

Aug 9, 1993

Dear Ufologist,

You have recently received a copy of the Associated Investigator's Report (AIR) #1, "published" by the Associated Investigators Group (AIG). This report was mailed directly to over 100 people known to be interested in UFO research, although, it was not mailed to me nor to many of the other "attackees" discussed in the paper. The initial recipients subsequently mailed copies to others. If you mailed copies to friends, please also send each one a copy of this response.

A major part of the AIR report is concerned with my "secret" association with the CIA. Other portions of the paper makes generally disparaging remarks about me and several other noted UFO researchers..

AIR #1 raises the question of whether or not my association with the CIA impacted on my UFO investigations or on the activities of the Fund for UFO Research. I can assure that that it did not, as is more fully described in the enclosed paper. I feel no need to 'defend' my CIA association, inasmuch as it is not based on UFO research, but rather on professional activities related to my work for the Navy, which is totally unrelated to UFO research. I have written this paper to clarify my association with the CIA and also for another reason which is probably of more importance to ufologists who may be recipients of further AIG reports.

The claim made in the AIR #1 (see the last page) that there are no errors in the paper and this is followed by the "promise" (or is it a threat?) of more "good" research to follow. In other words the writer of AIR #1 claims for himself, and for the Associated Investigators Group, godlike accuracy. This sort of accuracy would, indeed be reassuring, if it were true, especially in light of the AIR's which are promised on crashed saucers, mind control, CIA projects, etc.

However, I have discovered numerous errors in the paper. Therefore I feel it is my duty to inform the ufo community that this paper is not as accurate as one might hope. Furthermore, along with the errors is an overabundance of innuendo and false logic. Hence I must caution the readers of this and future papers against blind acceptance of what the AIR reports say. I'm afraid that if this paper is any example, then we must be prepared for a lot of hot AIR.

One more thing. The "ghost writer" of this paper is one Walter Todd Zechel who was an important figure in UFO research about 15 years ago. His approach to the UFO subject was to do anything which would advance his agenda, even at the expense and I mean \$\$\$, of other people. I know a number of people who suffered

economic loss as a result of WTZ's irresponsibility.

Bruce Maccabee

Hot A.I.R

or

The Mark of Zechel

by

Bruce Maccabee  
(not anonymous)

(Special message: I have plenty of case investigations and analyses to keep me busy. I don't need this crap, which forces me to use my precious time responding to worthless charges.)

"As you well know, there are a lot of people out there with particular axes to grind or pet cases or theories to spread around. Some of these people would like nothing more than to drag you down into the mud with them. I fervently hope that you will continue to operate with the same brilliance and astute logic and objectivity I've always admired in you. Please continue to demand evidence and proof, and demand as much of them as you would me."

(from a letter to Bruce Maccabee by Walter Todd Zechel, June 21, 1986)

The UFO community has recently been "rocked" by an unpublished but widely circulated paper entitled Associated Investigators Report #1 (abbrev. AIR) which reveals, "for the first time anywhere," my [secret] association with the CIA. It also levels charges of incompetence and/or outright fraud against several other UFO investigators. After reading this report the intelligent reader will, I'm sure, be somewhat puzzled. Why was it done? By whom? Was I really a CIA mole inside the UFO community? What is the Associated Investigators Group? Who wrote the report? Is it as accurate as it claims? Is there a "hidden agenda" for this paper? Or is this report really just a lot of [hot] AIR?

The Associated Investigators Group members are not named, although 14 pseudonyms are given at the end of the paper. Even the writer of the paper is

not named. In an "appendix" following the main text there is the following statement: "For the most part, this report is based upon interviews or discussion with the subjects named herein, and have been stated as accurately, candidly and forthrightly as possible. If there are any errors, which is unlikely, they are probably the result of misinterpretations by the subjects." (Subjects? Is this an experiment?) Clearly the writer assigns godlike accuracy to him (her) self and to the AIG. This would be reassuring, [if it were true] . The writer then advises readers to "not waste your time and energy attempting to impede our investigations by attempting to guess our identities..."

CAVEAT EMPTOR! Although gullible readers will probably fall for this crap, the astute reader will suspect any investigative writing which proclaims perfection! (The astute reader will also note one error immediately: "pellican" is not the correct spelling.) The reader should also be wary of any writing by people who (a) don't have the intestinal fortitude (read "guts") to identify themselves as they accuse others and (b) have the gall to advise the readers not to try and identify them. One wonders what these "stealth investigators" have to hide. Could a similar paper be done about them?

Finally, there is also a promise of more of this "good" research to follow and [that is the reason for this paper]. Although there is no need for me to defend my association with the CIA, since it is based on continuing professional activities related to my job as a Navy physicist, I feel that I must alert UFOlogists to the evidence of poor research, use of inference and innuendo, errors of fact and just plain mudslinging in this paper so that readers will be better able to [judge the level of accuracy of any future hot AIR] reports. On the other hand, the promise of future investigative reports may also be just hot air.)

## SUMMARY OF THE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST ME AND MY RESPONSE

The perceptive reader will, of course, immediately realize that, had my association with the CIA really been totally secret, the paper would not have been written because [no one would have known about it].

The writer essentially poses a legitimate question (which other people have asked me already), namely, what has been the nature of my association with the CIA and has it impacted on my UFO research and my activities in the field. Unfortunately, however, the writer, goes on to argue, via innuendo and false logic, that my association with the CIA has been poor judgement on my part, at best, and, at worst, has negatively impacted the UFO field in two ways which are treated separately below. In the following paragraphs I will answer the legitimate questions. I will also identify the false logic and innuendo and respond to it in a manner that rational people will understand.

