any of the people involved in the recovery and have no knowledge regarding the dates of the recoveries.... My association...was rather limited so that although I had been invited to participate in several discussions associated with the reported recoveries, I could not personally attend the meetings."

He then goes on to name two people whom he knew were involved, and one person whom he thought would have been involved. All three of the individuals in question are now dead.

There are no dates of meetings, no places of meetings, no purposes of meetings mentioned anywhere in the letter. The description he provides of aliens and their craft is so brief and general that one could almost conclude it was offered in passing. ("...materials reported to have come from flying saucer crashes were extremely light and very tough... (the) people operating these machines were also of very light weight....") Hardly the sort of definitive description you imply.

As to how much the public should be told, he states very clearly that he does "not know why the high order of classification has been given" nor why the existence of these devices is denied.

(4) The fourth paragraph of your letter enumerates four alleged outcomes of the "meetings" you allude to in paragraph three. According to you, "The outcome of the meetings" was that "we do not know what we have", nor "who manufacutred them", nor "where they came from"; and presumably because of this, "the subject matter was to remain the most highly classified subject matter in these United States".

FACT: Your entire fourth paragraph is fabrication! There is no mention of any of this whatsoever in the letter in question.

(5) Building fabrication upon fabrication, you go on to state in paragraph five that "certain diversionary measures were set up to draw public attention away from the truth pertaining to flying saucers". You list these as "Sign, Grudge, Blue Book, Robertson Panel, Condon Study, Civilian Study Groups, etc.".

FACT: Nowhere in this man's letter does he mention or even allude to any of this. The truth or falseness of such a statement is irrelevant here. The fact is that the man never raises the point at all. Your placing of words, indeed of entire paragraphs in this man's mouth is nothing less than blatant, outright, malicious deception on your part. LIES! Pure and simple! The man never said any of this, and you know it. But are you satisfied? Hell no! You have the colossal temerity to go on from there.

(6) "Because of what this scientist says", you say, "'The cat is out of the bag'." "In a few short months the 35-year-old security lid will be lifted (and) the public will know the truth", you say.

Bill, how in hell do you get off making these statements? If the security lid isn't lifted in a few short months, who is going to look the fool? And on the other hand, and perhaps even worse, suppose you do somehow manage to get a peek under that lid-- who is going to believe you given the above pack of bold-faced, monumental lies with your name proudly affixed to them? You arrogantly break confidences, you cast aside any sense of professional ethics, you claim to possess evidence which you do not possess, you brazenly place words-- indeed entire paragraphs-- in people's mouths, you lie, you plot, you scheme, you place deceit and subterfuge above friendship-- even if you should manage to grasp a piece of the truth, it will become useless in your hands. Your detractors will simply trot out your record and you will be laughed off the stage.

I know this is harsh. Truth always is. If I were not your friend, I would ignore you rather than take up two hours of my time to write you this letter. The fact is that you are a fairly decent researcher. You deserve a chance to succeed. There is still time for you to redeem your reputation before it goes totally down the toilet. You're going to have to make a few apologies and eat a lot of crow (something that's going to be very difficult for you to do since you seem to have an image problem with admitting you are wrong), but I don't think it's too late yet to turn things around. Believe it or not, people respect a man who can admit his faults. I'll help you where I can-- that is, if you want me to-- but you're going to have to reestablish contact with me first. All it takes is a phone call, or a letter if you prefer. I'm going to be out of town from July 15th (evening) until about July 29th. You've got that long to think about it. If I haven't heard from you by August 4th, I'll see fit to release copies of this letter to anybody I decide ought to have one.

This isn't intended to be blackmail, Bill. It's just that a lot of people are aware of my association with you. If you are not willing to confess your sins publicly and try to get yourself back on the right track, then I will be left with no alternative but to do what is necessary to protect my own reputation by dissociating myself from you and proceeding accordingly.

Do, please, let me hear from you. It will be much easier if we can keep this between you and me.

Most cordially yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Bill', with a horizontal line underneath.

