



VOLUME 4 (NEW SERIES)

ISSUES 7-8-9


SEPT. 30, 1989

PRICE: \$6.00

THE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER OF THE
FAIR WITNESS PROJECT
INC.

4219 W. OLIVE AVE. SUITE 247
BURBANK, CA 91505
(213)-463-0542

©1989 FWP, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



IN THIS ISSUE

"Revelations: UFO's and the U.S. Government: Part II"	1
"MJ-12 Document Analysis Report to be Released"	4
"Editorial", by Jimmy Ward.....	6
"An Interview with Bill Moore"	7
"Critical Comments from <u>UFO</u> "	13
"Of Leaks and Plants"	16
"More Criticism"	16
"Open Letter To Bill English".....	19
"Intelligence, Counterintelligence and the Disinfo Game" ..	22
"Letter To the Editor".....	23
"More Letters"	25
"Sea Cows".....	27
"Japan", "Book Review"	27

REVELATIONS

UFO'S AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, PART II.

By William L. Moore

Copyright WLM, 1989

All rights Reserved

During my involvement with the Paul Bennewitz affair, as outlined in the text of my July 1, 1989 Las Vegas presentation (see FOCUS, June 30, 1989), I was either involved with or aware of efforts by the Air Force Office of Special Investigations which centered around other individuals and organizations within the UFO community. Once again, my role in these activities was strictly limited to the supplying of routine information. In this role, I was never required to violate confidential relationships or pass any information which I knew to be of a confidential nature. Furthermore, there was no "dirty work" involved. Indeed, I did nothing more than any other reporter would do during the course of routine duties. In the Bennewitz case, I became involved primarily because I saw it as an opportunity to learn more about the inside workings and machinations of the intelligence community with respect to UFOs. There is ample journalistic precedent for this sort of thing. Clearly someone at a high level was actively keeping tabs on a variety of UFO cases and the researchers involved with them. The questions I wanted answers to were "who" and "why"?

The time frame here was essentially from late 1980 through mid 1984. By early 1982, I had learned that there were no less than three other members of the UFO community who were actively doing the same thing. I have since learned of a fourth individual who was also involved. All four are prominent individuals whose identities, if disclosed, would cause considerable controversy in the UFO community and bring serious embarrassment to two of its major organizations. To the best of my knowledge, at least two of these people are still actively involved. The other two seem to have dropped out at about the same time I did. As far as I know, only one of them was aware of my activities. I maintained rather close contact with this individual and continue to do so to this day, even though we were involved with different agencies. The ribs of the UFO-intelligence umbrella spread out in a number of different directions, but they all seem to converge at a

common point. Find that point, and at least you know what door protects the keys to whatever our government knows about UFOs.

Drawing from my own knowledge and experiences, I can summarize the individuals and organizations who were the subject of intelligence community interest between 1980 and 1984 as follows. It is important to remember here that in some cases I was not personally involved, but rather only aware of these goings-on through conversations with others.

LEN STRINGFIELD

I had attended the Clear Lake Texas MUFON Symposium in June of 1980 and was one of these Len briefed on his then very controversial alien body photos which were later shown to be a hoax. In the late fall of that year, after I had begun to cooperate with the C/I people, I was told that Len "had been set up for a fall" by someone named McCulloch, and that McC had done it as a "favor" for someone who had once "helped him get out of a jam." When I asked Len about this, he told me that a person by this name had indeed been instrumental in passing him the photos in question.

Stringfield remained the subject of some interest through 1983, after which I heard very little more about him. The C/I people seemed to know a lot about Len and his sources. The impression I had was that someone else much closer to him than I, was keeping tabs on his activities, but of course I never knew for certain.

PETE MAZZOLA AND THE "SCIENTIFIC BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION" (SBI)

This was one of the most bizarre situations of my experience. Mazzola had started SBI as something of a maverick organization sometime in the late '70s. It lasted until his unfortunate death in (I think) 1983. During that time, the organization published a journal known as "The SBI Report". Mazzola, who had been a police officer by profession, was a sort of rough-cut individual with a heavy Brooklyn accent and a penchant for adding "you know" to virtu-

ally everything he said. Although Pete had good intentions and tried his best to be thorough and objective, many in the UFO community regarded him as something of a buffoon. For my part, I could see little about him or his group which would attract more than passing attention from anyone in the intelligence community.

Apparently there was something there I couldn't see, however, because for about a year, beginning in early '81, Pete and SBI were the subject of serious scrutiny by the C/I people. Much of it had something to do with some film footage from a Florida UFO case which Pete was supposed to have and which C/I wanted in the worst sort of way. As far as I know, the case never got any publicity and I never saw the film. My role was to try to get Pete to send the film to Kal Korff who, at the time, was in a good position to arrange for competent computer enhancement and analysis. Once Kal got the film, I was supposed to try to get a copy made and pass it to Rick Doty. Kal, of course, knew nothing about the ulterior motives here. He did speak to Mazzola a couple of times about this film, and Pete did acknowledge its existence, but Pete maintained that while he had been promised the film, he didn't yet have it in hand. He seemed very secretive about providing any further details, but he did agree to involve Kal in the analysis process once he got the film. In the end, it all came to nothing. Pete maintained that he never did receive the film and that his source had broken off contact. The C/I people lost interest, and that was that. I was left with the impression that the film had been intercepted and the witnesses somehow persuaded to cease communications with Mazzola before they ever sent him the film, but of course I never did know for sure.

There was also something about an alleged abduction case that SBI was looking into in New Jersey, but as I recall it, Doty only brought this matter up once and then seemed to lose interest. I did discuss the case with Mazzola and he sent me some material on it, but Doty only looked it over and then returned it without making copies.

PETER GERSTEN

Peter was, and still is, the legal consultant to the CAUS organization. He was the subject of

intense interest to C/I, particularly during the CAUS v/s NSA legal proceedings which lasted through early 1983. I know that they had collected a lot of information on Peter, and that someone near him was supplying it. I am not certain who that someone was, but I have my suspicions. Certain things that were said led me to believe that Peter's effectiveness had been seriously compromised, although I must admit that these things may have been said with the intention that I would repeat them and thus help discredit Peter to the UFO community. If that was the intention, it didn't work because I didn't repeat them.

Curiously, there was very little interest in Peter's involvement with the Cash-Landrum legal proceedings in Texas in '83-'84. When I inquired about this, I was told that "the government knows the case will be dismissed" and that I shouldn't be concerned with it. As it turned out, the case was dismissed, and that was that.

BARRY GREENWOOD AND LARRY FAWCETT

Only two things come to mind here. The first is that several months before their book was published, I was told that the C/I people had obtained a copy of the Clear Intent manuscript through an operative. The second is that C/I's interest in CAUS stemmed largely from the fact that they were the organization behind Gersten in the CAUS/NSA lawsuit. Of the two, the C/I people were much more interested in Fawcett, and it seemed clear that someone who knew him well was the source of much of the information that came through. Greenwood was hardly ever mentioned, and if I brought him up the matter was quickly dismissed with some off-handed comment like, "Oh, you mean the writer?"— at which point the discussion quickly returned to Fawcett again.

WANAQUE RESERVOIR, NEW JERSEY

This was the site of a UFO flap in the '60s which NICAP had actively investigated. Beginning in late 1981 and continuing into 1982 there was another series of events in the area which had the C/I people in an absolute frenzy. Somewhere in my notes I have the names of a number of people who were involved. In any case, the prime concern as far as I knew it was trying to collect data and photos without the news

media or the UFO community becoming aware of what was going on. I was asked to survey various contacts in the UFO community in an effort to see if any were aware of these goings-on, and I did so. The results were entirely negative. I was then asked to report the moment I had any indication that details of this affair had leaked. As far as I know, they never did. Although I was told that C/I had collected considerable data (including photos), I never saw any of it. If I can locate my original notes on this matter we may be able to locate some of the people whose names I have and reopen the case. Unfortunately, I have not been successful in finding this material to date. One possibility is that it was thrown out by my ex-wife who disposed of several boxes of material back in '83 after we broke up.

APRO (The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization)

This was one of the major UFO organizations in the U.S. up until the death of its founders, Jim and Coral Lorenzen, a couple of years ago. Since that time it has been dormant. Headquarters were in Tucson, Arizona. I had been a member of the APRO Board of Directors for a time until I resigned in 1984 to form the Fair-Witness Project.

The Lorenzens and APRO were the subjects of on-again, off-again interest during the entire 1980-84 time period. As far as I know, it was mostly passive monitoring rather than active meddling, although I knew of some disinformation activity around them as well—particularly with respect to the Cash-Landrum and Bennewitz cases. For a while, particularly between '80 and '82, APRO was an easy mark because they had employed an office secretary whom I was led to understand was "cooperative." When the Lorenzens let this individual go, Jim told me privately that one of the reasons was that unauthorized people had been allowed access to confidential files. APRO's membership was told that the person had been let go due to financial reasons. It was the middle of the Reagan Recession, public interest in UFOs was at a low ebb and membership was down, so there was certainly some legitimacy in that position..

LARRY W. BRYANT

Larry was also involved with CAUS and was (is) a maverick in his own right. His name came up quite often in discussions, but I never had any direct involvement in whatever activities revolved around him. Bryant's current difficulties with his employer (the U.S. Army) over his UFO-related activities began in 1985, and, so far as I know, are not connected in any way with the C/I interest in him, although it seems reasonable that the situation is at least being monitored.

-There were several mentions of an on-going interest in a trance channeler/contactee in New Hampshire whose name I do not recall (although I wrote it down somewhere at the time). My understanding was that someone was making a systematic study of this lady and that she was readily cooperating with it.

-There was also a man who lived in a trailer in a remote area of Utah near the Nevada border who was the subject of quite a bit of interest. Apparently this man was reporting frequent contacts with aliens (the typical small stature-big eyes type) in the desert near his trailer. These took place only at night, and he was the only one living in the area (which was south of the Dugway Proving Grounds) for many miles around. This man had told someone in town about his experiences and from there word got to the C/I people who were intensely interested, even to the point of having made several trips out to visit with him. In the end, the man simply disappeared (leaving his trailer and belongings behind) and was never found.

Curiously, all of this developed shortly after the release of a paperback sci-fi thriller called The Ogden Enigma by Jean Snyder, the plot of which centered around a crashed saucer which was hidden in a hangar located on a remote section of the Dugway Proving Grounds. Snyder, whom I spoke to on the phone a couple of times, alleged that while his story was essentially fiction, the part about a crashed saucer being stored at Dugway was, he believed, factual. This same assertion is made in the introduction to his book.

There is more to this story, but since I have plans for separate publication, I will leave it as is for now.