ACCUSATION # 1: The writer charges that my support for UFO cases which, in the mind of the writer at least, are "obviously" poor cases or frauds (New Zealand, Kirtland Landing Case, Gulf Breeze, Guardian) has caused other researchers to waste time and money carrying out their own investigations. (How horrible!) But more germane to the issue which is the subject of this paper, my CIA association, is the writer's allegation that my support for these cases has been "CIA inspired." According to the writer, "This certainly would have served the CIA's interest in keeping serious investigation of the UFO phenomena out of the public domain." Also, according to the writer my support of these cases is evidence for poor judgement on my part, and no one with such poor judgement should be a leader in the UFO field (after all...I might lead people astray!) (I guess the writer does not think much of the average ufologist's ability to discern fact from fiction in UFO investigation.)

RESPONSE: The writer implies, without evidence, that a general policy of the CIA, the "CIA's interest," is to suppress serious UFO investigation. That implication runs counter my impression gained over the last nine years or so which is that, at least the part of the CIA with which I have had contact, [has no policy or "interest" regarding UFO investigation], although several employees have expressed an interest and numerous employees have attended the several UFO lectures (the term 'briefings' is too formal) I have presented there. The writer alleges that my support for these cases has been "CIA inspired." WRONG! The fact is that the my CIA acquaintances have never indicated that I should support any particular sighting. In fact, the comments they make tend to be skeptical or just plain negative regarding sightings and [the reality of UFO phenomena in general]. My support for these cases has nothing to do with the CIA and has everything to do with my own investigations of them. The astute reader will realize that the opinions of these cases offered by the writer are just that...opinions, unsupported by any evidence in the hot AIR report. If the writer or any of the AIG group are intelligent enough to have good arguments against these cases then they can send me their arguments directly or even argue in public if they want to.

The writer accuses me of poor judgment in supporting these cases. It's hard to defend oneself against accusations of "poor judgment." It is like being accused of "poor taste." People will have differing opinions about the same subject. Which person is correct? It becomes more a matter of consensus than establishable fact. At any rate, I will stand by my past investigations and publications. I have rejected many alleged UFO sightings, but the particular ones held in disfavor by the hot AIR writer are cases I did not reject for reasons which I considered to be very good at the time and I still consider them to be good. If others wish to disagree publicly with my conclusions they should be willing to state their argument(s) ["anonymously"] as opposed to ["anonymously."]

On the other hand, these charges of poor judgment can be reversed. I

suspect that the AIG members, should they ever reveal themselves, will be charged with poor judgment for having circulated this paper widely in spite of the numerous errors, [ad hominem] attacks and argument by illogic and innuendo (see below). They will also be charged with "unkind conduct" for [not even having the courtesy to send me a copy first, although I am the main target of their attacks!] I first learned that the paper existed during the late evening of July 24 when Jim Moseley called me to ask me questions about it's allegations. Over the next week I heard from other people who had received copies. I learned that it had even appeared in England during the weekend of July 24. But, oddly enough, of the "subjects" I talked to, [none of them had received copies directly from the AIG.] I finally got a copy 6 days after this "load" had been dropped on an unsuspecting world from a person who had received his copy from the AIG in an envelope with no return address.

Why was this report circulated widely before I got a copy? I presume it was circulated by the [perpetrators] of this [travesty] in order to spread their [lies and innuendo] as far as possible before I (and the others mentioned herein) could respond. Furthermore, by not listing a return address or the name of a real person to contact there is no "official" person to whom I can send my response. I, therefore, must respond to the community in general.

**ACCUSATION #2:** The writer claims that the second negative impact of my association with the CIA has been its effect on the policy of the Fund for UFO Research. In particular, the writer suggests that my association with the CIA affected the decision of the Fund to reject a proposal by Walter Todd Zechel (WTZ) to sue the CIA a second time. The writer further charges that my CIA association also caused the Fund to support MJ-12 research in spite of "knowing" that the MJ-12 papers are fakes.

**RESPONSE:** WRONG and WRONG AGAIN! One fact that the writer has failed to take into account ("don't bother me with the facts, this is what I want to say") is that I did not "run" the Fund like an autocracy. I had one vote on the Executive Committee of five people and each action required at least 3 out of 5 positive votes. My suggestions were voted down a number of times.

In order to support his argument that my association with the CIA impacted on the Fund decision to reject MJ-12's proposal the writer has resorted to incomplete reporting and biasing of the facts. I present my version of the story of this particular incident below. Before beginning, however, I would like to point out that most of the information used in the AIG was supplied by WTZ. I know this because much of the information which is in the report I supplied to him, alone. The report also contains information which he, alone, told me (and which I didn't tell others...I kept his confidence, but obviously he didn't return the favor!). In fact, the whole paper bears the [Mark of

Zeche]. This leads me to speculate that WTZ's intent is to use this paper to get me off the Executive Committee of the Fund. With me not on the Executive Committee he could once again propose to re-sue the CIA without having to worry about my presumed interference or alerting of CIA officials (which I didn't do the first time and wouldn't have done at any time!). If that is true, then WTZ may be surprised to learn that I had, in fact, stepped down in favor of Richard Hall at the end of March, 1993, [months before there was any hint of the AIG paper]. I am now, after 13 years of continual "duty" with the Fund, Chairman Emeritus, with all the privileges that title bestows (none!). (My "golden parachute" leaves a lot to be desired.)