William L. Moore

WLM/s(encl.)
cc: File

Leading Scientist Tells All

Dear Gray:

I recently received a letter from a currently prominent and very active scientist, who presides over a major American university. This scientist acknowledged that the United States Government DID RECOVER THREE FLYING SAUCERS between 1947-50.

He named names, gave descriptions, told dates and places of meetings (which he attended) pertaining to these recovered Flying Saucers. The purposes of these meetings were to determine:

1. Just exactly what they did recover.
2. Who manufactured them.
3. Where they came from.
4. How much the American public should know concerning this.

The outcome of the meetings:

- (1) We do not know what we have.
- (2) We do not know who manufactured them.
- (3) We do not know where they came from.
- (4) The subject matter was to remain the most highly classified subject matter in these United States.

Hence certain diversionary measures were set up to draw public attention away from the truth pertaining to Flying Saucers:

1. Sign, Grudge, Bluebook.
2. Robertson Panel, Condon Study.
3. Civilian study groups, etc.

Now, because of what this scientist says, "The cat is out of the bag." In a few short months the 35-year-old security lid will be lifted, the public will know the truth, and perhaps a new "Pandora's Box" will be opened. But this is what we all have been anxiously waiting for these past 35 years. Now, we must determine where we go from here.

Please publish this in your next NEWSLETTER.
William S. Steinman, 15043 Rosalita Dr., La Mirada,
CA 90638.

William S. Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, Calif.
90638



William L. Moore
4219 W. Olive
Suite # 247
Burbank, Calif.
91505



William S. Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, Calif.
90638

William L. Moore
4219 W. Olive
Suite 247
Burbank, Calif.
91505

July 20, 1984

Dear Bill:

In reference to my Telephone conversation with you on 6-28-84 (our last verbal communication), your short letter to me dated 7-1-84, and your more extensive letter to me dated 7-12-84.

Bill, I am not trying to be arrogant, belligerent, and/or dishonest with you or anyone else. I believe that I am being truthful in saying that Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher did say that 3 flying Saucers did come into the hands of the United States Government between 1947 and 1950. Of course he didn't tell me directly; but this fact is based upon, and/or is logically deducted from the following:

- ① The interview notes between Sarbacher and Wilbert B. Smith, recorded

by Smith in his own hand, immediately following the interview on Sept. 15, 1950 (of which you have a copy). In these notes Sarbacher states, "THE CONTENTS OF SCULLY'S BOOK ARE SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT." We both know that Scully's book, Behind The Flying Saucers, told of three flying saucers that were recovered by the United States Govt. between 1947 and 1950. Logical deduction simply shows that if Sarbacher states that the contents of Scully's book are substantially correct — and since Scully's book tells of the recovery of Three Flying Saucers — Then Sarbacher is stating that the United States Government recovered three flying saucers between 1947 and 1950.

② My telephone conversation with Sarbacher in November of 1983, in which he stated, to me, that I am correct to say that Scully's book is true, as per my mention of the 1950 Smith interview.

③ My letters to Sarbacher and his response to me, of which you have

copies. In his reply, he did state that he remembers having that conversation (interview) with Smith in 1950 (even tho Sarbacher enters the name of the interviewer wrong - Dr. Brenner). Thus he once again is re-substantiating that he did answer Smiths questions as Smith wrote them down. I do admit that there now are 34 years separating that interview from the present time; but Sarbacher admits that he would know more detail if the facts were still fresh in his mind. (see paragraph #11, right after point #5 - also, I gave Sarbacher xerox copies of the Smith notes to jog his memory - so he read them along with my questions before he responded to me on 11-29-84.

Therefore, I can safely state that a well known Scientist (very well known in The 1950's), who was once incharge of The Graduate School of Georgia Tech. (1945-1948) revealed that the United States Government did recover Three flying Saucers between 1947 and 1949 (of which Roswell was one - and Possibly Aztec another).

did not attend the meetings.

