

THE SPOT REPORT

The truth is out there . . . but the UFO field will never find it!

No. 7

Friday, March 7, 1997

\$2.50

Bill Moore and the Roswell Incident: The True Believers Deceived

By Robert G. Todd

Through the efforts of the Fund for UFO Research (FUFOR), three documents have been made available to the general public for almost ten years. These documents consist of a 30 October 1947 cover letter from Air Force Brig. Gen. George F. Schulgen, then-Chief, Air Intelligence Requirements Division, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, A-2 (Intelligence), and the two documents the cover letter forwarded to "CSGID," apparently the Intelligence Division of the Army General Staff. The two enclosures consisted of a document identified as "Intelligence Requirements," and another document identified as a "Draft of Collection Memorandum."

All three documents appeared in a FUFOR publication entitled *Documents and Supporting Information Related to Crashed Flying Saucers and Operation Majestic Twelve*, dated June 22, 1987, compiled by Dr. Bruce Maccabee, then-Chairman of FUFOR. Dr. Maccabee's narrative claimed the documents "were released by the National Archives in 1985," and the declassification authority shown on Schulgen's cover letter indicates the documents were copied for somebody on January 29, 1985.

All three documents also found their way into another report prepared by FUFOR, entitled *The Roswell Events*, a supposed "Congressional briefing" revised and updated in December of 1993, and which FUFOR furnished to a number of senators and congresspersons in an attempt to enlist their support for an official inquiry (hearings) into the Roswell incident. Not surprisingly, at least one copy of the "briefing" also found its way into the files of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), headed by Dr. John Gibbons, President Clinton's science advisor.

In addition to figuring in the wildly speculative theories contained in the narrative portion of Dr. Maccabee's compilation, the three documents in question have been lauded in two books by Timothy Good, *Above Top Secret and Beyond Top Secret*. In both books, Good, a British "researcher," characterized the documents as "strong evidence" that General Schulgen knew about the alien craft recovered during the Roswell incident. American "researchers," Stan Friedman and Don Berliner, co-authors of perhaps the most fantastically absurd book ever published on the Roswell non-event, *Crash at Corona*, also pointed to these documents to support the idea that the government lied about Roswell, and that an alien spaceship and its alien crew actually were recovered by the Air Force, which has hidden the "truth" from the public ever since.

This would be all well and good, if not for one simple, indisputable fact: *All three documents are fakes!*

Peter Gersten, legal counsel for Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS), first brought these documents to my attention in August of 1987, when he furnished me with copies. Gersten suspected the documents were fakes and asked for my opinion. I compared the fake draft to Intelligence Collection Memorandum No. 7, "Unconventional Aircraft," dated 21 January 1948 (which was the final, published version of the draft memo), and although the classification markings on the draft seemed unusual for the time period, and numerous other differences between the draft and final versions were noted, nothing stood out as conclusive evidence that the documents were anything but authentic -- irrespective of the reference to "interplanetary craft," which I merely attributed to differing opinions that allegedly existed among military personnel who had official involvement with the subject at the time. I informed Peter Gersten that I had no good reason to believe the documents were not authentic. Nevertheless, the un-

usual classification markings nagged at me for almost ten years.

During the intervening years, I received only two requests for copies of the three documents as they appeared in the FUFOR publication, with one of those requests coming late last year. Because the classification markings continued to haunt me, in each instance when I furnished copies, I had to inform the recipient that, while I saw nothing that stood out as proof the documents were fake, since I had not obtained the documents myself, I could not vouch for their authenticity. After the second request for copies, I decided to lay my suspicions to rest by obtaining copies of the originals from the National Archives. Archives personnel furnished those copies in late January.

SCHULGEN COVER LETTER: A copy of the fake Schulgen cover letter accompanies this article as Appendix 1, while a copy of the genuine cover letter is labeled Appendix 2. A comparison of the two documents reveals the following anomalies:

1. The classification markings on the fake cover letter are different from those on the genuine letter, and are unusual for the time period. Without the genuine document for comparison, the classification markings, in and of themselves, are not sufficient to justify calling the fake letter a fake.

2. The genuine and fake cover letters both display handwritten notations, "X452.1/misc" and "X0009 phenomena," that are cross references to other decimal file numbers and titles. The handwriting on the genuine and fake versions is different.

3. Although the text of the fake and genuine cover letters is the same as the text of the genuine letter, it's clear that the fake was retyped using a different typewriter. In particular, note the differences in the typewritten numbers at the top of the page near the "SECRET" stamp, and below the date, "30 OCT 1947," rubber stamped on both documents.

