



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is **OPEN**

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jan](#) -> Oppenheimer & Einstien - 'New' MJ-12 Doc

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Oppenheimer & Einstien - 'New' MJ-12 Doc

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 12:04:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 12:16:02 -0500
Subject: Oppenheimer & Einstien - 'New' MJ-12 Doc

Here is my analysis/comment on the "Celestial " document:

COMMENTS ON AND QUESTIONS ABOUT DOCUMENT #1
in the Wood & Wood Collection
by Bruce Maccabee

Document #1:
Einstein/Oppenheimer: RELATIONSHIPS WITH INHABITANTS
OF CELESTRIAL (sic) BODIES

Note: it will be easier to understand some of my comments in the following if you realize that there have been identified "UFO" documents which were partially based, word for word, on real documents. The real documents were modified by the addition of UFO-related terminology. Also various "caveats" (security markings) have been added (such as "majic") to make them look as if they were part of a highly classified study of UFOs, etc.

1) Did E have a TS clearance (we know he had a clearance from the Navy for torpedo explosive (?) work). He did not work on "the bomb." I am only aware of the following open literature association between E and UFOS: someone asked (1952, 53?) what he thought people were seeing when they reported flying saucers. He responded "they must be seeing something" or something like that.

2) Why Einstein? What did he know about international law of territorial occupation or colonization or relationships between us and "estraterrestrial men?" Same question for Oppenheimer.

3) Why June, 1947 as "draft" date? the implication is that by June 1947 it was well accepted by a some people (including E and O) that ETs were real, flying around, and might communicate. Where is there independent evidence that saucer reality was accepted on a high level BEFORE July, 1947?

4) Celestial? (sp)

5) The first paragraph seems self-contradictory: "Relationships with (ETs) presents (sic) no bascially(sic) new problem (for) international law...", yet, "confronting intelligent" non-human beings "would bring up problems whose solution is difficult to conceive." So which is it, a piece of (international law) cake, or "too hard to do?"

6) The third paragraph says that a first condition is that they

should have human-like psychology. What if they don't meet that condition? We give up?

7) What guidelines in the Pentateuch? (guidelines for interactions between nation-states?) Guidelines for occupying territory?

8) Paragraph 5 clarified (I hope): "If these intelligent beings were in possession of a more or less (sic) culture, (sic) and a more or less perfect political organization, (then (1)) they would have an absolute right to be recognized as independent and sovereign peoples, (2) we would have to come to an agreement with them to establish the legal regulations upon which future relationships should be based, (sic) and (3) it would be necessary to accept many of their principles."

You know what this sounds like? It sounds like a discussion of how to interact with the aborigines (native peoples) of a country. Imagine someone in the 1600's or 1700's writing about how to deal with the American Indian Nations. Or, more primitive yet, someone writing about how Columbus should deal with the natives he discovered. How about the first contacts with the South Sea Island aborigines in WWII (Tasaday, etc)?

Also, it sounds like someone trying to determine how a "United Nations" organization would interact with aborigines. Discussions leading up to the founding of the UN?

Alternatively, this might be a stab at creating an "interplanet" law that would be needed after colonies of humans are established on other planets or on space stations. This would be something that people interested in space exploration and colonization might write. (see below)

9) Paragraph 6: cross off "to the earth" and imagine the US government vs the American Indians: if they attacked we could defend. Alternatively, this might pertain to the possibility that a well established colony of humans on another planet or space platform might become a threat to the earth. (see below)

10) Paragraph 7: Considering the UFO context of this document, the suggestion is made that ETs are homo sapiens that "grew up" on another planet ("celestial body in our solar system") and evolved a different culture. Actually, this is more consistent with thinking of a future situation in which a human colony "grew up" on another planet or space station and evolved its own culture. "Obviously, this possibility depends upon many circumstances, whose condition cannot yet be foreseen. However, we can make a study of the basis on which such a thing might have occurred." Might have occurred?

I believe that already by 1947 astronomers had concluded that the conditions for human-like life exist only on the earth and not on any other "body in our solar system." Hence I believe that for E and O to suggest otherwise would be highly unlikely. Furthermore, this paragraph suggests that the writers didn't know whether it was true or not and are therefore ready to "make a study." This uncertainty seems strange when compared to the opening paragraph which seems to imply that the writers are not merely engaged in an academic exercise to answer the question "what are the legal ramifications of contact with ET? or something like that."

