

ing Services of Greenwich, Connecticut, 1986 edition. It is listed as a "Top Secret Air Force program involving Rockwell International."

If the DMS "Sigma" is not the same as the Aquarius "Sigma," then Aquarius Sigma is probably wrong because duplication of code names in a close time frame is not within normal military procedure. Obviously, two programs with the same code name within the same branch of service (Air Force) would be confused. That's why selection lists of code names exist.

If the two projects are the same, where is the massive security for Aquarius "Sigma" that it appears in a commercially available directory?

Project Snowbird, in a previous issue of Just Cause, was described as a "Joint Army/Air Force peacetime military exercise in the sub-arctic region, 1955," according to Gale Research's CODE NAMES DICTIONARY, 1963. No connection to UFOs is apparent here and certainly not in the context of the Aquarius paper's description. Snowbird was a training exercise for Army and Air Force units under arctic conditions.

Finally, our last issue dealt with the short-lived confirmation of an Air Force "Project Aquarius" by the NSA. The revelation fizzled however when the NSA retracted its confirmation based upon a false assumption.

No other independent confirmation of the Project Aquarius document has been possible.

-- The CIA "MJ-5" memo - A one-page document (Exhibit 3) on CIA letterhead, but not released through FOIA. Source and year of memo are unknown. Deletions by MSF. This document first appeared in Moore's newsletter Focus. It has not appeared in any subsequent discussion of MJ-12.

The MJ-5 memo is a real problem. Type style, placement of security markings, use of CIA letter stationery instead of internal forms and language are all atypical of CIA standards. The executive order number quoted in the memo is non-existent. The deletion by MSF of the year forbids accurate follow-up and implies an attempt to cover a deception. We were informed by MSF in a June phone conversation about various points in favor of MJ-12. When discussion focused upon the MJ-5 memo, we stated our concern over the flaws in this paper. A response from the CIA regarding the authenticity of the memo was entirely negative, the CIA labeling the memo a "poorly made fabrication." When informed of this, MSF's only response was, "You believe them?" Indeed we do if the statement agrees with what we can see with our own eyes!

It is notable that MSF have let the memo quietly disappear from later presentations of evidence on MJ-12, even though, according to MSF's phone conversation, it came from the same source as the other documents. Why is this memo no longer being discussed? Suspicious as well is the similarity of the type style in the MJ-5 memo, written on CIA letterhead, and the Aquarius paper, written by the MJ-12 group. If the MJ-5 memo is no longer valid to present as evidence of MJ-12, and it came from the same source as the other documents, then what does this say about the Aquarius paper, or indeed the rest of the evidence?

--The MJ-12 Briefing Paper - An eight-page document with a title page, introductory page, three pages of text, a list of attachments, title page for Attachment "A", and Attachment "A," a copy of a signed letter by President Harry Truman. Source is unknown.

Numerous inquiries have revealed that there has been no confirmation of this document in any library or archive. The one source

most certain to have information on the Briefing Paper is the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas. Their response is Exhibit A.

Page 2 of the Briefing Paper refers to the formation of MJ-12 "by special classified executive order of President Truman on 24 September, 1947..." We have checked the Truman Library's listing of executive orders and found that no orders were issued on 9/24. Executive order numbers 9891 - 9896 were issued respectively on 9/15, two on 9/20, 9/23, 9/30 and 10/2/47, none even closely resembling the MJ-12 subject. There is no gap in the number sequence for these dates so none are missing. Further, the number quoted in Attachment "A" of the Briefing Paper, #092447 (Exhibit 5A), is not an executive order number but the date of President Truman's memo, 9/24/47! Executive orders are not numbered by date but are numbered sequentially, and at the time the numbers were only four digits.

Truman's "EO" (Exhibit 5B) was sent to the Truman Library for authentication. Their answer is Exhibit 6. None of the other attachments are available for examination.

We also find peculiar the atypical use of "0" prefixes in front of numbers (07 July, 06 December, 092447).

In the text itself, two things require comment. Page 3 of the Briefing Paper states: "The wreckage of the craft was also removed to several different locations." We question the wisdom of this practice, if indeed it happened at all. One of the first procedures in aircraft accident investigations is to reconstruct the vehicle from whatever is left of the wreckage. We saw this in the Challenger disaster; gather all the pieces in one place and reassemble them to either determine the cause of the accident, or in this case, see what the vehicle looked like. Apparently such was not done here. Keeping pieces in different locations forbids reconstruction and risks the loss of pieces in transit between various places. Immediate reconstruction is primary, especially with an exotic, unknown vehicle.

We draw your attention to Exhibit 7, a report on a 1950 UFO crash extracted from the Briefing Paper, page 5. According to a report by Jerome Clark in the February 1980, Saga UFO Report, a UFO crash took place 15-20 miles into Mexico from the Laredo, Texas area. It is most likely the same story referred to in the Briefing Paper as we find no other different 1950 crashed UFO reports in that area. The story is based on the testimony of Lt. Col. Robert Willingham, an eyewitness. Another reference, in Leonard Stringfield's THE UFO CRASH/RETRIEVAL SYNDROME, STATUS REPORT 2 (Case B-7) discusses the same story and gives the location of the crash as 30 miles NW of Del Rio, Texas, as corrected by further research.

However, the Briefing Paper pinpoints the "El Indio-Guerrero" area, some 90 miles SE of the Del Rio position and 70 miles NW of the Laredo site. There is a significant disagreement between eyewitness statements and the Briefing Paper regarding location.

Additionally, if the object were a spaceship (the Briefing Paper only says "probably of similar origin" to the Roswell crash), isn't it getting short shrift in the Briefing Paper? After all, MJ-12 was supposed to be an elite panel formed to study such incidents. This case is said to be only the second crashed UFO in history and yet it gets only slightly over 7 lines in the Briefing Paper! Visibly, there is no evidence that MJ-12 had much information on the 1950 "crash," despite the fact that it had almost two years to gather details. Is what is described in the Briefing Paper on the 1950 incident terribly different from a meteorite impact? Read it again!

MSF have stated that they have found nothing wrong in the Briefing Paper; that they find agreement with what they have discovered and