

# JUST

# CAUSE



Publisher:  
Lawrence Fawcett

Editor:  
Barry Greenwood

Address: P.O.Box 218  
Coventry, Conn. 06238

Subscription:  
4 issues-\$10 (\$15 foreign)

---

NUMBER 15

NEW SERIES

March 1988

---

(Copyright 1988)

## EDITORIAL

In this issue we are including a two-page rebuttal by Stanton Friedman to our stance on MJ-12. It consists of a 36-point list of assumptions he said we made in the September 1987 Just Cause, all of which are false, according to Friedman. We are commenting on each "CAUS assumption" because there are distortions and misstatements in the list he is circulating, and because we want to be as clear as possible on why we have problems with MJ-12 claims.

Press coverage on MJ-12 has virtually vanished and there has been little movement from MSF on new releases of evidence which they claim they have. Moore's newsletter, Focus, which we would expect to be a conduit for new information, has contained little more than reprinted press releases and, in the last mailing, an appeal for money to physically analyse the MJ-12 documents (something like \$3000 is needed). Only one document is an original (the Cutler/Twining memo) and amenable to scientific testing. Even with this there are no authenticating signatures on the document; it is not an original typed copy but a carbon, so consequently it is questionable how conclusive an analysis could be. We shall see.

One Friedman claim requires initial comment. In the Sept./Oct. 1987 International UFO Reporter, he attacks critics of MJ-12 in an article titled, "MJ-12: The Evidence So Far." Largely devoted to criticisms of Philip Klass, the article turns to this editor near the end. We respond to most of the points raised in our comments on the 36-point list in this issue. We will answer Friedman's point 1 here.

We are criticized for not accepting material from anonymous sources. This attitude, Friedman says, makes a mockery of police work and the investigation of Watergate, both involving the use of anonymous tips and leaks.

Friedman should know that in police work an anonymous tipster must have a track record of reliability, of being right about facts, for his information to be taken seriously. Courts will reject tipster testimony without this track record of accuracy. Watergate's "Deep Throat" produced irrefutable facts, established a track record and was thus a reliable source. Anyone questioning this should contact this newsletter's publisher, Larry Fawcett, a Connecticut police lieutenant who has long experience dealing with anonymous sources.

Also our policy statement published in the last CAUS Bulletin is quite clear about our concern with anonymous sources. We've received too much suspect information from such sources in the past. There is a saying, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." Our policy should help weed out the foolishness.

As we said in the September issue, such controversies rage on and on. We expect this to be our last extended statement on the documents unless new information surfaces. Our doubts are on the record.

### CAUS RESPONSE

The 36-point list of "Basic assumptions of CAUS" is on the last two pages of this issue. What follows is our discussion of them.

- 1) We never said nor implied this.
- 2) We never said we wouldn't consider anonymous or "leaked" documents, but if they do not survive our scrutiny we will reject them as proof of the associated claim per our policy in the last CAUS Bulletin.
- 3) If MJ-12 was a strong case then Dan Rather, Walter Cronkite, or Carl Sagan would be exactly the kinds of persons to give the story the enormous boost it deserved to millions of people. After all, isn't MSF's source leaking "authentic" documentation? If they don't think they can convince science and news media sources of the reality of MJ-12 with the source's information, why can't MSF agree with CAUS that the story has problems?
- 4) Nonsense! We never said nor implied this.
- 5) Anyone leaking classified information is at risk. The question here is whether the MJ-12 papers are authentic classified documents. This hasn't been established. If they aren't authentic the source can have a grand time doing what he/she wishes, constrained of course by keeping the story credible.
- 6) The meeting in Reese's office was mentioned as one example when an outsider could have planted a false paper. The point of this discussion was whether or not it is possible for someone to do this at the Archives. On October 13, 1987, a New York Times story told of the difficulty in preventing thefts at the Archives and the Library of Congress. Security at these institutions is geared toward preventing removal of documents and officials admitted that they could not stop this with present procedures. Body searches were considered at both locations and rejected because it "would be unseemly," according to a Library of Congress official. Without body searches and with security geared toward theft prevention, planting a single sheet in an Archives file would be relatively easy even for one of modest intelligence. Friedman neglected to mention that on page 7 of the Sept. 87 JC this editor was told by archivist Ed Reese, the person in charge of the records group containing the C-T memo, that such seeding could not be prevented.
- 7) Nonsense! Two of the three press stories we had reproduced in our MJ-12 report were favorable to MJ-12. Later press coverage after the story was digested became generally negative.

