

THE MJ-12 DOCUMENTS

AN ANALYTICAL REPORT

BY WILLIAM L. MOORE & JAIME H. SHANDERA

Copyright 1990, WLM/JHS

All Rights Reserved

The story of the so-called MJ-12 documents is not an easy one to tell. In order to do it proper justice, one must take into account a wide variety of often very bizarre occurrences and events experienced by the two authors of this report. Just exactly what these were and how they may or may not fit into the larger picture of this extraordinary situation is something which must wait for another day. This is the stuff that entire books are made from, and that process is already underway.

Another factor to be taken into account here is that the investigation into what is rapidly becoming "L'affaire MJ-12" is not yet complete. As any good journalist or writer knows, a premature rush to publish details of an incomplete case often works more against the ultimate objective than it does for it. As long as doors remain open and progress is being made, the best strategy (although not necessarily the easiest) is often to remain silent even in the face of extreme criticism. In such cases, it is necessary to keep in mind that the primary goal is the obtaining of information and not the silencing of the critics.

In any case, the purpose of this report is to present information on a rather narrow aspect of the MJ-12 controversy—that of the physical characteristics of the documents themselves. At the same time, it is important to note that Stanton Friedman has prepared an adjunct report on his own research, conducted somewhat independently, into the content of the documents, the people allegedly involved with MJ-12, and the larger picture of where all of this might or might not fit into historical perspective. Friedman's research, conducted under a \$16,000 grant from the Fund for UFO Research, has been separately published by that organization. Copies of this 59 page report

plus references and appendices are available for \$12.50 postpaid from the Fund for UFO Research, POBX 277, Mt. Rainier, MD 20712.

For those delving into this mystery for the first time, perhaps a brief summary is in order.

Over the past ten years, the team of Moore and Shandera, working closely with Stanton Friedman, has quietly but aggressively been pursuing contacts and developing sources of information centered around the role played by the U.S. intelligence community with respect to the subject of unidentified flying objects (UFOs). Moore is a professional author, researcher and journalist, Shandera is a television producer-director with strong background in television news, and Friedman is a professional scientist who spends a great deal of time studying and lecturing about UFOs. Their goal has been to determine the extent of and reasons for the government's cover-up of information about this subject.

The documents covered by this report came to us in a variety of ways from a number of different sources over the space of an entire decade. The story behind each is told in its appropriate section. Beginning with the release of some of this material to the press in mid-1987, an intense controversy has raged over whether the documents are authentic, and what their impact may ultimately be on the entire field of UFO research. It is the intended purpose of this report to provide some sense of focus to what has up to now been a confused jumble of conflicting allegations, pronouncements and opinions on the subject by a variety of individuals who, while having no direct connection with us or our work, have seen fit to intrude upon the controversy for sundry and often self-serving reasons.

The great bulk of the information contained herein has never before been made available either to other researchers or to the public. It is expected that many who thought the MJ-12 affair had become a dead issue and that there was nothing of importance left to say on the matter will be forced to open their minds and take another look at it. That is as it should be. Others, perhaps, will be forced to scramble to explain why they rushed to premature conclusions; which, of course, is also as it should be. In either case, no one interested in this controversy will be left untouched by this report.

It should also be noted that this report has been prepared upon the assumption that most of its readers already have some background knowledge of the MJ-12 controversy. For those who do not, an extensive bibliography has been included.

Any proper discussion of the so-called MJ-12 documents must, of necessity, begin by placing the entire matter into proper context and perspective. The fact is that these documents do not stand alone, but rather represent only the final link (so far as is known) in a chain of apparently related documents and events dating at least as far back as late 1977.

THE ELLSWORTH DOCUMENT (DEC. 1977)

As far as can be determined, the chain seems to have begun at Ellsworth A.F.B. in South Dakota. Sometime in the late fall or early winter of that year, the so-called Ellsworth Document (hereinafter referred to as "ED" and reproduced as Appendix A of this report) was officially fabricated as part of a government counterintelligence/disinformation operation. On January 28, 1978, a copy of this document was sent to the National Enquirer (tabloid) in Lantana, Florida, accompanied by an anonymous cover letter indicating that the event had "actually occurred", that it had been classified Top Secret by the Air Force, and that witnesses had been silenced.

