

***Deception: A Review and Critical Analysis of the book, Encounter In
Rendlesham Forest***

By Peter Robbins
April-May 2014

This book is provided copyright-free and the reader is welcome to post, print, distribute, copy or otherwise share it in total without prior written consent from either the author or original publisher. Requests for permission to use excerpts should be secured by contacting the author at probbinsny@yahoo.com. An earlier version of the review contained in this book appears in UFO Truth Magazine, issue number six. Visit their website at ufotruthmagazine.co.uk/

Table of Contents

Introductory quotes	3
Introduction	4
The Review and Investigation	6
The Investigation Continues	49
Conclusions	61

“I am afraid there is little I can offer; the only official report we have is from Lt Col Charles Halt which you already have. As far as I am aware, this report was looked at when it was received, and it was subsequently concluded that the events described were of no defence significance. The Ministry of Defence receives many UFO reports each year, and while we believe that explanations could be found for most, we accept that some will remain unexplained. It would seem that the RAF Woodbridge sightings would fall into this category. ... Finally, I wish you the best of luck with your book.”

Excerpt from a February 2 1993 letter sent to me from the Ministry of Defence in response to my letter of inquiry, signed N. Pope

“True we can put a book out then go on a book tour its OK with Warren and company so that what we should do. We will finish our research put it in a book so everybody can see it at once and then go around and talk about it. Everybody else does that why not us! Maybe we put the cart before the horse Jim! Travis (Walton), Warren, Robbins and (Robert) SALAS all wrote one why not us! Everybody loves there books while we’re at it lets see if we could get a movie deal also. We already had somebody offer to write it for us today how hard was that. I think I hear my phone ringing gotta go!”
John Burroughs, April 7, 2012

“We have never attacked another direct witness, nor will we. We have pointed out incorrect information, and corrected that information with others. I believe you might be one of the people who can very well not handle what is going to be released about RFI, or where our investigation that John and I started on December 26, 1980 is about to cumulate in the near future. We can’t wait for it all to be factually all put out to the public, for them to analyze and to debate.”
Jim Penniston, March 10, 2012

“Buy putting it in a book we will be able to show everything we have done. ... This is the best way then we can take question afterwards we want to thank Peter, Larry and Robert for the suggestion.”
John Burroughs, March 23, 2012

“There are moments that go beyond each of our poor lives.”
Charles de Gaulle

Introduction

Some months back, my friend and colleague Gary Hazeltine, who is also publisher of *UFO Truth Magazine* in beautiful West Yorkshire, asked if I'd be willing to use one of my regular magazine columns to review a new book due for publication in late April 2014. Issue number six of *UFO Truth* would be going out to subscribers in early May so it was imperative that I locate, read, then write my review as soon as possible, then make my deadline, something I regularly excelled at failing to do. Knowing something of my uneven history with two of the authors, Gary just wanted to make sure I was up for the assignment; he knew I would write an objective, even-handed review.

About a month before its release date I requested a review copy from the publisher through proper channels. Several weeks later it had yet to arrive. I was visiting New York City that week and as usual when in town, stopped by my favorite bookstore, The Strand on Broadway and 12th. I quickly made my way down the stairs to the basement, then advanced on the UFO and paranormal stacks where, specifically the shelves belonging to the "P" authors. There it was, two copies actually, weeks before publication date, and at half the list price. Thank you Strand. Once home I flipped through it, but it sat for about a week before I actually began reading it and making notes. And so it happened that as I read and wrote, making my objections and rendering praise in review form, I began to notice something, subtle at first, then more apparent, then truly begin to emerge from just below the surface of the words. If my imagination wasn't running away with me I could only characterize what I was observing as a pattern, but a pattern that seemed to have been deliberately undertaken, in an intentional manner, and calculated only to manifest negative intent. And the more I observed it come into play, the more uncomfortable it made me feel. This feeling was soon replaced by one of anger, and finally one of serious concern. More, it was something very few readers would ever pick up on or even look for. The reason for this was that each separate element in the overall pattern was a specific piece of information only available or found in *Left At East Gate*. Each data point was presented respectfully, if incomplete or in reconfigured form, then through the use of seemingly "objective commentary and a dose of good common sense, would conclude that the pattern-point's 'findings' (again) strongly suggested there was good cause to doubt Larry Warren's credibility and motivations regarding his involvement and claims, something

which only reflected poorly on my professionalism, research and investigation skills, and reputation.

By this point I was fully engaged in writing the most comprehensive book review in history and as a result, late in meeting my deadline as usual. It was handed in running hysterically long, though Gary agreed to print it in its final form, even if he did have to breakdown and redesign the immediate page layouts. But somewhere along in my reading and writing the review, I began to write a separate paper, the intention of which was to focus on, detail, document and explain my concerns in a more appropriate form. It was not lost on me that if I failed to make a case for what I perceived to be a grave series of concerns, no one else ever would. And possibly, no one else could. Over the next weeks I put more and more time into the paper until, by no stretch of the imagination, could it be defined as a 'paper' any longer. It was about here that I realized I was writing a book. I also realized how crazy it would sound to tell friends and colleagues I was writing a book that I had decided would take no longer than a month to research, investigate, write, fact-check, edit, review, finalize, and have in print in just under a month, start to finish – with an expanded version of the original book review included. Just under sixty pages of fourteen point translates into almost ninety standard book pages, so a book it is, even if a small one.

Let me just add the following. I took no pleasure and little satisfaction in writing any part of what you are about to read. At the same time I knew it was important for me to do so. I did look for some way out of this, or for some alternate set of reasons that might explain or justify why *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* was written in the precise manner it was. But I haven't been able to and must conclude that parts of this book was written with conscious intent to deceive its readers, and in so doing, demean the value of an outstanding book I had put almost ten years of my life into, and to minimize the contributions of the man responsible for setting that incredible undertaking into motion. I appreciate that in publishing this book I must take responsibility for all of the opinions, views and alleged conclusions expressed herein and I do.

And now, *Deception*, the only book ever written that begins with a book review, I think.

Peter Robbins
Brooklyn New York – May 7, 2014

The Review and Investigation

John Burroughs and Jim Penniston's book on the Rendlesham Forest UFO incident is finally out, as written by Nick Pope in collaboration with the two eyewitnesses involved on the first of three nights of UFO activity, now collectively known as the Rendlesham Forest UFO incident. As any author of a serious work of nonfiction can attest, the actual writing of such a book should not be an extremely challenging process and one not to be undertaken lightly. There is no question that doing the initial research is critically important, and, but the ability to bring it all together in a fully professional manner is something else again. Having devoted nine years of my life to coauthoring a work on the same subject I speak from experience.

Jim and John's choice of Nick Pope as the lead author seemed a logical one. Nick is an established writer in the UFO field and author of four previous books on the subject. He brings with him both name recognition and the unique caveat of having served in Her Majesty's Ministry of Defence for more than twenty years, several of which were spent officially charged with looking into UK UFO reports, a credential unique to this author. But there are downsides to this collaboration. To begin with, Penniston and Burroughs long-awaited personal story is communicated to us almost entirely in the second person and suffers for it.

Let me say at the outset that no one I know disputes the involvement of these two witnesses, or the fact that their encounter experiences and those they incurred at the hands of 'debriefers' in its aftermath resulted in ongoing personal suffering, serious physical ailments, and uncontested symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress. Even so, John's somewhat glib notion about the ease of writing such a book on their own ("how hard was that.?"?) seems to have proven a task beyond the pair's collective abilities. Then again, neither of them are trained writers, nor have they ever claimed to be.

In 1999 or 2000 I reviewed Nick's first of two works of fiction, *Operation Thunder Child*, for Vicki and Don Ecker's then-outstanding publication, *UFO Magazine*. I gave it a rave and deservedly so. It was an outstanding piece of 'what if' fiction and earned a review that reflected nothing less. Writing this review for Nick's first new book in fourteen years has been proven to be something else again.

A rather minor criticism to start with. This book is repetitious at times, in cases restating the same information, and occasionally on the same page. A far more significant shortcoming encountered in *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* is that the book is entirely devoid of footnoted annotations. This is certainly a much less time-consuming way to write an investigative work, but diminishes its value as a serious research tool immeasurably. The book I co-wrote on the Rendlesham incident, *Left At East Gate*, included hundreds of carefully researched annotations, and make no mistake about it, compiling, organizing, and proof-checking each one was a boring, repetitive, labor-intensive process, but one I undertook gladly as both Larry and I felt that doing so was essential to the value and integrity of what we had set out to do. The absence of same here left me with the distinct impression that rushing this book into print was more important to the authors than doing the best and most thorough job they were capable of. This leaves the reader with only the limited appendices, the book's index, and if you want to include it, the table of contents, as reference tools. The index is problematic in itself as it lacks a surprising number of significant inclusions. I know it is a challenge to make sure that all of the subjects, locations and individuals you've written about are listed in a book's index and that you're always going to miss a few no matter what, but it's the job of the authors, their editor, and their publisher to do their best to assure that this is accomplished as successfully as possible.

Encounter In Rendlesham Forest opens with a succinct introduction to its protagonists while setting the scene and offering some necessary background. The first chapter launches directly into the events of the first night with attention given to the other personnel who were directly or indirectly involved. I was surprised though at how disappointing it was to finally read Penniston and Burroughs' long-awaited account, this only because – with the exception of a number of quotations and statements from the experiencers, it is told entirely in the third person by Pope. Nick shares the pair's story clearly enough, but it is devoid of any real feeling or vitality, and I think it's a shame that the witnesses themselves decided against relating this all-important narrative in their own words. What such a telling might have suffered in terms of loss of the professional polish that Nick supplies would have been more than made up for in heart, tension, and the 'in-the-moment' quality that can make the act of reading a good work of nonfiction work so exciting. Jim and John's selected statements, while welcome, are not an acceptable replacement for this. The two write their own chapter at the end of the book so why not here? Nick Pope never

experienced the stress, challenge, or fear associated with these events, and when compared to experimenter accounts such as Travis Walton's in *Fire In the Sky*, Whitley Strieber's in *Communion*, Jesse Marcel Jr's in *The Roswell Legacy*, and Debbie Jordan and Kathie Mitchell's in *Abducted!*," there really is no comparison. Whitley of course is an accomplished professional writer but none of these other authors were. Here I must include Larry Warren as well. The incredible job he did in painstakingly writing, recreating, and relating his personal experiences in *Left At East Gate*, also someone with no previous writing experience, is consistently 'in-the-moment' and spot-on throughout. Then again, I'm biased. Hard work, definitely, but what a gift to the reader! The failure to fully recreate the most shattering night of the witnesses' lives gives us a book that opens on something of a flat, disappointing note.

But as I read Nick's treatment of the pair's experiences, I couldn't help but think about parts of Larry's account, and in the form of a number of haunting similarities shared by all three men during their respective encounters: the malfunctioning radios, the ferocious static electricity charge in the air, John and Jim's description of walking into the area "as akin to wading through deep water." Larry's memory of his movements having "become very slow, as if I were in a vacuum." As Penniston and Burroughs approached the small clearing "there was a silent explosion of light." As Warren and the men with him looked up to regard the reddish sphere of light, it "exploded in a blinding flash (and without a sound)." Penniston observed "that what had first appeared to be a sphere of light in front of him had dissipated and now had the appearance of a craft of some sort." Warren recalled "The explosion (of light) produced no noticeable heat. But now, right in front of me was a machine occupying the spot where the fog had been." Absolutely fascinating stuff. But when we come to the point in the narrative where Penniston touches the craft, there is a complete absence of any mention of his now-famous and insistent claim that a long binary code message down-loaded into his head. His December 2010 announcement of this allegation set off a major and still ongoing controversy in ufology, so why not introduce this charged moment in the context of where and when it was actually supposed to have occurred?

I do not know why Nick made this decision, but as a writer myself, I know that I've withheld such key information from its proper chronological place as a narrative device to build the reader's sense of anticipation or tension. To the informed reader though I fear that in this context it may only come off as

a bit ‘stagy.’ It certainly led me to feel that a ‘big reveal’ would be coming later on in the book. Unfortunately when we finally do encounter the binary code in the second to last chapter in the book, it is more with a whimper than a bang.