4. On Appendix 1 (the fake cover letter), the stamped date, "30 OCT 1947," clearly is a composite made by at least 2 different rubber stamps. The letters in the "OCT" portion are noticeably larger than the number portions, "30" and "1947." In addition, the year portions of rubber stamp dates are formed as one piece, with the numbers spaced closely together. On Appendix 1, however, the numbers are spread out more than would be expected if the year had been applied with a real date stamper. The numbers "47" in "1947" also appear to be slightly raised, suggesting that each individual digit moved freely. Thus, it appears that the "30" and "1947" portions were applied using a numbering rubber stamp to achieve the day-month-year military style date stamp. Also, it is highly unlikely that, in 1985 or 1986, the forger had access to a date stamp that had the preformed year "1947" on it.

The letter "T" in the "OCT" portion of the date stamp on Appendix 1 appears to be slightly raised, which suggests that the "OCT" portion of the date on the fake cover letter was formed using a do-it-yourself rubber stamp kit known to be available to Bill Moore of Roswell fame.

5. At the bottom of the genuine cover letter (Appendix 2) there appears a blocked area that was printed directly on the sheets used for carbon copies using a printing press. These blocks were used to record the initials of agency officials in the various offices involved in the coordination. In the case of the cover letter, two offices coordinated on it: AFOIR-CO (the Collection Branch of the Air Intelligence Requirements Division), and AFBIR, which was Gen. Schulgen's office. Appendix 2 shows that Lt. Col. George Garrett initialed the coordination block for AFOIR-CO, and Gen. Schulgen initialed for his office.

A portion of the coordination block also appears at the bottom of the fake cover letter (Appendix 1), and, oddly enough, the typed office symbols, "AFOIR-CO" and "AFBIR," appear in exactly the same positions on both copies. In addition, a small portion of Gen. Schulgen's initials also appears on the fake, and, like the

typed office symbols, that portion of Schulgen's initials appearing on the fake version appears in exactly the same position as on the genuine version. Since the fake and genuine cover letters were typed on two different typewriters at different times, the only reasonable explanation is that the coordination block was cut off a copy of the genuine document and pasted on the bottom of the fake for added authenticity.

6. It also appears that the stamps, "PRM 11681" and "HQ AAF" with "30 OCT 1947" and "AAG - MAIL BRANCH," were cut from a copy of the genuine letter and pasted on the fake. Overall, it is clear the forger went to a lot of trouble to make the fake cover letter look like the genuine cover letter. At first glance, one could be mistaken for the other, and without the genuine document to compare the two, there would be no good reason to suspect forgery.

7. The declassification notice at the top of the fake cover letter does not appear on the genuine cover letter, for good reason. The declassification notice on the genuine cover letter was rubber stamped on the document when it was copied for me. More important, however, is the fact that the declassification notice on the fake cover letter also was cut from another document and pasted onto the fake to add authenticity, and to "validate" the document as one "released" by the National Archives. In fact, the declassification notice on the fake cover letter was taken from one of the documents furnished to me by the National Archives in 1985.

In 1984, I submitted a request to the Archives for the decimal 000.9, "Flying Discs" records among the decimal correspondence files of the Air Force Director of Intelligence that were located at the National Archives facility in Suitland, Maryland at the time, as part of Record Group 341. Mr. William G. Lewis was the archivist at the Suitland facility who handled the request for me.

Because approximately 2000 pages of records were involved, copies of the records had to be shipped to me in batches. As each batch was copied, a declassification "slug" was prepared, consisting of a slip of paper with the declassification authority typed on it. Also contained on the slug was the number assigned to the declassification action for the records in question, as well as the name of the archivist who handled the request for copies, and the date the copies were made, which, in the case of the fake cover letter, was January 29, 1985. The declassification slug then would be taped face down on the copy machine, so that the declassification authority would appear on each copy automatically, saving Archives personnel from the laborious task of stamping each document individually. Once the copying was completed, the declassification slug would be discarded, since it pertained to a specific batch of records that had been copied on a specific date.

Sometimes the archivist's name or initials will be typed on the slug, along with the date of copying, but sometimes this information will be hand printed on the slug, as in the case of the fake cover letter. As it turns out, the hand printed "W G Lewis" and "Jan 29, 1985" on the fake cover letter are identical -- not just similar, but identical -- to the same information hand printed on

a declassification slug used on one of the batches of records furnished to me in 1985 by Mr. Lewis from the decimal 000.9 files located at the Suitland facility.