On the other hand, this might apply to far future space colonies that might try to break away from their parent earth nations and become nations on their own.

Paragraph 8: this paragraph seems to directly address the possibility of HUMAN colonization of planets, the opposite of other solar system planets being the source of ETs coming to earth. Amusing: in this paragraph it is suggested that water of hydration could be driven off by heating and split into H and O and that the O would be used for breathing and the H as fuel. Question: what is the H going to burn when used as fuel? O?

Paragraph 9: The original of this document could be about the possible problems for international law that could result if colonies of humans that have been established on other planets or bodies in the solar system for purposes of exploitation

decide to become independent nations (analogous to the American colonies of Britain!!!). It could also be about the problems of colonies of previously uninhabited places on earth where there is a "continuous interchange" of men who work in these places but with no chance of the place becoming an independent country.

Para 10): Thought EBE was supposedly invented by Bronk after the Roswell crash!! This paragraph, ostensibly written in June, 1947, says we now want to determine what to do if EBEs want to settle here

Para 11: item 1 of "what to do"/..... suggests that we consider them an independent people if they have culture and are politically organized. This paragraph also says what THEY could do: they could consider "what degree of development would be required on earth for colonizing." Do these statements make any sense in the context of a technologically superior "race" coming to "colonize" earth? NO. To me it appear as nonsense.

ON THE OTHER HAND, if this refers to HUMANS who grew up in space colonies and who now want to return to earth after developing their own "culture", then it does make some sense.

Para 12: item 2 of "What to do".....This doesn't suggest anything for us to do. Instead it says that EBEs have a "right" to colonize if THEY consider our culture "devoid of political unity." Does this make any sense at all? NO. More nonsense? It also is a little weird if one assumes this is a discussion of space colonies returning to earth.

Para 13: This suggests that the EBEs should carry out a colonization in which they would be our guardians of teach us something ("tutelage") with the "tacit approval" of the United Nations. I ask, what would the UN have to say if a technologically superior race of EBEs decided to colonize earth? Would the EBEs care what the UN had to say? Probably not. On the other hand, aboriginal races that are discovered by UN member nations might well care what the UN had to say. If this refers to human space colonies returning to earth with superior knowledge gained from living in space, then it might marginally make some sense.

Para 14: labelled (a). The first sentence says the UN regulated international relations and not tutelage (as mentioned previously). This implies that the tutelage is going to occur within a nation's boundaries and hence is not subject to UN control. The next sentence makes no sense. It appears to be the concatenation of two ideas. "It would have the right to intervene only if the relationships of a member nation with a celestial (sic) body affected another member nation with an extraterrestrial people is beyond the domain of the United Nations." This sentence falls apart at the word "is." Leaving off all words after "is" we have a sentence that says the UN could only intervene if "th relationships of a member nation with a celestial body" were to affect "another member nation with an extraterrestrial people." The meaning of a "member nation with a celestial body" is not clear. Nor is the meaning of a "member nation with an extraterrestrial people." Aside from the lousy sentence construction, this sentence doesn't really mean anything (unless this refers to an earthbound country that has a relationship with a space-based colony on some platform or planet and said relationship affects some other member nation which also has an "extraterrestrial" colony).

Para. 15: labelled (b): "If the United Nations were a supra-national organization it would have competency to deal with all problems related to extraterrestrial peoples. Of course, even though it is merely an international organization, it would have this competence if its member states would be willing to recognize it." This paragraph would make sense if "extraterrestrial peoples" was replaced with something more earthy or with "space colonies." "Supra-national" means "above" the national. In other words, if the UN could tell member countries what to do, then the UN could deal with problems of (aboriginal or space-based) peoples. However, the UN is only an organization of member states, not a superior ruling body over the members. But, if the member states would recognize the UN as being "superior," then the UN could handle these problems.

Para. 16: except for "celestial" this is one of the few

paragraphs that makes sense standing alone. However, with a change of a few words this could probably be made more "earthy."