As we continue to follow the story, we are reminded of how the pair chose to play down their anomalous experiences from the get-go, neither of them wanting to be fully forthcoming in their respective written statements or reports. Nor is there any mention of the forty-five minutes of missing time they’d experienced, and with good cause. The UFO ridicule factor was and remains very much alive and well, and likely on steroids in a 1980 military context. Ask yourself this question: if you were in John or Jim’s place, would you have wanted such information to become a part of your permanent military record? Me neither. It was Deputy Base Commander Halt – very much a fixture in the men’s lives at this time and for more than twenty-five years to come, who suggested they use the phrase “unexplained lights” instead of ‘UFO’ in relevant reports. We are also reminded that the Law Enforcement security blotters for that night were removed, then classified, never to be seen again.

In chapter two, “The Next Morning,” we begin with some military UFO-related history, information on base procedural matters, and are introduced to more of the personnel who had roles in the events during and/or leading up to the event. Burroughs and Penniston retrace their steps and return to the clearing where they again see the indentations in the soil associated with the craft. The next morning three others return to the site with them. Measurements and photographs are taken while plaster casts of the indentations are made. One of the men, Sgt. Ray Gulyas, later returns on his own to take personal photographs and make his own plaster casts. In chapter three, “Into the Darkness,” we jump directly to the particulars of Col. Halt’s third night’s encounter and those of the men who accompanied him into the forest on another now-famous part of the Rendlesham chronicles. Nick supplies much detail here and excerpted statements from some of the men involved. Chapter four picks up where “Into the Darkness” ends and culminates with the episode’s most dramatic aspect, that of the unknown coming in over the group’s heads and shining a pencil-thin beam of light into their immediate area.

Chapter five, “Charles Halt Over the Years,” runs five pages, ironically, the exact length I take to review it here. It is the first point in this book where I

felt the writing specifically calculated to present the reader with a consciously limited and highly controlled assessment of its subject, this by way of what it does *not* include rather than what it does. The treatment begins with what for me is a major inaccuracy: “Until John Burroughs and Jim Penniston decided to speak out, Charles Halt had probably been the person most closely associated with the Rendlesham Forest incident.” No, he “probably” was not. Larry Warren “probably” was. And while the author and I can debate the semantics of the use of the word ‘probably’ here, it is Larry Warren’s name and presence that have been front and center in this regard for more than thirty years now. The reason any of us even learned the names Charles Halt, John Burroughs and Jim Penniston was due only to Larry Warren’s having given them, as well other names of individuals involved to Coventry Connecticut Police Lieutenant and UFO investigator Larry Fawcett, this back in 1982. True, Halt’s name was included in the original October 2, 1983 New of the World coverage of the incident while Warren’s was noted in the same article under the pseudonym Fawcett had created for him, but the following year Warren came out under his own name, and very publicly at that, and it is *that* name which has remained at the forefront of those associated with the Rendlesham Forest incident ever since. It was years before the colonel publically began to speak out on his involvement, during which time Larry Warren was left to go it alone in the face of public speculation and accusations, this while Halt, Penniston and Burroughs (commendably) continued their hitches in the Air Force.

Nick then cites a series of statements made by Halt underscoring his involvement. This is certainly fair and appropriate, but the first of them is dated November 2007, hardly making him a pioneer in getting the word out in terms of chronology. Halt’s pro-UFO and pro-UFO cover-up statements are worthy of our respect, especially in their having come from an honorably retired United States Air Force officer, and it is his opinion that the intelligences behind the RFI were extraterrestrial in nature, the likelihood of which I agree. It is also in this chapter that Nick makes reference to a September 2012 clash between Halt and Colonel John Alexander, a retired Army officer who undertook his own unofficial investigation into the possibility of a government UFO cover-up. When Alexander concludes there was no Rendlesham cover-up, Halt responds that he is naïve, something with which I concur. But again, far more important is what Nick has chosen to leave out of this chapter, and in the process creating the distinct and decidedly false impression that all is copasetic between the officer and the two former enlisted men. He does this by omitting a number of ‘facts in

evidence,’ at least in this reviewer’s opinion. In his article, “Rendlesham Forest Thirty Three Years On,” which appeared in the October 2013 issue of *UFO Truth Magazine*, Mr. Halt makes clear at least some of the ‘missing in action’ information I refer to:

“The individuals originally involved in the first night/sighting have changed their story numerous times, to the point that one wonders what’s going on.

At least four individuals - the three that were involved in the initial sighting and a wannabee (*Warren, in Halt’s incorrect opinion*), according to them were brought to the Office of Special Investigation (OSI) and “debriefed” with injected drugs and hypnotized by Special Agents. They (*Jim and John*) did not make me aware of this until several years later. If I had known then I would have gotten involved. I am convinced the purpose of the “debriefing” was to get the facts and to plant false memories. There’s no doubt the “debriefing” was a success. On one occasion, one of the individuals (*Burroughs*) has taken me to the wrong “landing site” and made claims that were clearly wrong. (*Italics Halt’s*) *For 20+ years I repeatedly saw a notebook from the incident that was supposedly made that night on scene. I never saw any binary codes in the book and there are several glaring errors with what’s now being shown as authentic.*

None of this means the event didn’t occur. I’m firmly convinced the individuals that are now making different or absurd claims were messed with, for the lack of a better term.

It’s truly sad the way what’s happened has ruined the lives of several of the participants. I have tried to help them on several occasions only to be rebuffed. I knew two of the original participants from the first encounter (*Penniston and Burroughs*) very well personally. One worked with me countless hours as a Police Liaison in the command post on exercises. He was earmarked for special promotion. As a result of the UFO incident this didn’t happen. Another, I rode with on patrol numerous times. Both had their careers derailed and their personal lives turned upside down. They were never the same after the incident and the “debriefing.”

For me, Charles Halt long ago emerged as the most enigmatic player among the witnesses. He is in the unique position of being both witness/victim and manipulator, especially with regard to the influence he had over Jim and John for most of their adult lives – and in that respect he has successfully

played the pair off against Warren for several decades now. It's both interesting and depressing, and not without some irony, to observe that the kind of critical undermining which Halt has used against Warren for so long he now applies to undermine the credibility of Burroughs and Penniston. Oh what a tangled web we weave. There is no question that Larry Warren's 1982 'outing' of the colonel caused significant problems in both his professional and private life, this while he has always maintained it has nothing to do with his opinions about or attitude toward my coauthor. Halt's treatment of Burroughs has been particularly shabby though, exemplified by his statement about John having taken him to the wrong landing site, and that Burroughs had "made claims that were clearly wrong." How can Halt possibly know with certainty what the correct or incorrect first night landing site was? He was not there. John Burroughs was.

Given this fact, I found it interesting that throughout the book Penniston is particularly respectful and supportive in his references to Halt as exemplified here: "Colonel Halt is an officer who truly believes you are only as good as the people you command. From Major Command evaluations to local evaluations. The Colonel believes it was the NCO corps that made it all happen. Then his conduct in regards to The Rendlesham Forest incident, well, he was only following orders. And he stretched those orders as far as he could without jeopardizing his career." But the thing that frustrated me most about reading this chapter was remembering all the authors had claimed about their book being the definitive, tell-all-they-knew investigation of the Rendlesham incident, yet when finally given the opportunity to do so, they continue to withhold information that would have revealed a fuller and more truthful picture of what was going on behind the scenes, especially with regard to the enigmatic colonel. The best example I can give of this is as follows.

The first half of July 2009 found me in Roswell New Mexico. I had just completed a job for the city in my role as a consultant. Specifically, I had helped to organize that year's annual UFO conference and accompanying festival. I had remained in town following the events to talk with an assortment of local business people, to speak before the City Council at the invitation of Mayor Journey, and to spend some additional time with friends there. Toward the end of that week I went for a drive out into the desert with my friend Pat Colligan, then serving as a correctional officer at the prison just outside of Roswell. As we sat in his car talking, my cell phone rang. It was John Burroughs. I will always remember that call as it remains the only

time that John has ever called me. Pat clearly remembers it as well, and in one of those coincidences that keep life interesting, he is also a veteran of RAF Bentwaters, having served there as a nuclear weapons specialist from 1977 to 1980. He was rotated on to his next assignment, Griffiss AFB in Rome New York in July 1980, five months prior to the UFO incident, and while not close to any of the incident principles, he did remember both Halt and Burroughs.

John had phoned to tell me several things. First, that he was now convinced that Colonel Halt had misled him on a number of occasions and that he no longer trusted the man. Second, that he was planning to bring together as many of the Rendlesham witnesses as possible for a thirtieth anniversary event the following year, something that many of us wanted to see happen. John was working his plan in ways I could never have, including networking with a good number of the men who had been assigned to the base at the time. I told him I thought it was a great idea and that he could count on me and Larry to help out in any way we were able. Unfortunately the event never came off, but not for lack of John's commendable efforts. A few days later, on July 8, he sent me a copy of an email that he had sent to Charles Halt along with the latter's response. It was a communication in which the retired sergeant did not pull any punches. I read it with interest, growing more impressed with John's straightforwardness and in putting himself on the line with his former Air Force superior. At no point during our phone call, nor in any initial or subsequent follow-up – nor in any other written or spoken communication since then did he say, suggest or state that what he had sent me should be considered confidential, though I chose to do so for the next three years. When I finally did it make its contents public, it was in the context of a 2012 talk on Rendlesham that I had given in Arizona. After viewing a DVD of it, John posted the following:

“In his complete presentation he goes on to say Jim and I are being controlled (*to the best of my memory, not the word I used*) by Halt. Yet he reads some E-mails that I exchanged with Halt. He never had my permission to read those but I'm sure he had a excuse on why he did it. In those E-mails I'm takeing on Halt on some of the statements he has made. Just like I'm doing with Him and Warren. Its OK that I took on Halt but its not OK that I question what they have had to say.”

Why John chose not to share the contents of these significant emails with readers is a mystery to me. And if he did pass them along to Nick, then the

author of record's decision to make no reference to them – or to any aspect of the underlying and ongoing conflict between Burroughs and Halt, was a decision we can regard as consciously deceptive. This understood, with regard to the picture presented in the “Charles Halt Over the Years” chapter, here is John Burroughs' September 22, 2012 email reproduced exactly as I received it, sans email addresses:

From: JOHN Burroughs <email address>
 Subject: Re: Bentwaters
 To: Charles Halt <email address>
 Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2009, 12:15 PM

“OK Col lets see if you will answer some simple questions I have! First of all Ben Jamison has a copy of your tape that he copied off the original plus paperwork and a recorded interview he did with you that we would like to use. He has a agreement with you saying he needs your permission to use it will you allow that information to be used? On the tape itself both you and Col Morgan claim to have the original tape. Who has the original tape? General Williams who claims to have no knowledge of the incident or even the fact you wrote the memo had Col Morgan make a copy of the original tape and give it to Georgina Bruni. Col Morgan Original E-mail to me started with wanting to know what organization was behind a 30 year reunion I'm trying to put together. On the reunion I have been in contact with Gary Heseltine on the movie you guys are putting together and truly hope the project will happen. I asked him if you and him would like to be involved with the reunion and his response was he would be happy to help if he could. So I'm asking you now would you like to be involved in the reunion?

Over the years I have been told you have tried to keep me out of different shows about Bentwaters IE the ABC, SciFi and History Channel production. *(Note: Charles employed the same tactic repeatedly with Larry and I, and sometimes successfully, though not in the cases of the History Channel's problematic treatment of the incident, nor in the SciFi documentary, which was a project that was personally initiated by me)* I was told by them you told them you had know Idea how to get a hold of me yet you were working with Jim Penniston who had my E-Mail address and could get a hold of me and did pass it on. On out of the Blue with Mr. Fox you told him I was lying about being out with you on the 3rd night. When I first started saying I was out there you said I never was involved at all in the 3rd night. Well your tape

proved that I was. You then said I never went forward and met up with you. But I have a interview were you stating I did come forward and met up with your group! I have been told that your reasoning was I was a loose cannon and would talk to much to the press about the incident. Well you just did a press release saying that whatever you saw was ET in nature. What could I have ever said that would have caused more of a stir than that? How do you know forsure it was ET?