The Enquirer, to its credit, immediately launched an investigation in an effort to deter-

mine the accuracy of the information in the document, but lost interest in the story after they were unable to come up with anything to suggest that the "ED" was real, while uncovering a great deal to suggest it was not. For example, Capt. Larry Stokes, named in the document as the officer responsible for having upgraded the situation at L-9 to "Covered Wagon" status, turned out to have been hospitalized with a high fever from November 14-27, and thus was not even on active duty, as the "ED" claims, when the alleged incident occurred on November 16th. More than 20 other errors and discrepancies were found as well.(1)

Since there is little doubt that the "ED" is phoney, the only questions remaining are who created it, and why. The "who" part may never be known with any degree of certainty beyond the fact that it was clearly someone associated with either AFOSI Detachment 1302, the 44th Security Police Group, or one of three people from Washington, D.C. (possibly CIA) involved with a counterintelligence/disinformation training exercise being conducted at Ellsworth AFB during late 1977 and early 1978.

While a number of people have suggested that the "someone" in question might well have been ex-AFOSI Special Agent Richard Doty, those making such suggestions have been unable to produce anything beyond mere circumstance to support their claim. The facts are these:

Doty was indeed serving with the 44th Security Police Group at Ellsworth during the time the "ED" was fabricated and sent to the National Enquirer. In December, 1977, he was in his second year as Law Enforcement Flight Chief for that group, and had recently completed a three-week course in (air) traffic management and accident investigation.

Doty has admitted to the authors that he was in fact "aware" of the National Enquirer operation, but claims that he was only "peripherally involved" with it and that he had nothing to do with fabricating the "ED". He has consistently refused to discuss the matter further because, he says, he is bound by his security oath.

Through the cooperation of other sources, the authors have been able to learn that there were really two principal objectives behind the fabrication of the "ED":

(A) Beginning in mid-1977, several stories appeared in the National Enquirer which led Air Force security people to believe that someone at Ellsworth was leaking small amounts of material to the tabloid about sensitive Air Force projects, none of which seems to have had anything to do with UFOs.

(B) At about the time this situation came to their attention, some of the same A.F. security people whose responsibility it was to investigate such problems were involved in the above-mentioned, possibly CIA sponsored training program which had to do with the formulation and use of disinformation as a counter-intelligence tool. Such programs are often a double-edged sword in that while they offer training to a relatively large number of people, those sponsoring them often make a point of identifying specific individuals among those involved either directly or peripherally (i.e. as trainees, or perhaps as organizers and assistants), who might prove useful in future situations. It seems to have been through such a process that Richard Doty's name came to the attention of a shadowy figure in Washington who would later find ways to make considerable use of him. That man was "the Falcon".

In any case, someone responsible for setting up the curriculum of this training exercise hit upon the idea of getting two birds with one stone. They would create a document as an example of how such things were done, and then send a copy of it to the Enquirer along with an anonymous cover letter indicating its legitimacy. If, as suspected, sources at Ellsworth had indeed been in contact with the Enquirer, then it seemed reasonable to assume that those individuals would be among the first the Enquirer would try to make contact with in an effort to obtain more information about the "ED" and its contents. All that was needed was to monitor the activities of the Enquirer's people and of those individuals at Ellsworth suspected of being in contact with them. Those with whom the Enquirer made contact would immediately be questioned about the matter. And, since the target was, after all, the National Enquirer, what better topic around which to build a phoney document than UFOs? It was the one topic the Enquirer could be counted upon to take an immediate interest in. Whether the ruse was successful or not is uncertain, although there are indications that it was.

The one piece of forensic evidence in this case which seems to have been completely overlooked up to now is the fact that whoever created the "ED" made the mistake of writing out the date and number at the top of it and the distribution list at the bottom in longhand. A careful comparison of this handwriting with several samples of Richard Doty's handwriting (both printing and cursive) collected by the authors over the years fails to yield even a single point in common. Based upon a more limited sample, there are also no points in common with the handwriting of Sgt. Richard A. Benson, the man the Enquirer's suspicions centered upon as possible perpetrator of the hoax. Find the

person whose handwriting matches those notations, and you have the person who created the document.

Another point to be made here is that during his involvement with researcher/author Linda Howe in 1983 as part of the then ongoing Bennewitz affair(2), Doty once mentioned the Ellsworth incident to her and suggested it had been a real event. Later on, according to Pratt, he admitted to her that it had not really occurred. Curiously, Moore got quite a different response when he asked Doty about it in late 1981. Doty, after asking Moore what he knew about the affair, readily stated that the event had never occurred. Security regulations; he said, forbade him from making any further comment about it except to say that what little truth there was in it had been loosely based upon an actual UFO sighting in the area which had been experienced by a local sheriff's deputy. The deputy's sighting, however, had definitely not involved a landing. Doty also averred at the time that he had not been the one who had created the document.