Para. 17: Considering the previous paragraphs the first sentence here sounds somewhat redundant and somewhat senseless: "We cannot exclude the possibility that a race of extraterrestrial (sic) people more advanced technologically and economically may take upon itself the right to occupy another celestial body." Wait a minute, to this point the discussion has mostly been about EBEs colonizing earth. What is this "other celestial body?" consider what this sentence would mean if "extraterrestrial" were replaced by "people" (meaning humans) and "celestial body" were replaced by "country" or "area of the earth." "How, then, would this occupation come about?"

Another interpretation: this may refer to one space colony of humans trying to take over another space colony. Suppose, for example, the USA set up a colony on Mars and the Soviet Union (remember, this is ostensibly written about 50 years ago) were to set up a space colony on the moon. Now suppose the US colony decided to attack the moon colony. What could the UN do to intervene? If the space colonies were sufficiently self-reliant, not needing anything from the earthbound "mother" countries, then probably the UN could do nothing short of launching a space war to deter aggression. But this would likely end up an earth war.

Para 18: labelled 1. This paragraph does not answer "how this occupation would come about." Instead, it says "The idea of exploitation by one celestial state" (by another?) "would be rejected" (by whom or what?), "they may think it would be advisable to grant it" (what, exploitation?) to all others" (other what? "celestial" states? races? humans? EBEs?) "capable of reaching another celestial body." The two main portions of this sentence don't fit together. The first half says the "idea" of exploitation would be rejected. The second half talks about granting "it" to all others that are capable of reaching "another celestial body." Does that mean that any group capable of space travel will be granted "it" by the UN? Is "it" the right of exploitation?

This makes little sense as written.

Para 19: labelled 2: presumably this is another description of "how this occupation would come about." This does not answer that question. But it does discuss what might happen with occupation: a "celestial" body could be divided into zones which would be distributed among "other celestial states." This raises the question of how many "Celestial states" are trying to take over the earth. According to this paragraph, division into zones would present a problem of "distribution" and, furthermore, "other celestial states would be deprived of the possibility of owning an area, or if they were granted one it would involve complicate operations." Now this makes me feel sorry for the other "celestial states" that would be deprived of the opportunity for owning an area. This makes no sense....except perhaps in the context of the relationships between space colonies (of humans).

Para 20: labelled 3: This paragraph is another answer to how occupation would come about: "Indivisible co-sovereignty, giving each celestial state the right to make whatever use is most convenient to its interests, independently of the others." This is not a complete sentence, but if the first two words are assumed to answer the question of how occupation would come about, i.e., "by indivisible co-sovereignty," then the sentence makes sense. I presume occupation by "indivisible co-sovereignty" would work. Sounds like a real good deal for the occupiers since they get the "right to make whatever use is most convenient." However, there is a drawback to "indivisible co-sovereignty": "This would create a situation of anarchy, as the strongest on would win out in the end." In other words the "co-occupiers" would fight for control. There would be anarchy for a while, perhaps, but I presume that ultimately rule would be reestablished as a dictatorship. Overall, this paragraph makes little sense in the context of EBE taking over or occupying the earth. It might make some sense in terms of the relationships between space colonies of humans.

Para 21: labelled 4: Does this paragraph make sense in the context of occupation? Apparently it assumes that the EBEs would be moral and would allow themselves to be absorbed peacefully

into our culture in such a way as to be invisible ("their presence not be revealed"). This sounds like "stealth occupation" by agreement with the occupied, if one assumes EBEs are the occupiers and humans are the occupied.

Para 22: "Actually we do not believe it necessary to go that far." Huh? Not necessary to have stealth occupation? "It would merely be a matter of internationalizing celestial peoples and creating an international treaty instrument preventing exploitation of all nations belonging to the United Nations." What is this supposed to mean? By "internationalizing celestial peoples," the EBEs, who are about to take over or occupy the earth, we can create an "international treaty instrument" that will prevent "exploitation" by the EBEs of "all nations belonging to the United Nations." Don't we wish that were so!! In my opinion this paragraph makes little sense... UNLESS, it pertains to the relationships between space-based colonies of humans. IN that case, they essentially say that the United Nations (of earth) should be extended to space so that "space nations" would also be bound by basic laws of the UN (against the exploitation of one space nation or one space nation's possessions, by another space nation).