I have been told by more than one person who was involved in the command structure there was no investigation done afterwards which I don't believe. The part about Col Morgan that is very interesting is he released your tape and claims to still have the original copy of it. He will not support anything you are saying on the record to include that you have the original copy of the tape you made. General Williams says he knew nothing about the incident and would not support anything you said to include your memo saying he would never have allowed it to be sent to the British. Yet he knew that Col Morgan had the original tape you made and had him make a copy of it and give it to Georgina Bruni. Then there is Col Conrad who was the Base Commander at the time and moved to the Vice Wing Commander afterwards stating he never saw anything from his house like you claim and has given no support to your claims After being asked certain questions years later he said he would have to talk to Maj Zickler about the question before he could answer them. So you have the top four people involved in the incident and yet not one of you can agree on anything to include your memo having the wrong dates and times of the incident! Everybody agrees you would have never made that kind of mistake and you even had the statements in front of you when you wrote the memo. I have also learned that there were statements written by all of the people involved in the 3rd night and collected after the incident. As far as Maj Zickler goes everybody agrees that there is know way he had the ability or knowledge to become head of system security engineering and chief of operation security at GE Aerospace to include head of system control of the SDI program and was in charge of the GE Aerospace counterintelligence deception unit for special forces. You your self have stated he ran a major investigation afterwards involving OSI yet I can find know one who will support that.

On the questions of the paper trail of reports 1569 and Blotters you stated they were stolen. Well everybody who worked back in the area stated they were not they were available and maintained in the proper way and kept in storage the required amount of time. Everybody agrees that if they came up missing there would have been a major investigation done because they were controlled items. The fact that nobody in my chain of command can agree is

very interesting plus that a squadron commander seems to run the show is even more interesting! And after he departed Bentwaters moved to Eglin AFB Florida where there was then reported numerous UFO events He then moved on to become head of system security engineering and chief of operation security at GE Aerospace to include going to extensive lengths to test and create realistic scenario on Air Base Defense to include work with the US Special Forces counter intelligence deception unit. This is just a few things I have uncovered Col Halt and would welcome your response to! I would truly like for all of us to be able to get together next year and would welcome your involvement in the reunion.

Thanks
John Burroughs”

Halt sent the following reply to John later that day, and like John’s, it also appears here in its entirety:

“I’d be interested in hearing what you learned. Zickler's involvement is no surprise.” And that was it.

As I said at the time I first made this exchange public, I salute John Burroughs’ sincere efforts to get some answers to the important questions he asked. I can only imagine that John, like me, found the colonel’s response something beyond disappointing and evasive. Again, I can only wonder why this timely and relevant exchange – or at the least, some reference to it, was excluded from *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest*. Again, I think that John erred if he neglected to turn these emails over to Nick. But if he did, then Nick is guilty of withholding extremely significant information from us in a chapter ideally suited for its inclusion. What does this begin to tell us about the quality of the trio’s investigation and research, or their pledge to deliver the fullest and most honest telling of the Rendlesham story to date? In any case it’s the reader who suffers by being deprived of a fuller and more accurate understanding of the complex and contradictory nature of the relationship between the colonel and the witnesses. Here, as in other parts of *Encounter In the Rendlesham Forest*, “The inside story of the world’s best-documented UFO incident” proves to be something less than fully forthcoming.

The next chapter, “The Most Important Bases in NATO,” is a thoughtful commentary on the military-intelligence history of Suffolk and relates, among other things, the military history of the area and how unaware locals

were regarding the strategic importance of the region. It clarifies the respective roles of the USAF Law Enforcement and Security Police, and numerous specifics relating to the chain of command at the so-called Twin Base Complex, better known as RAF Woodbridge and RAF Bentwaters. It also makes clear that Pope, Burroughs and Penniston take their security oaths most seriously, and that both John and Jim feel understandably betrayed by the chain of command they had sworn allegiance to. Pope is at his best here and in a later chapter entitled “Project Condign,” given his vast knowledge of the military establishment in the UK, be it American or British. And it is also in this chapter that he addresses the loaded question of the presence of nuclear weapons at the Twin Base Complex. The author states at the outset: “We now come to a difficult point in this book,” and I can only respect the fact that this was very much the case for him, Jim and John, none of whom have ever confirmed nor denied the presence of such ordinance at RAF Bentwaters.

It is well known that the UK government’s official position is not to comment on such matters in an ongoing policy known as ‘NCND:’ neither confirm or deny. However, an outstanding exception to this rule was exemplified in a number of statements made by the late Admiral Lord Peter Hill-Norton, a former Admiral of the Fleet and former Chief of the MoD’s Defence staff, essentially the equivalent of an American Secretary of Defense, except for the fact that he is not a civilian. Following his departure from the military, Hill-Norton went on to serve his country as a MP in the House of Lords. It was during this period that my coauthor and I first contacted him, this through an introduction arranged for us by British UFO author and authority Timothy Good – the one person in ufology who the distinguished Englishman looked to and fully trusted and respected in regard to matters UFO. Hill-Norton went on to become one of my coauthor’s and my most ardent champions in the UK, and someone who took most seriously the information Larry Warren had made public, that being that the United States indeed had considerable nuclear ordinance stored at RAF Bentwaters, this in full violation of the treaty then existing between the UK and the US at the time of the incident.

As Nick Pope can well attest, Peter Hill-Norton was very much a larger-than-life individual who not only did not suffer fools lightly, he did not suffer them at all. And apparent by his words and actions, had little use for the ‘NCND’ policy when he felt it conflicted with what he believed to be more important issues. While *Left At East Gate* is completely absent from

this book's index, we find a reference to it on page fifty-four when Nick refers to a 1997 exchange between MP (Member of Parliament) Lord Hill-Norton and Lord Gilbert, the then-Secretary for Defence. *Left At East Gate* is never acknowledged as the source of Nick's statement, but the reader should be aware that on October 28, 1997, Hill-Norton, personal copy of *Left At East Gate* in hand, posed the following formal Parliamentary Question to Lord Gilbert during a session of the House of Lords: "Whether the allegations contained in the recently published book *Left At East Gate*, to the effect that nuclear weapons were stored at RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge in violation of UK/US treaty obligations are true." It was one of four specific questions the MP drew directly from his reading of *Left At East Gate* and put to the Secretary for Defense at that time. Lord Gilbert, who was and adherent of the NCND policy, responded to the question as such. The exact questions and responses were all dutifully noted in Parliament's equivalent of *The Congressional Daily Record* for that day, something which Larry Warren and I will always be proud of.

Pope states that the second of the four questions posed by the MP "is inspired by what Hill-Norton had learned about Charles Halt's UFO sighting and in particular by the final remarks on the tape recording, about the UFO firing light beams onto the base. In Hill-Norton's words, "Whether they are aware of reports from the United States Air Force personnel that nuclear weapons stored in the Weapons Storage Area at RAF Bentwaters were struck by light beams from an unidentified craft seen over the base in the period 25-30 December 1980, and if so, what subsequent action was taken." In fact this question was decidedly *not* "inspired by what Hill-Norton had learned about Charles Halt's UFO sighting and in particular by the final remarks on the tape recording, about the UFO firing light beams onto the base." It was 'inspired' by Hill-Norton having read it in *Left At East*, specifically something I had written in 1996 that appears on page four-hundred-thirteen: "For me, Halt's response was the equivalent of breaking a confidence. That is why I have decided to break the confidence that was implied when Halt asked me to turn off my tape recorder. He told us three things: He was very much aware of the NSA's interest in Larry. He had personally attempted to gain access to Larry's military record, without success. Light beams had penetrated the hardened bunkers of Bentwaters' weapons-security area. That was it, and that is plenty. I hope Halt understands why I have taken this action. Larry wanted to do it himself, but his doing so might have appeared personally based. This is not a personal matter."

Pope reemploys this tactic regarding the source of this knowledge, which of course the reader is unable to verify. Here I am compelled to say the source was me, via Larry Warren. It was I and no one else who put this information on the record, and seventeen years ago at that. It was, has, and never will be available in its first-hand form anywhere other than in the pages of *Left At East Gate*, which is the only place the author could have learned of it despite what the author says to the contrary. From page fifty five of our book:

““There was a second question, inspired by what Lord Hill-Norton had learned about Charles Halt’s UFO sighting and in particular by the final remarks on the tape recording, about the UFO firing beams onto the base: “Whether they are aware of reports from the United States Air Force personnel that nuclear weapons stored in the Weapons Storage Area at RAF Woodbridge were struck by light beams fired from an unidentified craft seen over the base in the period 25-30 December 1980, and if so, what action was subsequently taken.””

Hill-Norton was of course aware of Halt’s account and of the light beam that he and the personnel accompanying him witnessed, but it was not the subject of the question he posed to Lord Gilbert. Some months after Larry and I had conducted our 1993 interview with Charles Halt, we returned to the United Kingdom to continue our research and investigation. It was during this trip that we both spoke with Lord Hill-Norton from a pay phone just outside of the South London hotel we were staying at, the nuclear presence at Bentwaters being one of the subjects of our conversation. To the best of my knowledge Charles Halt never had any contact with Lord Hill-Norton. The interview referred to took place in a February 1993 at a time and location of his choosing; 1:00 PM in the food court of a shopping mall appropriately named ‘Pentagon City’ that is situated directly across the highway from the Pentagon. I will never forget the exact words the then-recently retired officer used to describe the effects of the light beams. They had: “adversely affected the ordinance.”

In Robert Hastings’ 2008 book, *“UFOs and Nukes,”* the author relates that, following an interview he conducted with the colonel in February 2006, ““Halt expanded upon his remarks via email. “I never told [*Left At East Gate* author] Peter Robbins any structure was penetrated by beams. I was several miles away. From my view, a beam or more came down near the WSA. I don’t know for a fact that the beams landed there. I know they were in the area. I was too far away but relied on the radio chatter which indicated the

beams had landed there.”” This passage is memorable for me not only for the obvious reason, but because to the best of my knowledge it marks the only time that anyone has ever deliberately lied about me in a book in my more than thirty years in the field of UFO studies. Larry Warren and, at the time, UFO researcher Bob Oechsler (who had driven us to the meeting), were also present when Halt made the statement, should this be of significance to the reader. I understand the colonel has since stated he *was* aware of the beams having penetrated the bunkers, but not as a witness, though I am not absolutely certain of this. I *am* however certain that I would be more than willing to undergo a Polygraph or Voice Stress Analysis regarding my allegation (or anything else in this book) and invite Charles to consider joining me in same. Not surprisingly, Nick ends this chapter without confirming or denying the presence of nuclear weapons at the Twin Base Complex, nor should we have expected him to. Penniston and Burroughs also choose to remain mum on the subject. As Nick has stated, the security oaths the three took bind them for life: “both in a legal sense and in the sense that we (he, John and Jim) remain loyal to our former government masters (his words, not mine).” This being their sincere belief, I am compelled to respect it.

We may all be of differing opinions regarding such a decision. Our authors consider their security oaths as binding to the degree that they supersede all else, while Larry Warren felt it was more important that the people of the United Kingdom and the United States be aware of a potentially cataclysmic treaty violation. Whether or not one chooses to see these opposing views or behaviors in terms of patriotic or treasonous or something between the two, it was indeed Larry Warren and he alone who made this fact public, another reason he has earned the enmity of the authors. But like Lord Hill-Norton, Warren chose to put the exposure of an extremely dangerous situation of tremendous defence significance above any oath or policy. For the record, the results of his doing so was the temporary loss of his right to hold an American passport, something which every American is entitled to, save convicted felons. His passport was suspended by the State Department at a time it was due for renewal, this not long after he first spoke out on the nuclear presence at Bentwaters during a talk we had given in Nottingham in 1994. In doing so he became the first, and to date only UFO witness, military or otherwise, to have ever been subjected to such a disciplinary action. Officially the reason for this was his “speaking out on a sensitive defense issue in a public forum on foreign soil,” and it took no one less than a former United States Attorney General to assist us in getting his passport

reinstated. I was privileged to meet with Ramsey Clark (who served under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson) several times leading up to our meeting with Larry, and still number among my most prized books a copy of Clark's *The Fire This Time* inscribed to me "For Peter Robbins, who cares about truth." These facts are all documented in *Left At East Gate*.

Chapter seven, "Debriefing the Witnesses," includes the original, official statements of (among others) Penniston, Burroughs and Airman First Class Ed Cabansag who drove them to an area near the scene of their encounter. As previously noted, both Penniston and Burroughs chose to exclude important details and generally downplayed the totality of what they had observed and experienced – and for reasons we can all appreciate. While they are "essentially works of fiction," in Nick's words, there was no way either of these Law Enforcement cops were going to risk the ridicule and unwanted attention that would almost certainly have accompanied their telling the unvarnished truth in their written statements.