Reproduced below as Exhibit 1 is a copy of the declassification slug from the fake Schulgen cover letter. Exhibit 2 is a copy of the declassification slug from the batch of 000.9 files copied for me on January 29, 1985, and Exhibit 3 is a copy of the declassification slug from the batch of 000.9 files copied for me on January 24, 1985.

An examination of Exhibits 1 and 2 will show that the hand printed information is identical in both exhibits, although the printed information on Exhibit 2 appears darker due to copying variations. The hand printed information in Exhibit 3 appears similar to the others, but not identical.

Also note that the declassification number does not appear in Exhibit 1, the fake cover letter. This would have provided further evidence that the fake is indeed a fake, since the declassification number applies to records in Record Group 341. The genuine Schulgen cover letter was not stored in Record Group 341 at the Archives' Suitland facility, where Mr. Lewis worked in 1985. It was filed among the decimal correspondence files of the Air Adjutant General (AAG) in Record Group 18, which were stored at the main Archives in Washington, D.C. proper in 1985. (Both sets of records have since been transferred to the National Archives at College Park, Maryland.)

Also noteworthy is the fact that, although the top of the fake cover letter shows a declassification slug for use on a copy machine, not one of the pages of the supposed enclosures bears the declassification notice, as if the notice on the cover letter was placed there only to "validate" the document as having come from the National Archives.

A careful examination of the genuine cover letter shows that it was prepared on the government size paper in use in 1947. Government size paper was slightly smaller than the typical 8½" x 11" paper used in the civilian world. (In recent years, Congress changed the law so that standard 8½" x 11" paper would be used by all government agencies.) As a result, the borders of the genuine cover letter appear on the copy of the letter furnished to me by the Archives.

When the genuine cover letter is held up in front of the fake cover letter so that the right-hand edge of the genuine letter is positioned at the right-hand edge of the hand printed cross reference, "X 0009 Phenomena," on the fake letter, it becomes apparent that the fake letter couldn't have been prepared on government size paper, even though it was typed on a different typewriter, and even though it displays the printed coordination blocks at the bottom, which were applied to genuine government paper using a printing press. Had it been prepared on government size paper, the left-hand margin would have been far too narrow, and certainly would not have been considered acceptable. Likewise, all pages of the two genuine enclosures to the genuine cover letter also were typed on government size paper then in use.

DECLASSIFIED PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12356, Section 3.3, NND 841508
By W.G. Lewis NARS, Date Jan 29, 1985

EXHIBIT 1 - Declassification slug from the fake Schulgen cover letter. Note handwriting identical to Exhibit 2.

DECLASSIFIED PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12356, Section 3.3, NND 841508
By W.G. Lewis NARS, Date Jan 29, 1985

EXHIBIT 2 - Declassification slug from the batch of 000.9 files copied for me on January 29, 1985.

DECLASSIFIED PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12356, Section 3.3, NND 841508
By W.G. Lewis NARS, Date Jan 24, 1985

EXHIBIT 3 - Declassification slug from the batch of 000.9 files copied for me on January 24, 1985. Note same declassification number as on Exhibit 2. Only the dates are different. Handwriting is similar -- but not identical -- to Exhibits 1 and 2.

In addition, if the right-hand edge of the coordination blocks on the fake and genuine cover letters are lined up, the handwritten word, "Phenomena," would run off the page. The fake cover letter is, therefore, a retyped, cut-and-paste fake. There is **NO** doubt about it.

Because the fake cover letter could not have been prepared on government size paper, if the person who claims to have "found" the fake documents in the Archives -- which almost certainly is the same person who forged the documents -- comes forward and produces copies of the documents from among genuine records at the Archives, it is safe to predict that the documents this "person" will produce will have to be on 8½" x 11" paper. In addition, the cover letter will not be on onionskin-type paper used for carbon copies, will not have the coordination blocks at the bottom printed on it in ink from a printing press, will not have the rubber stamp markings applied directly to the paper, and will not have the coordinating officials' initials signed in the coordination blocks in ink, and none of the documents will be on government size paper. In fact, the cover letter will have to be a modern-day photocopy on modern-day 8½" x 11" paper. All of the fake documents will have to be on 8½" x 11" paper. There is a possibility that the retyped originals of the fake enclosures to the cover letter were inserted into one of the files at the Archives by the forger -- but they won't be on government size paper.