Now let's get to the core of the matter, the rejection of WTZ's proposal to re-sue the CIA and the subsequent funding of Stan Friedman's MJ-12 research, the pertinent portion of the hot AIR paper page 8, last paragraph) reads as follows (I have labelled the abstractions from the paper with numbers for later reference):

(1) "It must be pointed out that the Fund rejected a detailed proposal to re-sue the CIA under FOIA submitted by Todd Zeche1 a few years ago. Zeche1 had outlined a plan to go after [the 15,000 documents described by Maccabee's friend, Kit Green], and had asked for a [paltry \$500] to get the effort rolling, using a diligent attorney who had volunteered to do the work. The Fund quickly rejected Zeche1's proposal, but later handed \$16000 to Stan Friedman in an effort to validate the MJ-12 documents." (my emphasis)

(2) "Unfortunately, we are forced now to re-examine the motives of Dr. Maccabee. We must ask if his CIA contacts had any input into this (or any) decisions regarding proposals. This input may not have been so obvious as one would first think. Consider the scenario wherein Maccabee's CIA contacts express subtle hints suggesting to Maccabee that there may have been an MJ-12, this may have been enough to influence his decision to make such a large grant. Conversely, who knows what input the CIA had in Maccabee's rejection of Zeche1's modest proposal."

I would like to answer the last implied question immediately: [the CIA had exactly no input to the rejection of WTZ's proposal, nor did it have any input to any of the decisions of the Fund For UFO Research. Period!] Of course the writer, and WTZ, could have learned this (whether or not they believed it) by just asking. But their approach is more consistent with that of paranoid delusionals who have fun speculating about being "under constant attack by dark forces" (in this case, the CIA) and don't like to ask direct questions and receive direct answers because they don't believe the answers. Furthermore, as I pointed out above, even if I had attempted to interject a "CIA perspective" into the internal deliberations of the Fund - [which I never did], the other members could equally well argue from their own perspectives. And when it came to the final "showdown", I had only a single vote. But, again, this logic is

irrelevant according to the writer whose attitude is "don't bother me with logic or the facts; I like my own conclusions."

Referring, now, to section (1) of the paragraph above, why did the Fund reject WTZ's? proposal? The very short answer is that it was at the wrong time and by the wrong person. More specifically, there are four basic reasons. Three of these are WTZ's own fault, and one was "bad timing." To understand these reasons the reader needs to know some history that is not generally available (see CLEAR INTENT by Greenwood and Fawcett for more information on the CIA lawsuit).

The original 1977-1978 CIA lawsuit was prosecuted under the rights granted by the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act (FOIPA...sometimes abbreviated FOI). The suit was filed on the behalf of a UFO group, now defunct, called Ground Saucer Watch (GSW). The success of the suit came about largely as a result of WTZ's own effort in conjunction with New York attorney Peter Gersten and with considerable help from Brad Sparks. The lawsuit was carried through to a surprising (to most of the world) conclusion: in December 1978 the CIA released [hundreds] of pages of UFO related material spanning some 30 years after claiming for months that it was involved for only a short time in late 1952 and early 1953 (the time leading up to the Robertson panel fiasco and the subsequent panel report which proposed "debunking" as the solution to the UFO problem). The fact that the CIA had lots of pages of material was not surprising to WTZ and others involved in the suit, however, because they had been "led to believe by the CIA's legal staff that the number of documents to be accounted for would be in the area of 10,000." (quote taken from the draft of "For Your Eyes Only," a paper written in January, 1987, by WTZ). (Years earlier, in the January 1979 bulletin of the Citizens Against UFO Secrecy, "Just CAUS," WTZ wrote that in September, 1978, "U.S. Attorney William Briggs led CAUS officials to believe that the CIA had located in excess of 5,000 documents. Evidently somehow over the years this number was doubled.) Furthermore, according to WTZ in his proposal to the Fund, a "reliable CIA source of mine" pointed out that most of the "components" the CIA which were searched were the wrong ones. Hence, presumably there could be unreleased documents in other components of the agency.

The release of a mere 900 pages dismayed WTZ and the others and they began planning, [in the spring of 1979], for another lawsuit. (This planning was going on when I met a CIA employee who suggested that there could be many more pages of material. Although this incident plays a large role in the AIR reconstruction of the events, [it played no role] in the Fund decision. My contact with the CIA is discussed more fully below.) However, for various reasons there was no second suit of the CIA in 1979 and WTZ subsequently dropped out of UFO research leaving a trail of unpaid bills and a "few pissed off people in my wake" (quote from his proposal).

Move ahead, now to December, 1986 (not exactly "a few years ago," as implied by the hot AIR paper). The Fund received a proposal from WTZ to re-sue the CIA for the presumed thousands of documents that hadn't been released. The Executive Committee of the Fund reviewed his proposal and made its decision based on the following factors:

(a) WTZ did not present a strong case that more pages would be released under a new FOI lawsuit. First his "evidence" that there were more documents was largely speculation based on hearsay or on information from confidential sources about which he would say nothing. In other words, he provided no [proof] that there were thousands more pages to be released. (In fact, one goal of the suit was a search to find out if there were more more documents.) Second, the previous suit had been successful only in retrieving documents of Secret classification and below. Both the CIA and later NSA (National Security Agency) lawsuits showed that the government could appeal to "national security" to withhold documents. There was no reason to believe that the same excuses wouldn't be used again to protect the "really good stuff" we wanted. In other words, they might locate some more, even many more, documents and simply refuse to release them all or in part for national security reasons. Hence the Executive Committee did not see much hope that a new lawsuit would produce hundreds or thousands, or [any], more documents than we already had.

(b) Had this proposal been sent by someone else we might have been more favorably disposed toward it. Although proposals to the Fund are evaluated more in terms of the capability of an investigator than his personality and personal history, in this case we could not overlook WTZ's actions in the past. Although he had established himself as a good, persistent investigator of UFO crashes and government cover-up, his meteoric rise (1976-77) and fall (late 1979) was well known to all of us. As he admitted in his proposal, his complete obsession with uncovering the cover-up overpowered his good sense in dealing with other investigators. When he left the field, some might say "drummed out," he owed money for phone investigations he had carried out at other people's expense. He had, to use his phrase in the proposal, "left a few pissed off people in my wake" when he vanished from the scene in late 1979, having been "burned out." The Executive Committee felt that the Fund would be condemned by many or most other researchers if it supported Mr. WTZ in [any] activity.