Chapter eight, "The Brits Are Coming," discusses how the British Government and the MoD first became aware of and involved in the events and their cover-up. Also included here is the story of how Colonel Halt was asked to loan the microsette recording he made to RAF Bentwaters Wing Commander Colonel Gordon Williams. Williams is reported to have played it at a staff meeting at RAF Mildenhall on December 30 where an incident-related smokescreen then began to fall into place. Pope also lays out a time line on which the British were first contacted, this originally through RAF Squadron Leader and liaison officer Donald Moreland. It was Moreland who ordered Halt to write a memo to the Ministry, but to "sanitize" it, as in minimize and downplay. There is little new information here, but the chapter offers a succinct overview at all the confusion, errors and poor decision-making that took place in the days following the events on the part of both the Americans and the British.

Much has been made of 'the Halt tape' over the years. It is in fact a segment of a longer recording the officer made that night but has never released to the public, something Larry and I learned from Charles himself. *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* includes a transcription of the tape in its appendices. Almost everyone familiar with the RFI has heard portions of this recording over the years as clips from it long ago became a staple of television programs and documentaries on Rendlesham. But how it first came into the public domain is a lesser known story. For the record, the copy that Halt

made for Gordon Williams was loaned to another officer who then made a copy for himself. Not surprisingly, several other copies came into existence in like manner within this circle of officers, one of whom ended up giving a copy to an English barrister and UFO researcher named Harry Harris. Harris in turn then sold it to Nippon Television through NTV producer Jinishi (Jimmy) Yaoi. In October 1984 NTV flew Larry Warren to Tokyo for a series of television appearances and interviews. Once there, Jim played the tape for Larry and gave him a copy prior to his departure from Japan. That December Warren gave it to Larry Fawcett who reproduced it for himself and fellow investigators, then passed it on to CNN's military and technology correspondent Chuck DeCaro. DeCaro in turn excerpted a portion for CNN's three-part Special Report on the Rendlesham Forest Incident which was broadcast internationally in early 1985.

Skeptical theories that might have accounted for the incident are reviewed by the author, then appropriately dismissed in Chapter Nine. The list is fairly substantial if well-known and includes such theories as the possible influence of drugs on the personnel involved, alcohol, delusions, practical jokes, unauthorized vehicles, meteors, rockets, mind control, secret projects and the always ridiculous and insulting lighthouse theory. Chapter Ten book-ends with what Nick terms "Exotic Theories," namely, whether the intelligences responsible for the events of December 1980 were extraterrestrials, beings from some parallel universe or hidden dimension, or time travelers. The lion's share of theoretics and 'what ifs' are reserved for the pros and cons of ET's or time travelers as the culprits responsible. No conclusion is reached or offered.

"The Story Gets Out" chapter begins with some interesting background on secret keeping in the Eighties and the origins of how the events in Suffolk made their way into public consciousness. Here Pope makes reference to how one 'Steve Roberts' (a pseudonym) alluded to the events shortly after they'd occurred to the partner of Brenda Butler, a local Suffolk woman with a serious interest in UFOs and the paranormal. The book *Skycrash* was written by Butler with Jenny Randles and Dot Street and was the first book available on the subject. It was published in 1984, and that while well-meaning, says the author, the information it communicated was more confusing than accurate. Then, at the bottom of page 126 we are introduced to Larry Warren.

Nick Pope gives a fairly accurate retelling of Warren's published account, right up until the end when several heretofore new details – new to me at least, are presented to the reader. They are, that the 'beings' Larry reported seeing were inside, and not on the exterior of the craft, and that during the incident other lights were observed in the sky and beams of light were being fired to the ground, at least according to Larry's account. What is the source or origin of these non-existent details? Only the author knows. Nick then states that an officer, "possibly Halt but more likely Williams" enters the scene. Larry has *never* claimed or stated that the officer referred to here was Colonel Halt. It was and has always been Williams. We then learn of an alleged communication between Williams and the three figures. Specifics of this source are sketchy, "but over the years one claim that surfaced is that the phrases "electronics division" and "part of another world" were used, prompting UFO believers to come up with theories revolving around a damaged alien spacecraft being repaired by the USAF.." In choosing to introduce these rumors – for that is all they are or have ever been – at this specific moment in the text, and phrased in just the manner they are, can only lead the reader to conclude the source of the "one claim" was Larry Warren. It was not, nor has it ever been.

The following day's debriefing, the one that Warren was involved in, is then discussed with the addition of several new inaccuracies. We are told that two debriefers presided when Larry has only and always maintained that there were three. Nick accurately reports that at the end of the debriefing it is Warren who asked the question, "What would happen if they talked about the UFO?" ... "Bullets are cheap," he said with a smile." However we are then told that this was followed by the remark, "Yeah, they're a dime a dozen." The continuing frustration of not having any footnotes to refer to aside, where did Nick come up with this? I've never heard it before and Larry Warren has never said or written it. Am I splitting hairs here? I don't think so. Wrong is wrong. If Pope can cite a source for this alleged statement, or of that there were only two debriefers, I'd appreciate his letting Larry and me know its source. And just in case anyone feels the need to question whether or not this colorful yet ominous response was actually uttered, it came from one Commander Richardson of the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), the only uniformed debriefer among the three, and in the unsolicited words of Steve LaPlume, a fellow Security Police Specialist also assigned to D Flight the night before: "I remember that Navy guy saying that "Bullets are cheap." The difference between us, I guess, is that I believed him."

Nick is ‘fair’ in asking us what we are to make of Warren’s recollections in that “his account contains elements that we have encountered in the accounts of other witnesses,” but that it is “problematic for several reasons.” First, that “none of the other witnesses recall seeing him (Larry) at any stage during the various encounters.” And second, “Just about all of the other witnesses are able to point to one, two or more people who were with them at the time, so that’s their corroboration.” How could Nick, Jim and John have overlooked the (also) unsolicited statement of 81st Security Police Specialist Greg Battram, also assigned to D Flight on the third night and included in *Left At East Gate*, as well as in several articles and papers I’ve written on the subject since then: “I know you were out in that forest ‘cause I saw you there, and we were all full PRP (Personal Reliability Pledge).” Additionally, Larry has made it clear from the earliest relating of his account that he *could* point to another person who was with him at the time, that being Sergeant Adrian Bustinza who stood at his side throughout the incident in the field. Adrian has made it clear for decades that he has no desire to become a part of the public dialogue among witnesses, writers and researchers, but in a rare exception, felt compelled to make a most important statement in defense of Larry’s involvement. It was predicated by a claim made last autumn by John Burroughs and posted on his and Jim’s Facebook page, he had spoken with Adrian who had told him that Larry was not there on the third night. Apparently Adrian never made such a statement to John, and when he learned about John’s saying that he had, felt compelled to share the truth of the matter with a Rendlesham researcher he both respected and trusted.

Some months back I learned I might have made an error, then repeated it fact in a public post of mine. The original information came to me last October from a trusted colleague in Norfolk UK. Had I misinterpreted something Ronnie Dugdale told me about an exchange between him and Adrian Bustinza, one where I misunderstood that he was *characterizing* Bustinza’s words rather than quoting them? John Burroughs apparently has felt this to be the case, so I checked in with Ronnie yesterday to confirm whether I had been right or wrong. Briefly, the back story was this. Last autumn John posted a statement saying that Adrian Bustinza had told him Larry Warren was not deployed on the third night. John’s allegation proved untrue and Adrian told Ronnie the following in a Facebook message which Ronnie communicated to me: “OK I will say this YES, YES Larry was there!!! But so was John, and the rest of the guy's. I know who was with me

at all three different times of one night because I was instructed to go with certain guy's and to go pick-up certain Lt's, Sgt's and Yes I was all over the place because I was the NCOIC that night! That means that I could go anywhere and I did.” Ronnie is someone who has earned my complete trust over the years. When I contacted this to him last night, he reconfirmed the content of the above Facebook message.

Then there is the statement of Master Sergeant Ray Gulyas. We were introduced to him on page nineteen when, along with Penniston, he was ordered to join Major Drury and Captain Verrano the morning after in an inspection of the first night landing site. At that time Gulyas measured the area and took photographs which he then gave to Captain Verrano. But the sergeant's interest in the event apparently ran deep. Pope: “In a telling foretaste of the suspicion that would soon infect many of the participants, in these strange events, Gulyas returned to the site later to take his own photos (and) Bizarrely, like Penniston, took plaster casts of the indentations on the ground – again, on his own initiative.” Why is Master Sergeant Gulyas relevant here? Because in 1985, he, Larry Warren and other involved USAF personnel were filmed for the very first CNN *Special Assignment* that the then-fledgling news organization was in the process of producing. Part two of the report featured interviews with Greg Battram, Sergeants' Ball and Gulyas and Captain Verrano, among others. Gulyas, face and voice disguised, makes a number of thoughtful comments, then adds, “We saw flying objects containing maybe other people and (an)other life form.” Like others who were filmed by CNN, the precautionary action of disguise is a good indication of the fear of ridicule any of us might experience when pressed to go on the record on national, and in this case, international television. This is a key to why other Capel Green third night witnesses have been loath to follow Larry Warren into public life. In *Left At East Gate* Warren expressed his disappointment about this and more:

“Bernard Shaw introduced the final *Special Assignment* with something like, “This airman may be alone when he claims he saw UFOs at RAF Bentwaters, but he also claims to have seen alien beings as well.” Alone? What about the other guys who saw UFOs, and said so on the show? DeCaro (CNN military and technology reporter) then amended the situation somewhat. “Warren's description of the transformed object match what three airmen reported at the same location the night before. But Warren's story takes an even stranger twist.” There I was, under my own name, the only witness not blacked out, directly answering DeCaro's questions about

the life-forms we saw. CNN placed my experience on the second night of events, when it had been on the third. Why did the media insist on revising history? Apart from the error of referring to Gordon Williams as a lieutenant colonel, I stated only what I knew to be true. At the end of the interview, DeCaro's voice came in again: "CNN has contacted two airmen who Warren said were present that night. Both say that something happened, but neither confirm nor deny Warren's story." Fear of ridicule. Fear of consequences. To rephrase a question I asked earlier, if you had been a part of this contingent of men would you have decided to come forward after the fact and publically lend your voice to Larry Warren's, just because you had witnessed it. Just because it had happened, or just because you felt it was important? I don't think I would have.

Pope notes that "Another problem is that there's no witness statement from Warren and neither do any of the other witness statements mention him." Nick seems once again to have forgotten this part of Larry's account as well, occurring just before his debriefing and appearing on pages fifty-one and fifty-two of *Left At East Gate*, a book he certainly read.

Excerpted here from that book, Larry Warren on "no witness statement from Warren:" "We faced a long counter on which numerous documents were arranged in stacks, one for each of us. I tried to scan them, but they were too much to absorb. A staff sergeant named Jackson, whom I recognized from the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) told us to sign our names at the bottom of each document and not to forget to write our Social Security number under our names.

As I leafed through mine, I tried to remember all I could in the time I had. One was a Joint Army Navy Air Publication (JANAP) 146, a rather standard, all-encompassing security document. A few others seemed routine as well, not unlike the papers I signed when I entered the air force (*sic*), basically reaffirming our security oaths. But two stapled pages stood apart from the rest. As I read them, I got mad: the document was a typed statement as to what each of us had seen in the forest. Each statement was the same – a whitewash of what we had witnessed the night before. It stated that we had only seen some unusual lights in the trees, and nothing more. I couldn't believe it. An airman named Russell protested the contents of the statement, saying it was not accurate. We were told to sign them and go into Major Zickler's office. I signed the damn thing and went into the chief's office." So much for "no witness statement from Warren."