- 8) More nonsense! All of this was considered. Does Friedman say that because some of the officials allegedly in MJ-12 knew each other, that confirms the existence of the panel? They were top officials who certainly had interrelationships on a wide variety of matters in the administration. What must be shown is their being linked by MJ-12-related activity for Friedman's close-relationship theory to be valid. He infers that various meetings between these officials were UFO-related, whereas this has not at all been established.
- 9) Not what I said. MSF have much to gain from the documents being accepted as real, not from knowingly releasing phony documents and eventually getting caught. They cannot deny that they control the "secret" information they have and that once they gain general acceptance there would be substantial gain in terms of books, media appearances; etc. Such a revelation would be one of history's major events.
- 10) If MSF sent copies of the documents out in 1984 and 85, they kept it a secret. Despite being a board member of CAUS, Moore never once informed us of any of the finds for assistance or comment. In fact during a 1985 phone conversation with Larry Fawcett, Moore wanted our planned December 1985 JC article on MJ-12 halted, though the information was acquired independently. He refused to explain why this was necessary.
- 11) Menzel's credentials were extraordinary. Where is the evidence of linkage to UFO belief and MJ-12 aside from suspect documents?
- 12) Who said this? We didn't.
- 13) Is Friedman saying here that he knows more about Roswell than the agencies he claims are withholding the information? In other words, why bother going to the agencies from which the papers are supposed to originate for authentication; MSF will authenticate them for us and act as final word on the matter.
- 14) The Briefing Paper version of the 1950 story differs sharply with eyewitness accounts from previous investigations cited in our report; yet this doesn't seem to bother MSF. Why doesn't Friedman use this space to explain the anomaly instead of ridiculing us for bringing it up?
- 15) The point here is that the story in the documents could have been manufactured from existing reports and books on Roswell. The scientific data in the BP attachment list (still unavailable) could be checked for consistency with what knowledge and testing techniques were used during that time. It could dramatically improve the credibility of the story. Why is it missing? Could it be that this kind of information is too difficult to fake? Friedman thinks it's not possible that the story in it's present form could have been manufactured. Is it really not possible?
- 16) Question: What were these meetings about? Only a few days earlier the CIA was formed. Might the meetings have been related to administrative and policy matters of a fledgling CIA? Or other Truman administration concerns? The point is that at least a hint that these meetings dealt with UFOs is necessary before inferring anything. Is there an appointment

book, a log, a diary indicating the subject?

- 17) Here again, what is the subject of the meeting? Ike was just elected at the time and was certainly briefed on many topics. Question: How is it that a briefing on such an ultra-top secret matter relating to UFOs gets into the New York Times? If I were General Twining I would make darn well sure that an MJ-12 briefing would have been done in total secrecy.
- 18-20) A secret, non-UFO memo, written on the same day as the C-T memo by Mr. Lay, has Lay's name and position at the bottom with an indication that a copy was supplied to Mr. Cutler's files. Question: Why didn't Lay or Coyne take responsibility for the C-T memo if one of them produced it? Mr. Lay did sign his name to verifiable correspondence of that day. A sample of Coyne's memos is still unavailable but why should he be different and not sign his name? If Cutler transmitted a change of appointment to Lay or Coyne, there should be a record of this instruction (phone log, cable; etc.) If Lay or Coyne took it upon themselves to make a change without Cutler's knowledge, then surely one must have indicated on the memo who produced it as a pure courtesy to their boss in case of an error. It would be embarrassing to Cutler if a subordinate took unapproved action and signed Cutler's name to it. (see also point 34 following)
- 21-23) We acknowledge that every last scrap of paper from the Truman and Eisenhower years have not been examined for proof of MJ-12. But proof must be found to support MJ-12. One can't believe it on the assumption that documentation is there in unexamined files.
- 24) Where did we say this? An untrue, baseless statement.
- 25) More baloney! We never said this, as is documented in 200+ pages of CLEAR INTENT and Just Cause and CAUS Bulletin.
- 26) See remarks in point 8.
- 27) See remarks in points 18-20.
- 28) It is interesting that Friedman agrees with us that the C-T memo seems to be a "plant," one of our very early suspicions when the memo turned up so out-of-place. Proving a link between the Air Force classification review people and the planting of the memo is another matter. Friedman accuses CAUS of "conclusion-jumping" in his IUR piece but this is as clear an example of this as anything presented.
- 29) One may spend hundreds of hours in library research on any proposition but if that research doesn't produce proof, or even a reasonable likelihood of the proposition's reality, it is for nought. Is it Friedman's argument that if person A spends 200 hours in a library with little to show, and person B spends 150 hours researching a different tilt of the same argument with similar results, then person A wins by 50 hours?
- 30) Prove it! Also referring back to points 18-20, if it is Friedman's belief that Lay's office was responsible for the

C-T memo, as is clear in Friedman's comment, where is Lay's typewritten signature as it appeared on other correspondence of that same day?