(c) WTZ shot himself in the foot by indicating that big money - that's BIG money - was soon to follow. He wrote in his proposal that he was authoring two books, one of which would be a hardcover with a "six figure advance...currently being negotiated." There would also be a feature film budgeted at another six figure number. He was expecting to submit part of the book to a publisher in 3 months. The Executive Committee members read this and asked, "if there are megabucks only a few months away, why does he need us?"



(d) The fourth and final "killer" reason was bad timing. Perhaps WTZ, not being active in the field, did not know that in 1985 the Fund had volunteered to put on the "Fortieth Birthday Party" in the Nation's Capitol. I refer to June 24, 1987 as the 40th anniversary of Arnold's sighting, and the party was the International MUFON Symposium. The Executive Committee had decided to make this as international as possible by inviting researchers from all over the world. We knew that this would take money...more than we could take in "at the door" from the attendees alone. By the fall of 1986 we were activitely searching for donations (and beginning to chew our fingernails). We expected to have to raise some \$15,000 or more in donations [beyond] the expected registration fees. By December, 1986, when we received WTZ's proposal, we had not yet achieved our goal...[although we had already committed to a number of speakers from overseas]. Our collective finger nails were getting shorter.

It was in this context that we evaluated WIZ's proposal to re-sue the CIA for a "paltry 500 to get the effort rolling," as it says in the AIR. WRONG! Had it [only] been \$500, and if it had been someone other than WTZ, we just [might] have been interested. However, it wasn't just \$500. The suit would have required an "initial contribution of \$500 to cover basic expenses in preparing the suit" and "once the suit was ready to file...[an additional contribution of about \$2,000 as a retainer for the attorney(s)]" (from WTZ's proposal). There was no mention of a "diligent attorney who had volunteered to do the legal work." Since WTZ's time scale was measured in months, we could see that the \$500 right up front would be followed soon by another \$2,000, for a total of \$2,500 [that would be needed during the spring/summer of 1987 for his lawsuit]. Since we were trying to save every penny toward the MUFON Symposium, still 6 months away, [we weren't about to commit to anything until we had paid for the symposium]. In other words, we had our own problems with money. Now reread reason (c) above. The Executive Committee members wondered why he needed a "paltry" \$2,500 from us when, if he waited a few months, he would be [rolling in dough]. (Note: evidently his book and movie proposals also fell through.)

As you may well imagine, the combination of these reasons was enough to cause the Executive Committee vote against the proposal. My "CIA connection" (reference section (2) above) had nothing to do with the rejection. In fact, I never discussed his proposal [or any other proposal] with my CIA contacts. Furthermore, I had no "protective feelings" for the CIA...and I still don't. I still think they're holding onto something we want and if someone should propose another lawsuit, then have at it!

So now you see that the version of this "rejection incident" as reported in the AIR, where any errors are "unlikely," is a lot of hot air...just as their claim to investigatorial perfection!

The Fund's decision not to fund the CIA lawsuit apparently did not sit well

with WTZ. In the draft of his last issue of "For Your Eyes Only" written in January, 1987 he refers to his offer to "launch a new suit against the CIA, this time seeking the 15,000 documents that were never scattered throughout the CIA's files as it contended, but were instead held in one location, as would be expected if UFOs are considered a serious intelligence target. But it appears UFOlogists are more concerned with [holding conventions] where everyone can propose their latest theories and wallow in the comradery of fellow believers, than they are to get down in the trenches and slug it out with those responsible for making UFOs a laughing matter and relegating the subject to the science fiction section." (my emphasis) As the reader will note, this disparaging reference to "holding conventions" is a low blow; the Fund was already committed to holding a convention. We didn't have the money to do both, and we couldn't arbitrarily cancel the convention to support WTZ's speculative proposal.

Referring, now, to paragraph (1) above and the research into the MJ-12 documents, the hot AIR paper says that the Fund "quickly rejected Zechel's proposal, but later handed \$16,000 to Friedman.." It does not point out that Friedman received support for MJ-12 research [2 1/2 years later], under conditions that were considerably different from the conditions under which WTZ's proposal was rejected. The MJ-12 papers, more precisely referred to as the "Eisenhower Briefing Document," (EIB) were released in the late spring of 1987, just before the 1987 Symposium. Charges and countercharges began flying around immediately and continued into 1988. In the summer of 1988 the Fund took a poll of contributors to determine what interested them the most. MJ-12 came out on top. The Fund then made a public appeal for a \$16,000 proposal by Stan Friedman to try to prove or disprove the validity of the document. We all knew it was a shot in the dark, but only by dilligent searching of old records could we hope to learn anything. Everyone who contributed to the special MJ-12 effort knew exactly what the money was going for. The Fund did not use general funds over which the community had no control.

Referring to paragraph (2), above, the writer questions whether or not my "CIA contacts had any input to this" and suggests that they may have hinted the MJ-12 documents were real, thus influencing me to "make such a large grant." As I have stated above, however, the CIA contacts never advised me one way or the other and never influenced the Fund decisions one way or another. I'll go farther to say that they never hinted that the MJ-12 documents were real. They were as puzzled and skeptical as everyone.

The writer has alledged that I supported MJ-12 research while knowing that the EIB was a fake. WRONG! I [still] don't know whether it is fake or not, or whether it might be partially true and partially false. Numerous investigators have provided circumstantial evidence on both sides of the question. Many of the "conclusive" arguments against the document have been shown to be ill conceived. Yet we have yet to find conclusive proof of its reality.