To his credit, Pope goes out of his way to say that, despite Halt's insistence that Warren hadn't even been posted to RAF Bentwaters at the time, his paperwork clearly establishes Halt's claim to have been incorrect. Here again though, Pope relies on yet one more uncredited fact made public only by my coauthor and me and no one else. It was something that Halt communicated to me on June 23, 1992 at the outset of our first telephone conversation: "His participation *wasn't*." It goes on from there. Pope correctly states that hypnosis can implant false memories, though I think he should have made it clear in that passage that this would only be in the case of an irresponsible, incompetent or agenda-driven practitioner. References to the use of sodium pentothal have been used by some of the witnesses, but it's my belief that the drug administered, either on its own or in tandem with sodium pentathal, was far more likely sodium amythal given its documented effectiveness in creating false memories rather than in getting a subject to tell the truth. Note: It's important to remember that, given what these and other witnesses were put through following their anomalous experiences, some aspects of their respective accounts may always be open to question, even, and perhaps especially by the witnesses themselves. I think that John, Jim and Larry would all agree. More follows about those who were involved in disseminating incident-related information early on such as 'Steve Roberts' (actually a sergeant named J. D. Engles) and David Potts, another pseudonym, in this case a RAF Watton radar operator. It's in this chapter that Pope includes a brief section on some of the early researchers who looked into and contributed to what we know about the incident. I should add that in sub-section (a single paragraph) dedicated to the American researchers, some of who "played a key part in bringing the Rendlesham Forest incident out of the shadows," there is no mention of this particular investigative writer.

"Rendlesham Rumors" (chapter twelve) continues on in a similar vein and reviews some of the best and least know rumors, beliefs, claims and gossip surrounding the events. Among the topics covered are, were jets scrambled to intercept the UFO, post-incident postings, any connection with a classified radar system named 'Cobra Mist,' possible involvement of the HMS Norfolk, alleged evacuation alerts at local prisons, a cover story for a biohazard alert, and men in black. I definitely learned a few things here, but just as my attitude was picking up, I was stopped cold by more, let's call them 'untruths by omission,' under the topic headings of "Post-Incident Suicides" and "Weather Weapons." Here the author begins by telling us

about the “disturbing rumors in relation to the incident that a young security policeman nicknamed Alabama ... committed suicide after the events, because he was unable to handle what happened.”

This ‘rumor’ was “brought to the attention of Lord Hill-Norton ... (who) “decided to probe further by asking a formal, written question in the House of Lords.” Nick then quotes the suicide-related question posed by the MP and the response he received from the Secretary for Defence. In the process we learn something about the chain of events which accompany such an inquiry. Penniston is unable to recall any suicides during this period or at any other time during his deployment at RAF Bentwaters. Burroughs states “No suicides that I’m aware of.” And so, in Pope’s words, “Notwithstanding, we have no evidence that would substantiate the claim of any suicides being directly attributable to the Rendlesham Forest Incident.” There is a major evasion and omission at play here, but as always, the reader is completely in the dark because they are unable to access the source of this most serious allegation. The source was Larry Warren. He was a first responder to the scene where the young airman had placed his M16 under his chin, pulled the trigger, and blown the top of his head off, this on a remote stretch of RAF Bentwaters tarmac. We are first introduced to ‘Alabama’ on page thirty-nine of *Left At East Gate*, in fact he was my coauthor’s roommate. But let Larry tell you:

“Many events followed in rapid succession. Some were tragic. One of the first odd things I noticed was that some of my fellow cops, ones who had seen the UFO, were suddenly no longer on base. The poor kid who’d read the Bible during the debriefing was so shook up about being told that religion had been invented to maintain order and control that soon after he went AWOL. He flew to Chicago, where he was met by the FBI, put on the next plane to England, and returned to duty. He’d told me he felt the place was evil and that, if he didn’t get out, he’d die. Shortly thereafter, he blew his head off while on post. I saw the aftermath of the suicide, and it wasn’t pleasant. People who didn’t know the truth said he had been unstable to begin with; I knew otherwise. For the base commanders, the tragedy was just one more thing to cover up. For me, it was one more thing to expose.”

This event was indeed covered-up, quickly, and obviously effectively. The death of this young man might well have been relegated to obscurity had Larry Warren not made sure that his roommate’s suicide would become a matter of record. And the single reason Lord Hill-Norton “decided to probe

further” was because he read about Alabama’s suicide in his copy of our book – but unlike Pope, Pennison or Burroughs, he took it seriously. Seriously enough to put it in the form of a “formal, written question in the House of Lords,” which he asked on October 28, 1997 along with the other three questions he had learned only through Larry Warren and me.

The second sub-topic to draw my enmity, “Weather Weapons,” begins by acknowledging the terrible destruction that the “Great Storm” of October 1987 wrought on the Rendlesham Forest and correctly notes that “Larry Warren has claimed that when stationed at Bentwaters/Woodbridge he saw what has been dubbed a cloudbuster – a device aimed to create rainfall. This device was based on the controversial theories of the psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich.” The author then reviews other UK and US weather modification experiments and sums up the sub-section, “This is all rather tenuous; a mixture of historical rumor and fact about weather modification experiments, most of which predates the Rendlesham Forest incident; a claim by Larry Warren; and the fact that (years after the Rendlesham Forest incident) Rendlesham Forest was hard hit by a freak storm.”

Yes, Larry did tell me this, and was most insistent in doing so. He was *certain* he had seen what would have been a huge version of a cloudbuster (flatbed trailer-mounted and painted olive drab) by the base flight line, but only after he came upon a photograph of one in a brochure he picked up and read in my apartment. It was published by the American College of Orgonomy (the scientific study of how energy functions), an organization involved in the furthering of Dr. Reich’s scientific work and located in Princeton New Jersey. By the way, the “device” that Nick Pope characterizes here as “based on the controversial theories of the psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich,” is hardly theoretical. Years ago I was invited to observe the demonstration of one at a location in rural New Jersey. As I and the other invited guests listened to the trained cloudbuster operator tell us what he was about to do, we watched him cut a cloud in half, vaporize a cloud, and create clouds where none had been previously. To this day that afternoon remains one of the most memorable and exciting of my life.

The reason the brochure was in my apartment was that I was a volunteer fundraiser for this institution at the time. Prior to this, Larry had never even seen a picture of this apparatus, nor was he familiar with Dr. Reich’s scientific work and discoveries, other than what he had learned from me in the few months prior. I on the other hand had been deeply involved with

these studies since I was a teenager, and was deeply involved during the period we worked together as well, and in fact still am. But why did the author choose to present Larry's allegation in a manner that suggested he was the only witness to observe such an apparatus by the RAF Bentwaters flight line? Two additional witnesses insisted they had also seen such a cloudbuster there as well. Howard and Grace, who Larry and I interviewed on August 25, 1991 in Glens Falls, New York, were a most credible married couple, both honorably retired USAF sergeants who had served together at the Twin Base Complex in 1982 and 1983. And their account was hardly hidden away in some arcane source. It appears on pages one-fifty-one and one-fifty-two of *Left At East Gate*. Due to another seemingly conscious choice to withhold important supporting testimony Warren again appears to be the lone witness or lone claimant to an aspect of the RFI while the facts say otherwise. Neither is acceptable in a book claiming to be "a definitive account of the RFI" in Jim Penniston's words.

Chapter thirteen is entitled "No Defense Significance?" It is all Nick's and constitutes the most uncontestably accurate writing in the book. In it the former MoD official gives a capsule history of the Ministry's UFO Project, some or most of which will be new to American UFO researchers and I daresay a number of their UK counterparts. He discusses the influence of the US UFO policies on those of the British military and intelligence communities and introduces us to key figures who were involved on both sides of the Atlantic during this period. Pope also speaks frankly if briefly about his years at the Mod (1985-2006). At the time of his retirement he was an Acting Deputy Director in the Directorate of Defence Security, no mien accomplishment. It was during the period of 1991 to 1994 that he "worked as a civil servant within Secretariat (Air Staff)." It is here that we're told, in the words of Under Secretary for Defence, Doug Touhig, that: "Part of his duties related to the investigation of unidentified aerial phenomena reported to the Department to see if they had any defence significance." Reading about the work Nick did during this period of his life especially re-impressed upon me the seriousness of his commitment to the security of his country, even knowing him for as well as I do. A valuable point of focus in this chapter relates to the specifics of the phrase "defence significance," as used and understood within the Ministry, and it is something of an education in itself on how the military-intelligence mindset functions. The author zeros in on the extremely relevant importance of 'defence significance' when applied to the matter of 'unidentified aerial phenomena' in general, and the case of the Rendlesham Forest incident in specific.

“Project Condign” was a study which Nick Pope was directly involved in, and whose aims were centered on codifying the procedures surrounding the handling of UFO-related information within the Ministry. It gives us a window into this complex process as well as detailing the specifics of the author’s active participation, or more accurately, what the author has been cleared to share with us about his participation. Pope was involved in this project both when he was assigned to Secretariat (Air Staff) 2a (UFO-involved), and for some for a time afterward. The act of both hiding and learning information concurrently is part of the lifeblood of members of the intelligence community, a place where unidentified flying objects mutate into unidentified aerial phenomena and hard questions are ultimately asked about the potential applications of UFO-related technology, something which all rational students of the subject agree is a primary objective of military-intelligence interest. John Burroughs’ comments at the end of this chapter were both thoughtful and perceptive: “If you look at the MoD papers it’s very clear there is a race by many countries to get their hands on the technology that we encountered over those three nights. And yet, so far as most people in the world are concerned, they just want to know if we’re alone or not. It’s very clear there is a race, around the world, to have the upper hand in technology which would then give that government an upper hand not only on its own people, but on the entire world.”

“Beyond Rendlesham” (chapter fifteen) is a brief compendium of some of the world’s best-known UFO incidents, all but one of which are well-known to UFO investigators worldwide. They include the 1948 Captain Thomas Mantel incident, USAF pilot Milton Torres 1957 ‘shoot-down’ order, the 1976 Iranian UFO incident, the 1978 Frederick Valentich disappearance, the 1980 Cash-Landrum encounter, the 1997 Phoenix lights, and so on. The information in this chapter will only be of interest to the novice or anyone completely unfamiliar with ufology. “Other Voices” follows “Beyond Rendlesham,” and presents “some of the other opinions that have been offered on the Rendlesham Forest incident, by people whose opinions are relevant or particularly significant, given their position.” The primary personage here is Lord Hill-Norton, and Jim and John take the opportunity to express their appreciation for the former’s courageous position with regard to the UFO question. ‘Other voices’ heard or referred are Margret Thatcher, the late Georgina Bruni, author of the Rendlesham book, *You Can’t Tell the People*,” Michael Portillo (Secretary for Defence between 1995 and 1997), RAF Bentwaters Base Commander at the time of the

incident, Colonel Ted Conrad, Paul Hellyer, a retired Minister of Defence and Deputy Prime Minister of Canada, and, a personal hero of mine, Apollo 14 Lunar Module Pilot, Dr. Edgar Mitchell.

Chapter seventeen is called “The Search for Answers” and with the exception of brief opening and closing remarks by Nick, is entirely written by Pat Frasogna, the author’s attorney. Save for the last chapter, this is the one and only part of *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* not written by Nick, Jim or John, and a reminder of the promises the book fails to deliver on. In Jim’s words: “We have a number of contributors which will lay out much of the particulars with it, along with our never told accounting and supporting evidence.” Mr. Frasogna begins by telling us how he first became interested in the RFI (in a 2008 episode of the television program “UFO Hunters”), and how it fired his interest in learning more about the case. And in fact the attorney went on to learn all he could about the Rendlesham incident. More impressively, he organized his own UFO conference in Mississippi in 2011, bringing in John, Jim, and authors Linda Moulton Howe and Tom Carey as his speakers for “the first UFO conference ever held in the state.” This was something of a surprise to me as I had spoken at a UFO conference in Gulfport Mississippi almost twenty-five years prior. ‘The Great Gulf Coast UFO Gathering’ was organized by my friend Charles Hickson and held in November 1990. At the time I had been researching the subject of my talk, “The Bentwaters Air Force Base UFO Cover-Up,” for more than three years.

It was during Mr. Frasogna’s conference that John and Jim invited him to work with them, an offer the attorney kindly and gladly accepted on a pro bono basis. It was also that year that Mr. Frasogna instituted the first of numerous FOIA requests, the specifics of which are noted in the chapter. He also began the legal battle to secure copies of his client’s USAF medical records, a fight he is still waging to this day. It is infuriating to read about the hoops one is required to jump through in attempting to secure what is considered sensitive data from the government, and the roadblocks that are placed in the path of a good and decent attorney who is obviously doing his best to serve his clients’ interests. It reminded me, if in perhaps a smaller way, of my own frustration in the course of instituting ten or twelve FOIAs regarding Rendlesham. Nick ends the chapter by letting us know that “We do not intend to comment at length on the material presented in this chapter,” certainly an appropriate decision to make at this point in any such inquiry.