PHILIP KLASS

On several occasions, the opportunity presented itself for me to ask about Klass' alleged role as a C/I operative—an "official debunker" as it were. Usually all I got was a flat denial that he was involved in any way, but on one occasion I got a surprise. "He's the perfect 'useful idiot,'" I was told. "We don't need to put him on the payroll. All we need to do is set him off and he mindlessly does whatever we want with no further prompting."



MJ-12 DOCUMENT ANALYSIS REPORT TO BE RELEASED

Many readers are already aware that Stanton Friedman has received a \$16,000 grant from the Fund For UFO Research to look into the authenticity of the MJ-12 documents. Stan has already done a considerable portion of the work and expects to have his report ready by the end of the year.

Stan's work, however, deals with background research into the names, dates and places involved as well as efforts to uncover additional references or verifying information about the MJ-12 project by conducting a systematic search of selected government and private document files considered most likely to produce results.

Equally important is the analysis of the documents themselves. Questions about format, stylistics, typewriters, type faces and similar areas of concern must also be considered in order to have as complete a picture as possible about these very controversial items. As an adjunct to Stan's work, Bill Moore and Jaime Shandera have been shepherding the documents past a series of professionals who have expertise in these areas. The results, now virtually complete, will be the subject of a report which is expected to be released in conjunction with Stan's findings by year's end.

This report will cover aspects of all three documents. The Eisenhower briefing of November,

1952; The Cutler-Twining memorandum of 1954 which was found in the National Archives; and the Truman memorandum dated September, 1947. Although the Truman memorandum was attached to the Eisenhower document, it has been treated separately for analytical purposes since the two were allegedly written more than five years apart.

A preliminary peek at the results? According to Moore, "One strong, one weak and one leaning positive but still open to question."

FOCUS subscribers will be advised when the report is ready for distribution.



FLASH! FLASH! FLASH!

The following late-breaking development occurred just at press time. Since it's certain to be controversial, we take pleasure in including it here for the information of our readers.

KLASS ON THE ATTACK

October 12, 1989

"He who does not bellow the truth when he knows the truth makes himself the accomplices of liars and forgers".....Charles Peguy

Dear Mr. Moore:

This is in reply to your Oct. 6 letter which harshly ridicules my claim that the signature on the "MJ-12 Truman memo" is a photocopy forgery of (an) authentic Truman signature on his letter of Oct. 1, 1947 to Dr. Vannevar Bush.

By the time you receive this letter you should have heard from your long-time "crashed saucer" collaborator and associate, Stanton Friedman, informing you that my claim has been confirmed by a respected document examiner. Because he does not wish to become publicly involved, I shall refer to him as "PT". But you know his name and telephone number be-

cause he is the document examiner with whom you, Shandera and Friedman earlier worked in connection with the MJ-12 documents.

You will recall that he earlier informed you that the MJ-12 Truman memo was a counterfeit because it was

Because he does not wish to become publically involved, I shall refer to him as "PT". But you know his name and telephone number because he is the document examiner with whom you, Shandera and Friedman earlier worked in connection with the MJ-12 documents.

typed using a Smith-Corona machine that was introduced around 1963— more than 15 years after the Truman memo, dated Set. 24, 1947, allegedly was typed.

You and your associated opted to withhold this vital finding from the public (and your fellow UFOlogists).

I learned of PT's activities in investigating the MJ-12 documents from another respected document specialist in Washington and called him. He expressed considerable interest in obtaining a copy of the authentic Truman-Bush Oct. 1, 1947 signature, which I promptly sent via overnight mail.

Today PT called me to report that his analysis indicated that the MJ-12 Truman signature was a photocopy forgery of the Oct. 1, 1947 signature. Further, that when he showed enlarged copies of the two signatures at a West Coast meeting of other document examiners, none challenged his conclusions.

Further, PT told me that because of his close relations with Friedman, he had already called and informed Stanton of the results of his (PT's) analysis. I presume that Friedman has by now briefed you and that if you want further verification you will call PT.

I invite your comments and apology.

Phillip J. Klass

BILL MOORE RESPONDS

16th OCT.'89

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

Dear Mr. Klass:

Thank you for demonstrating the usual "skeptical" approach of deciding what the truth must be before examining any evidence, and then stopping to crow the moment you discovered something that seems to support your preconceived notions. Naturally it would never occur to you that you might have missed something. Equally, it would never occur to you to tell all of the story when only half of it says what you want to hear. Thus, here's my side of the story you tell in your letter of October 12th. Of course, you will suppress this the moment you read it so as to make certain that at least some of your victims never get to read it. Why you are such an asshole, Phil, I probably will never know—but I remain confident that eventually your scales will balance.

(1) First of all, allow me to thank you for placing on the record the fact that the respected document examiner in question (PT) does not wish to become publicly involved. We were wondering how to get around that, since if we had said it, you would have never believed it. Now you have said it.

I would also like to thank you for placing on the record that you have discovered, by your own means, our on-going consultations with professional document analysts. It's always good to have you confirm that we have been doing our homework. That way, when the whole story is told, there won't be any question about the basics, or about the fact that we have been talking to top people in the field.

(2) Secondly, I acknowledge that PT did indeed make his findings known to us some time ago and we have not yet published them. I also acknowledge that your rendition of his professional opinion is essentially accurate. THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY, Phil, is two-fold: (A) PT is only one of the document examiners we have consulted on this matter. There are, in

fact, three others who have been involved. It was our feeling that a proper investigation required several opinions in order to make the findings as credible as possible. In the case of the issues involved in the Truman document, the four opinions involved are mixed. That is why I said in Las Vegas on July 1st that the document, "though not yet disproved, ...presents the weakest case of the three." Curiously, there is evidence on the other side of the coin as well. It's really quite a confusing matter once you take the trouble to examine ALL the evidence. But of course, since you've already decided what constitutes the bottom line, you wouldn't be the least bit interested in the complete report, would you? No matter—I'm sure there are many others who will be. We expect to have it published by year's end.

(B) While PT did confirm your position on the document, his opinion to us also included the statement that "although the document itself may be a fabrication, the information in it could very well be real. This sort of thing," he said, "is not uncommon in such a situation."

(3) We did not "opt to withhold" these admittedly vital findings from anyone. The only reason they have not yet been released is that they are not yet complete. Our plan had been to publish concurrently with Stan's FUFOR report at year's end. In spite of your partial scoop, we will adhere to that schedule. I expect our public, both yours and mine, can wait that long for good data. Indeed, if we thought you could bring yourself to participate in an impartial report that will contain considerable positive as well as some negative data, we would consider asking you to participate.

The above are my comments, as requested. The apology, however, should be from you—for jumping the gun, as usual, for personal gain; and, (also as usual) for misleading your public by telling only that part of the story which supports your pre-conceived position.

Cordially,
William L. Moore



EDITORIAL

By Jimmy Ward

Let me start right out by saying something controversial. I too have read Whitley Strieber's *Communion and Transformation*, but I'm not sure he was ever abducted. Nor am I certain that alien visitors are in contact with him now. No... he's not really lying either! He believes it!

Let me explain. Whitley is only one of literally dozens of people in that same area of the country who have had similar experiences and visits. They too have been visited by bug-eyed aliens, monks, men in wet suits, etc. They have seen faces on walls and ceilings, had lights switched on and off in their homes, and similar weird events. So what has been happening to Whitley has been happening to many others as well. If they're not being visited by aliens, then what's going on?

I've been corresponding with a family in Connecticut who has been keeping a diary of events and of what they've seen and experienced. The diary is a list of things without emotion or attempts to explain. I'm waiting now for answers to some questions I've already asked even though I'm pretty sure I already know those answers.

You see, Whitley and the rest of these people all live in the same general area the so-called boomerang UFO has been seen, and their experiences all began at about the time it first appeared in their area. I don't believe it is an alien spacecraft because it has been too localized for too long a period of time. Rather, I believe its propulsion system is responsible for these goings-on. How?

Well, recently, in Canada, a model plane was flown and kept aloft using microwaves beamed at it from the ground. The craft converts these microwaves into electrical power to run the motors. No fuel, in the conventional sense, is needed. Northrop is also working on a similar model. But this boomerang UFO has been appearing for years, you say? Well, microwave

continued on page 13

AN INTERVIEW WITH BILL MOORE

Q : There have been a number of complaints voiced in print concerning problems surrounding W.L. Moore Publications' subscription offering of the "Missing Segment from 'UFO Cover-up?...Live!'" videotape (also known as the "Doty tape"). What's going on here?

A: The Doty tape mess has indeed been troublesome, for us as well as for others. We have had nothing but problems with this item ever since we got involved with it. To date, we have managed to fill slightly more than half the orders we have received, and we have every intention of honoring the rest. These have been handled in the order they were received. Believe me, we have had our share of complaints about this, and every one of them has been fully justified. Had I known the nightmare this thing was going to become, I would never have undertaken the project to begin with. Now we are stuck with it and I expect will lose more money and friends before it's all over.

Q: John Lear and M. William (Bill) Cooper have made a number of highly controversial statements about the alleged relationship between the U.S. government and extraterrestrial visitors. Can you provide any insight as to what's going on with these two individuals?

A: I presume by now that most of the UFO community has had a chance to read and assess my Las Vegas paper. I think the time had come to blow the whistle on government disinformation about UFOs and provide some much needed counterpoint to the Lear-Cooper material. One of the key points in that mess, at least to me, was that I was able to establish a direct connection between one of Lear's "confidential" sources and the very same office in Washington that was responsible for directing much of the effort against Bennewitz. That, coupled with the fact that much of Lear's material was essentially an embellished regurgitation of the same fluff they fed Paul, told me what I needed to know about Lear. As for Cooper— he's a highly intelligent individual who is very good at taking in material from a variety of sources and twisting it around to suit his purposes. Either

he's a clever opportunist who's taking advantage of the Lear situation and the general paranoia of the UFO community to try to make himself look important, or he's a C/I man whose specialty is deception. My present thinking is that the former is more likely the case because his methodology doesn't fit the latter type at all. All anyone needs to do to call his credibility into serious question is to compare his earlier pronouncements with those he is making currently and take note of the host of inconsistencies. The problem is that many of his followers simply don't care about verifying what he says—it's the paranoia factor that grabs them. If Cooper's life has been threatened (as he says it has) and if Cooper lost his job because he knew too much (which is one of his latest claims), then to these people it's proof positive that he must be telling the truth. Anyone who says otherwise must be part of the cover-up. It's all a nice, neat little package. Unfortunately, (in my opinion) less than 10% of what he says has any truth to it. The rest is pure, unadulterated hogwash!