In addition, the "SECRET" stamp at the top of the cover letter clearly was applied over the retyped information, "AFOIR-CO/Lt Col Garrett," which means it had to be applied using a rubber stamp when the document was forged circa 1985-86. Furthermore, the "SECRET" marking at the top of the cover letter matches the "SECRET" markings on the fake enclosures, which further verifies that the enclosures are indeed fakes. Since it is unlikely the forger sat in an Archives reading room and applied the fake "SECRET" stamps to fake documents, it is possible the forger typed up the fake enclosures to the cover letter, applied the fake "SECRET" stamps, and then went to the Archives and inserted the fakes into a file, in which case they may not be photocopies, but they certainly will be on 8½" x 11" paper, and not on government size paper. If the fake cover letter also was inserted into a file at the Archives, it will have to be a photocopy on modern-day, 8½" x 11" photocopy paper.

8. Handwritten along the right-hand edge of the genuine cover letter is the notation, "350.09 Intelligence," which is the decimal number and title of the file in which the genuine document is located. The fake cover letter bears no such notation, perhaps to thwart attempts to find the genuine documents. According to the Archives, copies of the genuine documents are not filed in "452.1 Misc." or in "000.9 Phenomena," files that are cross-referenced on both the fake and genuine cover letters. By leaving out the reference to "350.09 Intelligence," perhaps the forger thought his forgery would never be uncovered. Without the genuine documents, it's very difficult (if not impossible) to prove forgery.

DRAFT OF COLLECTION MEMORANDUM: The first page of the collection memo was retyped on the fake without alterations of any kind, except for the unusual classification markings. The first substantive alteration to the genuine text appears in paragraph 4.

The genuine document says:

This strange object, or phenomenon, may be considered, in view of certain observations, as long-range aircraft capable of a high rate of climb, high cruising speed (possibly sub-sonic at all times) and highly maneuverable and capable of being flown in very tight formation. For the purpose of analysis and evaluation of the so-called "flying saucer" phenomenon, the object sighted is being assumed to be a manned aircraft, of Russian origin, and based on the perspective thinking and actual accomplishments of the Germans.

The portions in the above quote in bold, underlined italics highlight information the forger deliberately omitted from the fake version, or otherwise rearranged or altered from the text in the original version, in an obvious attempt to make the document appear more mysterious than it really is. By removing the phrase, "possibly sub-sonic at all times," the forger hoped to remove clear proof that the drafters of the genuine document were thinking in terms of terrestrial aircraft, and not extraterrestrial spaceships. Likewise, in removing the "air" from the word "aircraft" to form the

word "craft," the forger further attempted to add a sense of mystery to the documents, and by implication suggested that the prevailing opinion among the military personnel "in the know" was that the flying saucers weren't merely advanced aircraft of terrestrial origin, but instead were extremely advanced craft of extraterrestrial origin, capable of flight both in the atmosphere and in space. These are subtle -- but substantive and highly effective -- changes to the genuine text.

Paragraph 6 of the genuine document included the following passage:

A recent report indicates that the Russians are now planning to build a fleet of 1,800 Horten VIII (six engine pusher) type flying wing aircraft. The wing span is 131 feet. The sweepback angle is 30 degrees. The Russian version is reported to be jet propelled.

The passage quoted above was deleted entirely from the fake version for obvious reasons.

One hundred percent of the genuine document was geared toward the idea that some type of object was flying around, and the thinking within Air Force Intelligence (AFIN) was that the most likely source for the aircraft was the Russians, based on the Horten brothers' flying wing designs. The genuine documents are logical and internally consistent, whereas the changes the forger made in the fake documents render them illogical and internally inconsistent. The forger would have us believe that AFIN knew from the Roswell incident that the flying saucers were alien spacecraft -- that they really came from outer space -- but they wasted the time of countless intelligence personnel in the pointless search for the Horten brothers, their sister, and their associates who had knowledge of their flying wing designs, when such information obviously had nothing whatever to do with alien spacecraft -- unless the forger intends to propose the ridiculous idea that Adolph Hitler entered into an intergalactic pact with the aliens under which the Nazis were furnished with advanced extraterrestrial technology that was captured by the Russians following World War II! The fake documents don't make sense, but the genuine documents do make sense. There is no better proof that the fake documents are indeed fake.