“The Rendlesham Code” chapter arrives on page two-twenty-nine and is the second-to-last chapter in this three-hundred plus page book. Nick sets the mood thusly: “Over the years, as bits and pieces of the Rendlesham story came to light, Jim Penniston kept one staggering aspect of his encounter secret. In chapter 1, we heard how out of all the witnesses who saw the UFO over three nights, he came the closest. Indeed, he touched it. The secret he kept to himself, for over thirty years, is that *when* he touched it something extraordinary happened. Essentially, Penniston claims that when he touched a particular symbol he received a sort of “telepathic download” of ones and zeros, which he now believes was a binary code message.” What then follows over the next two-and-a-half pages, in Penniston’s own words, is his memory of the event.

“The Rendlesham Code” includes interspersed commentary by Nick, a translation of the coded message, and an important excerpt from a hypnotic regression conducted on Jim. We’re told that the code was a “secret he kept to himself, for over thirty years,” then learn of a 1994 reference to it. John Burroughs is on record as saying that “As far as what I knew about the codes I did not see the codes in the notebook before OCT 2010. I did hear him say Binary before then it was in Linda (*Moulton Howe’s*) book and in his Hypnois.” Penniston’s public stance regarding the code and its source have remained insistent, consistent, and not open to serious questioning. But here, in his own words, we see the retired sergeant not only with his guard down, but in Nick’s telling words, “I think it’s abundantly clear from what follows that Penniston is still traumatized and confused by these events to this day.”

Jim states that ““the term “binary code” was unknown to me at the time (of the event) and I did not make the connection until 2010,”” yet in his September 10, 1994 hypnotic regression there is this exchange:

“Hypnotherapist: And by touching the symbols you disrupted the repair program?”

“Penniston: I activated a binary code. The two (government agent) men want to know why.”

Despite the contradictions, my best sense throughout is that Jim is doing his level-best to communicate how overwhelmed he was by the mind-blowing events of that night, by the “download,” and by the insecurities, nightmares and feeling he was on the “verge of madness” after the fact. At their best,

reading parts of Jim Penniston's account flashed me back about twenty-five years and was reminiscent only of my first reading of Larry Warren's handwritten chapters about the third night and the one that followed. That is the highest writing-related compliment I can pay Jim. I was glad to learn that once he had finally written all of the ones and zeros into his small loose leaf, "Thoughts of what had tormented me from shortly after the incident and seemed to run unabated were actually gone. I was free, and more importantly, I was relieved."

But he was hardly out of the woods. Penniston was subjected "to at least fourteen debriefings and two by non-Air Force personnel," yet never once mentioned the notebook or its contents to any of his interrogators, this because he was never asked about it. Here Nick observes that, "This seems disingenuous to say the least, because when one is asked to give a full account of an event the omission of a germane is nearly as bad as a lie. It seems to me that either the memory had been suppressed or he chose not to raise it, for fear of losing his PRP certification or even being discharged." It was a sleep-related problem almost certainly a residual effect of the incident that originally led him to see a hypnotherapist. The author poses some necessary questions regarding possible confabulation or brain damage as the cause of Jim's belief that "They are time travelers. They are us," "when," in Nick's words, "one would expect him to come up with a story about extraterrestrials, not time travelers."

Penniston tells selected people about the code, including journalist, author and filmmaker Linda Moulton Howe, several computer experts, Gary Osborne, an esoteric author and scholar with a specialty in ancient Egypt, and Kim Sheerin, the co-producer of the History Channel's "Ancient Aliens" show Jim and John were involved in filming with Linda at the time of the December 2010 Rendlesham conference.

What follows is the Binary Code translation offered by Jim, based on the work of the various experts that he and John consulted. It consists of brief snatches of text, together with numbers, interpreted as latitudes and longitudes, the locations of which are given in brackets." As best as I understand it, the sixteen pages of ones and zeros are now in the form of a translation from the code which emerge as follows: EXPLORATION OF HUMANITY, followed by coordinates for the location of "a mythological lost land said to be off the coast of Ireland" called Hy Brasil. This is followed by CONTINUOUS FOR PLANETARY ADVAN???, then

FOURTH COODINATE CONTINUOT UQS CbPR BEFORE. They in turn are followed by the longitude and latitude coordinates for Caraol, Belize; Sedona, Arizona; the Great Pyramid in Giza; the Nazca Lines in Peru; Tai Shan Qu, China; Portal at Temple of Apollo in Naxos Greece; EYES OF YOUR EYES, ORIGIN; then the coordinates for Hy Brasil again, and finally ORIGIN YEAR 8100.

Among proponents of the time traveler theory there is a hope that the interrelationship between these esoteric, mystical, historic and highly-charged locations can somehow be combined with the worded parts of the message, then interpreted, read, and ultimately understood to offer us incontrovertible proof that time travel is real and that time travelers from our future were behind the events of December 1980. As Pope notes, “It is a bizarre mixture,” ... “At times Penniston seems certain about things, but elsewhere it’s clear that he’s plagued by anxiety and self-doubt.” A representative sampling from these pages underscores this: “As I have always said from the beginning of my exposure and witnessing of the incident, it was clear that I could with 100 percent certainty tell you what the craft was not. The hard part is this: what exactly was it?” “How could I go home and 24 hours later write those ones and zeros down from memory? How, why, and a thousand more questions I have. Under hypnosis, I reveal that they are time travelers from the future.” “How can it be that the physical evidence (*what physical evidence?*) seems to back up the hypnosis? It is all good food for thought, I guess.” “During my investigation and in the course of my research with the time traveler evidence ... the answer to the question is that there are no definitive answers at this point in time.” “If we knew how powerful we really are, how powerful we really could be, then we would cause chaos around us, and this could never be permitted. We could rearrange the reality around us in the way that we wanted to, in the way that – if this is real – the future humans had learned how to do, which gives them access to these sorts of incredible abilities, such as time traveling.” “You must decide is this as Jim Penniston believes, that it is time travelers from our future came back in time to 1980, or is it something totally different than that? It is for you to decide.”

Following Jim’s statement, Nick makes the book’s most memorable understatement: “It is extremely difficult to evaluate the material in this chapter.” But whatever your reaction or thoughts to this random sampling from this passage may be, even if disbelief or mocking, Nick is correct in that this witness, who at times throughout his ordeal has been in a state that

none of us can even begin to imagine, “deserves better than this.” Here again the author repeats possible explanatory factors for the reader to consider. “Is Penniston telling the truth?” Obviously about some things, Not so obviously about others. Is he confabulating, i.e.: “telling the truth as they perceive it but where events did not take place as described.” Is it a possible symptom of a brain injury, consequence of all he was put through during his many debriefings? Somehow the result of a hypnotic regression? Penniston feels that that “Any inconsistencies in my account can easily be attributed to the meddling of the inept debriefing and the drug-induced attempted extraction of information by U.S. agents at the AFOSI building, or quite possibly the phenomenon itself. The other factor is simply my state of mind at the time of the incident.” Fair enough.

“What is the message itself?” asks Nick. Had he still been working for the Ministry he might have secured the assistance of cryptographic experts there, but the option is no longer open to him. Is it a binary code at all, or instead “an anthropocentric one?” That word sent me to my dictionary where I learned it meant “regarding man as the central fact, or final aim of the universe.” Okay then. For Pope, the code “seems simultaneously profound and banal. Exploration of humanity. Continuous for planetary advance,” not unlike the contents of so many channeled messages reported in New Age circles or among UFO contactees. That the locations identified in the code “read like a New Age holiday wish list,” (I liked that one) but “Again, is this proof that the message is genuine or confabulated? Have the experts somehow shoehorned the data into something that fits their own belief systems? Is it just wishful thinking? Or is the message more subtle? Is there a more complex message hidden deeper inside the obvious one? I have no answers here, which is why we provide the raw data in Appendix B. Maybe other experts will come up with an alternate translation.” Was the author really as much in the dark about all this as his writing seemed to reflect? It seemed odd to me, especially given his background, that when he asks, “genuine or confabulated,” he leaves out a third and equally respectful option: was it real, confabulated, or an intelligence operation?

Jim: “A question running through my thoughts is this: why did I decide for this binary message to be made public? After all, it could be conceived as a private message, for only me to know. But then I ask why would it be me? I am only one of many, so I think that the only answer that I can give is the most honest and simple. So my thinking is that it is for all mankind and not just one man. After all, if they are really from the future, then this is a

message for all of us, for us in the future, giving me this conclusion for myself about the binary: what if the whole point to the contact in December 1980 was for us to publish this binary message at this point in time? It is my thought, but if they are from the future the great part of that thought is that someone in the future will know if it is true or not. Is there more to come? Yes, I believe there is much more to come!”

There is no way to say this without coming off at least somewhat unsympathetic or sarcastic, so let me just do it and move on. If there is more to come, please, time travelers, extraterrestrials, inter-dimensionals or whoever you are, do not let it be in the form of one or more sequels to this book.

I’d describe myself as patient, but by this point in the book I was ready to blow my top. In all the years I’ve known Nick Pope I have never seen him struggle so hard to come up with something, *anything*, to explain a given that is clearly unexplainable. He’s a talented writer but here has clearly met his match. *Nothing* he is able to offer even comes close to answering *any* of our questions, or for that matter, his. Nowhere is there any *actual proof* of time travelers as the cause of the RFI. We do however have abundant proof that Jim Penniston believes they are, these being two quite entirely different things.

During his years of service to the Ministry of Defence, Nick Pope was trained not only to be an effective communicator, but likely, how best to reveal information while concealing more sensitive data at the same time, a necessary skill for a civil servant working in sensitive government positions. All I saw was a man dancing across the pages as fast as he could. Faced with such an impenetrable wall of theories, speculation and vapor, may I, with respect, put forward a possible explanation for the code enigma, one never mentioned, offered, considered, or seemingly imagined in this book? A month or so prior to learning that Nick would be working with the witnesses, I phoned, to tell him in so many words I felt he should be careful about getting involved with them should they ask. The main reason, my certainty the origin of the binary code lay not with time travelers, but with American military-intelligence. He heard me out, thanked me, than changed the subject of our conversation.

We now know that privately at least, Jim Penniston had been plagued by doubt and confusion about what happened to him in the forest and the

repercussions of what he was repeatedly put through in the weeks and months thereafter. But since the night he first went public about this, he has remained dead-on consistent with regard to his binary code views, steadfastly maintaining it is not a theory, feeling, thesis or some philosophical construct he came up with. He simply 'knows' that the time traveler explanation is 'the' empirical, factual answer to the question, and that those of us who have suggested otherwise are wrong. This is what concerns me most about Jim: his rigid, not-open-to-question insistence about the source of the code. While secular and not theological in nature, it does make him something of a fundamentalist by definition. Isn't there a stronger likelihood the source of Jim Penniston's simultaneous confusion, doubt and certainty is very much within our own time frame and of decidedly earthly origin?

In the years leading up to the Rendlesham Forest incident there was already more than enough cause for concern among certain members of the military-intelligence establishment centered on the challenge of containing a situation in which military personnel found themselves confronting a genuine CE3 or CE4. The risks associated with a security breach in such a beyond-top-secret possibility would certainly have been too great to leave to chance and the likelihood is over the years a number of workable contingency plans would have been formulated, possibly tested, and filed, ready for possible deployment should the need arose. One plausible scenario? Employ methods and techniques necessary to identify a best candidate eyewitness/experiencer in such a containment priority and as soon as possible after the fact. Convince the unconscious asset they had been selected, 'chosen,' by time travelers from our future as the recipient of a message for humanity. With some assistance and luck the individual might have the potential to become a true shiny object in ufology, or even more desirable, transition into the broader popular culture, but a shiny object specifically implemented to draw attention away from such an event, and from any possible whistle-blower reckless enough or with the kind of courage and intent it takes to jeopardize such a security containment by getting actual, verifiable, scientific evidence into public or media hands.

A separate benefit to those in charge of such a disinformation program (for that is just what I think it is) would be to toss the legitimate UFO research community a bone with enough controversy and intrigue attached that its members or at least a some of them might be sent off chasing their collective tail for some years to come. However we are talking about playing God with

a human life here, one who in their own mind have come forward in good faith to share a message of tremendous potential importance with the rest of us. And if this be the case it is something none of us should be having any fun at the expense of.