Whoever did create the "ED" also made one other apparent error. Unfortunately, we must say "apparent" here since although the cover letter written to the Enquirer exists as an original document, the "ED" itself exists only as a photocopy and thus cannot be considered best evidence. Even so, a careful examination of both documents leads to the strong probability that both were typed on the same typewriter—a fact that, if true, flies in the face of assertions by the anonymous writer of the cover letter to the effect that he served on "a special team of individuals" appointed by the Air Force "to investigate the incident", and that he "obtained a copy of the original report" only after it was classified on December 2, 1977; both of which seem intended to give the appearance that the "ED" itself was written by someone other than the writer of the cover letter. Furthermore, a comparison of the typeface used on the "ED" and its accompanying cover letter with the typeface which consistently appears on the 44th Security Police Group's "Desk Blotter" during the time frame in question clearly shows that the "ED" and the "Blotter" were typed on two very different machines. This makes somewhat less tenable the Enquirer's 1978 hypothesis that a disgruntled Sgt. Benson "whiled away a whole shift dreaming this thing up"—an hypothesis based mostly upon the then popular but since largely discredited technique of voice-stress analysis.

THE "WEITZEL" LETTER (JULY, 1980)

Chronologically speaking, the next item in the chain is the so-called Weitzel letter ("WL") which was sent anonymously to the now defunct Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (APRO) of Tucson, Arizona, in the latter part of July, 1980. While not actually a document in the sense of the word as applied in this report, it is nonetheless important in that it is directly connected to AFOSI's efforts to obtain the assistance of a source within APRO in the early days of the Bennewitz affair. The letter is reproduced in its entirety as Appendix B.

Essentially, all that we know about the "WL" is covered in Moore's paper "UFOs and the U.S. Government, Part I" which he read at the Las Vegas MUFON Symposium on July 1, 1989. The appropriate paragraph is quoted as follows:

"The letter, which is loosely based upon an actual UFO case, was written anonymously to APRO in July, 1980 by Richard Doty and is directly related to the Bennewitz affair. Essentially it was "bait". AFOSI knew that Bennewitz had close ties with APRO at the time, and they were interested in recruiting someone within the APRO organization who would be in a position to provide them with feedback on Bennewitz' activities and communications. Since I was the APRO Board member in charge of Special Investigations in 1980, the Weitzel letter was passed to me for action shortly after it had been received. It was not long thereafter that I came to know Richard Doty and began providing him with information about the Bennewitz case."

Actually, the "WL" turned out to be nothing more than an exercise in futility since Moore's cooperation with AFOSI derived not from that letter, but rather from his meeting with the source codenamed "Falcon", who, in October of 1980, designated Richard Doty as middle-man in that relationship. Given the circumstances of this event, it seems reasonable to conclude that Doty had come to the attention of "Falcon" as a result of the Ellsworth training exercise

on disinformation in 1977; thus making the choice of Doty as middle-man an entirely logical one. What the relationship between Doty and "Falcon" was during the intervening three years is anybody's guess. Since Doty steadfastly refuses to discuss the Ellsworth affair beyond those points already on record, we are left once again with either trying to make a case out of purely circumstantial evidence, or allowing the matter to remain unsolved.

With respect to forensic matters, a comparison of the typefaces on the "WL" with those which appear on the "ED" leaves no question that, as expected, different machines were used to create both documents. The typeface on the "WL", however, is to play a very important role in determining the question of Doty's credibility, as we shall see later in this report.

On the question of style and content, a comparison of the "ED" cover letter and the "WL" brings to light certain curious similarities which suggest that the creators of both had, at the very least, undergone similar indoctrination in the fabrication of this sort of disinformation. For example:

Both letters employ the odd style of placing a semicolon rather than a colon or a comma after the salutation.

Both allege that the incident involved actually occurred.

Both indicate that the writer was in a position to have some first-hand personal knowledge of it.

Both stress a need for anonymity due to the alleged "active duty" status of the writer.

Both mention the existence of photographs which the writer is unable to provide.

Both allude to an official cover-up.

Both are loosely based upon actual UFO incidents which have been highly exaggerated and elaborated upon.

Both use the term "individuals" in place of "people" or "persons".

In other words, based upon the above, a reasonably good case might be made for the hypothesis that the writers of both letters

referred to the same set of guidelines in the creation of their work. (If there's one thing the military is well-known for, it's their penchant for sticking to the rules. Note also that the above "points in common" are essentially content and not stylistic similarities.)