"DRAFT" INCLOSURE NO. 1: This fake document contains the largest number of alterations. The very first page of the genuine document contains handwritten cross references to other decimal numbers and file titles, handwritten notations that do NOT appear on the fake version. Other notable differences include the following:

1. Subparagraph 1a of both the fake and genuine documents asks, "What German scientists had a better-than-average knowledge of the Horten brothers' work and perspective thinking; where are these scientists now located, and what is their present activity?" But the genuine document goes on to say, "Should be contacted and interrogated," whereas the fake document says, "These should be contacted and interrogated." In short, the genuine document contains an incomplete sentence, which the fake document corrects. Even more curious is the fact that the collection memo, as it was finally published, also contains the incomplete sentence, "Should be contacted and interrogated," which is further proof that the genuine document was the document used to produce the published version!

This peculiar discrepancy may help identify the forger as a teacher (or former teacher) who simply couldn't stand to see an incomplete sentence in an official government document -- or as somebody who suffers from Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) whose affliction simply wouldn't allow him to repeat the incomplete sentence in the fake. It is a peculiar discrepancy indeed, especially in light of the published version.

2. Having omitted a sizable portion of paragraph 6 from the other document, the forger felt free (if not compelled) to omit three subparagraphs from his fake "Draft Inclosure No. 1," concerning the information deleted from the other document. These three subparagraphs, 1b, c, and d, asked what Russian factories are building the Horten VIII design, why are they building 1800 of the planes, and what is the Russians' tactical purpose for building the planes -- all questions that make it abundantly clear that the only source for the saucers given any credence by AFIN was the Russians. The remaining paragraphs in the fake were moved up

in place of the deleted subparagraphs.

3. A revealing alteration appears in paragraph 3, "Items of Construction." Paragraph 3b of the genuine document says:

Composite or sandwich construction utilizing various combinations of metals, plastics, and perhaps balsa wood.

But (with the fake additions highlighted), paragraph 3 of the fake document says:

Composite or sandwich construction utilizing various combinations of metals, metallic foils, plastics, and perhaps balsa wood or similar material.

If the fake draft were genuine, there would have been no good, logical reason to delete the references to "metallic foils" and "similar materials" from the final version -- no logical, credible reason whatsoever. Yet this is exactly what the forger expects us to believe, and no doubt he/she/it will manufacture all kinds of absurd reasons for these supposed deletions.

4. Paragraph 3c also was altered by omitting genuine text. The fake says, "Unusual fabrication methods to achieve extreme light weight and structural stability," whereas the genuine document actually says, "Unusual fabrication methods to achieve extreme light weight and structural stability particularly in connection with great capacity for fuel storage."

Again, the forger omitted the highlighted genuine text because it attributed the flying saucers to terrestrial technology, and not to super-advanced alien technology.

5. The same motivation appears to be behind the forger's omission of information from paragraph 4, "Items of Arrangement." Paragraph 4 in the genuine document says:

- h. Bomb bay provisions, such as dimensions, approximate location, and unusual features regarding the opening and closing of the doors.

Whereas subparagraphs 4h and 4i in the fake document say:

- h. Unusual features or provisions regarding the opening and closing of the doors.
- i. Bomb bay provisions, such as dimensions and approximate location.

The highlighted portions from the genuine document clearly referred to the location and operation of bomb bay doors on unconventional (but terrestrial) aircraft -- not to the location and operation of exotic alien doors on extraterrestrial spaceships. Still, the forger cleverly manipulated the genuine text to add weight to the idea of extraterrestrial origin. Most important of all, however, the forger manipulated the genuine text to validate the Roswell incident, which is yet another clue to the forger's identity.

Paragraph 5, "Landing Gear," in the fake document had phony additions made to the genuine text:

- a. Indicate type of landing gear - whether conventional, tricycle, multiple wheel, etc., or of an unconventional type such as tripod or skid.

Obviously, a "tripod" arrangement would be useful only for aircraft capable of vertical take-offs and landings. Otherwise, we might reasonably expect a tripod (as opposed to a *tricycle*) arrangement to dig into the ground upon landing and flip the aircraft over. The genuine document contains no reference to tripod landing gear, although it does mention a skid arrangement for landing, which certainly isn't beyond reason, even for conventional aircraft.

7. Paragraph 6c(4) in the genuine document says, "Type of fuel," whereas the same paragraph in the fake memo says, "Type of fuel, or, conversely, lack of visible fuel supply."

The fake documents contain other, minor differences, but the points addressed above are more than sufficient to show that the fake documents are indeed fakes, and that, through the omission of genuine text and the addition of fake text, the forger attempted to add mystery to the draft collection memo, and attempted to make the UFO field believe the primary motivation behind the

memo was the crashed alien spaceship supposedly recovered during the Roswell incident. The fake documents were designed specifically to validate the Roswell incident, in much the same way the fake MJ-12 documents were designed to validate the Roswell incident.