## MORE HOT AIR

Having discussed...and dispensed with...the two major allegations of this paper I will now deal with the other allegations. This is done in the Appendix on an item-specific basis. My discussion of the various items listed there illustrates the errors in this paper. Without trying to analyze each slanted word and sentence, and continuing most of my discussion to events, etc., which are directly connected to me or which I know about, I have found 19 errors of fact, illogic or innuendo in the self-proclaimed "perfect" paper. One person I spoke to about this paper pointed out that whenever he gets something like this, loaded with [ad hominem] attacks and verging on libel and slander, he automatically assumes that maybe 50% is completely false, 50% is basically true, and that the true 50% is written in such a way as to make it look bad for whomever the paper is about. I guess that person hit the nail on the head this time.

But what is important now is not this widely circulated paper. The "cat is now out of the bag" regarding my "CIA association" and from now on I'll probably be viewed with suspicion by the more paranoid members of the UFO community. The important question for the UFO community is how to view the next AIR paper which may report on items for which there are no independent checks. As this paper shows, the AIG members are not infallible (far from it!). Hence readers of any such reports should be prepared to view very skeptically any further hot AIR reports.

(P.S. Now re-read the abstract from WTZ's letter to me in 1986 at the beginning of this paper.)

## APPENDIX

To avoid having to virtually retype the AIR, I refer to the items of interest by listing the page, paragraph and line which contains specific words of interest and these words are [italicized]. The reader is invited to use the AIR as a reference for the context of the items and to keep track of the number of factual errors and inferences presented as fact in order to better assess the claim that any such errors are "unlikely." Errors are expressly designated as ERROR followed by a # sign.

ITEM 1 - pg 1, para. 1, sentence 1: "long standing [secret] relationship with the CIA and U.S. Intelligence community." Although my first contact with the CIA was UFO related (see below), my contacts since 1984 have been as a result of my Navy work. Although I have not publicized this information, WTZ knew, as did the members of the Fund and various other members of the UFO

community. Hence it has not been a real "secret." If it were, this paper wouldn't have been written because no one would have known.

ITEM 2 - pg.1, para. 1, sent. 1: "[briefing them about various UFO matters and Investigators]." I have discussed UFO matters with several employees who have expressed an interest in UFOs and have provided them with my opinions on various cases and people [just as I would with any other persons interested in the subject including other ufologists, newsmedia reporters, etc]. The use of the term "briefings" is too formal. Casual discussions or, for groups of people, informal lunchtime lectures would be more appropriate. The CIA invites people with many different interests to provide entertainment lectures for the employees. (I once heard Tom Clancy speak there.)

ITEM 3 - pg.1, para. 9, sent. 2: "At the same time and for undisclosed reasons, Maccabee briefed the CIA men on the CIA's own UFO files released under the Freedom of Information Act." After the 1987 MUFON Symposium in Washington, D.C., where the MJ-12 papers were discussed publicly for the first time Ron Pandolfi invited me to give a general lecture to employees on UFOs and MJ-12. I took the opportunity to inform the CIA men and [women], which included employees of all "ranks" including secretaries, about "their own documents" because (hold your breath....here is the formerly [undisclosed reason]) I wanted them to know what their own employer had been doing. I also wanted to see what the response would be. After all, CIA documents would, presumably, have some considerable level of credibility so I tried to make the case for UFOs based largely on those documents. After that I discussed the MJ-12 papers in the context of having built a case for UFO reality using the CIA documents. I learned later what the response was: many of the listeners became interested in the subject and started snooping around in whatever files they had access to. Ron said that I created a lot of "spies" in the agency. However, I have no evidence that anyone found anything not already contained in the FOIPA document package.

ITEM 4: pg.1, para. 5 sent. 1: "Maccabee first [approached] the CIA in early 1979..." (after visiting New Zealand as part of my investigation of the world famous New Zealand Sightings of December, 1978). WRONG! Actually, I never [approached] the CIA. The CIA contact was made, [not at my request], by a scientist who worked for the MITRE corporation. (See below) ERROR #1

ITEM 5: pg.1, para. 5, sent. 2: "...Maccabee, for [unclear reasons] decided the film represented some sort of probative evidence of UFOs and [set out to bring it to the attention of CIA officials]." WRONG! I [never] "set out to bring it to the attention of CIA officials." My reasons for viewing the New Zealand sightings as valid evidence may be unclear to the writer, who has probably never studied them (and quite possibly [couldn't understand the technical arguments even if he did!]), but they are clear to numerous other people who have heard the lectures I have given and read the published papers,

including papers in [Applied Optics], a technical journal. The claim that I [set out] to inform the CIA couldn't be [farther] from the truth. Informing the CIA had never even crossed my mind. After all, the CIA was the "bad guys" who had just two months before, been caught with their pants down when they released hundreds of pages of material. ERROR #2

ITEM 6: pg. 1, para. 5 sent. 3: "He then [put out feelers through his contacts with companies performing tasks for the CIA]..." WRONG! The way this is presented the reader might assume that the writer (or WTZ) has some evidence, as, for example, by checking with companies that perform tasks for the CIA. However, this is a (one of many!) false impression created by the writer. I never contacted any companies. What I did was tell Jack Acuff, Director of NICAP at the time, that I would like to speak to experts in the field of radar. He, in turn, put me in contact with a scientist, Dr. Gordon MacDonald, at the MITRE corporation. I was invited to discuss the NZ sightings with him and several other scientists at MITRE in McLean, Va. and I did (and they generally agreed with my conclusions). Then, a week or so later, I learned that MacDonald had contacted a man at the CIA who contacted me and offered to provide technical consultation if I would provide a [briefing] to some CIA employees. At first I was leery of doing anything with the CIA, but I knew they had radar experts, so I stipulated that if they would give me some feedback I'd tell them what I know. So I briefed them and I received some helpful comments. There were some minor criticisms but no strong disagreements with my analysis. (I had concluded, by the way, that in certain instances there were correlated radar-visual observations of unidentified objects.) ERROR #3.