The idea that both documents were written by the same person (possibly Richard Doty, as some have suggested) falls completely apart, however, upon careful examination of the numerous dissimilarities therein, all of which are stylistic in nature. For example:

The "ED" letter employs military style for the writing of dates. In the "WL", the style is civilian.

The "ED" letter uses the term "Air Force"; the "WL" uses "USAF".

The writer of the "ED" has a much better grasp of spelling, grammar and sentence structure than is demonstrated in the "WL"
Compare:

THE ELLSWORTH DOCUMENT & COVER LETTER

Contain c.650 words (combined) of text.

This text contains just 7 errors of usage, only 2 of which are spelling errors. (One of these is the word "nuclear", which is misspelled "necular"—an unusual error for one presumably charged with guarding nuclear missile sites, and, thus, suggestive of a writer whose specialty lies in other areas. It is also suggestive of a writer other than Doty, who spells nuclear correctly in documents clearly attributable to him.)

The writer demonstrates proper use of the possessive form.

The writer employs and demonstrates proper use of parentheticals.

The writer displays a consistent habit of correcting himself through the use of overstrikes. (There are 7 of these visible in the text.)

THE WEITZEL LETTER

Contains c.750 words of text; a sample sufficiently similar to the above to permit reasonable comparison.

This text contains no less than 18 errors of usage, of which 8 are spelling errors.

Improper use of the possessive form is demonstrated.

No parentheticals are employed.

The writer (Doty) displays a habit (visible in other documents attributable to him as well) of correcting typographical errors by writing over them in pen rather than overstriking with the typewriter.

The fact that two clearly distinct writers emerge from the above comparison is extremely important in two ways: First, *it demonstrates that as early as mid-1980 there were at least two individuals involved in officially creating spurious material and providing it to public sources; and second, both can be traced to a common point, i.e. the training exercise in counterintelligence and disinformation conducted at Ellsworth A.F.B. in late 1977 by "men (pl.) from Washington (D.C.)."*

THE "AQUARIUS DOCUMENT" (FEB. 1981)

The next link in the chain was the so-called Aquarius Document ("AD"), which is reproduced as Appendix C. Rather than spend time recounting the history of this item de novo, the material about it which is already on record is reprinted here as a starting point.

From FOCUS, June 30, 1989, page 13:

"(The "AD") is an actual example of some of the disinformation produced in connection with the Bennewitz case. The document is a retyped version of a real AFOSI message with a few spurious additions. It was apparently created by AFOSI, or at least I always assumed it was, and it was handed to me in February, 1981 (sic.) with the intention that I would pass it to Bennewitz. My understanding, although I never knew for sure, was that Bennewitz was expected to wave it to the press and others as proof of what he was saying about an alien invasion, at which point the document would be denounced as a counterfeit and Bennewitz would be further discredited. Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately, depending upon one's point of view) it didn't turn out that way." (A highlighted version of this document showing the original text and the added disinformation is also included in Appendix C).

"One additional bit of information about this document is the way in which it initially came to be known to the UFO community. In September of 1982, insofar as I was aware, there were only three copies of this document in existence. One of these I had passed to Bennewitz, a second was in safekeeping, and a third was in my briefcase during a trip I had made to San Francisco. While there, I had a morning meeting with a man who turned out later to be an associate of UFOlogist Peter Gersten of New York. That same afternoon, my car was broken into and my briefcase was stolen. Four months later, a copy of that same document complete with annotations I had pencilled on it, turned up in the hands of none other than Gersten himself. To this day, I have never received a satisfactory explanation of how he obtained that document."

And, from FOCUS, September 30, 1989, page 8 (interview with Moore):

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

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

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

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

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

"A: First of all, it is important to take note of what I said in Las Vegas, which was that the document is a retyped version of a real AFOSI message with a few spurious additions. I also stated that it was apparently created by AFOSI, or at least I had always assumed it was, and that it was handed to me in February, 1981 with the intention that I would pass it to Bennewitz. I thought the "created by AFOSI" statement would have laid this matter to rest, but apparently not. Therefore: First: I did not retype the document, nor do I know who did. Certainly it was someone involved with the Bennewitz C/I effort, maybe Doty, maybe not. And Second: I know that the version I was handed was a retype be-

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

Even after the above material was released by Moore in 1989, questions about this particular document have persisted. Although most of these have resulted from misperceptions and misinterpretations of what Moore actually said, there does appear to be some need to set the record straight, and in some small cases, even to correct it. It is with that in mind, as well as the need to be as complete and specific as possible in this report, that the following facts are offered:

First of all, the date of February, 1981 is incorrect (if only by a few days). In checking his records, Moore has determined that the correct date was March 2, 1981. At a meeting with "Falcon" on that date, Moore was shown the original "AD", which appeared to be a typical government telex on thin computer paper with perforated edges. After examining it, Moore asked if he could keep it. "Falcon" said no, that Moore was only being given the opportunity to read it; at which point Moore proceeded to re-read it while making a conscious effort to imprint as much of it as possible upon his memory in the process. Immediately following that meeting, he wrote out some notes on a legal pad. (For the record, Moore had already been told of the alleged existence of Project Aquarius during an earlier meeting with "Falcon" in December, 1980 and had filed a FOIA request on it with HQ/USAF dated 29 December, 1980. Their negative response dated 12 February, 1981 sent from FTD at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio was already in hand at the time of the March 2nd meeting.)

At a meeting with "Falcon" and Doty in Albuquerque several weeks later, Moore was handed the retyped version which appears herein as Appendix C. When Moore commented that this version of the "AD" was somewhat different than the one he had been shown earlier, and that someone had obviously made some significant changes and additions in the interim, he was informed that this had been necessary in order

to "sanitize" it. "Falcon" then told Moore that he could have the copy in hand, and that perhaps Paul Bennewitz might be interested in one as well.

Moore, realizing that the original had been retyped and altered for a purpose, resisted providing Bennewitz with a copy for several months, even though several times during that interval it was suggested that he do so. Finally, in June, 1981, Moore carefully marked a copy so that it could be readily identified, and provided it to Bennewitz. Unknown to either "Falcon" or Doty, however, Moore confided in Bennewitz that the document might be a set-up, and advised him to use it only for his own purposes and not to go public with it. Bennewitz listened intently, put the document in his safe, and never did publicize it.

Bennewitz' failure to make public use of the "AD" must have been very frustrating to those who had planned otherwise. As indicated above, the "AD" only became public knowledge after it fell into Mr. Gersten's hands. Whether the San Francisco break-in (which occurred on September 13, 1982 and was reported to SFPD) was engineered as a result of that frustration and the document passed to Gersten with the expectation that he would circulate it, remains unknown. Certainly the government had motives of its own in wanting to discredit Gersten, since at the time he was causing them considerable headaches with his continuing efforts to take the government to court on F.O.I.A. matters and his plans to make a federal case out of the Cash-Landrum incident. Gersten quietly began circulating the "AD" to a few members of the UFO community in early 1983, but since he never endorsed it as authentic, it couldn't be used against him.

On March 12, 1983, the subject of the "AD" came up at a board meeting of the Fund for UFO Research, which Moore and Shandera attended as guests. Moore's statement that the document was a retyped and altered version of an original has since been misinterpreted by a number of people (who weren't there but only heard about it later through the grapevine), and is the origin of the rumor that Moore himself was responsible for re-typing the document. Such rumors are nothing more than unfounded gossip.

The Moore-Doty reconstruction of the original "AD" text (Appendix C) came as a result

of Moore sitting down with the retyped version in late 1988 and, using his memory and notes taken in 1981, attempting to come as close to the original content as possible. Once Moore had done all he felt he could along those lines, he took the matter up with Doty, who was able to offer a few additional changes. The reconstructed version which appears herein is the result of that process, and is believed by both to be a very close approximation of the original. "Falcon" did not take part in this process.

Forensic evidence with respect to the "AD" is sparse, but important:

The document contains c.350 words of text.

This text contains a total of 10 errors of usage, of which 7 are spelling errors. (Four of these are misspellings of the same word, "depicting", which is spelled "deplicting".)

The writer displays a habit of correcting typographical errors by writing over them in pen rather than overstriking with the typewriter. Four of these are evident.

A small sample of handwriting appears in the upper right-hand corner in the form of two notations which read "B I D - 1" and "C C - 1".

The typewriter involved uses a modified courier typeface typical of IBM and Olivetti electrics made during the 1970s and used by thousands of government offices. (The specific make and model of the machine is actually unimportant in this case, and thus we did not go to the trouble of identifying it further.)

Based upon the above, several conclusions can be drawn:

(1) The high incidence of errors in the "AD" compares favorably with the similar high incidence found in the "WL", suggesting, but not conclusively proving that both were typed by the same person. Since the "WL" was created in mid-July, 1980, and the "AD" had to have been typed (for reasons we shall make clear later) between November 17, 1980 and March 2, 1981, it is also reasonable to suppose that the person's skills would not have changed much in that time. Both arguments, however, are admittedly speculative.