The part in Barkers Newsletter article concerning the purposes of the meetings, the outcome of the meetings, and the diversionary measures stemming from the meetings, is not relative to the Sarbacher letter, and never was intended to be so. This whole portion, is my own conjecture pieced together from many substantial sources of information, of most of which, you are quite aware.

I do believe that Sarbacher is a key figure in the crashed Saucer solution. I say this because of the following:

- ① Sarbacher, as mentioned previously, did verify that Saucers were recovered by the U.S. Government.
- ② He did lead us on to other channels of information, such as Fred Darwin, Eric Walker, and others.

The "Cat is out of the bag", as far as opening a good sized hole in the Security wall that separates the "Nuts and Bolts" Saucers from the American Public is concerned.

I do believe that in a few short months (depending on what you consider

short - compared to what I consider short) the 36 (not 35) year old security lid will be lifted, and the public will be made aware of the truth (perhaps not all of it), concerning these Crashed-Recovered Flying Saucers and the occupants therefrom.

So, you see Bill, I am not lying and/or misrepresenting anything at all. I don't believe that I am destroying anything at all; But, rather, am building credibility into the whole Crashed-Recovered Saucer Controversy. I have not spawned one lie after another; But rather one truth logically upon another truth. I am not leaving a trail of wreckage, like, as you state, "Todd Zeche did"; But, rather, am clearing a clean clear cut path to the ultimate solution to the entire U.F.O. enigma.

A good investigator, utilizing his God given logical mind, can see the facts, as laid down by me in every thing that I have stated thus far relating to the Crashed-recovered Saucer subject matter.

Bill, I called you on 6-28-84 not in reference to my correspondence with Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher, nor in reference to my Gary Barker letter; But in reference to a telephone conversation that I had with a Colonel [redacted]

[redacted] on 6-24-84. I didn't have to call you to tell you about it; But I did call you - actually letting you know that the subject matter concerning Savcers, nor your name were not even brought up to Col. [redacted] at all!! But you immediately got all excited, jumped all over me, "reading me the riot act." Something about sure does tend to hit a very delicate spot with you - what is it?

U
your: The fact that I had provided Steinman with the Colonel's name in confidence, and he did. Heehee NOT to try to contact the man! (See # one or my 7/12/84 letter.)

vacat. my vacati
[redacted] It was good source WM. 1) to find from

2 letters amongst my stack of accumulated mail, one dated 7-1-84 and the other dated 7-12-84. In the first letter (7-1-84) you end with the statement, "I am not angry with you, only dismayed." Evidently you really were angry, and this anger festered within a very short ^{period of} time. Because, in the second letter (7-12-84 - I still on vacation) you state, "It has now been more than 2 weeks since you broke off contact with me after I read you out for having cavalierly broken, which I considered, a commitment of Confidentiality on your part

I guess, while I was on vacation (6-30-84 - 7-17-84), you thought that I was harbouring a grudge and/or tense feelings towards you by being childish, stubborn, and/or ashamed of myself. But the fact is, I was on vacation not even thinking of any of this, while you were fuming and progressively becoming more and more angry - imagining all sorts of bad things about me. You actually got to the point to where you started trying to gather mud to sling at me and threaten to flaunt this so-called mud before the so-called

Ufological community in order to expose me as a fraud, in order to discredit me.

Bill, I am suprised, or should I say, shocked at you. That you would lower yourself to that extent. You mentioned a "nameless" researcher whom I (me) had a similar experience with. If moseley is that person that you preferred not to name - well you already know that I apologised to him via a letter, of which you have a copy. If moseley isn't that unnamed researcher, then I don't know who you are speaking of!!

I don't have any hard feelings towards you, and I am sorry if I touched a weak spot in your Psyche and/or contacted an old skeleton in your closet. I would wish to remain friends with you. I have been very open with you in all of my investigations maybe too much so. I guess I will just have to keep some of my findings to myself. I hate to have to handle a fellow researcher with kid gloves.

I tried once again to contact George T. koehler ; But no luck at all.

That man is a very hard person
to contact.