- 31) The Truman memo has not been verified by any authority, despite it seeming provable by bearing a signature and being on letterhead. It's status as an executive order is not verified because no executive orders were registered on September 24, 1947, according to the Truman Library and the executive order listing in the United States Code. Where is the original? The signature can't be studied for authenticity and neither can the stationery. Is it impossible for example that a hoaxer could have used a genuine, non-UFO memo as a model for manufacturing an unreal memo? MSF will certainly reject this but are still left with an unauthenticated xerox photocopy made from another photographic reproduction (Shandera's film) to defend the story, something I would not want to go to court with.
- 32-33) Wrong! We didn't say Moore forged the BP, C-T memo, or the Truman memo, though we don't exclude anything. In fact we had indicated that OSI agent Richard Doty was a logical suspect because of his past involvement in suspicious events. There appears to be a number of others involved as well. Moore could clear up some of these problems but has chosen not to. Instead the ball is kept rolling by promises of new information which doesn't appear; by releasing documents which suddenly drop out of sight without comment (CIA MJ-5 memo, Project Aquarius paper).
- 34) The fact that the C-T memo is an unsigned carbon is very relevant to the issue but not in the way MSF indicate. The absence of a signature makes it less valuable as proof. Friedman's allowance that it is a "possible" plant isn't helpful to it's credibility either. Unless it can be firmly linked to the White House staff it will remain suspect.
- 35) Linda Howe has fingered Doty as one of her sources; we've already printed her version of the meeting with him in the last CAUS Bulletin. Where did we say that her testimony was irrelevant? Shandera's role in the affair is clearer if one reads an article in the April 1988 issue of Fate Magazine by Jerome Clark titled, "UFO Crashes (Pt.4)," just received by CAUS. In fact we urge readers to digest this piece because it proves how very bizarre MSF's story is. One tidbit is the inclusion of Marjorie Fish's speculative research into the origin of Betty Hill's aliens (Zeta Reticuli) as proven fact by Moore's mysterious "Falcon" character. It is almost as if this detail were included to bait Friedman into believing the story because Friedman had defended this speculation in the 1970s.
- 36) We never said this either. However, in this case where is the disinformation coming from? Is it from all the sources unable to verify an MJ-12, or is it MSF's source?

The next page contains a copy of a non-UFO memo by James Lay, as referred to in points 18-20 and 30.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL  
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET~~ SECRET

July 14, 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary of Defense  
The Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission

SUBJECT: Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program

REFERENCE: Memo for Gen. Cutler from Addressees,  
same subject, undated (received July 14,  
1954)



The President has been advised by me of the reference memorandum and of its conclusion that "no revisions seem appropriate in NSC Action No. 779."

Accordingly, the President has decided that action by the National Security Council regarding the reference memorandum is not necessary, and that this matter should be handled through regular procedures, including normal budgetary review to the extent required.

The President has also asked that the Atomic Energy Commission, after consultation with the Department of Defense, transmit an appropriate reply to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in response to the report of the Research and Development Subcommittee on this subject which was transmitted to the President, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

JAMES S. LAY, JR.  
Executive Secretary

THE DIVISION OF CLASSIFICATION, U.S. ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, HAS DETERMINED THAT THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS NO RESTRICTED DATA OR FORMERLY RESTRICTED DATA. ERDA HAS NO OBJECTION TO ITS DECLASSIFICATION.