(2) The habit of correcting typographical errors by overwriting them in pen is another point in common with the "WL", and once again suggests, but does not

THE CARTER BRIEFING NOTES (MAR. '83)

In early March of 1983, Moore received a phone call telling him that some information was going to be made available to him but that he would have to go and pick it up. "You will be receiving some instructions," the caller said. "You must follow them carefully or the deal is off."

After making a cloak-and-dagger trip across the country, Moore ended up in a motel on the edge of a mid-sized city in upstate New York. At precisely 5:00 P.M., according to arrangement, an individual came to the door of Moore's room bearing a sealed brown manila envelope. "You have exactly nineteen minutes," the person said. "You may do whatever you wish with this material during that time, but at the end of that time, I must have it back. After that, you are free to do what you wish."

Inside the envelope were eleven pages of what purported to be a Top Secret/Orcon document entitled "Executive Briefing, Subject: Project Aquarius" and bearing the date of June 14, 1977. "May I photograph this?" Moore asked; "May I read it into a tape recorder?" The courier, who stood quietly in the corner of the room the entire time, replied, "Both are permitted. You have seventeen minutes remaining."

Moore hastily adjusted the shade of the lamp on the night table and, placing the pages in its light one-by-one, took the best pictures he could. In order to assure scale later, he took a quarter from his pocket and placed it on the lower left corner of each page as he photographed them. Once that task was complete, he quickly undertook to read the text into a pocket recorder, taking care to read in the word "line" at the end of each line, as well as verbally noting punctuation marks, etc. so that a complete reconstruction of the text could be made in proper format should the photos not turn out. (They did, but all were of low contrast and, although legible, some were moderately out focus as well.)

When the time was up, the courier collected the pages, carefully counted them, replaced them in the original manila envelope, and left. It had been an unusual experience, the entire significance of which remains unclear to this day.

The documents themselves seem to be a transcription of notes either intended for use in preparing a briefing, or taken down during one and typed later. Much of the information therein is highly controversial in nature and is of such an esoteric quality there seems to be no real way to verify much of it.

In 1985, researcher Lee Graham, who was aware of the document's existence through Moore but did not have a copy of it, asked if he might have a copy of a portion of one page to show to a friend who might be able to help verify it. This was provided, but it turned out that the friend could be of little assistance. It was as a result of this effort, however, that this partly expurgated half-page got out into public circulation and became known as the "Snowbird Document." Since that time, various individuals have either tried to use it to their own advantage as "proof" of something (especially of strange goings-on in mid-Nevada), or have panned it viciously while knowing nothing of its background.

In May, 1987, Moore and Shandera decided to release portions of two additional pages in an effort to see whether any other researchers would either recognize the material, turn up with copies of it, or be able to shed additional light on the situation. Aside from a vicious attack on the material by the editor of the CAUS Newsletter who, while completely ignorant of the document's background or origin, immediately concluded it had to be a hoax, nothing of significance was gained by this process either.

Since that time, the document has remained under study and, although some progress has been made, Moore and Shandera have decided not to release any additional information about it until their study is either complete or they feel they can go no further with it.

The text of everything which has been released thus far is as follows. Because the quality of the photos which Moore took is so poor, we have elected not to reproduce these pages in the appendix. (In cases where material has been deleted, the deletions have been made by Moore and Shandera for the purpose of protecting the integrity of their project. There were no deletions in the document as provided to Moore.)

THE MJ-12 DOCUMENTS (DEC. 1984)

On December 11, 1984, a brown manila envelope arrived in the mail at the North Hollywood, California, residence of Jaime Shandera. It was taped across all seams with a brown, official-looking sealing tape, bore no return address, and was postmarked Albuquerque, New Mexico, December 8, 1984. Inside was a second, smaller brown envelope, also taped, which, when opened, revealed yet a third envelope within. This third envelope was a white, ordinary-sized letter envelope bearing the Marriott Hotel logo on the back flap, but with no other marking and no tape thereon. It contained a black plastic cannister within which was a roll of undeveloped 35mm. Tri-X film. This, upon development, yielded a sequence of eight good quality negatives of what appeared to be a 1952 briefing document for then president-elect Dwight Eisenhower, followed by two blank frames, and then the same sequence of eight frames a second time. The remainder of the roll was blank. After examining these through a 10x glass, Moore and Shandera arranged to have the negatives professionally printed at a photo lab owned by an associate. The results are reproduced herein as Appendix H. Both Moore and Shandera were present in the darkroom at the time the prints were made.

As stated earlier, the purpose of this report is to discuss the forensic analyses of the documents themselves. For more complete information on the content material (people, places, backgrounds, dates, events, etc.) the reader is referred to Stanton Friedman's 59 page adjunct paper "Final Report on Operation Majestic-12", as cited earlier herein.