There exists at least one other version of the collection memo. It was released last year by the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) after they reviewed old intelligence records that had not been indexed previously.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF INFORMATION (EEI): INSCOM released several hundred pages of records related to flying saucers. Included among those records was a letter, dated 21 October 1947, from the Office of the Deputy Director of Intelligence, Headquarters, European Command, to the Assistant Chief of Staff, A-2 (Intelligence), U.S. Air Forces in Europe. The subject of the letter was, "Transmittal of EEI on Alleged 'Flying Saucer'."

The "EEI" cited in the letter's subject line was the "Essential Elements of Information" which the letter stated had been "written by WRIGHT FIELD, OHIO, concerning the flying saucers recently sighted over the UNITED STATES." The letter further stated:

For your information, the Air Materiel Command at WRIGHT FIELD is making a study of this subject and is constructing models to be tested in a wind tunnel. As a guide in constructing the models, descriptions from various persons who claimed to have sighted these objects were used. The Air Materiel Command is of the opinion that some sort of object, such as the flying saucer, did exist.

The 21 October 1947 letter also contains a "memo for record" ("M/R") which reads: "Inclosed EEI was given this office by Lt Col Seashore of the Air Materiel Command."

The EEI that accompanied the 21 October letter is titled, "AIR INTELLIGENCE GUIDE for ALLEGED 'FLYING SAUCER' TYPE AIRCRAFT," and bears no date, although, obviously, it had to have been prepared prior to 21 October 1947. In fact, related correspondence released by INSCOM shows the EEI had to have been prepared before 20 October 1947.

Like the genuine draft collection memo, and the final, published collection memo, the EEI makes no mention of "interplanetary craft" or "metallic foils," but instead concentrates exclusively on flying wing designs developed by the Horten brothers, and the German High Command's "definite interest" in these designs toward the end of World War II. And like the other genuine documents, the EEI -- which definitely was prepared at Wright Field where the Roswell myth says the debris from the alien spaceship was taken -- expresses the need to contact and interrogate the Horten brothers, their sister, and their associates who might have information on their unconventional designs. In fact, INSCOM released a large quantity of records which detail the efforts of Counterintelligence Corps (CIC) agents in Europe to locate and interrogate these people, and the documents report on these efforts in some detail. Interestingly, one of the documents includes a drawing of a Horten aircraft design which depicts an aircraft with what appears to be a dome, and shows how the pilot would fly the plane while lying belly-down under the dome.

Perhaps the most important feature of the EEI is the fact that -- with minor, non-substantive exceptions -- it uses language identical to the language used in the genuine draft collection memo, and in the final, published memo. Substantively, the EEI is identical to the genuine draft and final versions of the memo. The language used in the EEI is so much like the language used in the genuine draft memo that there is no doubt in my mind that the EEI was the basis for the draft memo Schulgen submitted for publication. The basic points covered in the three documents may be organized a little differently in each version, but they all say the same thing.

Ultimately, the technical intelligence (T-2) personnel at Wright Field were responsible for the contents of the genuine draft memo. And it is clear from the records released by INSCOM that the T-2 personnel had relied on the descriptions furnished by witnesses who claimed to have sighted flying saucers. They were even building models for tests in a wind tunnel, based on the descriptions the witnesses gave -- and not on recovered debris from Roswell.

Again, the contents of the fake documents are illogical and internally inconsistent, and no amount of twisted reasoning and preposterous theorizing on the part of the Roswell promoters can explain away the illogic and the inconsistencies. It makes NO sense to waste valuable time and resources hunting down the Horten brothers and their associates if the U.S. government had already recovered a crashed alien spaceship in New Mexico -- NO SENSE WHATSOEVER! The story these fake documents tell is downright stupid, which is more than enough evidence to show they are fakes.

WHO FORGED THE FAKE DOCUMENTS?

Logically, the person who claims to have "found" the documents at the National Archives is the chief suspect. But who was that?