Para 23: This paragraph says that there has been a loss of interest "by states here on earth" in law related to the occupation of unoccupied or unpossessed territories (terra nullius or, in this document, "res nullius"; look it up on the web! a hot topic in Australia!!!) since there are no longer unoccupied territories on earth. However, there are potentially "territories" in space which could be occupied (moon, planets) and this possibility brings forth again the need for international laws related to territorial occupation.

Paragraphs 24, 25 and 26: Except for the misspelling of "celestial" in para. 26, these paragraphs are acceptable as written. These paragraphs effectively define occupation as "the means for acquiring sovereignty over territories...either inhabited or in an elementary state of civilization." In other words, send your army and/or civilians to simply "move in" on the present inhabitants, if any, and "take over" the land or area to be occupied. Then you can teach them your ways of "civilization" (see previous reference to tutelage). Paragraph 26 "predicts" a rise in "imperialist expansion" by states taking over extraterrestrial bodies in interplanetary space where "the celestial states present new problems."

This sounds very much like thinking related to an outer space treaty between space colonies or nations and has NOTHING to do with ET's coming to earth.

Para 27: Aside from poor sentence construction this paragraph makes sense. It says that extraterrestrial territories such as the moon belong to no one. (Hence it is available for occupation by colonization by terrestrial states. However, terrestrial states might have to divide the moon into zones or else fight over control of the moon.) However, if a celestial body were found to have an indigenous race, then no single terrestrial nation could claim it. Instead it would be considered as communal property of all "celestial states." Of course, this has nothing to do with EBEs taking over the earth.

Para 28: change in subject: are "celestial astroplanes" flying around in our atmosphere because of atomic testing? The implication here is that there have been a number of flying saucer sightings already by the time of this document in June 1947, enough sightings to cause an alarm. Another implication is that there were none before the first bomb (Aug. 1945). This implication contradicts the implied or explicit claims in other documents that there was "hard evidence" such as crashed saucers before 1947 and even before 1945 (e.g., in 1943).

Para 29: This paragraph says that the military accepts the reality of "unidentified space craft flying in our atmosphere" and "possibly maintaining orbits about our planet." Ostensibly written in June, 1947, this is certainly premature from the conventional history point of view which is that, publically, the AF has never acknowledged "unidentified space craft." But, more to the point, there is little evidence of the acceptance of UFO reality by the AF top brass until early 1952. IN 1952 Stephen Possony wrote a document which includes the sentence, "The Air Force cannot simply assume that flying saucers are

estraterrestrial." Possony, a top level civilian consultant to the Air Force was in a position to know what the top brass was thinking. Evidently the brass was thinking "ET." But this is 1952 after a lot of water had flowed, and a lot of saucers had flown, over the dam.

Para 30: The sentence structure of this paragraph (one sentence) seems more convoluted than any of the previous. Was it by the same writer(s)? It almost makes sense as written. IF the words "...and the exclusion of" which follow the word "disarm" are removed the sentence becomes understandable. This paragraph says that efforts to reach agreements to disarm or discontinue testing of nuclear "weapons that are too destructive" have been unsuccessful despite the "lamentations of philosophers, the efforts of politicians and th conferences of diplomats." However, " by some miracle we cannot explain" there have been agreements on chemicals in warfare.

Para 31: This paragraph introduces the idea of an atomic bomb carried by a "space vehicle." This makes sense in the conventional way if we assume the writer was thinking of atomic bombs on ballistic missiles..rockets which would go far enough above the earth to be in outer space for at least part of the journey. We know that in early 1949 Lincoln La Paz (famous meteoricist - who studied meteors) was already warning the Air Force Office of Special Investigations that green fireballs might be Russian missiles which we could call "fractional orbital bombs" but without the bombs. (However, he predicted that bombs would be added later.) "The use of the atomic bomb combined with space vehicles poses a threat on a scale which makes it absolutely necessary to come to an agreement in this area." The writer(s) then refers to the appearance of "unidentified space vehicles (opinions are divided as to their origins) over the skies of Europe and the United states has sustained an ineradical (sic) fear, an anxiety about security, that is driving the great powers to make an effort to find a solution to the threat." Note: this sounds as if it COULD have been written in 1949, 1950 or so when the missile race was really on and after there had been enough saucer and green fireball sightings so that it would make sense to worry about distinguishing between a ballistic missile and a saucer. This sort of reason sounds really premature for a June 1947 document.