Please stay in touch with me.
Come on over to the house someday,
But call first.

Very Sincerely
Your friend

Wm Stemman

NOTE: NO MENTION
WHATSOEVER THAT
BARKER HAD
ALTERED HIS
LETTER!

Wm 12/21

↑

I HAVEN'T THE
Foggiest NOTION WHAT
HE'S TALKING ABOUT
HERE.

Wm 12/21/41.



AUTHOR, LECTURER, RESEARCHER

AND INVESTIGATOR



POST OFFICE BOX 1845,

PRESCOTT, ARIZONA, ZIP: 86302

PHONE:

(913) 506-8365

4219 West Olive St., Suite No. 247, Burbank, CA 91505

Bill Steinman
15043 Rosalita Dr.
La Mirada, CA 90638

31 July, 1984

Dear Bill:

Thank you for responding so promptly to my letter of 12th July.

UFO'S AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT: PART IV.

By William L. Moore.

Presumably by now most of you know something about the role of the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) in collecting data on UFOs while at the same time being involved spreading disinformation about the subject. (not see Parts I-III of this series in preceding issues.) As far as I was able to learn, OSI's primary role was essentially limited to data collection on the one hand and maintenance of security for special projects on the other. Dissemination of rumors and disinformation came under the latter heading.

It was fairly easy to learn that information, once collected, was passed through channels to those who had some specific need-to-know for it, and that those individuals were for the most part connected with agencies other than OSI. More importantly, those charged with collecting data or conducting counterintelligence operations generally knew only what they needed to know in order to perform their specific functions.

Based upon what I was able to glean from a variety of sources and observations, it seemed at first there were a number of "upstairs addresses" on the receiving end of OSI's UFO data collection operation. One of the functions of the mysterious Project Aquarius was related to be a communications umbrella through which the various interested groups could pass and receive data when necessary without revealing specifics about themselves in the process. The apex of the umbrella, I was told, was the MJ-12 group. The ribs represented the various agencies which fed information into Aquarius.

One of the ribs, I was able to learn, represented a small but effective UFO "special interest" group within the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). This group was composed of two quite distinct branches or arms, one of which lived at DIA's imagery division (DC5C), and operated out of a suite of rooms in the Melpar Building in Falls Church, Va, with an additional presence at the Digital Imagery Processing Service (DIPS) located within the Naval Intelligence Support Center (NISC) facility at Suitland, Md. The group oversaw a small "black" budget appropriation and need-to-know access was maintained by probably not more than a dozen individuals at any given time. Over a space of several years, I only ever heard three names of people reportedly associated with it. These were Col. R. "Donny" Phillips, perhaps the

leader of the group; M.Sgt. Theodore Zahrodney, who I understood did some of their field work; and John W. Westerman, an imagery specialist reputed to be DC5C's liaison with Aquarius. The name David R. Kennelly also came to my attention once, but only because a certain phone number traced out to a phone in his office. All of this comes from knowledge I gained up through about mid-1985. I have been led to understand since then that the group, now referred to as a "working committee", underwent something of a reorganization in the latter part of 1986, and as far as I know, it continues to function. One of the results of that reorganization was the establishment of a computerized data base and communications network known, curiously enough, as "MJ-SETI".

The other arm or branch of the group as I knew it had evolved from a project (with a small "p") which originally operated out of Wright-Patterson AFB, but which moved over to DIA essentially intact following an administrative-level political fight in the late 1970s. There are several reasons why I consider it unwise to say anything more about this branch at this time.

Because DC5C's specialty is imagery and analysis, their interest in UFOs should be considered both obvious and legitimate. In addition, DIA's SIGINT (Signals Intelligence & Technical Sensors) unit, DC7, shares essentially the same facilities and cooperates closely with DC5C. Since at least one of the four named above, Zahrodney, held desks in both sections, it seems reasonable to suppose that DC7 contributed other members to the UFO group as well.