Apparently FUFOR has been selling the fakes to an unsuspecting public only since June of 1987, when Dr. Maccabee used them in his compilation. But, just about a year before, Bill Moore, head of the Roswell/MJ-12 Dream Team, wrote an article, "Phil Klass and the Roswell incident: the skeptics deceived," which appeared in the July/August 1986 issue of the *International UFO Reporter (IUR)*, in which he quoted extensively from the fake documents. The "New Listings for Spring 1987" mailed by William L. Moore Publications & Research, a copy of which I received in May of 1987, lists a paper entitled "Phil Klass & The Roswell Incident: The Skeptics Deceived," by Bill Moore. The listing indicates that this was the first time Moore offered the paper for sale, although it gives the date of the paper as July 1986. Presumably the paper Moore offered for sale contained the same information as his *IUR* article. As far as I can determine, Moore's *IUR* article was the first public mention of the fake documents. The declassification notice on the fake Schulgen cover letter indicates that, if the document were genuine, it would have been copied at the Archives on January 29, 1985. But it's not genuine, so we don't know exactly when it surfaced, or who "found" or manufactured it. All we do know is that, based on Bill Moore's listing, the fakes had to be created sometime prior to July of 1986.

I wrote to Richard Hall, Chairman of FUFOR, asking where they got their copies of the Schulgen letter and its two enclosures, but I have yet to receive a response. Whatever their source for the fake documents, we are left to assume they merely accepted them as genuine on good faith alone.

In his *IUR* article, Moore writes as though he was the person who "found" the fake cover letter and its fake enclosures. According to Moore:

The document is a five-page draft (not a final version) of a Secret data collection memorandum on flying discs, intended, once finalized, for distribution to Air Force military attaches in Europe and Asia. Apparently the text of this draft met with someone's disapproval because the final version -- a copy of which was found in a different file -- had been somewhat reworked before being approved for distribution.

It seems clear that Bill Moore was the first person to write about the fake documents, and he wrote about them in such a way as to suggest that he, personally, "found" them. Although the declassification notice says the cover letter was copied on January 29, 1985, none of the publications produced by Moore during 1985 of which I am aware made any mention of the draft memo, although they did mention the approximately 2000 pages of flying disc records I uncovered. As noted above, a declassification slug from one of the batches of those 2000 pages of records sent to me was cut from one of the documents and pasted on the fake cover letter. Neither the Schulgen letter nor the draft memo was in that batch of records sent to me, and the declassification slug was specific to that batch of records. That particular batch of records covered the 1950-53 period, not the late 1940s. The same batch of records copied for somebody else on a different date would show the different date on the declassification slug.

Exactly when and where did Bill Moore "find" the fake cover letter and its fake enclosures?

As noted earlier, the typewriter typestyle used on all three of the fake documents matches the typestyle on one of at least three typewriters Bill Moore has used in the past, but doesn't match either of the two typestyles used to produce the genuine documents. And as noted previously, Bill Moore uses a do-it-yourself

rubber stamp kit, like the one apparently used to fake the "OCT" portion of the date stamped on the fake cover letter, and the typestyle of the impression appears to match one Moore uses.

In his *IUR* article, Moore claims the draft collection memo is dated October 28, 1947, yet neither the fake version nor the genuine version bears any date. Schulgen's cover letter bears two dates, one typewritten ("28 Oct 47"), and the other ("30 OCT 1947") applied with a rubber stamp dater. The typewritten date, "28 Oct 47," was the date Schulgen's cover letter was written, and the stamped date, "30 OCT 1947," was the date the letter was signed and presumably dispatched. The actual dates when the two enclosures to the cover letter were prepared cannot be determined from the documents themselves.

Moore leaves himself some wiggle room in his *IUR* article when he alleges that he found the draft version of the collection memo in one file, and a "final," "reworked" version in another file. It isn't known if the "final," "reworked" version to which Moore referred was the final, published Intelligence Collection Memorandum No. 7, or the version I refer to as the genuine draft collection memo.

Unfortunately, to explain away the fakes, all Bill Moore need do is say the fakes were in a file when he visited the Archives, and cite the file number and title. If the fakes are in the file, we should be able to determine whether or not they are authentic, based on the points raised above. If the documents are not in the file, however, all Bill Moore need do is assert that they were there when he examined the file, and he doesn't know what happened to them after that.

Then another charter member of the Roswell/MJ-12 Dream Team, backward engineer Stan Friedman, who, either wittingly or unwittingly, has spent considerable time running interference for the con man (or men) who manufactured the fake MJ-12 documents, can concoct another asinine reason why we should accept the fake documents as genuine anyway. Perhaps he'll suggest that the MJ-12 group -- who Friedman apparently believes think the "research" he and Bill Moore perform is so important that they keep tabs on them -- read that Bill Moore found the draft memo, so they went to the files and removed it to preserve the security of Friedman's beloved "Cosmic Watergate." And, once again, the "absence of evidence" will be turned into evidence of a conspiracy.