Q: A small but vociferous segment of the UFO community has expressed a sense of outrage over the revelations you have made recently. How do you feel about this?

A: Government disinformation about UFOs has been going on for a long time. My goal is to try to stop it by exposing it to the public, and at the same time, uncover what is behind it. If the UFO community is upset by what I'm doing, it certainly hasn't shown in the dozens of calls and more than 100 letters I have received. So far, supporters have outnumbered critics by a ratio of eight to one! To those who have expressed outrage over the fact that I allowed myself to become involved in the disinformation game, I point out two things: First, if I hadn't done it, the government would simply have found someone else who would have; and Second, if I hadn't blown the whistle and exposed the process, the UFO community would still be in the dark about it and fawning after Lear and Cooper. In short, if you want the world to know that the lady's wearing poka-dotted bloomers, the best way is to run the evidence

up the flag pole in front of a crowd of people. Naturally a few people are going to be horrified by the process, but that's the way it goes.

Q: Some people have suggested that the government counterintelligence people were onto you all along, and that both you and Linda Howe have, in essence, poured your coffee from the same pot. Is this possible?

A: Of course it's possible, but I think it's highly unlikely— especially since I brew my coffee strong and black while Linda prefers hers weak and with lots of sugar. In a more serious light, the difference here is that I knew disinformation games were being played. This put me in a much better position to safeguard against them than others who had no idea what was going on. Remember, I also had contacts who were far enough removed from the counterintelligence side of things to enable me to do a certain amount of double checking. This is why I have continually held my cards close to the vest and played to the table only when I was reasonably certain I was on a solid footing. The principal point, however, continues to be not who was (is) being duped, but rather, why. Until the last card has been played, the game isn't over.

Q: Is it true, as alleged in the July-August 1989 issue of International UFO Reporter (IUR), that you have admitted to once working as an agent for the Defense Investigative Agency (DIS)?

A: I do not now, nor have I ever been connected in any way with the DIS, although it is admittedly possible that some of the information I supplied to AFOSI ended up in their files. If this occurred, responsibility for it would lie with OSI and not with me.

Q: With respect to the so-called "Aquarius Document" which purports to be a facsimile of an AFOSI teletype message dated 17 NOV 1980, several questions still remain:

(A) Are you the one who retyped the document?

(B) If not, do you know who did?

(C) The fact that you have identified changes, additions and deletions allegedly made in the retyped version suggests that you either had access to or were familiar with the text of the

original version. How do you explain this?

(D) Did the text of the original really refer to "NSA" rather than "NASA"?

A: First of all, it is important to take note of what I said in Las Vegas, which was that the document is a retyped version of a real AFOSI message with a few spurious additions. I also stated that it was apparently created by AFOSI, or at least I had always assumed it was, and that it was handed to me in February, 1981 with the intention that I would pass it to Bennewitz. (See FOCUS, June 30, '89, p.13.) I thought the "created by AFOSI" statement would have laid this matter to rest, but apparently not. Therefore:

First: I did not retype the document, nor do I know who did. Certainly it was someone involved with the Bennewitz C/I effort, maybe Doty, maybe not.

And Second: I know that the version I was handed was a retype because I had seen the original earlier on, or at least, what I believe to this day to have been an original since it was a teletype copy and not a xerox. The reconstructed version which appears in FOCUS is the combined product of both my and Rick Doty's memory. To the best of my (our) recollection, the original did indeed refer to NSA.

Q: What about the "other" Aquarius document— the one with "Executive Correspondence" on the cover and of which you released several highly censored pages in FOCUS back in 1987. Isn't this a retyped document as well, and why haven't you said anything about it since?

A: I was told that the original briefing to which it allegedly pertains was an oral briefing and that the briefing officer used handwritten notes as an aide-memoire. The version I have is allegedly a typed (not retyped) transcript of those notes which the briefing officer later composed as a memo to file. Naturally I have no way of proving this as I only have the source's word for it. Just for the record, the "source" was NOT Rick Doty.

There are several reasons for continuing to withhold the larger portion of this material:

First: We are continuing to study it with our goal being to release a complete report at a later date.

Second: We do not know if it is authentic.

And Third: It is a control mechanism in case anyone else comes forward with a similar claim. I.E., if anyone can supply any portion of the "missing text", we would be in a position to refute or verify. (In this light, Bill Cooper claimed to have seen the same document as part of his experience. Cooper then supplied a typed version of what he said was the complete text of the document. His only mistake was that he assumed the version we had was pre-censored and that we would have no way of knowing what the allegedly missing text said. Unfortunately for Cooper, we were able to expose his version as being exactly identical to ours with respect to uncensored lines, and completely different from ours where Cooper had filled in what he assumed was missing from our document. When Cooper was confronted with this, he changed his story and tried to claim that the reason the text of our document differed from his was that it was we who had been provided with an altered document. Now think about it— does it make sense that even if we were supplied with an altered document, the only alterations were exactly those lines which WE arbitrarily chose to black out before releasing it in FOCUS?

Q: How do you know that the MJ-12 documents, or indeed any of the other documents you have or claim to have are authentic? Isn't it possible that you too have been led down the garden path just like so many others?

A: How do I know these documents are authentic? I don't. The point is that the documents exist and that they came through government sources. The correct question in either case is "why", and that's what a large part of my investigative effort has been all about. Certainly there are strong indications that at least some of the documents are phonies; and there are equally strong indications that some of them aren't. That fact alone provides more than enough reason to be very careful in the approach we take. To simply reject everything out of hand (as Barry Greenwood of CAUS has suggested) just because some things are phoney would be tantamount to throwing the baby out with the bath water.

Am I being led down the garden path? Perhaps. Once again the correct questions here

are who is doing the leading, where will the path go, what can be learned in the process, and (again) why is this happening? If it's to dissuade me from doing further research on Roswell, it isn't working very well, is it? My research is every bit as active as it ever was. Just because, until recently, I have been allowing Stanton Friedman to act as writer for the team, does not mean that I have not been busy in my own right, or that I have abdicated my role in any sense of the word.

Q: Didn't you and Bob Pratt collaborate some years ago to write a fiction novel entitled The Aquarius Project, and wasn't Richard Doty a part of this effort? Why wasn't the book ever published, and why wasn't Pratt aware that you were also working with Jaime Shandera at the time?

A: Pratt and I did indeed write an unpublished novel which was completed in '82. It was essentially fiction based on fact, and Doty did indeed play a role in the project. The book was never published because the so-called Reagan Recession was going on at that time and UFO books were a drug on the market. Although the plot took some very fascinating twists, there is nothing therein that the UFO community doesn't already know with respect to either Aquarius or MJ-12. Recently there has been a renewed interest in the manuscript and perhaps it will be published after all.

It is important to note here also that I brought Shandera into our project in June of '82; consequently the reason I never mentioned him to Pratt was that he wasn't involved at the time. Pratt certainly knew of Stanton's and my association; however even Stanton didn't know a whole lot about what I was trying to do with Aquarius/MJ-12 by January of '82 because at the time I was playing very close to the vest and Stan, who had moved to Canada in '81 (I think) was very far away.

Q: We all know what you have claimed to be getting from "Falcon". How about addressing the question of what you are giving him in return.

A: What am I giving Falcon? Up to late '84, I knew where I stood on that one. Since then, it's been something of a mystery to me as well. I think I'll pass on that question just now be-

cause anything I might say would be speculation on my part; and everybody knows the penchant some members of the UFO community have for transforming speculation into truth.

Q: Word has it that Robert Hastings is presently working on yet another indictment of you and your alleged involvement with disinformation, deception and deceit. Care to comment?

A: Robert who? ...Oh yes, that's Mr. "Hasty Pudding", isn't it. I wonder why he just doesn't call me and ask his questions? I've tried to make contact with him on several occasions, but he refuses to speak to me. Rather than trying to communicate on a reasonable level, he has instead resorted to making wild allegations that I have "harrassed" and "spied" on him. He's flattering himself, of course! Frankly I have much better things to do with my time.

In any case, Mr. "Hasty" can say whatever he likes. In the long run, I'm the one who is holding the cards and it's going to be up to me to either put up or shut up. Nothing this man can possibly say will make one iota of difference in that process. My policy is and will continue to be one of ignoring him and his bosom buddy Todd Zechel, for whom "Hasty" seems to be only an unfortunate stooge. Zechel's reputation is allegedly so bad with UFOlogy that the only way he can continue to operate is through a mouthpiece. In my opinion, "Hasty" is not the one who's writing those papers, the poison pen is more likely held by Zechel. "Hasty's" gullibility and paranoia make him a convenient puppet and Zechel seems to use him as such. As to why Zechel hates Bill Moore, it's a very long and rather humorous story involving the ability of an over-active imagination to transform a small matter of coincidence into a full-blown, raging conspiracy.

Q: An Englishman named Christopher Allan, who some have characterized as a British "Phil Klass", has offered the opinion that the MJ-12 documents are counterfeit and that the counterfeiter based his work on the 1950 Wilbert Smith memorandum from Canada which also refers to Dr. Vannevar Bush as having been involved with UFOs. Do you have any comment on this?

A: Christopher Allan and I have been corresponding for some time. In my opinion, to compare Allan to Klass is to do Klass a disservice. In any case, the one point neither Allan nor anyone else can answer is how the writer of the Eisenhower Briefing document knew that Menzel would check out. Every attempt I've seen to answer this very important question has been nothing more than sheer speculation. Allan, of course, can speculate all he wants.

In light of your comment about Bush & the Smith memo, please note that the Smith memo clearly identifies Bush as "head" of a project to determine modus operandi. The Eisenhower document identifies Hillenkoetter as heading MJ-12. Seems like if someone was going to use the Smith memo as back-up for forgery, they wouldn't have made such an obvious mistake.

Q: In spite of the revelations you made in Las Vegas, Linda Howe reportedly still feels that there really was a UFO crash at Aztec, New Mexico. She also argues that Richard Doty wasn't her only source of inside information. Do you have any additional comments on this matter?

A: Linda Howe may "feel" that the Aztec crash really happened, but she certainly hasn't put any evidence on the table to back it up, or to refute the extensive material on this case presented over four years ago in "Crashed UFOs: Evidence in the Search for Proof" which was published in the '85 MUFON Conference Proceedings. As for her "other sources", this is nothing new either. Remember that in Las Vegas I said that I had become aware in early 1983 that Rick (Doty) was involved with a team of several others, including one fellow from Denver that I knew of and at least one who was working out of Washington, D.C., in playing an elaborate disinformation game against a prominent UFO researcher..." The "researcher" involved here was Howe. Doty was involved with at least three "others", possibly four; only one of whom would have had any visible connections with him.