For reasons of clarity and simplicity, the following discussion of the so-called MJ-12 documents has been broken down into three separate areas of concentration. These are (1) The Eisenhower Briefing Document of 18 November, 1952; (2) The so-called Executive Memorandum of Harry Truman dated September 24, 1947; and (3) The Cutler-Twining Memorandum of July 14, 1954 which was not on the film but was found by Shandera and Moore in the National Archives in July of 1985. Although the

Eisenhower Briefing Document ("EB") and the Truman Memorandum ("TM") were apparently part of the same briefing "set", they are really two quite separate entities and are treated as such in this report. The Cutler-Twining Memorandum ("CT"), being above and apart from the first two since it purports to be an onionskin carbon copy of the original, is covered in a section of its own and is reproduced herein as Appendix I.

BEST EVIDENCE

The study and analysis of both "EB" and "TM" would be considerably easier and more definitive if the original paper copies were in-hand. The availability of only photographs, even though the negatives are of good quality, places serious limitations upon our ability to conduct a proper analytical effort and to arrive at firm conclusions. With originals, which of course would be "best evidence", it would be possible to determine the age and type of paper, discern watermarks (if any), perhaps date the ink used, and verify beyond question the authenticity of the Truman signature which appears on "TM". Because we have only photographs, all of these key points are lost to us. Even so, considerable information can be gleaned from these documents which presents a fascinating picture with respect to the question of their authenticity.

During the course of their investigation, Moore and Shandera obtained assistance from both the FBI and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department in an effort to identify key questioned documents examiners who might be willing to lend their expertise to the project. Ultimately, four different individuals were selected and approached. Although assistance, information, comments and opinions were obtained in all cases, because of the lack of best evidence and the highly controversial nature of the subject matter involved, none of these four was willing to allow their name to be publicly used in this report. The consensus was that while it might be possible to prove the documents as forgeries if some glaring inconsistency or mistake was evident in them, in the absence of such a finding, it would be virtually impossible to prove them unquestionably authentic based upon photographic evidence alone.

If the MJ-12 documents had been the only factors involved, perhaps the investigation

(b) The signatures in question were not written "in succession" to one-another.

(2) *The old saw that "no two signatures can be exactly alike" is true only when "speaking microscopically and not as the carpenter measures." In other words, if the two Truman signatures in question here were exactly identical in every detail, an argument that both might be authentic would be almost impossible to defend. As has been demonstrated, however, while the signatures appear to be extremely similar to the unaided eye (i.e. "as the carpenter measures"), they are clearly dissimilar in a number of ways when examined "microscopically". Indeed, given the width of the lines, they cannot even have been written with the same pen; nor are there any unusual tremors visible which, according to Osborn, would be clear evidence of a traced or hand-copied forgery.*

This leaves only the question of whether the two signatures are "suspiciously" similar. "Suspicion", implying as it does, doubt or mistrust without proof, is a difficult concept to deal with in a study such as this. Certainly those individuals who blindly debunk anything having to do with UFOs will continue to claim that the "TM" must be a fabrication because of the "suspicious" nature of the signature thereon. Others, recognizing that debunkers are naturally suspicious of anything that challenges their narrow-minded concepts of reality, will no doubt sift the evidence carefully and find no reason for suspicion whatsoever. Yet, if suspicion implies doubt, then given the circumstances it does not seem unreasonable to retain certain doubts about this document. Only the availability of an original for expert examination could dispel these, and that, unfortunately, is something which we do not have.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Only three additional things remain to be said here. The first is that the alleged number, "092447", of the "Special Classified Executive Order" which, according to the "EB" is supposed to be the "TM" document, is essentially a non-number. While it is generally conceded that certain executive orders do exist which have never seen the light of day due to their continued security classifications (most of these, however, from the Johnson administration during the Viet Nam War era), and while it is equally conceded that there is no real re-

quirement that executive orders be numbered according to any specific system, the particular method of numbering witnessed with respect to the "EB"/"TM" situation is certainly unique to anyone's knowledge in the public sector. Of course, it remains possible that extraordinary circumstances caused Truman to go outside the established system, but in the absence of evidence this must be considered speculation.

Secondly, a curious comment made by one of the questioned document experts who was consulted during the course of this investigation seems to bear repeating here. According to this individual, the possibility that the information in the "TM" is correct while the document itself may be a fabrication should not be ruled out. Apparently, cases involving leaks of sensitive information, the retyping or recasting of documents is not especially uncommon to the process.