ITEM 7: pg. 1 para. 7 and pages 2 and 3. This presents the hot AIR version of my interaction with a CIA employee and his [supposed] statement that there were "15,000 UFO-related documents." The actual history is as follows:

After I discussed the NZ case one employee, Dr. Christopher "Kit" Green (KG), invited me to visit the CIA again a week or so later to have a general UFO discussion with him and a couple of other employees. It was at this time, during a discussion of the CIA lawsuit, that he made a general comment that there [could] be more pages because he knew, from the compartmented organization of the agency, that other parts of the agency could have information of which he would not be aware, even though he thought he was the "custodian" of the UFO files. In other words, [he knew that he would be unaware of any UFO files that might be possessed by "custodians" in other components of the Agency]. This all happened in late March and early April, 1979. I knew that WTZ and Peter Gersten were interested in going after more agency documents, so, about a month later I revealed my "secret" meeting and KG's comment that there might be more, perhaps 15,000 more, pages. This I did to support his WTZ's effort. I don't remember exactly what I said, but, since WTZ recorded my conversation (without telling me) he can perhaps supply me with a transcript.

Whatever I said, it is clear that WTZ interpreted it as meaning that KG had said there [were] 15,000 UFO-related documents. Almost immediately WTZ wanted to know if I would reveal the contact's name, which I didn't. Then he wanted me to find out if the contact would be willing to testify to the existence of 15,000 more pages. I called KG and he made it clear that he didn't [know] that there were thousands more pages. He could only testify to what had been in his own file, which he had given to the FOIPA coordinator, a thousand pages or so. All else was speculation. When I told this to WTZ and Gersten they appeared to get angry and wanted to sue [me] for covering up information. I managed to convince Gersten that I didn't know anything and that I couldn't force KG to make any statements that he didn't want to make. That ended the situation.

ITEM 8: Pg. 2, para. 7: "It was clear from Maccabee's statements to Zechel that Maccabee intended to cooperate with the CIA on a continuing basis..."  
WRONG! I didn't reveal KG's name because I felt it was not my prerogative. If WTZ and Gersten wanted to sue the hell out of the CIA that was their business. I didn't want to get KG in trouble if there were a lawsuit simply because he had inadvertently leaked information, [if] it was valid information. I didn't expect to continue my contact with the CIA and had no further contacts until 1984 (see below). ERROR #4

ITEM 9: Pg. 3, para. 2, sent. 2,3 : "At one point Zechel asked him directly, if he was working for the CIA. [You might say that, Maccabee replied]." I would like to state that I have never been employed by the CIA nor paid by the CIA. The hot AIR paper should have pointed out that the context of this statement was a casual conversation with WTZ. I pointed out that by talking with Ron Pandolfi or other employees I was providing them with information, and [in that context] I was "working for" the CIA. I was saving the employees some effort to learn what they could by themselves by other means. However, I didn't tell them everything. In other words, I have withheld information from Ron and others. I never mentioned WTZ's proposal to re-sue the agency, for example.

Regarding my employment, I might add that, although I am a civilian employee of the Navy, I have never been in Naval Intelligence or any intelligence agency. Nor have I been advised in any way related to UFO research activities by any agency of the government except that the laboratory where I work has said "keep our name out of it."

ITEM 10: pg. 3, para. 2, sent. 4 : "In [April 1990], however, Maccabee began to back-pedal on what he'd been told by the UFO files custodian in 1979.....In this version the CIA man had merely been speculating about the totality of the CIA's collection, judging by the one or two thousand he had control over."  
WRONG! Evidently WTZ has "conveniently" (because it makes a better story?) forgotten that the "back peddling" had all occurred in [May, 1979] . For the reader who doesn't know who is telling the truth I ask whether or not you think that WTZ would have failed to pursue this point (i.e., are there 15,000

documents or aren't there?) in the spring of 1979 when the subject was hot...[he needed to know whether or not there were thousands more pages for the next lawsuit]. I submit that WTZ did the logical thing in 1979 and asked me at that time to clarify the situation: was my contact aware, or wasn't he aware, of "15,000" pages? The writer's indication that this "back-pedaling" didn't take place until 1990 is part of the poor investigation evident in this paper.  
ERROR #5

The AIR paper continues in the next several paragraphs to build an argument which the writer portrays as logical (the "custodian" should know how many documents there are). However, the truth or falsity of the claim that there are thousands more pages of UFO documents cannot be determined from the information I was given. The simple fact is that, because of the compartmented nature of the CIA (and other intelligence agencies), [it may be that no one who knows how many pages there are].

ITEM 11: pg. 3, para. 7, sent. 3: "Green was awarded the CIA's National Intelligence Medal for his work on a "classified project" from 1979 to 1983 [precisely the years in which Maccabee was meeting with him at CIA headquarters]." WRONG! (Way to go, Kit!) It appears that the writer/WTZ is trying to imply that the "classified project" was related to UFO research and my contacts. I don't know what the "classified project" was, but I do know it had nothing to do with my contacts from 1979 to 1983 because [there weren't any]. After that last meeting with KG in the spring of 1979 I didn't see him again and had no contact with the agency until June, 1984 when I was contacted by Dr. Ronald Pandolfi regarding my Navy work. He had been tracking developments by the "other side" in that field of research and wanted to know what the US state of the art was. ERROR #6