Friedman is an integral part of the team of Roswell/MJ-12 scammers. The function he performs, which essentially is that of a shill in a con game, is critical if the scam has any chances of working. The only question remaining is whether Friedman is a knowing, willing participant in the scam, or merely a buffoonish dupe -- a useful idiot in the eyes of the con men who run the Roswell/MJ-12 scam. Frankly, in my opinion, Friedman isn't clever enough to be anything but a buffoonish dupe. The Roswell/MJ-12 con men know a useful idiot when they see one, and are able to manipulate Friedman's obsession with Roswell to achieve their ends -- all without Friedman even being aware he's being used as their front man -- the visible, vulnerable (albeit unwitting) member of the team.

Bill Moore should identify the record group, entry or series, box number, and specific decimal file in which he allegedly "found" what he identifies as the "draft" version of the memo (the one containing the references to "interplanetary craft" and "metallic foils"), and he should identify the record group, entry or series, box number, and specific decimal file in which he allegedly "found" the "final," "reworked" version he claims was "found in a different file."

While it's true that the text of the genuine Schulgen cover letter was reproduced faithfully in the fake version, the fake cover letter unquestionably is a fake. Why go to the trouble of producing a fake when the real thing already exists? The only reasonable explanation is that the forger thought it would tend to "validate" the fake enclosures if they were typed on the same typewriter, and displayed the same classification markings as the cover letter. Otherwise, why not use the genuine cover letter which the evidence shows conclusively had to be available to the forger? But then, the genuine cover letter also displays the handwritten designation of the file where the genuine documents can be found, the disclosure of which might result in the forgery -- and the forger -- being unmasked.

Except for Peter Gersten's suspicions almost ten years ago, the "documents" Bill Moore apparently "found" at the National Archives have gone unchallenged until now. In this instance, how-

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

~~SECRET~~

AFOIR-CO/Lt Col Garrett, AFOIR-28 Oct 47

X452.1/misc

X0009
Phonetic

Intelligence Requirements on Flying Saucer Type Aircraft

30 OCT 1947

Hq, USAF - AFOIR

Lt. Col Garrett, AFOIR/4544

ID
n: Plans and
Collection Branch

1. It is requested that a Collection Memorandum, similar to the attached draft, be issued to the addresses indicated thereon. This is in accordance with conversation between Lt. Colonel Smith and Lt. Colonel Garrett.
2. It will be appreciated if, at the time this Memorandum is reproduced, (10) additional copies could be run off and sent to the Directorate of Intelligence, Air Intelligence Requirements Division, Collection Branch, for their purposes.

FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE:

Incls.

1. Intelligence Requirements
2. Draft of Collection Memorandum

GEN. F. SCHULZ
Brigadier General, U.S.A.F.
Chief, Air Intelligence Requirements Div.
Office of Ass't. Chief of Staff-2

2 AAF
30 OCT 1947
MAIL BRANCH

PRM 1158

THE SPOT REPORT
FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1997
APPENDIX 1

~~SECRET~~

28 Oct 47

(4)

Intelligence Requirements on Flying Saucer Type Aircraft

Hq, USAF - AFOIR

30 OCT 1947
Lt Col Garrett/mob/4544

CSGID
Attn: Plans and
Collection Branch

1. It is requested that a Collection Memorandum, similar to the attached draft, be issued to the addressees indicated thereon. This is in accordance with conversation between Lt. Colonel Smith and Lt. Colonel Garrett.

2. It will be appreciated if, at the time this Memorandum is reproduced, ten (10) additional copies could be run off and sent to the Directorate of Intelligence, Air Intelligence Requirements Division, Collection Branch, for file purposes.

FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE:

- 2 Incls.
- 1. Intelligence Requirements
- 2. Draft of Collection Memorandum

GEO. F. SCHULGEN
Brigadier General, U.S.A.F.
Chief, Air Intelligence Requirements Div.
Office of Ass't. Chief of Air Staff-2

30 OCT 1947
AAG - MAIL BRANCH

PRM 11681

RECEIVED
E. O. 12958, Sec. 1.3
NND 76 0168
OCT 27 1947

THE SPOT REPORT
FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1997
APPENDIX 2

OFFICE SYMBOL	1. AFOIR-CO	2.	3.	4.	5.
NAME AND GRADE OF OFFICER	Col Taylor 3rd				
	Lt Col Garrett	Geo. F. Schulgen	Brig. Gen. USAF		