Of course, who can blame Ms. Howe for trying to save face? After all, she must find these revelations both embarrassing and troubling; especially coming as they have during the very time she is seriously involved in trying to promote her new book. Remember that the tome is self-

published, and if it doesn't sell she stands to lose a bundle. It's a very unfortunate predicament for her.

Q: A few very vociferous people in the UFO community have called your motives into question with respect to your statement in Las Vegas. What about this?

A: I went to a great deal of trouble in Las Vegas to put my motives on the table. Those who continue to dwell upon them or remain skeptical of them seem to be incapable or unwilling to assimilate and digest what is obviously a very much larger picture. Curiously, some of those very same people who scream bloody murder at ad-hominum attack tactics when they are employed by certain UFO debunkers are now actively employing those very same techniques against me. When the debunkers make ad-hominum attacks, the pro-UFO people invariably argue that such attacks are made only because the debunkers can't find any other way to support their position. "When you can't attack the evidence, attack the witness." Need I say more....? Yes.

The criticism of "what (I) did to Bennewitz" is just another example of this. Truth is, all I "did" to Bennewitz was report on his thinking, movements and activities. Trading information is perfectly good journalism and it's not unethical. The "ethical question" raised here is just another way to conveniently avoid the real issue; the inference being that if I am unethical, those who cast the aspersion must somehow be better. Rubbish!

If we're going to question motives here, then let no one be above reproach. Certainly I have my motives; just like everyone who takes issue with me has his or her motives. One wonders, for example, just what Barry Greenwood's motives were when he debunked the MJ-12 documents to the press before he had ever seen copies of them. Curiously, he has remained one of my most vociferous critics ever since. Could it be fear... fear that I might just come up with something before he does? Or could it be a feeling of inadequacy for the situation in hand. After all, debunking the documents takes nothing but rhetoric. Researching them takes visits to archives, libraries and document repositories all over the country. Greenwood must certainly feel inadequate for

such a task since, by his own admission, he's been to the National Archives all of once (for an hour or so), and to other key facilities... never. And does he have an open mind? Does he seek information? Not from me he doesn't. I've never corresponded with him, never spoken with him on the telephone, and have met him face-to-face all of one time— in Washington D.C. in a lobby for about ten minutes. We exchanged pleasantries. No motives were discussed.

Q: Jim Moseley, writing in the Fall '89 edition of Caveat Emptor, implies that it was you who went to the government and blew the whistle on Paul Bennewitz. Is this true?

A: Moseley's exact statement was, "Whatever Bennewitz was up to, Moore told the government all about it." This is very misleading. First of all, it was the "government" who came to me, not vice-versa; and secondly, my role was essentially limited to supplying them with information concerning Paul's thinking, activities and inter-relationships with others. In addition, it would be more correct to say that I worked with rather than "for" a government agency. That agency, as is made perfectly clear in my Las Vegas paper, was AFOSI, and my contact man was Richard Doty.

Q: What about Timothy Green Beckley's recent book "MJ-12 and the Riddle of Hangar 18"?

A: It's strictly an opportunistic publication. Beckley's idea of research is to take everything he can get from others and twist it into cash as quickly as possible. The book is just another of his shoddy attempts at "me first" journalism. About the best thing it has going for it is its glitzy cover.

Q: On page 41 of the September/October 1989 issue of UFO magazine there is a review of Whitley Strieber's new novel Majestic. In it, George Earley, the author of the review, makes two comments about you: First, that you "served the U.S. government as ...a purveyor of UFological disinformation"; and Second, that you are "reputedly on Strieber's payroll these days." What is your reaction to this?

A: I don't know what Mr. Earley's dictionary

says, but mine defines "purveyor" as one who provides. There is a big difference between one who is aware of a disinformation operation and one who actually provides (i.e. "purveys") the disinformation itself. In Las Vegas, I stated very clearly that my role in the government's disinformation game was limited to providing information on the thinking, activities and inter-relationships of certain people in the UFO field. I had nothing whatsoever to do with the counterintelligence and the disinformation, although I either knew or was aware of a number of people directly involved with that end of things. Where Mr. Earley gets "purveyor of ufological disinformation" out of that, I cannot imagine. Seems like New England is full of people these days who are so busy believing what they want to believe that they haven't got time to look at the facts.

The "reputedly on Strieber's payroll these days" bit is just another example of this. As near as I can trace it down, this one originates in a rumor started by Barry Greenwood, who, like Earley, could have easily checked the matter with a simple phone call to either me or Strieber. Yet neither one of them could be bothered. I wonder why?

Q: That's all well and good, but even though you denounce Greenwood and Earley for not checking, you still did not address the real issue here. ARE YOU on Whitley's payroll these days? Is there any agreement between the two of you? Did you take a payoff on Majestic?

A: Whitley called and asked me if I would be willing to meet him in New Mexico, show him the crash site, and introduce him to some of the original witnesses. I said I would do it if he would pay the air fare and expenses, but that I did not want a fee. He said he would be uncomfortable if I didn't accept payment, so in the end I took \$300 for three days, plus another \$160 in air fare. That was the sum total of my "payoff" on Majestic. I am not on Whitley's payroll, nor have I ever been.

Q: How did Lee Graham come to get involved with the MJ-12 and other documents?

A. As I said in Las Vegas, Lee is an aircraft buff who spends a lot of time chasing details of our

newest experimental aircraft through the Freedom of Information Act. His interest in UFOs, which stems from his interest in aircraft, goes back at least ten years.

Lee's motives are best summed up as a "quest for truth." It's become almost a religious matter for him. He writes hundreds of letters to virtually everyone from the president on down in an effort to find someone who will help him find that truth. Give him a lead, and he'll chase it to the ends of the earth, so long as the chase can be done through the mails. He's very loyal in this process, and very open about it—the loyalty being to both his friends and his employer (he never talks about his work, which is classified); and the openness coming from the fact that there's absolutely no paranoia in his life. For him, chasing the truth about UFOs is like trying to fill every blank space in a stamp album—he's not going to feel complete until it's done.

In any case, shortly after Jaime Shandera received the MJ-12 documents anonymously, I had a conversation with Rick Doty about them. Rick was curious, interested and concerned. "What are you going to do with them?", he wanted to know. "What do you suggest?", I replied. "Well, if I were you," he said, "I'd find some way to protect my ass."

When I asked what he meant, he suggested that I find someone to show them to who would do a lot of talking about them to a lot of people. "Show them to this person," he said, "but be sure not to give him any copies. Let whoever it is talk all they want. That way you can verify how long you've had the stuff if you ever need to, and at the same time, if the person you select does enough talking, you might learn something from the feedback. If those things are real, talking about them is going to attract somebody's attention. Pick your man, and then just monitor what happens."

It sounded like a good idea and I decided to act on it. After carefully considering several likely "candidates" and discussing them with Rick and others (including "Falcon" himself), we settled upon Lee Graham. Our reasoning was that Lee could be depended upon to carry the banner on this thing without making a cloak and dagger affair out of it. Lee, for his part and without really being told what was expected of him, grasped the nature of his role

almost at once and seemed to feel very content with it. All he needed to do was to write letters and ask questions—all I needed to do was keep in contact with him and monitor the feedback. From a legal point of view, neither of us was doing anything wrong even if the documents were real and had not been declassified. Under the law, the liability lay with the anonymous source who had leaked them.

Anyway, Lee and I became good friends in this process, and we are still good friends.



EDITORIAL ...Continued from page 6

plane models have too. In 1985, Raytheon flew an early model for over ten hours in a test. But the plans were apparently canceled, or at least nothing further has been heard about it in public.

As many readers are probably aware, certain microwave frequencies can and do produce physical and mental effects in humans, including emotions and hallucinations! It can also trigger ESP-like experiences. As far as I have been able to learn, the experimental microwave planes tested so far all have a waffle-like or grid system on their underside—and so does this boomerang UFO! I don't think this is all coincidence, although admittedly it does need further checking. If the hypothesis is correct, those who have had the most frequent exposure should be the ones who have the most "visitor experiences". Those who have had one or two exposures should have their "experiences" a few days after their exposure, not while they were exposed. Also, a blood test should show elevated white blood cell counts (sometimes as much as 50% above normal). Strieber should be able to verify this in his own case at least.

It's an angle on abductions that hasn't been pursued before. I should think that at least someone in the UFO community would want to do some further checking before ruling it out.



CRITICAL COMMENTS FROM UFO MAGAZINE

The information that (William Moore) has shamelessly revealed, about the extent of disinformation in ufology and when he participated in it, represents the blackest mark on this field yet to surface. No single element within the flow of UFO information does more damage to the UFO field and deflects popular interest in it than the actions of those agencies and individuals who, without reprisal, blithely override the Constitution of the United States. ...UFO asks readers to think long and hard about the implications of these current disclosures."

Vicki Cooper in UFO Magazine
Sept./Oct. 1989

"This has been going on for too long. The bottom line is that the UFO community has been had.... In his speech he criticizes others for spreading disinformation, but for the last ten years, Bill himself has been one of the biggest sources of disinformation in all ufology. His money motivation is blatantly obvious."

Barry Greenwood of CAUS
as quoted in UFO magazine
Sept./Oct. 1989

BILL MOORE REPLIES

Dear UFO Magazine:

With respect to your editorial (pg. 2) and the associated article about me (pgs 4-5), please allow me to point out that counterintelligence people associated with the U.S. government have been disseminating disinformation about UFOs to the public (of which the so-called UFO community is a part) for many years. Only by exposing this process can we ever hope to learn anything about how it works or anything about its impact on us as UFO researchers and journalists. Only by exposing it and ultimately

understanding who's behind it and why it's being done can we ever hope to develop a strategy for counteracting its influence. In light of this, your editorial comment that these revelations represent "the blackest mark" on UFOlogy yet to surface somehow suggests that we would be better off not knowing how vulnerable we have been and are. I disagree. Rather, I think the exposure of this heretofore only suspected chicanery places us in the strongest position we have ever enjoyed.

Barry Greenwood's assertion that "money" is my motive is laughable on two fronts. In the first instance, all he needs to do is come out here and take a look at my income tax returns or my bank balances to see just how much money I make from my activities. (I'll make them available to him if he comes.) In the second, if we are to accept Greenwood's philosophy that making money is an inherently evil motive, then I suppose none of us should ever go to the movies, buy a newspaper, watch the evening news on TV, listen to the radio, buy a copy of your magazine or purchase food from a super market—all of which operate solely for the purpose of turning a profit. (Who knows—maybe Barry Greenwood is really a closet communist?)