cc: Mr. Cutler ✓

*J. Hartsock* 5/14/76  
REVIEWED BY DATE

DECLASSIFIED	
Authority	MP 88-25#1
By	<i>JAS</i> 11/26/88
	NLE Date

UNCLASSIFIED SECRET

ALL False

Basic assumptions of CAUS Preliminary by S.T. Friedman

10/2/87

1. The Truman and Eisenhower libraries and the National Archives have complete files of all papers ever prepared during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.
2. No anonymous leaked documents will be considered in the search for truth about UFOs or any other matter involving national security, cover ups, etc.
3. Big names such as Walter Cronkite, Dan Rather and Carl Sagan are in an excellent position to provide an objective review of UFOs in general and MJ-12 in particular.
4. Everything said by the Archives is totally true and cannot be checked for accuracy.
5. There is no danger <sup>or risk</sup> whatsoever to the person or persons leaking the filmed document or "planting" the Cutler-Twining memo.
6. Ed Reece's office is the location wherein Archive Documents are brought for review by researchers.
7. There has been only negative press coverage of the MJ-12 documents.
8. There is no point in checking the contents of the documents or the dates of the documents or the relationships between the persons named therein.
9. Friedman, Moore, and Shandera somehow had a great deal to gain from releasing phony documents.
10. MSF obviously didn't send out copies in 1984, December, when the documents were received (Briefing ) or in July 1985 when they found the Cutler-Twining memo to make things more mysterious.
11. Friedman's very surprising findings about Donald Menzel are irrelevant.
12. Everybody well known in ufology, is a persistent and careful researcher (especially the editor and publisher of the CAUS Newsletter) and could be depended upon to do a complete and thorough investigation of the Roswell Incident.. starting in early 1985.
13. There is no point in checking with MSF about the important aspects of the documents since they already know a lot. It is much more useful to check with those who know nothing about Roswell or UFOs (Ike & Truman Libs., Archives etc) because they aren't biased.
14. If a story in the briefing disagrees with other versions of what might be the same story, (crash of Dec. 6, 1950) the briefing is a forgery.
15. If a story in the briefing agrees with already investigated and compiled versions of the same story, (Roswell Incident) the briefing is a forgery.
16. Trivial data such as the fact that Sept. 24, 1947, was the only date in the last 8 months of 1947 when Bush, Forrestal and Truman met together and was preceded by a Bush-Forrestal meeting are irrelevant.
17. Trivial data such as the fact that Ike was indeed briefed on Nov. 18, 1952, by at least one member of MJ-12 (Nathan F. Twining) as is noted in the NY Times, The Twining files, the Eisenhower files, is irrelevant.
18. Trivial data such as the fact that Cutler instructed James Lay and J. Patrick Coyne to "keep things moving out of my basket" while he was gone are irrelevant.
19. The fact that another memo from Cutler to Twining contains almost identical language " your concurrence with the above arrangements is assumed" is irrelevant.
20. The fact that there is considerable variation in the format of various NSC documents with regard to the presence or absence of White House at the top, a signature at the bottom, typed or rubber stamped classification markings is irrelevant

21. The fact that the Cutler-Twining memo says nothing about an "NSC meeting," a "Special meeting," or a "special briefing" is irrelevant and should not be used to question the Ike Library comments about NSC and Special meetings.
22. The fact that the Ike library has more than 200,000 pages of NSC material from the Ike era which have not been reviewed at all for MJ-12 or other Cutler or Lay material is irrelevant.
23. The fact that a brief search for the 2 Cutler-Twining memos of 1953 and the Menzel NSA letter or memo turned up none is irrelevant with regard to the thoroughness of the Ike Library search for relevant materials or their use of the term "All" Cutler letters or memos.
24. Obviously there are no "Black" Programs .
25. Freedom of information guarantees access to all government material which is easily accessed via computer or other such modern technique.
26. The close relationships amongst the various members of MJ-12 are irrelevant.
27. The fact that James S. Lay was the Executive Secretary of the NSC for many years and not just a subordinate to Cutler is irrelevant in determining whether or not he would have had the authority to notify Twining of a relatively trivial change in an already scheduled meeting.
28. The fact that there were at least 6 teams of 4 members each of USAF personnel working on declassification or at least classification review of USAF RG 341 for a period of at least 4 months and could bring in brief cases, notebooks etc is irrelevant in one's evaluation of the possibility of the Cutler-Twining memo having been planted at the Archives.
29. Hundreds of hours spent reviewing thousands of documents in various presidential and other archives count for nought with regard to an evaluation of the briefing and Cutler-Twining documents. Filing of FOI requests and reviewing the documents received is far more instructive about documents, people, relationships, office style and other factors.
30. The fact that the Cutler-Twining memo was almost certainly typed on the same typewriter on which various memos, letters, etc were typed for James Lay is irrelevant
31. The very unusual period after the date on the Truman-Forrestal memo is irrelevant even though it is very often present on items prepared for Vannevar Bush and for Robert Patterson, in effect Forrestal's predecessor.
32. The fact that Bill Moore occasionally or even always uses a day month, comma year date format proves he forged the briefing document, but presumably not the Cutler Twining nor Truman-Forrestal memos.
33. The fact that other people such as Hillenkoetter himself uses a day month comma year format is irrelevant.
34. The fact that the Cutler-Twining memo is a carbon and unsigned is irrelevant to the question of whether or not Cutler, Lay, Coyne prepared it.
35. The fact that Linda Howe and Jaime Shandera are both TV producers who have worked on in-depth documentaries is irrelevant.
36. No government official has ever put out disinformation to help cover the tracks of legitimate information not desired to be released.