During my first meeting with Ron we discussed my Navy research. I didn't mention my previous visit to the Agency 5 years before, nor did I mention anything about UFOs because I didn't want him to think I was "nuts." However, I subsequently learned that he discussed my visit with someone who did remember, because soon afterward I got a phone call in which he brought up my UFO interest. I didn't quite know how to take this and approached the situation with some caution. So, over the next few years, when we met to discuss LIS research and projects we would occasionally also discuss UFO cases I was working on and ufology in general. There were several people who were mildly interested in the subject, but none, to my knowledge, was actively involved in research. In the summer 1987 after the release of the MJ-12 papers and the MUFON International Symposium in Washington, DC, where the MJ-12 papers were discussed publicly for the first time Ron asked if I would be willing to give a lunchtime talk at the CIA. That sounded amusing, so I said yes. My talk to all-comers, secretaries, messenger boys, researchers and spies (?), centered around the papers which the CIA had itself released, and, of course, the

already controversial MJ-12 papers. Although I gained no new information, Ron said that I created a lot of "spies" in the Agency, as everyone tried to find documents on their own. (Clearly most of the employees were not familiar with the UFO phenomenon in general and the CIA documents in particular.) Subsequently I spoke there in 1990 about the Gulf Breeze sightings and most recently about a magnetic case that occurred in Gulf Breeze last September (1992). In each case I presented lectures that I had already given to other audiences. The most recent lecture was a repeat of my presentation of the magnetic case at the April, 1993, meeting of the American Physical Society in Washington, DC.

ITEM 12: pg. 4, para. 3., last sentence: "[..Bill Moore's best known creation--the MJ-12 hoax]." WRONG! It is my belief, having known Bill and having known about his investigative approach for more than 13 years, that the suggestion that Bill faked the MJ-12 papers (EIB) is [extremely hot air]. WTZ has his own reasons for claiming that Moore faked the document. Part of WTZ's "hidden agenda" (hinted at in the paper) is to discredit the Roswell/Corona crash and the MJ-12 papers in order to build up his own baby, the Dec. (5,6,7 - pick a date), 1950 Texas-Mexico border crash (see pg. 7, para. 1,2, of the AIR report). [There is no evidence that Bill Moore created the MJ-12 documents. If they are a hoax, it is not his fault]. ERROR #7

NOTE: THE ASSERTION THAT MOORE CREATED THE EIB/MJ-12 PAPERS LEADS TO NUMEROUS OTHER ERRORS IN THE PAGES FOLLOWING PG. 4. I HAVE NOT ENUMERATED THEM.

ITEM 13: last sentence at the bottom of page 4: "There are probably thousands of people all over the country suffering from the same sort of [paranoid delusions] as Paul Bennewitz." YES! And the writer of this paper seems to be one of them. Presumably the AIG members are others.

ITEM 14: pg. 5, para. 3, sent. 4: "In fact, Moore told Todd Zechel in early 1980 that 'I'll bet you've heard that you can't [make money off UFOs?] Well, I proved that wrong!' For WTZ to accuse BM of trying to make some money off UFOs is like the pot calling the kettle black. WTZ has established a track record of grand schemes to make movies and books that would lead to BIG BUX.

ITEM 15: pg. 6, para. 8, sent. 2: "[Quickly] Moore set about circulating this material.." WRONG! The EIB was received in late December, 1984. Bill and Jamie told only a couple of people about the EIB over the next couple of years and did not generally release it until after it was published by Timothy Good in England in the late spring of 1987, [three and a half years later]. ERROR #8

ITEM 16: pg. 8, para 1, sent. 1: "...[thanks' to Maccabee's influence] ..." WRONG! Here the writer implies that I had some influence on how Whitley



Streiber in MAJESTIC and how Howard Blum in [OUT THERE] portrayed Moore and Doty. WHAT AMAZING GARBAGE. Sure I knew Whitley, but I had no involvement with his book. He met Moore on his own and formed his own opinion, I presume. As for Blum, I never had a discussion or contact with him before his book came out [or since]. Hence I could not have influenced him. ERROR #9

ITEM 17: Pg. 8, para. 5, sent. 2,3: "How much involvement did he have in spreading the MJ-12 hoax? How much influence did Ron Pandolfi have over his conduct during this whole affair?" Answer 1: I supported, and continue to support, legitimate investigation into the EIB/MJ-12 papers which are not yet proven to be a hoax. Answer 2: NONE.

ITEM 18: pg. 8, para. 6, sent. 2: (referring to my paper "UFO Landings near Kirtland AFB or Welcome to the Cosmic Watergate") The report was [co-authored by Bill Moore]. WRONG! I wrote the whole report based on my investigation. Afterward I sent it to Bill and asked him to write an addendum outlining what he knew. He did so. The title page of the report, which anyone can obtain from the Fund for UFO Research, reads "(the above title) by Bruce Maccabee with comments by Bill Moore." Bill's input to the paper is confined to the "notes" on pages 29 and 30 of the 30 page report. I made no changes in my text as a result of Bill's notes. This is hardly what one could call "co-authored." ERROR #10.

ITEM 19: pg. 8, para. 6., sent. 4: "A careful examination of the circumstances surrounding the documents ([and Maccabee's own report]) clearly shows that the document is a fraud created by Doty." WRONG! There is no evidence that it is a fraud. Furthermore, there is testimony by people mentioned in the report which indicates that it actually happened. In particular, Maj. Ernest Edwards confirmed the details about the sightings of the Manzano Guards, but, unfortunately, too late for me to include this in my paper. If the writer has any conclusive evidence that it is a fraud, as opposed to [innuendo and "wishful thinking"] (he hopes it is a fraud because it makes his story better), then I would like to see it. ERROR #11

ITEM 20: pg. 8, para. 6, sent. 7: "Maccabee now privately admits that the whole MJ-12 mess is [probably a hoax]. WRONG! I would agree that it is, [possibly] a hoax (NOT BY BILL MOORE), but I have seen no evidence that makes me think that the EIB itself is probably a hoax. [If it is a hoax, then it is extremely sophisticated, utilizing historical details that were not previously known. It certainly isn't "crude," as has been suggested by some considerably less-than-brilliant skeptics]. ERROR #12

ITEM 21: pg. 8, para. 6, sent. 2 : "When did Maccabee know the MJ-12 material was fraudulent, was it before he provided Stan Friedman with \$16,000

of Fund money?" WRONG! This sentence is evidence of the argument by innuendo and interence with some slanting of the data included. I didn't know that the document was fraudulent before Friedman's investigation and [I still don't]. [Final judgement awaits evidence...none of which is presented in the hot AIR paper].