VICKI COOPER "CLARIFIES"
(Excerpted from her letter to Bill Moore
dated Oct. 1, 1989)

"Dear Bill:

"I...think a few brief clarifications are in order:

"Your inference that my remark (i.e., your revelations: "the blackest mark on ufology yet to surface") suggests we'd "be better off not knowing how vulnerable we have been and are" constitutes a complete misreading of my meaning. That disinformation and misdirection about UFOs are pervasive in this field is well known.... Anyone who can't see how vulnerable we are simply isn't looking. I submit that you put the blinders on when you chose to be part of such a disinformation campaign, in

your assumption that "exposure of this heretofore unsuspected chicanery places us in the strongest position we have ever enjoyed." Who are you kidding?

"The "blackest mark" I refer to is, purely and simply, that your actions, if true, have not only contributed to the physical and psychic disintegration of an individual, but have again shown those responsible for such programs that some ufologists can be easily "had." What you did and for all I know are still doing allows these "spook" types to have an ever-expanding field day at the expense of legitimate ufology. After your disclosures do you SERIOUSLY think anyone with half a mind infers that your/our position is strengthened? Does strength in our maligned field come from the arrogant assumption that you can beat these guys at their own game...?"

"I'll make an assumption here: Your beef with Greenwood further plays into "their" hands...."

BILL MOORE RESPONDS:

Dear Vicki:

Thank you for your "clarifications" letter. It is a source of never-ending amazement to me how some people in this field have become such experts at making federal cases out of assumptions and rumors. Somehow I had always expected that you, as a fellow journalist, were above such tactics. Needless to say, I am chagrined and dismayed to see how you have fallen prey to the temptations of yellow journalism. How sad—and indeed, how tragic for those in UFOlogy who have in the past looked to you for something better than pulp.

In any case, let's examine your letter:

Granted it is well known that "disinformation and misdirection about UFOs are pervasive in this field." The question here is not that it exists, but rather who is responsible for it, how is it being done, and (most importantly) why?

This is especially true when we find our own government expending money and manpower over a long period of time to maintain a clandestine power base in this process. To suggest that participation for the purpose of gaining enough inside knowledge to expose, "allows these 'spook' types an ever-expanding field day at the expense of legitimate (?) UFOlogy" is tantamount to suggesting that every undercover officer or journalist in the country should be punished for whatever parts they have played in illegal activities for the purpose of either having those involved brought to justice or exposed to public view. Great logic, Vicki! If you knew me at all well, Vicki, you would know that I don't make a practice of going out on limbs unless I am reasonably certain there are nice soft cushions underneath to catch me should I fall. With that in mind, I am confident that I could go into a court of law, and using acceptable standards of evidence, provide sufficient testimony from first-hand witnesses to show that my personal involvement in the Bennewitz affair did nothing to cause him "physical or psychic disintegration" in any way. Indeed, even Paul Bennewitz himself could not truthfully testify otherwise.

In modern American society, when a patient dies on the operating table, is it reasonable to suggest that the entire hospital staff should be held responsible. Of course not! Now, with that in mind (and remembering that opinion and invective do not qualify), I would like you to carefully consider what evidence either you or anyone else can produce to suggest that I should be held accountable for what happened to Paul Bennewitz. Yes, I was in the hospital; but when it came to the operating room, all I was doing was taking notes. Certainly I regret what happened. I liked Paul. But in the final analysis nothing I could have done would have made things any different for him. All we can hope for is that publicizing the notes I took in the process will help prevent the same thing from happening to someone else. That's what it's really all about, Vicki. If you can't see that, then you're the one who has "put the blinders on."

Moving on to something lighter, do you seri-

ously think that the counterintelligence community needed me to show them "that some UFOlogists can be easily 'had'!" How absolutely droll! Come-on, Vicki— all anyone needs to arrive at such a conclusion is to read some of the moronic rubbish they write—some of which, I might add with all due respect, can be found in the pages of your magazine.

I don't have any "beef" with Mr. Greenwood—he's the one who is trying to rake me over the coals with little more behind him than malicious rumors, inferences and inuendo! Indeed, I hardly know the man or any of his immediate associates. I have met Greenwood exactly once (in a lobby in Washington, D.C., for about ten minutes in 1987). In all the years he's been with CAUS, he's never phoned or written to me—not once! Yet he is such an authority on my activities and motives. I have never met Larry Fawcett at all, although I have had perhaps five or six phone conversations with him over the past seven years (the most recent of which was maybe 1985), and we have exchanged letters not more than three times in that timespan. As for Melesciuc, I have never met, spoken to or corresponded with the man. In fact, I'm not even certain how to pronounce his name.

Ask yourself— are the activities of these individuals more consistent with those who genuinely want answers to their questions, or are they more consistent with those who would rather try to make themselves look important at the expense of others? If it was answers they wanted, Vicki, wouldn't it be more logical for them to write and ask for them rather than forever beating their breasts in print?

In closing, if you're going to continue to allege that I have "knowingly misrepresented facts", please have the decency to provide some evidence of substance to back it up. If it is true that I am "guilty of deceptions which have intentionally misled UFOlogy and harmed at least one person" then where is the proof? Fact is, these allegations aren't true at all— they're simply what you want to believe.



OF LEAKS AND PLANTS

The following is excerpted from a letter to the editor published in the *Washington Times* on August 21, 1989. The writer argues that an article previously published by the *Times* "fails to distinguish between two entirely different problems for journalists." He goes on to state:

"In the case of genuine "leaks" of information from nonofficial sources, journalists are dealing with individuals who may be acting for a wide variety of motives, primarily personal ones. Here the journalists' problem is essentially the credibility of the "leaker." Once satisfied that the informant has access to reliable information and reasonable efforts are made to corroborate it, then publication seems in order regardless of the motives of the source.

"An entirely different situation exists when release of information is sanctioned by cognizant authorities. Here the material is not "leaked," it is "planted." It is patently absurd to say that the president authorized "a leak" of information. Here the issue is not credibility, it is motive. Journalists who permit themselves to be used as mere transmitters of such information are unprofessional—and they are missing the story. Why the material is being "planted" through "sources" is every bit as important as the information itself.

"Leaks are often the basis for legitimate investigative reporting of great importance. "Plants" should be treated with similar skepticism and critical inquiry by alert members of the media."

Eugene J. Carroll, Jr.

(NOTE: The writer is a retired rear admiral and is deputy director of the Center for Defense Information, a nonprofit research group.)



MORE CRITICISM

Ever since Bill Moore made his presentation in Las Vegas last July 1st, there has been a wave of misinformation sweeping through the UFO community with respect to what he did or did not say. Many of the misinterpretations of Moore's text can be traced directly to people having heard only what they wanted to hear and then somehow miraculously transforming it into what they have subsequently come to believe they did hear. Add to this the cacaphony of derision that has spilled from a small element of the UFO-fringe community whose credibility has been seriously called to question by Bill's revelations of government disinformation, and the combination is sufficient to spawn some pretty wild-eyed material. Unfortunately, a few writers went to press with what they thought was good information only to learn later, much to their dismay, that it wasn't. One such article, which carried no copyright notice, is reprinted below and is followed by Bill Moore's categorical response to same. We offer it as typical of the sort of emotionally charged gobbledygook that is currently making the rounds on some branches of the UFO grapevine.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

By William S. English

Reprinted from "The Pegasus" newsletter, Special Edition (Vol I, #2, October 1989).

"In light of the many facts that have or have not come to light during the past few months, this is the final report that will be produced by UFINET and myself concerning Mr. William Moore. This is because it has become evident that we will in reality never know the true answers concerning what is or is not true with this gentleman. And because, frankly, it's not worth flogging a dead horse, which is what Bill Moore has become.

"Let us once again review the facts as they were presented by Moore at the 1989 Las Vegas MUFON Conference and Symposium.

"Essentially, Moore stated the following during his speech at the conference;

1. That he worked for the government as a disinformation agent.

2. That he was instrumental in relaying false information to Paul Bennewitz, and he played a part in having Bennewitz involuntarily committed to the New Mexico State Mental Hospital on three separate occasions. And his association with Bennewitz began in the later (sic.) part of 1979.

3. That his informants, Condor and Falcon, worked for the government, and the information released by them during his television show "UFO COVER-UP LIVE", was false information.

4. His association with the government was to gain information of their operations and he had his own reasons for working for them.

"Whatever his reasons might have been, they certainly have the appearance of having nothing to do with the advancement of Ufological studies.

"Additionally, more facts concerning Mr. Moore have come to light, which appear to have a very relevant bearing on everything else that seems to be taking place.

"It has been reported by various sources from around the nation that Moore's business practices are in serious question. It also seems his obsession for character assassination has acquired him a significant number of enemies, (I count myself among them).

"Before continuing, I feel it is essential to state my own personal position in the Moore Controversy. This, to present to you the reader, the facts so that you might be able to form your own opinions on the matter, but at the same time have a more complete picture.

"The fact that I personally have no great affection for Moore is, I'm sure, quite evident. I am among the many who have fallen victim to Moore's lies and character assassination. I have, however, been more fortunate than most as the facts and evidence have, for the most part, shown the lies Moore has attempted to spread about me are just that. Lies....There

have been those who have not been so fortunate in this area. It would seem Moore has had more successes than failures in this department. Thus he continues to persist.

"You have seen the facts Moore made evident at the MUFON Conference. Now take a look at the refuting facts as they are the truth, verified by many reliable sources.

1. From Paul Bennewitz; Moore stated that he began his relationship with Paul during the later (sic.) part of 1979, and it was at this point Bennewitz began sending his Dulce Report to APRO. In actuality, I personally began looking at the Bennewitz papers at the APRO offices in the later (sic.) part of 1978. Also, Bennewitz himself, through a spokesman, has stated that he did not meet Bill Moore until May of 1988, when he presented himself at Paul's home uninvited and insisted that Paul talk with him or else.

"If this is the case, why would Moore make such a statement which is so contrary to the facts as we have been able to establish them from other sources?? Moore said he lied to us, but in the admission of the lie, he is still lying. WHY??

2. Falcon & Condor: During his speech, Moore made the statement that, he believed the evidence presented by his two birds, Falcon and Condor was false information. Yet he allowed this segment to appear on the television production that he played an instrumental part in producing. He also began to sell out-takes of the Falcon and Condor segments through his distribution company, advertising them as having additional information that would play a significant part in UFO investigations. This apparently was not true. Bill Knell, of New York, stated in his newsletter for the month of August, that not only did it take a greater amount of time than it should have to get the tapes from Moore, but that the information was absolutely worthless garbage. If this were from just one source it would not be significant because it could be interpreted as just one dissatisfied customer. Unfortunately this comes from several different sources from around the country.