Para 32: This paragraph makes complete sense as it stands alone./ There is no reference to EBEs or unidentified space craft. This is simply an analysis of the military situation that could be caused by the proliferation of "nukes" (nuclear tipped ballistic missiles) which are described as the "ultimate weapon of war" because they would strike very quickly and come from above so the "bombee" wouldn't necessarily know when to expect it or where "bomber" was located. Also, impossible to defend against.

Para 33. This paragraph points out that at the time of writing (1947?) only slow moving bombers were available for weapon transport. HOwever, looking ahead ten years (1957) "When artificial satellites and missiles find their place in space we must consider the potential threat that" (here is where the paragraph gets a little "wacky") " unidentified space craft pose. One must consider the fact that mis-identification of the space craft for a (sic) intercontinental missile in a re-entry phase of clight could lead to accidental nuclear war with horrible consequences." Wrong.

So what if they misidentified a "space craft" (an alien flying vehicle - flying saucer) as an intercontinental missile. If the object were a missile, it would be only minutes to seconds between the (radar) detection and the explosion. IN other words they would have very little time to wait to find out whether they had detected a missile or a space craft. IF after, say, 5 minutes there was no explosion, then they could safely say they detected (by radar) a "space craft." Now, admittedly from the time of first detection to the time of identification as either a space craft (no explosion) or a missile/bomb (big explosion) they would be wondering what to do about it. But only in a "launch on detect" scenario would we be likely to mount a retaliation - leading to "horrible consequences" - before waiting to see whether it was a missile or a "space craft." Also, of course, unless the space craft were following a ballistic trajectory from a reasonably likely source (e.g., from te direction of the Soviet Union), it would be rejected as an atomic threat. In other words the fear that an "space craft"

would be mistaken for an intercontinental missile was unfounded in 1947 and in years later. Recall that in 1953 the CIA did suggest that saucer sightings could clog communication channels. And, in earlier years, there could well have been a fear that SOVIET BOMBERS might be misidentified as "space craft." But, of course, the solution to this problem was to scramble jets at the first contact and identify the radar targets. (This actually happened Dec. 6, 1950 at about 10 AM when unknown radar targets were detected coming from the north near Greenland. see "THE UFO/FBI CONNECTION/ the REAL X-files by B. Maccabee).

Para 34: the preceding 3 paragraphs were more concerned with nuclear and war affairs on the earth. Now we get back to the ET's....or do we? "Lastly, we should consider the possibility that our atmospheric tests of late could have influenced the arrival of celestial scrutiny. They could have been curious or even alarmed by such activity (and rightly so, for the Russians would make every effort to observe and record such tests)." What? The Russians? What do they have to do with "celestial scrutiny?" There is no doubt that the "Russians would make every effort to observe and record such tests." But that doesn't mean that the EBES would "observe and record such tests." They might not give a damn. Or they might. This sounds very much like the ORIGINAL writer of this paragraph was concerned with some PEOPLE (Soviets or friends of the Soviets?) observing tests.

Para 35: "In conclusion it is our professional opinion based on submitted data that this situation is extremely perilous and measures must be taken to rectify a very serious problem are very apparent." Huh? Leave off the last three words, please. OK, so this writing was ostensibly based on "submitted data." So E and O didn't have their own data to go on? They were handed what data they needed in order to write this? And they describe the situation as "extremely perilous?" What situation? The "stealth takeover" of the earth by EBES? The situation with the atomic bombs on ballistic missiles would be perilous in the future, but not at the time of writing when only bombers could carry bombs. So, what situation is "extremely perilous?"

DISCUSSION:

Having read every word of this document and having tried to make some sense of it I suggest

- 1) Ostensibly this is about relationships between humans and "extraterrestrial men" or non-humans (EBEs). However, the paper does not follow what I, at least, would consider to be a logical flow. The first part starts off with international law and how it might apply to relationships with "extraterrestrial men" (humans?) and EBES coming to earth. But then it inserts comments that could apply to humans occupying other "celestial" bodies. Finally, it switches to a military threat, not from the EBES but from the Russians.
- 2) there are numerous misspellings and several paragraphs have poor sentence construction
- 3) many of the statements seem to make no sense in the context in which one supposes they are to be taken
- 4) the stamp TOP SECRET seems to have been made on a small rectangle of paper attached to the top of the typed document.
- 5) I think E and O could have done a LOT better than this if they were really concerned about the impact of EBE colonization of the earth
- 6) I think this document could have been created by modifying a real document that discusses the problems of colonization by humans of over "bodies" in the solar system, including the problems that could arise if such colonies decided to become independent. There may also have been a real document discussing the problems created by atomic warfare.

