

PHILIP J. KLASS
404 "N" ST. SOUTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20024
(202) 884-8901

1988
Jan. 7, 1987

Dear S. Terry Friedman:

I read with great interest your article on the MJ-12 papers in the Sept./Oct. 1987 issue of International UFO Reporter, copy of which just arrived. It prompts a number of questions to which I seek answers. (These are numbered for your convenience for your responses.)

You write: "In the course of publicizing the book [i.e. Roswell Incident], Moore was contacted by a variety of persons, one of whom indicated he would be willing to share certain information available to him as a member of the 'inside' government community dealing with flying saucers. Contacts were made; meetings were arranged; certain information was exchanged. It appeared that the individual was legitimate but that any information he and his associates provided needed to be checked because apparently 'they' wanted to establish that our team would not run wild with any information and that we would seek to verify it first." (Emphasis to indicate focus of my question.)

The foregoing suggests that this person, whom I'll call Mr. X for convenience, did supply some UFO information which Moore and/or you then tried to verify.

Question #1: Did this contact with Mr. X and his transmittal of information to Moore occur prior to Dec. 11, 1984?

Question #2: When Moore and you tried to verify the accuracy of this information, did you find that all of it appeared to be authentic or did you find that Mr. X sometimes supplied bogus information?

Question #3: When Shandera and Moore (reportedly) received the MJ-12 papers on Dec. 11, 1984, did Moore then contact Mr. X to ask if he was the person who had mailed them to Shandera?

Question #4: If so, did Mr. X confirm or deny he was the source?

You write that you and Moore had "made contact, for a movie project that never got off the ground, with Jamie Shandera..."

Question #5: Was that movie intended to focus on the "Roswell Incident" and related crashed saucer claims?

In discussing the "Hillenkoetter briefing document" and the "Cutler/Twining memo," you write [p. 14]: "There is no direct linkage between the two." You seem to ignore the most obvious---that the briefing document uses the term "Majestic-12" (and "MJ-1") and the Cutler/Twining memo uses "MJ-12".

Question #6: Have you or Moore, in your extensive archival research, found any other documents that refer to "Majestic-12" or "MJ-12"?

S. Terry Friedman:

-2-

Jan. 7, 1988

I believe you already have supplied the answer to this question #6 at the beginning of your IUR article, when you wrote: "I have spent considerable effort to determine the validity of the November 18, 1952, TOP SECRET/MAJIC EYES ONLY 'briefing' document and a supporting TOP SECRET RESTRICTED memo from the office of Gen. Robert Cutler to Gen. Nathan Twining dated July 14, 1954, the only other so-far known old 'document' that mentions MJ-12 or Majestic 12." But I ask for your response.

You will recall that when you and I appeared on a KSDO (San Diego) talk-show on June 22, 1987, you said "I got my first copy [of the MJ-12 papers] roughly 2-1/2 weeks ago, my first full copy," i.e. early June, 1987.

The next day, June 23, I sent you a partial transcript of what you had said, noting that I "occasionally mis-speak in the heat of debate" and that "you might suffer that human frailty. Hence I offer you the opportunity to revise for-the-record any of the following statements you made during our appearance" on KSDO. In your reply of July 9, you offered a few minor revisions but did not challenge your KSDO statement that you did not receive a full copy of the MJ-12 papers until early June, 1987.

Question #7: Based on the foregoing, is it true that the "considerable effort [you have spent] to determine the validity" [of the MJ-12 papers and Cutler/Twining memo] occurred AFTER EARLY JUNE, 1987, WHEN YOU FIRST OBTAINED A "FULL COPY" OF THE MJ-12 PAPERS?

Question #8: Before expending this "considerable effort" did you first check with Moore and Shandera to determine what investigation they themselves had performed during the previous two and a half years since they (reportedly) received the material in December, 1984?

To avoid over-burdening you with questions, I will end this letter at this point and will raise additional issues at a later date. You will note that wherever possible I have tried to phrase my questions so that they can be answered with a simple "yes" or "no" or other brief response. However, you are welcome to be as verbose as you wish.

Sincerely,

cc: Mark Rodeghier
Barry Greenwood
Dennis Stacy
Jim Moseley

P.S. For your convenience, I will make photo-copy of your reply and mail it to the persons receiving a copy of this letter