"Moore's statement concerning Falcon and Condor is a bit odd. Especially since in 1979, I met with Moore at the Parfait Palace in Trail Dust Town, Tucson, Arizona and related to him my own experiences concerning the Project Grudge/Blue Book Report #13. This meeting was arranged by APRO's very own Allen Benz.

"It was during this meeting I related everything I had seen in the report. I might add also that in 1977, I had related exactly the same things to Stanton Friedman, Jim Lorenzen, and Allen Benz after hearing Friedman give a lecture and (sic.) the Pima Community College. During the course of Friedman's talk he made mention of the fact Blue Book #13 did not exist. As this was not true, I approached him after his talk and told him so. It was then that I was invited to speak with him and the others at length at the APRO offices on north Campbell Ave.

"Almost ten years after the fact, Moore's two birds related "almost" verbatim everything I had told him in 1979. To add insult to injury, Moore between the time I re-emerged into the public eye and the time of the broadcast of his television show, began to spread the rumor that I had admitted to him that I, and one Gerry Schultz, were doing LSD together when we concocted the Blue Book Report scenario. The reason was supposedly because we were trying to redirect APRO into a more positive direction from where it was. This in fact was not true and never was. On a more personal level, I believe this was an effort to mis-direct public attention from myself and onto him and his supposed informants, in order to maintain the credibility of his work, and the television production.

"After the airing of his TV show (30 minutes after it went off the air in New Mexico) I contacted Moore's Offices in California in order to bring him to task on the matter. I was informed that Moore was in Washington, D.C., and he was unable to talk with me. I then talked with his associate Jamie (sic.) Shandera, and made my displeasure in the matter known clearly.

"Within a matter of days, I wrote to Moore reiterating (sic.) my feelings and position on the matter. Shortly there after (sic.) I received a

letter from Moore stating I had in fact said these things to him during our meeting at the Parfait Palace and he went into great detail concerning lawsuits that were brought against Allen Benz and myself by Coral Lorenzen and her associates in California and more or less accused me of perfidious activity against APRO. Then at the end of his letter he asked me to work with him on several investigations in the New Mexico area. If I were such a soundrel, why would he do this?

"I in turn responded to his letter point by point, and challenged him to take a polygraph test with me on the validity of his statements versus mine. He agreed, stating he had nothing to hide. As of yet I have not been able to pin him down to make the arrangements, and at the conference he not only studiously (sic.) avoided everyone that wanted to take him to task, he avoided me also.

"Apparently grants and funds have also fallen victim to Mr. Moore. The Fund for UFO Research, in Maryland was a victim most recently. Moore received a grant of something in the area of sixteen thousand dollars and produced nothing. I know for a fact that one of the conditions that exist in order to receive a grant from the fund is that all materials, equipment and data gathered using moneys (sic.) granted by the Fund, become the property of the Fund for UFO Research. The Fund has received nothing in return for the grant, and the money was apparently wasted. It would be interesting to have an exact account of what the money was used for.

CONCLUSIONS:

"Based on everything that has taken place during the past year and a half concerning Moore, it has become apparent that once he meets his obligations at the several speaking engagements he has been booked for this year, his popularity will decrease. Already there is a growing number of people around the nation that are placing vigorous objections to Moore's being a speaker at their conferences and symposiums. In short, Moore is no longer a viable part of the Ufological Investigative community.

continued on page 21

AN OPEN LETTER TO BILL ENGLISH

06 OCT. '89

Dear Bill:

In reference to your "The Pegasus/Special Edition" of October, 1989, I note that you have made a large number of errors in the "Enough is Enough" article. I certainly hope you will print my side of the story in your next issue. Let's take a look:

(1) I have never stated anywhere, either publicly or privately, that I "worked for the government as a disinformation agent." Please re-read what I said in Las Vegas as well as in my previous letter to you for clarification.

(2) I was not "instrumental in relaying false information to Paul Bennewitz" with the one exception being that I did give him a copy of the so-called Aquarius document. In this instance, however, I urged him not to go public with it because I could not vouch for its authenticity, but only to use it for his own personal information. Ultimately he took this advice because when the document finally did surface it came through other sources. Once again, see my Vegas Text ("VT", pg.13) for additional details.

(3) You state that I "played a part in having Bennewitz involuntary committal to the New Mexico State mental hospital." This is both untrue and erroneous on its face. First of all, if Paul was ever involuntarily committed to a state mental hospital, I am completely unaware of it. My statement (VT, pg.8) was, "Not long afterward I heard he had been hospitalized and was under psychiatric care." The hospital, as I understood it, was a local facility, not a mental hospital or institution, and Paul had not been "committed". He was simply under the care of a psychiatrist. Secondly, you will note that in the same reference cited above, I clearly state that I tried to counsel Paul to drop his UFO activities before they completely destroyed his health. Indeed, I genuinely liked Paul, resented what "they" were doing to him, and did

everything I could (short of blowing my own cover) to get him to realize he was the object of an extensive counterintelligence game. The fact is, Paul already knew that. Somehow I think much of his problem came from his unflagging belief that if he stayed with it long enough, truth as he saw it would somehow triumph over deception.

(4) My association with the Bennewitz case began in late 1979. I did not actually meet the man himself until early 1981. (See VT, pg.8, which clearly states, "I first met Paul in early 1981....") If you haven't got a copy of the text, please let me know and I'll be happy to send you one.

(5) The question of how long I have known Paul Bennewitz is one that is easily answered due to the fact that on a number of different occasions I was accompanied on my visits to him by other individuals who, I am sure, would be more than happy to verify that fact if necessary. One particular occasion, which you can easily check on if you wish, occurred in 1984 when I and Jaime Shandera were visiting with Paul in his office. We had been there about twenty minutes when Tracy Torme, Tom Adams and Gary Matheson walked in. They were quite surprised to see me; I was quite surprised to see them; and Paul seemed quite amused by it all. Ask Tracy, Tom, Gary or Jaime about it. I am certain they will recall the incident. You might also talk to Gabe Valdez, who knew as early as '81 or '82 that Paul and I were acquainted. Furthermore, on every occasion that I was at Paul's home, I was there as an invited guest.

(6) My informants, code-named "Falcon" and "Condor" did indeed work for the government. However, my statement concerning the "UFO Cover-up?...Live!" show was, "I am convinced that at least some, quite possibly a substantial portion, of that information falls under the category of disinformation." "Some" is quite

different from "all" (as implied by your article), and "a substantial portion" can still be considerably less than half. Admittedly it is open to interpretation, and as such, was a poor choice of words on my part.

(7) I have never said that I "lied" to anyone. What I did say was that I had "practiced an occasional deception now and again over the years in order to protect the integrity of our project." (See VT, pg. 15.) I am confident that anyone in the same position would have done the same thing. The "occasional deceptions", however, were all of my own doing. On NO occasion was I ever asked or ordered to lie by anyone connected with the government.

(8) I did not play an "instrumental part" in producing "UFO Cover-up?...Live!". Michael Seligman, as producer, had complete control and final say over the show at all times. Indeed, on the evening the show was broadcast, Michael and I had two arguments on the set over his trying to put words in my and Shandera's mouth in the final version of the script. Seligman (who had hired a Congressional investigator to authenticate credentials) was present at both the "Falcon" and "Condor" interviews, asked some of the questions himself, and had final say over which segments of the more than an hour-and-a-half of tapes would be used. My role was strictly limited to that of consultant, as was Mr. Shandera's.

(9) I have never offered "out-takes of the Falcon and Condor segments" for sale at all—nor has anyone else to date. The segment to which you refer was an interview with Richard Doty which was cut from the show at the last minute due to the live feed from Russia having run three minutes overtime. Bill Knell's assessment of the Doty interview as "worthless garbage" is his own opinion. Others have expressed quite opposite views. Perhaps you should view the tape and make up your own mind. I'll be happy to send you a gratis copy for the asking.

(10) Our meeting at the Parfait Palace in Tucson

took place in April of 1982, not in 1979. The meeting was arranged by you and I, not by Allen Benz. Friedman's lecture at Pima College took place in 1978, not 1977. The APRO offices at that time were at 2840 N. Country Club Rd. (room 103), not on North Campbell Ave.

(11) Anyone who wishes to verify the allegations made in the APRO lawsuit against you and Allen Benz can easily check the complaint papers which are a part of the public record here in California. I understand that one of the difficulties they had was finding you for the purpose of serving papers. Perhaps that was the reason you disappeared in 1982, only to "re-emerge into the public eye" seven years later in 1989?

(12) "Falcon" and "Condor"'s interviews on "Cover-up" were not "almost verbatim" repetitions of your material, although admittedly there are some similarities. Neither of these two sources has ever met you; nor, at the time we were working on the show, did I or anyone I knew have any idea where you were. Had I known, I would have provided the show's researchers with your whereabouts and you would have been contacted by them. Since there was no "public attention" on yourself, your assertion that I was trying to "mis-direct it" away from you is illogical.

(13) You cannot possibly have "talked with (my) associate Jamie (sic.) Shandera" thirty minutes after the cover-up show went off the air, because he was with me and fifty or more others on the set in Washington until nearly midnight, and then we returned to our hotel together. Jaime went to New York the day after the show, and did not return to Los Angeles until several days later.

(14) I have never suggested you are a "scoundrel", nor do I believe such a thing. Obviously I hold a certain amount of respect for you, or I would not have asked you to assist me in investigating cases in your area. If you will remem-

ber, it was you and I who made the first inquiries into the Cash-Landrum case even before Schuessler got involved.

Now that I think of it, I wonder if your bad opinion of me isn't the result of things you may have heard from John Lear. Lear has said a lot of things about me to a lot of people, and some of those things were patently untrue. Perhaps you too were misled?

(15) If you had wanted to "pin me down" to make arrangements for a polygraph test, why didn't you either write or call? You certainly had my address and phone number, and I might note here also that my last letter to you (dated October 31, 1988) has remained unanswered.* Obviously if I avoided everyone at the MUFON Conference, I avoided you too. The reason I came and left so quickly was as a snub to Lear and to MUFON for continuing him as host. It had nothing to do with you. Had you called and asked for a meeting with me in Vegas, I certainly would have been happy to accommodate. I had an entire day of private meetings that Sunday.

*(Anyone wishing copies of my two letters to Bill English dated Oct. 19th and Oct. 31st, 1988 may have them for the asking and a postage stamp.)

(16) Your assertion that I received a grant of \$16,000 from the Fund for UFO Research is in error. It was Stan Friedman who got the grant, and he will be supplying his final report to the Fund by year's end. The last grant I got from them was for \$500 to investigate an aspect of the Roswell case and to interview a retired general in Utah. I have not yet completed that work, but expect to have it done and a report written by year's end as well. I will also supply them with an accounting of how the money was spent.