Finally, two points of evidence suggest that something occurred on September 24, 1947 which seriously upset Secretary of Defense James Forrestal. The first is that when penning an entry into his personal diary concerning his meeting that day at the White House with President Truman and Dr. Bush, he erroneously gave the date as September 25th and referred to Dr. Bush as "Mr.". "25 Sept. 1947," he wrote, "Saw the President today with Mr. Bush." While both mistakes seem odd for the usually meticulous Mr. Forrestal, what seems even more significant is that within a hour or so after leaving his meeting at the White House, he presented himself at the District of Columbia's Metropolitan Police Department and secured a permit to carry a concealed personal firearm (Smith & Wesson revolver).⁽²⁶⁾

THE CUTLER-TWINING MEMO (JUL. 1985)

The story of the circumstances leading to the discovery of the Cutler-Twining Memorandum ("CT") is a lengthy one, most of which is better saved for another forum because it is not directly pertinent to this report. Since our purpose is to present an analysis of the document

itself, coverage of background material should necessarily be limited to only those facts and events which directly contribute to that objective. With that in mind, the essentials are these:

From roughly August, 1979 through mid-1987, Moore maintained Post Office Box 189 in Dewey, Arizona as a correspondence address. Following his move to California in early 1983, this address saw considerably less use, but Moore continued to maintain it anyway and to check its contents once every few months during trips to visit his children then living in nearby Prescott. Occasionally, when periods of several months had passed without his being able to visit Dewey, Moore would phone the local postmaster and ask if any first class mail had accumulated. If some had, Moore would then arrange for the postmaster to place it all in a large envelope and forward same to him in California. Such was the case in the early part of March, 1985.

The packet arrived several days later. Among the various items therein was an unusual postal card which, based upon the stamp, had been mailed from New Zealand, but (according to the fine print) had been procured from the Ethiopian Tourism Commission, Box 189, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. (Note that the box number <189> is the same as Moore's P.O. box in Dewey.) It was impossible to determine when or from what city the card had been mailed since that part of the cancellation had run off the edge of the card. (A second, similar card which arrived several months later, however, was postmarked Christchurch.) It was also not possible to determine when the card had arrived, except to say that it must have been sometime between the Christmas holidays of 1984 (when Moore had last checked the box) and the time that Moore called the Dewey postmaster.

The message on the card was typewritten and enigmatic. Part of it read:

"When doors won't open, search for windows. Add some zest to your trip to Washington; Try Reece's pieces. For a stylish look, shop Suit Land."

At the time the card arrived, Moore and Shandera weren't planning any trip to Washington but, as coincidence would have it, Friedman was already there. Moore called Friedman at his motel and read the card to him over

the phone. Both concurred that the reference to "Reece's pieces" probably meant Ed Reese, who was associated with the then Modern Military Branch of the National Archives and whom Stanton had planned to see anyway. (It took Shandera to point out that Reece's Pieces was the candy that Elliott gave to E.T. in the movie.) Suitland, of course, is the site of a large federal documents repository associated with the Archives.

When Friedman checked with Ed Reese, he was informed that arrangements had been made by the Air Force to declassify a large block of files which had originated with the Intelligence Directorate between 1946 and 1955, and that many of these had originally been Top Secret. Curiously, according to Reese, the Air Force seemed to be giving some priority to this project and was taking some unusual steps in the process— like sending over a number of declassification officers directly from the Pentagon to handle the task. There was also a block of old Air Technical Intelligence Center (ATIC) records from Suitland which specifically dealt with former Air Force UFO projects (mostly SIGN and GRUDGE), which were also being released as part of this process. Friedman made arrangements to be kept informed of the progress of the declassification process.

The original plan was for Moore, Shandera and Friedman to go to Washington as soon as the documents were available for inspection, but as things worked out only Moore and Shandera were ultimately able to make the trip. They departed on Monday, July 15, 1985, about a week after they had been informed that the documents were ready. On Thursday, July 18, after having searched through nearly 100 boxes of material, Shandera discovered the "CT". It was in box number 189 (!) of Record Group 341, immediately adjacent to file folder 4-1846. (Moore and Shandera have plans to publish a full account of the circumstances leading up to the finding of the "CT" at a later date. Meanwhile, readers will find a few additional details in Friedman's report.)

PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

A copy of the "CT" memorandum is reproduced herein as Appendix I. It is an unsigned, faded-blue carbon copy of an original on onion-skin paper which bears the watermarks "Dictionation Onionskin" and what appears to be "Fox". Very slight raised impressions of some of the