Bottom line: I don't buy it.

.....

Date: Sat, 16 Jan 1999 17:49:45 -0800
To: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>

From: Ryan S. Wood <rswood@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Authenticity of the Oppenheimer/Einstein draft
Cc: Bob Wood <drbobwood@aol.com>

Hi Bruce,

Thanks for your detailed comments on this letter. I will read them over and comment on them hopefully soon. In the meantime, let me provide you with some additional discussion that we have prepared that may address some of your concerns.

Assessment of originals. Since typewriters are six lines per inch if the paper is not slipping, it is possible to enlarge or reduce copies to the exact size of the original. Then, on pages 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 one can measure the width of the original remnant of paper edge to be 8.0 inches. The paper size of 8 x 10.5 inches was used during the war.

Chronology. Both draft authors were at Princeton at the time, although some records for 1947 are missing from various files.

Type and handwriting. The top secret markings are done with paste-on labels, also consistent with the period. This would be consistent with having been typed before the classification was applied. The type shows p=92s, o=92s, m=92s and other letters with small spaces filled in, thereby indicating a carbon copy. If so, the classification would have had to be a paste-on label. The initials of Vannevar Bush are similar to exemplars of his initials.

Content and authorship. A comparison of the language of this draft with writings of J. Robert Oppenheimer shows clearly that he did not dictate it or write it, since his work is quite sophisticated and urbane. The misspelling of the word "celestial" as "celestrial" would be consistent with a circumstance of a secretary taking down dictation =97 and the secretary not being knowledgeable in astronomy. With Einstein dictating, with his German accent, several of the misspelled words become more reasonable. The misspelling of the word basically in the second sentence may suggest that the secretary was not working from dictation but directly from Einstein=92s words. This would also favor security, since the dictation pad would not exist to have to be classified. The content of this piece can be compared against what Einstein might have said if he were given a specific request. The five asterisks separating the sections appear to be separating hypothetical questions. They are consistent with the answers to the following seven questions:

What relations should we have with extraterrestrial men?
Where might they be coming from?
What should we do if they want to settle here?
What does international law say about this problem?
Do they have a right to move into unsettled territories?
Do we have more rights to settle on the moon than they do?
Has our testing of atomic weapons caused the presence of the visitors?

Reference 1 says that when Einstein executed his first contract for Dr. Vannevar Bush in late 1941, Bush required Einstein to submit his written report to Bush directly in Einstein=92s own handwriting so that no typist or other assistant would see it. This work pertained to uranium isotope separation, an early difficult problem. This historical piece of information would be consistent with the idea of there being no dictation pad. This is consistent with not correcting the typing errors.

Bush himself =97 consistent with the awkward beginning of the sentence =97 possibly typed the note at the end. The intent is less clear, except Bush did not want Oppenheimer talking to President Truman on this topic.

As far as the overall message of the draft is concern, it is unclear. Einstein says that that the "measures to be taken to rectify a very serious problem are apparent." It is certainly not apparent to us what he was recommending.

Some have noted the presence of phrases that seem to be of a more modern era, such as, "at any rate," to the point where, "in any case," or "to a certain extent." A literary analysis of the piece, looking at sentence structure, sentence beginnings

and endings, shows consistency with other examples of draft Einstein material of the era. A comprehensive set of comparisons is in preparation.

In summary, clues from the original, the chronology, the type, the handwriting, the authorship and the content all favor authenticity.

1. Sayen, J. (1985). Einstein in America. Crown Publishers, New York.
Dr. Robert M. & Ryan S. Wood
Majestic Documents Investigators | Researchers
PO Box 2272, Redwood City CA 94064
<<http://www.TheWordisTruth.org>>

.....

My comment on the response: aside from misspelling and some poor sentence construction, which MIGHT be explained as resulting from translation from German to English in a draft, the document seems to contain too much illogic and not enough continuity of subject matter to have been written by a couple of geniuses. The response is not sufficient to convince me.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).