(17) I'm not surprised to hear the news about your break with Cooper. What amazes me is that the man continues to have a following in spite of a history of self-contradiction and opportunism.

As for the Bill English/ Bill Moore controversy, obviously you have been the victim of a great deal of misinformation. I hope the above will help set the record straight and serve to thaw the situation just a bit.

Cordially,
William L. Moore



MORE CRITICISM *...continued from page 18*

and almost anything and everything he has done, or is trying to do, will come to nothing. It is advisable for Moore to seek real employment with the rest of us, instead of feeding on, and victimizing those of us trying seriously to find answers to the questions of UFOs."

"BILL COOPER BAD NEWS FOR UNIFET"

"It is with a great deal of sadness that we announce that Mr. Bill Cooper has been removed from the Board of Review of the UFINET NEWS AND INFORMATION SERVICE.

"Although UFINET supports freedom of speech and the tenants (sic.) of the Constitution of the United States, it will not support the spreading of lies and mis-information (sic.) to the public. Especially when it concerns other members of the UFINET Board of Review, and or prominent members of the Ufological Community. Mr. Cooper began to spread the rumor, that on his return from the MUFON Conference in Las Vegas, Bill English was fired upon by unknown assailants. This is not true. UFINET wishes Mr. Cooper the best in his endeavors, but will not tolerate this activity from any of its members. We deal in facts not fiction."



INTELLIGENCE, COUNTERINTELLIGENCE, AND THE DISINFORMATION GAME

By Brian Parks

The primary objective of the intelligence community, both military and civilian, is to gather information on a variety of subjects from whatever sources are available. The counterintelligence aspect of all this is to obstruct a foreign agency in its ability to do the same. It is quite obvious that certain agencies of our government have been gathering classified intelligence on UFOs and have given us reason to suspect that hard physical evidence is a part of this. The "government UFO cover-up" is one of the most popular topics of UFO research. Yet the dark side of this same coin is rarely spoken of. The UFO community at large has become very vulnerable to disinformation and counterintelligence to protect classified UFO data. One very significant reason is our emotional response of fear and embarrassment when confronting this issue. The strange mixture of UFO fact and fiction is either swallowed whole or dismissed in its entirety leaving nothing but confusion in its wake.

In July, 1989, researcher William Moore gave a presentation at the MUFON Symposium in Las Vegas which dealt a heavy blow to disinformation. He had to hurt some feelings and demonstrated certain vulnerabilities in the process. He demonstrated that the current rumor mill has sources and a purpose, and we need to confront this problem to get honest answers from our government. In the July/August, 1988 issue of *International UFO Reporter*, I wrote that having known Bill for some years, I was not aware of anyone as wary of disinformation as he is. The important problem is that most others in the UFO community either reject all leaked or anonymous information or believe it blindly regardless of content or source. Instead of ignoring anonymous information we must rely on the integrity of researchers involved and the ability to cross-check this information with documented facts. By cross-checking, I do not mean that if more than one source

is spreading the same rumor then it must be true. Some leaks may be very significant, but they can also be protected by professional intelligence methods of disinformation in order to protect the truth.

One of the aspects of the Air Force Office of Special Investigations is that it acts as a watchdog over certain classified government information, including counterintelligence activities. They have been involved in disinformation as revealed by Moore and others. AFOSI regulation 124-88 states the following:

"A major concern in leak cases is to avoid lending credence to the compromised material. Often the greatest harm comes from confirming that the U.S. has certain intelligence, technologies, or policies. In the absence of official confirmation, publicized material can be damaging but must still be classed as speculation. Sometimes, the very existence of an official investigation provides confirmation. The problem may be a determining factor in deciding whether an investigation should be undertaken."

Please stop here and read the above at least once more— then consider its application to the situation concerning the MJ-12 documents and related research. If any portion of this information is true, the implications are very far reaching indeed. With this in mind, we must accept the simple fact that those professionals who safeguard this information are going to do their jobs. It is up to us to be careful and do ours.

My current assessment of the situation is that some people in high places want the public to know certain truths while others do not. The UFO community are the useful idiots in a very powerful game. I have no intention of making personal accusations or pointing fingers of suspicion. I offer this as a warning to all of us who claim to have an interest in the truth.

The game is complex, sometimes obvious to the point of stupidity; but more often it is not. The game has motives and it has rules. We must be aware of this both to survive and to have any hope of ultimately learning the truth.



LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

DAll of the below is no more than an opinion that I've formed out of a 3+-yearlong association with those who term themselves "UFOlogists". I want you to know, before you read on, that I have a lot of opinions and I express them freely whenever I feel that some good may come of that expression. For example, I have an opinion of opinions that says that opinions are like unto sphincters in that we each have one, although some are less burdened than others with the obvious effects of soap and water.

If my opinion of most spokespersons of UFOlogy turns out to be accurate, then I want to "define my terms" here. Ergo, the following: Webster's defines "opinion" as, "A belief stronger than an impression, less strong than positive knowledge". So, as you read the below, keep in mind that my opinion is formed as a result of my experience of you. In other words, this is what I and others like me get out of what you, as a body, are all putting out. This is what's coming across. Is it what you really want to communicate? I believe that it's time, and perhaps it's past time, to take what is called a "hard look" at the field in order to examine what you've been doing so that you may decide if it is what you want to continue to do. In other words, does "UFOlogy", as it is today, really work?

I'll stick with Webster's to define one more term, i.e., "community" (as in "UFO Community"). A "community" is a group or class having a common interest. Well, I suppose that you who are currently involved with what you pur-

port to be the "study" of UFOs could be called the "UFO community" according to the above definition. You are indeed a group or class. Do you have a common interest? Apparently, yes. As you have stated repeatedly, your common interest is in getting at the truth of UFOs. So, there is a "community" of UFOlogists. Yet, expectations that this "community" will act communally in its own best interests are constantly being shattered between the jagged rocks of dissention and the monumental tides of egoism.

A very wise man once told me something that I have held to be true for no other reason but that it works.....period. What he told me was this: "When peoples' actions do not support their stated intentions, then their stated intentions are not their true intentions." That might be too difficult for some of you to understand, so I'll try a little parable:

Let's suppose you awaken in the middle of the night. You go into your living room and you discover a stranger sitting on your couch. The stranger says, "I'm waiting for a bus". What would you conclude? Is the stranger telling you the truth? Does the bus stop in your living room? If you're one of the really unusual people in the world, perhaps it does. In that case, the stranger might be a truth-teller. Break out the tea and cookies.

In the world I live in, the bus does not stop in my living room. That stranger would not get a warm reception from me. Why? Because his actions clearly do not support his stated intentions. Clearly, his intention was to break the security of my home and endanger the safety of my loved ones and my property. His presence in my home at that hour and without my knowledge and permission would prove that to me. I would act on that. His words are lies that need not concern me. Forgive me if this reads like a grade school primer. It's just that my experience leads me to conclude that there are many "UFOlogists" whose intellectual abilities seem to soar to heights dreamed of by only slugs and jackasses. If they have grasped this concept of actions-v/s-statements, we can proceed.

I'm almost certain that "UFOlogists" will agree

that your intention is to "get at the truth of UFOs", or words to that effect and having the same or a similar meaning. I believe that one could reasonably infer from those words that your "search for the truth" would proceed within some sort of rational framework perhaps vaguely resembling what is referred to as the "scientific method". One might also reasonably infer from your statements that the framework within which you proceed would be somewhat free of the sort of devices resorted to by pre-schoolers, such as "naaa-naaa-na-na-naaa, your mother wears Army boots", etc. Alas and alack, such is not the case.

In support of that, I proffer the example of the controversy surrounding the MJ-12 papers. On the one hand we have Moore and company who received the papers many years ago. That group held the papers for almost three years without mentioning them in public. They used that time to test the papers' validity, and non-validity, in a variety of ways. Only when they had gone as far as they felt they could on their own did Moore and Shandera make them public. And, please remember this once and for all, no one in the MSF group has ever said that the papers are authentic! What the MSF group has said, over and over and over again, is that they appear to be authentic, in that they have passed every test to which they have so far been subjected. The papers have been made public so that others may assist in testing, I say again, testing their authenticity.

So, what "tests" have been applied to the papers? Two persons currently with CAUS are on record as condemning the papers before they even saw the documents! What claptrap. Other nattering nabobs of nitwitism have taken the position that the papers are false because they didn't come upon them in all their years of "research". Now, the idea that "a thing isn't real if I didn't find it first" may have some value as a metaphysical argument, but it has no value in, and makes absolutely no contribution to, any "search for truth" in the practical world. It is, and remains, an utterly pure statement of egomania.

Another argument read recently emanates from John Keel, a man recently identified in

the pages of UFO magazine as a "first-rate researcher" and a "patriarch of UFOlogy". According to the patriarchal pronouncements of Mr. Keel, the papers are "obvious hoaxes" because one or more of them bear the stamp "TOP SECRET - EYES ONLY". This "first-rate researcher" baldly claims that the "EYES ONLY" part of the stamp means that the papers would have been burned after reading and, therefore, no copies could exist! He is mistaken, as anyone with even a little experience of government security techniques will testify. Documents which are intended to be burned after being read will say so, as in: "Burn this document after reading", or words to that effect.

Then there is the "Las Vegas test". It goes like this: The MJ-12 papers are undoubtedly false because "didn't Moore admit at the Las Vegas Conference to being part of a disinformation campaign?" The implication being, and the inference invited, is that all of Moore's work is to be invalidated and he to be rejected because of his investigative journalist's effort to get to the bottom of a government campaign of lies and distortion. By the same illogic, Woodward and Bernstein should be punished for being part of the Watergate coverup and all undercover cops should be tried and punished for their roles in whatever illegal activities they are part of. Good grief! Don't these people get the essential communication that Moore was trying to give them? The government coverup of UFO information does exist! Since it does exist, there must be something to cover up! That fact is a neon-bright validation of the basic premise of "UFOlogy"! Some people are so busy trying to make Moore seem "wrong" that they miss that entirely. Too simple, I suppose.

Also think about this: Just how the heck do you get to the bottom of something like this coverup and its included disinformation without getting into it?! Of course, those who are yapping at Moore's tail are the sort who, upon tasting of a teaspoon of saltwater, will declaim upon the nature of the oceans and the art of navigation. The honey-dipper brains who scream at Moore for being involved with the government disinformation campaign are the same sort who would scream at their auto mechanic for hav-

ing grease on his hands. Preposterous!