A wild premise? Of course, but when compared with the alternative? Let's slow down and take a moment to reflect on Jim Penniston here. At the time of the events an earnest, patriotic, twenty-something, go-by-the-regs United States Air Force Sergeant and a proud member of his base's Law Enforcement Police. Jim went on to serve in Operation Desert Storm, provide security for heads of state and general offices, be selected to write counterterrorism, security, defense, and contingency plans for the Air Force as well as some of America's closest allies, and even to acquire a NATO Top Secret security clearance. We are not talking about some uninformed oddball here, anything but.

Now consider the likelihood that this man, rather than having been chosen by visiting time travelers was instead the mark, target, victim, subject, of a highly sophisticated, long-term intelligence operation calculated to make him think, feel and *believe* that he had been contacted by time travelers for reasons, shall we say already in evidence. I am aware and concerned about the effect such speculation may have on Jim Penniston. It may the first time he fully considers the possibility he is a victim of an operation perpetrated on him by the government he had sworn to protect and serve. If this be the case I hope those closest to him, the people who care about him the most, will remember that this could be one of the most challenging times in his life. I can only add that with regard to Jim Penniston, all I ever wanted was to be his friend, something I told him to his face on the night of December 28, 2010. I know he remembers.

We seem to have arrived at a moment in our collective cultural, intellectual, and popular history where an extraterrestrial explanation for events such as the one that occurred in the Rendlesham Forest, correct or not, is among the more conservative of the options open to us. On the other hand the far more exotic science-fiction staple of time travelers is the equivalent of a ticking time bomb of ridicule, and successful enough, could cause the serious, documented scientific facts associated with the Rendlesham incident to be taken less seriously, even relegated to the equivalent of a dusty footnote to the sensationalism. If this comes to pass then those who set such a plan into action will finally have succeeded in their objective.

I wish I could say this was my only binary code-related concern but it is not. If, again, there is no definitive resolution to the meaning of the message carried within the code, something which I feel will prove to be the case, than even in the absence of such a scenario as noted above, there will remain a committed core of individuals who will continue to believe in the code's authenticity, and in the sincerity and intent of its originator. For them, the answers to the enigma that at present remains just out of reach, may prove to galvanize them into a corps of true believers, now on a quest together for the meaning of the message given to the one they respect by the time travelers. Others who are looking for answers in their lives might learn of this quest, movement, and join them, likely drawn from the ranks of New Agers, wide-eyed star children, dedicated mystics, and other innocent seekers of the truth. This kind of 'movement' desires nothing by way of scientific explanation. They are looking for something that exists on a higher plane, transcendence in the form of a key to it all, an actual message – from ourselves, sent back by them/us from the future! Such a message might well contain the solutions to the world's current problems and crises. It might even have the potential to unite us all with who we are destined to become. Why would they – we – have returned to our time if not to offer us assistance, support, peace, at a time when we need it most? There is a name for the kind of group I describe. It's called a cult.

Webster's Dictionary defines the word "cult" as "a group considered obsessive in their beliefs." The Oxford Dictionary, "A misplaced or excessive admiration for a particular person or thing," and the Cambridge Dictionary as "a system of religious belief, one not recognized as an established religion, or the people who worship according to such a belief." There have been UFO related cults before. It may be stretching it a bit, but I think these definitions loosely apply to the UFO contactee movement of the late Fifties and early Sixties. Certainly the 'Realians' fit into this category, being a well-organized UFO movement which first emerged in the mid-Seventies led by a former Canadian journalist named Claude Vorilhon "Rael." Their mission on earth was and remains, "to bring the most important revelation in the history of mankind" to wider recognition. For some, the followers of Swiss UFO contactee Billy Meier also constitute a cult. Heaven's Gate was a cult led by a much more sinister 'prophet' who was ultimately able to convince his followers to join him in 'dropping their bodies' in preparation for their boarding the mother ship that they believed to be traveling in the tail of Comet Kohoutek. On March 26 1997 the bodies

of all thirty-nine members were discovered in the communal home they shared in Rancho Santa Fe, California.

Please understand that in *no* way do I mean to suggest or infer that a possible cult organized around a collective longing for access to the knowledge trapped in the code would manifest itself in a hostile or destructive manner, but from what I observe there is already a small core of devoted followers who admire Jim as someone with the courage, forbearance and character to continue to lead this still-fledgling quest for the code's ultimate translation. For me, the revelation, for lack of a more descriptive word, of Jim's message is already fused with something akin to a religious sensibility: "But then I ask why would it be me? I am only one of many, so I think that the only answer that I can give is the most honest and simple. So my thinking is that it is for all mankind and not just one man. After all, if they are really from the future, then this is a message for all of us, for us in the future." All I know is that if a 'cult' were to form it would not be led by time travelers or by Jim Penniston, a man already overwhelmed by all he has been put through. It would be led, overseen, and invisibly managed by a small, nameless group of individuals working out of an office in Maryland, Virginia, Washington, or some other undisclosed location God knows where. Such a possibility is not out of the question and it is of the deepest concern to me.

"Final Thoughts From John Burroughs and Jim Penniston" is the nineteenth and final chapter of *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* and is introduced by Nick thusly: "In this next chapter, I make no comment at all. Burroughs and Penniston wanted it this way, so that their material would stand alone. They, after all, were the ones who experienced this and had to live with what happened next." Jim's voice is heard first. He discusses a number of subjects including the wide variety of medical problems he has had to deal with post-RFI, the great majority I'm certain incident-related. He reflects on the debriefings and why the service branch he devoted so many years of his life to would let the things that happened to him happen. We learn about his and John's meeting with former Base Wing Commander, General (ret.) Gordon Williams, and of the pride their former CO seems to take in the pair's continuing search for the truth. Jim makes a passing mention of the binary code but adds nothing to what we already know, or more correctly, don't know.

John takes over about half way through and dates the beginning of his and Jim's information quest to the spring of 2009. He also talks, among other things, about their meeting with Williams and being stonewalled by the Veteran's Administration as they attempt to secure their medical records. John is understandably angry at the government agencies holding up medical treatment and on the medical issues he faces, the worst of which continues to be his serious heart problems, again, almost certainly incident-related. He reports being in contact with his senators on efforts to secure his and Jim's medical records, and of the impenetrable secrecy which still surrounds the source of all they've been through. The final paragraph is collaborative and warrants being repeated in full:

"In closing, it's our belief that the Rendlesham Forest incident is a bigger and more significant case than Roswell, and been "bedeviled by misinformation, disinformation, and people wanting to write themselves into the story. It has been our intention, in this book, to place in the public domain everything we know about the extraordinary series of events that took place at Bentwaters and Woodbridge, both during the encounters and in the aftermath. While there have been previous books on the subject, they have been written by people in the UFO community. Now the military personnel at the heart of this incident will finally have their say. We intend to set the record straight and tell the full story of these extraordinary events for the first time. We do so in order to reveal the truth about events that we believe are of immense historical significance and public interest. We also do so for the men and women stationed at Bentwaters and Woodbridge at the time, many of whom have suffered as a result of what happened. It is our hope that the publication of this book will lead to the wrongs they have suffered being righted. We had hoped to show why Nick Pope had made the statement "I've gone on record saying Rendlesham might be the turning point in history that leads to the explanation of the UFO phenomenon." As far as we see it, is there more to be told? Absolutely! This book describes the events from A to Z on the historical aspects of the Rendlesham Forest incident. It goes into further detail about some of the supporting information. It does cover the binary code release and some thoughts on what we, the witnesses, think. It is the most accurate and factual book written to date. But the real questions for the readers to ask are: Is this really the story of the witnesses and has everything from the witnesses been addressed? Is there more to come? Yes, there is more to come."

As I read this chapter, I felt the return of an old, familiar feeling, one I first encountered in association with the Rendlesham incident sometime during the second half of 1988. It was pure, unadulterated anger, the specific source of which was rooted in my growing realization of how truly awful Larry Warren had been treated by the service branch he'd sworn to serve. As Larry and I continued to work together over the years, to study and read everything relevant I could get my hands on, to conduct interviews and continue the research that repeatedly drove me back to Suffolk England, the concern I felt grew to encompass the others, the men and women who had also suffered variations of what Larry had. This and not my interest in UFOs and their implications was what became the driving force that compelled me, obsessively at times, to work this case, week after week, month after month and year after year for almost a decade, this in an effort to answer my own questions about Rendlesham and complete the book in as professional manner as possible. For several pages of the final chapter I couldn't help thinking about Larry's story, and reflected in my mind's eye those that lay with Jim and John, Ed Cabansac, Adrian Bustinza, Bobby Ball, Bruce Englund, Bonnie Tamplin, Ray Gulyas, Steve LaPlume, Steve Longero, Greg Battram, and so many others, the great majority of whom I will never meet, not forgetting the story of a young airman who roomed for a while with my friend at RAF Bentwaters and went by the nickname of his home state, and then was no more.

But to the final paragraph of J&J's chapter. Bigger and more significant than Roswell? In some ways yes, but like these Rendlesham witnesses I have a bias here. Then again, I've studied a great deal of the available case evidence and have been fortunate to be friends with some of the leading researchers and authors in its investigation and learned more through them and their books. I'm also extremely proud to have worked for the great City of Roswell, and during the years I did, was able to visit significant locations and learn even more about the events of July 1947. Roswell was really *the* UFO event that truly put the subject on the map and set in motion the Modern Age of UFOs. But in uniquely important respects Rendlesham is its true inheritor, and the biggest and best-documented UFO event we have to work with now.

Rendlesham has been "bedeviled by misinformation, disinformation, and people wanting to write themselves into the story." Here, obviously referring to Larry Warren, the authors again display their true lack of knowledge concerning the many documented facts supporting Warren's deep and

genuine involvement. Here the only revelation is that neither Penniston nor Burroughs is able to resist getting in just one last condescending dig at someone they feel endeavored to “write themselves into the story,” this when Larry Warren should only have their respect, admiration and goodwill.

“It has been our intention, in this book to place in the public domain everything we know about the extraordinary series of events that took place at Bentwaters and Woodbridge, both during the encounters and in the aftermath.” No, it wasn’t, or they would have done so. Some of what they share with us is of real value, but hardly anything we didn’t already know.

“While there have been previous books on the subject, they have been written by people in the UFO community. Now the military personnel at the heart of this incident will finally have their say.” No, this is the *second* book on the incident to be co-written by an authentic Rendlesham eyewitness. The first was a former Air Force Security Police specialist stationed at RAF Bentwaters with Penniston and Burroughs. I remain an investigative writer specializing in the subject of UFOs, but believe me, Larry Warren is definitely not one of the “people in the UFO community”, though he does have many friends and supporters there. John and Jim as the “the military personnel at the heart of this incident?” They were at the heart of the first night’s UFO incident, two more nights of which were to come.

“We intend to set the record straight and tell the full story of these extraordinary events for the first time.” This book does not really come close to setting the record straight. Neither is it “the full story.”

“We do so in order to reveal the truth about events that we believe are of immense historical significance and public interest. We also do so for the men and women stationed at Bentwaters and Woodbridge at the time, many of whom have suffered as a result of what happened. It is our hope that the publication of this book will lead to the wrongs they have suffered being righted. We had hoped to show why Nick Pope had made the statement “I’ve gone on record saying Rendlesham might be the turning point in history that leads to the explanation of the UFO phenomenon.” Noble sentiments. Larry and I had prioritized identical hopes in dedicating our time and energy to the writing of our book, and John and Jim’s hope is our hope as well.

“As far as we see it, is there more to be told? Absolutely! This book describes the events from A to Z on the historical aspects of the Rendlesham Forest incident. It goes into further detail about some of the supporting information. It does cover the binary code release and some thoughts on what we, the witnesses, think. It is the most accurate and factual book written to date.” Readers were told “there is more to come several pages prior so point made. As for their book’s describing the events “from A to Z” (which I believe was part of an earlier possible subtitle), saying something is so does not make it so, and if John and Jim believe their “A to Z” statement, then the alphabet they’ve been working with is missing more than a few of its letters. Their book “covers” the binary code if that means they have talked about it, reproduced the sixteen binary pages from Jim’s notebook, and shared some of their thoughts. What we’ve never provided with is anything resembling proof that “time travelers from the future” were the intelligences behind the RFI. All we get from them is speculation, confusion, and frustration.