ITEM 22: pg. 8, para. 7, sent. 2: "...and had asked for a [paltry] \$500 to get the effort rolling, using a diligent attorney who [volunteered to do the legal work]." WRONG! Here is WTZ's listing of "Costs to the Fund" : "I seek an initial contribution of \$500, which would cover my basic expenses in preparing the suit for filing. Once the suit was ready to file, I would need an additional contribution of about \$2,000 as a retainer for the attorney(s)." ERROR #13

The subject matter of this paragraph is more fully discussed in the main text of this paper.

ITEM 23: pg. 9, para. 7, ". ...all this should be viewed...in light of Dr. Maccabee's (hence FUFOR's) [concurrent relationship with the CIA]. WRONG! More ultimate claptrap. The allegations in this paper should not be viewed in the light of my CIA association. [The Fund has never had a "relationship" with the CIA]. Furthermore, as I pointed out in the main text of this paper, my CIA acquaintances had no impact on my UFO activities with respect to MJ-12 or any other aspect of government cover-up investigation. ERROR #14

ITEM 24: pg. 9, para 8., sent. 3: (regarding my analysis and support of the Gulf Breeze Sightings) "...most serious researchers have come to the conclusion that indeed the case is a hoax." Is that so? Does the writer, or WTZ have any evidence of this? Did they take a poll? Where is it published? Just how many serious researchers, as opposed to those who merely [read] papers about the case, are there? How do they explain all the other sightings? I suggest that if the AIG really knew how to investigate sightings, as opposed to writing scurrilous "expose" papers, they ought to look more carefully into Gulf Breeze (and New Zealand and Guardian).

ITEM 25: pg. 10, top para. sent. 2: "Or is his technical ability to analyze photographic evidence really that poor?" More unmitigated garbage. Would the writer like to challenge me to an analysis duel, perhaps? My analysis of the Gulf Breeze photos has recently been reviewed and expanded by Jeff Sainio. Perhaps the writer would like to smear him, too.

ITEM 26: pg. 10, top para. sent. 3: "...one could [speculate] that Dr. Maccabee's public support for the case might have been [encouraged by his intelligence contacts]." WRONG! One could also speculate that the writer is a moron or a childmolester or a sexual deviate (pick one...or several). Speculation is easy. Why didn't the writer simply ask me, "Did your

intelligence contacts "encourage" you to support the Gulf Breeze sightings?" I would have answered...[NO]. Although they didn't try to advise me one way or another, their comments were more to the opposite, since they were skeptical of the sightings. ERROR #15

Oddly enough, the writer provides support for my claim in the previous sentence that my CIA contacts [didn't] encourage me to support the Gulf Breeze Sightings by stating that Pandolfi told "others" that he considers Ed Walters to be a "total fraud." Not only has he told others, he also said that to me. However, he pointed out that he has no evidence that Ed is a fraud.

ITEM 27: pg. 10, para. 7, sent. 2, 3: (Referring to the Guardian investigation by Maccabee and Oechsler) "[It is not known] whether any Fund for UFO Research monies were expended in this investigation...again, [it is unknown] whether Fund for UFO Research monies have been expended." In keeping with the "slant" or bias throughout the paper, the writer publishes a simple question [for its value as innuendo or suggestion of wrongdoing]....a simple question which could have been answered before the publication by a simple phone call to the Chairman, Richard Hall, or to any of the other members of the Executive Board. The answer is NO (a thousand times, no).

ITEM 28: pg. 11, para. 2, last sentence: (referring to the Fund's non-support of the demonstration by Operation Right to Know) "But given Dr. Maccabee's relationship with the CIA, the actual reasons for this opposition are in question." As I have pointed out before, my "relationship with the CIA" had no effect on the policy and decisions of the Fund for UFO Research.

ITEM 29: pg. 12, para. 3 In this paragraph it is suggested that my CIA connection had something to do with the decision to "terminate" Larry Bryant's membership in the Executive Committee. WRONG! The decision was based on internal Executive Committee deliberations and my association with the CIA had nothing to do with it. [In fact, I was not in favor of terminating his membership]. ERROR #16

ITEM 30: pg. 12, para. 3: "For some reason Bryant's request [angered the CIA].." WRONG! Angered the CIA? What the hell would the CIA care about a request for FBIS reports [which are not classified] (as the AIR paper correctly reports)? I have no information that Bryant's request "angered the CIA." ERROR #17

ITEM 31: pg. 12, para. 3: "...Maccabee was scolded by Pandolfi" because of Bryant's FOI request. WRONG! He never mentioned it to me. ERROR #18

ITEM 32: pg. 12, para. 3: "Bryant's action '[could jeopardize the Fund's relationship with the CIA].'" WRONG! More misinformation. [There never was a

"Fund relationship wltH the CIA"], so Bryant's action could not jeopardize it.  
ERROR #19

ITEM 33: pg. 12, para. 5. This paragraph, entitled "Maccabee Disinforms FUFOR" is more complete poppycock. First of all, "disinformation" includes falsehood. Providing disinformation is different from providing incomplete information. It is true that I never told the Fund members everything about my CIA contacts. After all, most of my contacts were professionally related and they had no need to know.

I have ignored numerous other innuendoes and "truth-stretchers" because I don't want to end up writing a paper that is several times longer than the AIR itself. I think it is clear that the writers are not infallible and that if future papers are like this one, [LET THE READER BEWARE]!

\*\* End \*\*