Just as preposterous is a recent editorial in "a leading UFO magazine", wherein a "journalist" says that Moore's actions are "the blackest mark on 'UFOlogy'". I suspect that this calumny is a result only of the editorialist's current emotional investment in a certain one of Lear's bunch of paranoids.

I read a cartoon strip some months ago which I will share with you here. The strip shows two men fishing. "A" says to "B", "What do you think of this UFO thing?" "B" replies, "I don't know. If they're real, why haven't they landed and made themselves known?" "A" then says, "Well, maybe they're looking for intelligent life." If "they" are looking for intelligent life, they will find little of that among the extant bevey of braying behemoths of braggadocio and pusillanimous pap purveyors currently infecting and infesting the body of "UFOlogists".

The same wise and gentle man who gave to me the actions-vs.-words concept also gave this to me: "You will always be able to tell who are the pioneers of the world, since they are the ones with the arrows.....in their backs." Well, Moore has enough arrows in his back to qualify him as a pioneer many times over. Please notice that I did not say that Moore is the pioneer. I said that he is a pioneer, i.e., one of many pioneers in the field.

So, "UFOlogists"! Your stated intentions are not supported by your actions, I observe. How do you "get at the truth of UFOs" by tearing at each other and eating your own young as if you were sharks in a feeding frenzy? How are you getting at any truth at all when you allow every crackpot and incompetent to publish his or her unsupported opinions as if they were eternal, universal fact? What proofs do you demand? What standards do you hold "researchers" to? What the heck are the rules of the road in "UFOlogy"? Are there any rules? Are there any standards?

Judging by the actions of most of you, your real purpose would seem to be to put as many arrows into each others' backs as you possibly can. Clean up your act! If you want to be

treated with respect and seriousness, act as if you are careful, respectable, serious, real researchers following some sort of methodology. Establish a set of standards for research, including reality tests. Empanel a board of persons to review papers submitted to UFO journals prior to publication. Give them a set of standards to work to out of common agreement among "UFOlogists". MUFON, if it were capable of the task of setting the standards and establishing peer review, could be the catalyst which finally gets "UFOlogy" to the point where it's taken seriously by the larger "scientific community". It's high time to corral the bayers and brayers and let the many serious folks among you really get down to work.

Sincerely,
J.C. Patrick
Trenton, NJ



MORE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

DI have just received the latest issue of FOCUS and it certainly goes a long way towards explaining many of the different issues surrponding you and your associates. While I don't necessarily agree with all of your actions, I certainly can understand and appreciate where you are coming from and given the same set of circumstances, I doubt if any researcher would have acted differently. I think given these revelations you are in a rather unique position to perhaps put the field of Ufology back on the right track. I think that it is extremely important that someone in the know begin to shed some light on the ramblings, ravings and unchallenged proclamations spewing forth from Lear, Cooper, English, etc. For as long as they are allowed to ramble forth unchallenged, the already muddy waters will continue to grow darker with dis and mis information.

J.L.
New York

Dearest Bill:

So sorry to hear about the death of MJ-12 along with your credibility and reputation. Should you need further consoling please don't hesitate to call. You have my number.

R.G.
New Hampshire

Dear Mr. Moore:

I waited patiently as you advised. I came to Las Vegas, I saw, I listened carefully. After some lengthy consideration I conclude that I prefer your "evidence in search of proof" over wild tales and conspiracy theories in search of evidence. Please begin my subscription to FOCUS.

J.R.J.
Texas

Dear Mr. Moore:

I hope people are throwing less "rocks" at you and your efforts to get to the bottom of the UFO situation now that you have cleared the air. As I've said before, I'm behind you guys 100% for what that's worth. If there's anything I can ever do to help, please let me know.

D.M.
New Jersey

Dear Editor:

I wish to write you this letter and tell you I went to the trouble of buying Dr. Edith Fiore's recent book *Encounters*. Things were pretty consistent, although non-rigorous, until I hit page 106 and then I skimmed through the rest. At that point, I said to myself, "Oh No!, another book on our Space Brothers and the wonderful things they are doing for these very fortunate abductees and contactees." Our "Space Brothers", preaching the message of good will and love to all mankind through the abductees and contactees while curing whatever ails them

and keeping the world safe from disaster. This, I believe, is nothing more than another Adamski story disguised as an authoritative book on abductions! It is a very poor approach and most unprofessional for a person of Dr. Fiore's supposed stature. As stated in the book, "Hypnosis is no truth serum." Obviously, the scientific filter system did not work in this case. I only hope I may receive a refund.

R.C.
Indiana

DELUSION, BENIGN AND BIZARRE

(Excerpted from an a feature article by Daniel Goleman which appeared in the New York Times, June 27, 1989.)

"Delusions are more commonplace than most people assume, a growing number of researchers are concluding. These researchers say the delusions of those with psychiatric disorders are fundamentally no different from, say, a private belief that a color is unlucky or popular beliefs in the existence of flying saucers...."

"A belief is considered a delusion if a person holds to it no matter how bizarre it is and despite all evidence to the contrary. A belief that flying saucers exist is considered benign, while the belief that a person has been contacted by people on flying saucers is worrisome. Some researchers say most people have minor delusions of one kind or another...."

LARRY BRYANT (OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. BRANCH OF "CAUS") REPLIES

"Once again, Scientism rears its ostrich head in denying the reality of 'flying saucers'— and (through inference) in denying any call for serious concern about the UFO problem.

"I suppose that back in the '50s the late Donald E. Keyhoe would have been branded deluded for his insistence that the government was suppressing certain hard-core evidence of UFO

reality. But today, we know that he was correct in his "J'accuse" stance on what the government knows, and when it knew it, about hundreds of UFO reports being carefully collected and studied behind the scenes.

"Recent action via the U.S. Freedom of Information Act reveals part of the government's vast storehouse of UFO-related documentation, some of it originally bearing security classification ranging from CONFIDENTIAL through TOP SECRET.

"Many of us who have had a chance to assess this material have concluded that, yes, indeed, there has been some widespread delusion about the issue of UFOs as alien spacecraft (a.k.a. flying saucers): Science has deluded itself by heaping ridicule on the subject. And the big-league news media have deluded themselves by accepting Science's glib dismissal of "UFOlogy" as a valid field of inquiry.



WE'VE HEARD OF SEA COWS, BUT.....

Those who assert that UFOs are responsible for cattle mutilations got something of a boost in early September when the Associated Press reported that scientists counting fish from a submarine discovered what they believed to be the remains of a Holstein cow 690' below the surface about 20 miles west of Baranof Island, Alaska. A videotape, made during the "sighting" (which lasted only a few seconds) was played for a reporter from the Sitka (Alaska) Sentinel, who concurred in the identification. The condition of the carcass indicated it hadn't been there for very long.

Our thanks to both Jerry Lucci and David Kruzek for tipping us to this item..



POLKA-DOT TIES AND UFO'S ARE "IN" IN JAPAN

According to Time magazine (Sept. 18, '89), the new prime minister of Japan, Toshiki Kaifu, publicly favors polka-dot ties and baseball games. But "in private", Time reports, "according to a letter written to a minor functionary in 1983," he is an acknowledged UFO buff who has looked for saucers during trips to Australia, the South Pole and Switzerland.



BOOK REVIEW

TO CATCH A FLYING STAR, A Scientific Theory of UFOs, by John Ackerman, Forward by Walt Andrus, 150pp., illus. List: \$15.00 (Special price to individual members of UFO or space societies: \$9.95) ISBN 0-912183-03-9.

This book reasons, by virtue of the mass of detailed sightings, that UFOs are alien spacecraft from other worlds. But this is not the primary thrust. It then proceeds to construct a theory of how they fly, using the scientific method. As a result of deduction based on a multitude of observations combined with induction based on our current knowledge of physics, the theory that evolves results in a fascinating design of a space ship, including the methodology for levitation, stabilization, and power source. The theory is presented in terms that any college student can comprehend.

It provides the means of its own verification by suggesting specific observations, both at short and long ranges. It also suggests fields in which we can direct our experimental and theoretical work here on earth to bring us closer to building our own advanced spacecraft.



THANK YOU, TIMLIN !!

The directors and staff of FWP wish to announce that the improvements in the format and style of our newsletter, "FOCUS", are the product of the applied talents of Tim Kloos and the computer whizzes down at TIMLIN INDUSTRIES, INC. We couldn't be more pleased and Tim and his folks have our smiling thanks and humble gratitude for a job well done. We invite your attention to the advertisement below. Thanks again....

TIMLIN INDUSTRIES, INC is primarily an advertising specialty company, silk screening on items such as bumper stickers, key tags, pens, magnetic items, etc. All artwork, setup and printing is done in house, giving us great flexibility on the project, from start to finish.

We also specialize in page layout, setup and printing via the latest in desktop publishing, for all your publication needs.

If you have any needs regarding specialty advertising or assistance in your publication, please feel free to contact us.

Our TOLL-FREE number is:

1-800-748-5522

ADVERTISING SPACE (SUCH AS THE ADVERTISEMENT ABOVE), IS AVAILABLE IN FUTURE FOCUS PUBLICATIONS. FOR MORE INFORMATION AS TO RATES, SIZE, ETC. CONTACT US FOR COMPLETE DETAILS.



Focus

FOCUS is a quarterly newsletter published by the Fair-Witness Project, Inc., a non-profit organization founded in 1984 and incorporated in the State of Delaware. Publisher is the Fair-Witness Project, Inc. Co-editors are William L. Moore and Jimmy Ward.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR are welcome and will be run if appropriate. Please address letters to the Project c/o the address on the front cover. Letters must be signed and must bear a return address. Anonymous letters will not be considered.

UNSOLICITED ARTICLES are welcome and will be considered for publication, but cannot be returned unless accompanied by sufficient postage.

FOCUS subscribers are reminded that they are entitled to a 25% discount on the purchase of books and publications from W.L. Moore Publications. To receive a listing of available items, please write.

FOCUS subscriptions are \$20.00/ year for domestic and \$25.00 for foreign. Newsletters are mailed bulk rate to U.S. subscribers, and surface rate to foreign. Foreign Air Mail service is available at extra cost. Please contact us for details.

EDITORS who receive FOCUS on an exchange basis are hereby granted permission to quote from articles appearing herein provided that quotations do not exceed 200 words per article, and providing that due credit is given both the writer (if listed) and the Project. For permission to use larger quotations or to reprint entire articles, please contact us in writing.

DONATIONS to the Project are welcome and are tax-deductable.

ADVERTISING in future publications is available and welcome. For information as to size, rate, etc., contact us for details.

THANK YOU FOR READING FOCUS