Now, before you go running off to compose a FOIA request to DIA for information about all of this, you should be advised first off that all you're likely to get is the old run-around, and second, that your letter may set off more of a chain reaction than you are prepared to cope with. Consider the following:

While the Freedom of Information Act may be a good tool for curious members of the public seeking information from their government, few realize that it is also an excellent way for our government to monitor who is doing what in the way of research and who may be leaking what to whom in the way of classified or otherwise sensitive information. For example, if source X quietly tells you in confidence certain details of highly classified Project Y, one of the

things you can do with that information if you are to file a FOIA request about it. Why? Those responsible for replying to your request are also trained to spot clues of potential security breaches and report them directly to the person responsible for investigating such activities.

In other words, if you, a member of the public, with no clearance and no need-to-know, write a FOIA letter asking for information about a classified matter, and if your letter contains enough specifics about that matter to lead someone in-the-know to have passed it to you, then you may find yourself unwitting subject of an unwanted security investigation. Under certain circumstances, repetition of the name of some highly classified project is sufficient to set off the bells. And, if the situation is regarded as serious enough, not only will you not receive the information you requested, but your action may well result in steps being taken on the inside to identify the source of the leak and reverse the damage done. If that occurs, not only will you end up with nothing, but your trusted source ends up in a heap of trouble.

One reason why I have little or no faith in major UFO research groups such as CAUS, is to maintain that FOIA is the best way to conduct research, and whose leadership has no working knowledge of how the government and the intelligence community interact with such requests.

One of the bizarre and unusual experiences of my life is a case in point. Lee works for a major California aerospace contractor and has a Secret clearance. He is also a board member of Fair-Witness and a good friend. Over the years, both his hobby as an aircraft collector and his intense interest in UFOs have led to him writing literally hundreds of FOIA letters to virtually every agency of the government in search of information.

In such a letter, written to the office of then President George Bush in 1987, Graham made reference to the term "F-117a", the new apparently still classified designation for the aircraft then up to then the F-19 stealth fighter. He also mentioned the apparently still classified name of the stealth fighter project, which was "Senior Trend". Graham had received both pieces of information from a friend and had close personal ties with individuals in need-to-know positions within the aerospace industry. His repetition of this information in an otherwise innocuous FOIA letter led to all kinds of hell, the end point of which was a visit to Graham by two government types (one of whom refused to identify himself) who told him that the stealth fighter project did not in fact exist (contrary to official denial to that point) and that the terms he had used in reference to it in his letter were highly

classified. Graham was then asked to sign a security non-disclosure statement (which he did) and was told that further discussion of the topic in any public forum would be a violation of that agreement.

Following the public disclosure of both stealth fighter and bomber projects in 1989, Graham again wrote a FOIA letter to the office of the vice president (now Dan Quayle), in which he made reference to both the stealth situation and the question of authenticity surrounding the controversial MJ-12 documents. One of the things requested was that Quayle's office confirm or repudiate the MJ-12 documents (copies of which Graham had attached to his letter along with a copy of the text of my Las Vegas speech from July 1, 1989), and, if authentic, to officially declassify them or direct him to an agency of the government from which declassified copies can be obtained.

Graham's letter upset someone in Quayle's office enough to send copies of the correspondence to the Air Force which immediately turned the matter over to the Defense Investigative Service (DIS) Personnel Control Center in Baltimore, Maryland and insisted they take action on it. In October, 1989 DIS initiated a reinvestigation of Graham's security clearance—a process which caused considerable consternation for Graham and others at his place of work. Meanwhile, as an adjunct to this investigation, DIS Director William A. Hughes removed Graham out of the headquarters office in Baltimore, initiated an S.I.I. (Special Investigations Inquiry) into the status of the MJ-12 and other documents (including the text of my Las Vegas speech) which Graham had attached to his original letter. "Attached documents forwarded for security determination," the cover sheet said.

