

REVELATIONS
UFOs 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 virtually 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.

-MANAQUE 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

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 because 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 typed using a Smith-Corona machine that was introduced around 1963-- more than 15 years after the Truman memo, dated Oct. 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.

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 because 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

same techniques against me. When the debunkers make ad-hominem 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. Rich 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, 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.

CRITICAL COMMENTS FROM UFO:

"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."