In April, 1990 the security investigation of Graham was closed and his clearance reaffirmed by DIS. On May 24, 1990, in response to another FOIA requesting his own records, DIS released a partial copy of his file to him and indicated that documents withheld were being forwarded to AFOSI (!) for release determination by that agency. In looking through the 70+ pages which were released, Graham was surprised to discover copies of the MJ-12 documents, each one of which bore a large "Unclassified" stamp across the lower right portion of the page. Also stamped "Unclassified" was the cover of my Las Vegas text, and the retyped AFOSI document reproduced therein as page 19. Missing, and apparently forwarded to AFOSI for their determination, was page 15 of my text—the page containing the conclusions section of my speech!

What the significance of all this may ultimately be to the continuing MJ-12 controversy remains

SEE
FOIA
24 JAN 2011
Lee

unclear at this point, although it appears we may have a somewhat oblique confirmation of the documents' authenticity through the DIS' having submitted them for a security determination and them having been officially stamped "Unclassified" in the process. What seems important here also is the fact that nowhere in all of this is there any indication that the DIS' Special Investigations Inquiry found the documents to be bogus.

What UFO researchers prone to file FOIA requests at the drop of a hat must not lose track of here is the fact that Lee Graham came very close to losing both his clearance and his job over this matter! In addition, others he is involved with have also come under scrutiny (some having even been told to avoid getting into discussions with him), and the security officers at his place of employment have continued to keep close tabs on his activities.

In a somewhat similar situation, I made the mistake of sharing in confidence a piece of what I considered to be sensitive information with a member of the CAUS organization back in the latter part of 1982. Shortly thereafter, CAUS broke the confidence by repeating my information both in public and in FOIA requests. The result: a very promising source I had been developing suddenly broke contact and I never heard from him again!

FOIA is by no means a new thing in government. While its original purpose was to serve the public's right to know, it has been around long enough for those in government whose job it is to keep the public from knowing, to develop ways of using the mechanisms of the Act to their own advantage. (Try, for example, making a FOIA to the CIA on some sensitive topic, and invariably the first reply you receive from them will be a letter asking you to submit full details of whatever else you might know about the material you have requested. Naturally they allege that this information is needed to enable them to better fulfill your request, and of course this may be the truth—it's just not all of the truth.) Indeed, the FOIA letter you innocently write today may be kept on file by the agency of its destination for as long as 15 years.



THE SEARCH FOR EXTRA TERRESTRIAL ARTIFACTS

By Dr. Vladimir Rubtsov

This article was presented by Rubtsov at the 18th Annual World Conference of the Ancient Astronaut Society in Chicago, August, 1989. Dr. Rubtsov received his Master's Degree in computer science and his doctorate in the philosophy of science in 1980. His doctoral thesis was on "Philosophical-Methodological Aspects of the Problem of Extraterrestrial Civilizations", the first of its kind in the USSR. He has been active in astronaut studies since 1966, having published a book and over 40 articles on the subject of extraterrestrial intelligence. Current Rubtsov is a senior research fellow at the Department of Philosophy, Ukrainian Extraterrestrial Polytechnic Institute in Kharkov. His address is: Ul. Chernishevskogo, 88, kv. 66, K. 310023, USSR.

The reader is asked to excuse the somewhat awkward grammar and composition, which is due to the fact that English is Dr. Rubtsov's second language.

The following is copyrighted (c.1989) by Vladimir V. Rubtsov and the Ancient Astronaut Society, all rights reserved, and may not be reproduced in whole or in part without permission of the Society.

The Ancient Astronaut Society is a nonprofit corporation organized exclusively for scientific, literary and educational purposes. Its objectives are to search for evidence to determine whether Earth was visited by intelligent beings from outer space in the remote past, and whether a highly developed, technological civilization existed on Earth before recorded history. Membership in the Society is open to the public. For information write to: Ancient Astronaut Society, 1921 St. Johns Ave., Highland Park, IL 60035.

The search for "extraterrestrial artifacts" is one of the most important and worthy directions of investigation in paleoanthropology. And yet it progresses by touch, so to speak, with no serious theoretical basis. In fact, there is even no real search. There have only been a few attempts to apply rather vague