Encounter In Rendlesham Forest is “the most accurate and factual book written to date.” All writers, myself included, like to take pride in their work. Then there’s the use of such a phrase as a sales tool, not that there is anything wrong with that. But again, saying something is so does not make it so.

“But the real questions for the readers to ask are: Is this really the story of the witnesses and has everything from the witnesses been addressed? Is there more to come? Yes, there is more to come.” Right. “Is this really the story of the witnesses?” Trick question. Some of it is, some of it isn’t. Has “everything from the witnesses been addressed?” No, it has not. And yes, we now know all too well there is more to come.

“Conclusions” follow “Final Thoughts” and begins: “This then, is the story of the Rendlesham Forest incident. It has been the story not just of the world’s best-documented and most compelling UFO encounter but also of the effect these events had on the two military men at the heart of the incident. Once again, this is *not* the story of the Rendlesham Forest incident. It is a *part* of the story of the Rendlesham Forest incident. Neither is it the story “of the effect these events had on the two military men at the heart of the incident.” It is a *version* of the story of two military men at the heart of the first night’s event. “Bigger than Roswell?” Different than Roswell certainly, but comparing the incidents is something I’ll leave to others.

This is Nick Pope's list of what we have learned from our reading of *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest*:

1. A UFO landed next to one of the most sensitive installations in the NATO alliance.
2. A UFO was seen over three nights by dozens of military personnel.
3. A beam from one of the UFOs was shined down to the ground next to the Deputy Base Commander and the personnel who were with him.
4. Beams were also shown down onto the base, including the Bentwaters Weapons Storage area.
5. The UFO was tracked on radar.
6. Physical trace evidence was found at the first night's landing site.
7. A highly classified UK study revealed that a number of personnel were exposed to radiation.
8. The US government refused to acknowledge the event ever happened.
9. The US government claimed it has not investigated UFOs since 1969.
10. An Air Force general removed UFO related evidence without informing the UK government.
11. A former Chief of Defence Staff was convinced that the UK had covered up the incident.
12. Important document files relating to the events were lost or destroyed under suspicious circumstances.
13. John and Jim's USAF medical files remain classified despite efforts to secure them.
14. Both the American and British Government continue to deny and ridicule the subject in public while taking it very seriously in private.

With the exception of the classified Ministry study, and the Air Force general who removed information without permission of the MoD, everything here was published seventeen years ago in *Left At East Gate*, minus of course Jim and John going after their medical records.

The author then talks about why such secrets are kept from us, reminds us of his coauthors' continuing efforts to bring more attention to the incident, and "that Penniston and Burroughs are campaigning not just for themselves but for everyone involved." Pope closes by letting us know that the "prediction," "there is more to come," has already come true." This because they testified on Rendlesham at last spring's Citizen Hearing on Disclosure held at the National Press Club. Their testimony was well-received by the distinguished

panelists, some of who are lending a hand in the pair's efforts to secure their records. An appendix follows and contains a copy of Colonel Halt's January 1981 memo, reproductions of the sixteen pages of ones and zeros, three relevant MoD documents, and a transcription of Colonel Halt's tape recording. Only two drawings appear throughout this book, one of the craft, the other of the symbols on the craft. An index is included at the end. No photographs appear anywhere in this book.

Would I recommend *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* to friends, readers, colleagues, or a member of the general public? Yes, if you want to read for yourself the newest book on an extremely important UFO event. Yes if you know or have a particular interest in one of the principles. You should read it if you want to check out the parts I liked or to read the witnesses' first night accounts, even if much of it is not told in their own words or voices. Buy the book because you want to see if my characterizations of the book were accurate. You must see the binary code material for yourself. Read it if you've been following the Rendlesham case and the ongoing controversy accompanying it. You want the fullest picture possible to compare and contrast with your other incident-related reading, something I can only respect the reader for. Or, read it to fully appreciate the fact that extensive sections of *Encounter In Rendlsham* are the very dictionary definition of the word "disinformation."

There is one seemingly minor aspect to the book I found surprising and note here. For some reason the authors made the decision to have this be the top liner-note on the rear of their book jacket: "This is the only UFO book ever to have requested security clearance from both the American and British governments." On the surface this has a most impressive ring, the term "security clearance" carrying the gravitas it does. It suggests the book is worthy of special respect, certainly in the minds of some readers. What this really tells us is that *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* is the only UFO book whose manuscript was fully vetted and redacted where necessary by official readers employed by both the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, this to insure that any potentially embarrassing, sensitive or classified information they came upon did make its way into print. You may feel otherwise, but I'd rather read a UFO book that had not been subjected by this procedure, and by two different countries at that. Otherwise, no, I would not recommend this book to anyone, and if you were me, I don't think you would either.

Would you recommend a book that had repeatedly used your or your coauthor's personal experiences or research without once acknowledging you as the source? Would you recommend a book that on the occasions it did credit you original information, it was always to some incorrect or imaginary source? Would you suggest to anyone they read a book where everything the author had taken from your book was presented with what you could only interpret as an intent to deceive the readers? Me neither. I would however recommend the book, *Deception: A Review and Critical Analysis of the Book, Encounter In Rendlesham Forest*

The Investigation

Disinformation: “false information that is given to people in order to make them believe something or to hide the truth.”

“Why did Larry Warren know the 'wrong' dates to tell when, in principle, he would not have seen Lt. Col. Halt's memo until it was obtained via FOIA, over the personal objection of Col. Halt? Was he briefed, (or chemically debriefed) to present a version of the story with little green men in flying saucers along with inaccurate dates as part of a much more sophisticated preemptive disinformation plan? Or is it just the case that all Larry Warren knows came from the Halt Memo in the first place?”

John Burroughs, April 29, 2014

John Burroughs timing is extraordinary. Even as I sit here finalizing this manuscript he reminds us of how little he actually knows about Larry Warren and the extraordinary amount and variety of well-documented quality evidence which more than confirms the depth, actuality and seriousness of his involvement on the third night of the Rendlesham Forest incident. While Burroughs’ “little green men in flying saucers” insult only serves to underscore his taste for condescension, I appreciate his sharing this knowledge of the “preemptive disinformation plan” that my unknowing, Manchurian Candidate coauthor had been the longtime victim of, a plan so secret that Nick Pope was completely unaware of it, or for some reason decided to withhold from the book. The problem with John Burroughs’ thesis is that twenty six-years ago and a full four or five months prior to Larry’s and my first research visit to the Rendlesham Forest, he identified the *precise* location of his incident for me with an ‘X’ on a Suffolk East Anglia surveyor’s map. More, a month or two later, I watched as he made a drawing of the incident area for me, again identifying the very same location.

This, of course, is proof of nothing. Unless you know that several years later, soil samples I took from this exact spot, soon to be known as the ‘affected’ area, were compared to random ‘control’ samples collected from other parts of the field named Capel Green where the event occurred. The professional analysis conducted on them confirmed beyond any reasonable doubt that something truly anomalous had taken place at this exact spot. A scientist named Matthew Moniz, then employed by Springborn Laboratories in Wareham, Massachusetts in their Environmental Sciences Division,

conducted the tests utilizing almost twenty pounds of soil I had collected as he's instructed, then carried back to the States in laboratory-supplied containers in my suitcase, all of which were fully declared at JFK Airport Customs on arrival, that being a story in itself. What did the results of the tests reveal?

1. The affected samples contained in excess of four times the amount of tiny metallic particles naturally occurring in soil found in this area. When I asked Moniz what this indicated to him, he told me he could only conclude that *whatever* sat on the precise ground Larry had identified, had to have exerted a tremendous electromagnetic effect on the soil just below it.
2. Seed germination tests undertaken in control samples produced normal plants from seeds in expected periods of time. However identical tests conducted with affected soil samples produced mutations of the plants, all of which took longer to mature than their healthy counterparts. Note: These test were conducted some dozen years after the event had occurred.
- 3, "Percent Moisture Factors of the three soil samples were taken. The two control samples close in their percentages, whereas the noted landing site soil desiccated very rapidly and had a lower field moisture capacity than the controls."
4. "Following Percent Moisture, rehydration was attempted. The two control samples rehydrated quite easily, whereas the landing site sample required a great deal of manipulation to achieve homogeneity. The water tended to bead up and roll off the sample."
5. "Close examination under a microscope revealed no noticeable differences between the control samples, whereas the landing site sample was visibly different."
6. "The landing site sample had a higher content of silica that is indicative of exposure to high temperature or energy." In layman's terms, the sand that is naturally found in soil in this area had been reduced to silica – an interim form of glass.

I went off on a digression here as I took John's claim to be something of a challenge. On the exact site that Warren 'claimed' to be the location of the anomalous event he'd participated in the soil had been subjected to an

intriguing variety of dramatic physiological changes when compared to unaffected soil from the same field. What it comes down to is this: “preemptive disinformation plans,” even particularly good preemptive plans, do not melt sand.

Like many who have been following developments in the Rendlesham case, I had been reading about Jim and John’s plans and promises for their book for more than a year, and they were promising a lot. John: “You will see after it is made just how serious we are about getting Justice for those involved in this incident. For soon it will be judgement day for many who were involved in this incident! For we feel it’s time that more than lip service is done about this incident. We were handed a stage or platform according to some and we clearly saw from the beginning that stage needed to be rebuilt. It was clear real witnesses who were trained investigator needed to take charge of this investigation. And now after years of hard work it’s time for it to be spelled out from A to Z!”

Where was the “getting Justice for those involved in this incident?” What “stage or platform” had been rebuilt here, and into what? It seems the one definitive action the pair could have actually taken to assist in getting justice for the others involved had been shelved more than a year ago. In a statement released last April, Burroughs and Penniston informed us they would be making a major announcement during that month’s Citizen Hearing on Disclosure held at the National Press Club in Washington. They testified on the Rendlesham Forest incident the day before I did and the news they made public was that their attorney was attempting to secure their USAF medical records. Most appropriate in an investigation of this sort, but why hadn’t they asked their attorney to file a class action rather than individual actions and gone after the medical records the other Rendlesham veterans who might want copies of their records as well? Shortly after testifying, the name of their Facebook page was changed from “Justice for the Bentwaters 81st Security Police at Rendlesham Forest 1980” to “The Rendlesham Forest Incident First Responders Page of 1980.”

Jim: “We have a number of contributors which will lay out much of the particulars with it, along with our never told accounting and supporting evidence. ... Our personnel investigation has far reaching effects, and we are accomplishing this, but some things are on-going as we speak. Our efforts will benefit all involved.” Where are the number of contributors promised? Absent it seems, save only for a chapter written by their dedicated attorney

Pat Frasogna. What are or will be the book's "far reaching effects?" What are or will be the "benefits to all involved.?" None I could discern.

John: "We will look at the human side to include why people turned to drugs and alcohol after the incident And if they were involved with drugs and alcohol before. We wil also look at the people careers before and after the incident and how one person even claimed they thought about takeing there life the human side. We also will brake down the main skeptics lives and how little they know about the military even a Major who was the Air Force. And just how misleading they have been and take a close look at there personalities. We will also take a close look at all the researchers that looked into the case to include one (*Peter Robbins*) who was completely fooled and has down nothing about it. I was there when they were given evidence telling them about the inconsistencies about what they had been told and written and yet they have done nothing to try and set the record straight but continue to push there book as being factual." What happened to the promised look at the human side and those who turned to drugs and alcohol? Where is the close look at all the researchers, and what happened to the close look at the "one who was completely fooled and has down nothing about it?" The original plans for this book even called for a chapter devoted to my coauthor, something John made clear on April 23, 2012: "This will be the title of the Larry Warren chapter. "I'm not upset that you lied to me, I'm upset that from now on I can't believe you" - Friedrich Nietzsche," which is a misquotation of this quotation.

I can only assume it was Nick Pope's influence with an eye toward a kinder, gentler treatment of those who had incurred the pair's wrath: "For soon it will be judgement day for many who were involved in this incident!" But promises were made that have not come to pass, and the most awaited one of all, actual *proof* that the intelligences behind the Rendlesham incident were time travelers was nowhere to be found. This is something Jim Penniston had been promising since the night of December 28, 2010 when he first made this revelation public before an audience of nearly four hundred in Woodbridge Suffolk, not far from the sites of the 1980 incident.

Jon and Jim's incessant criticism, undermining, and demeaning of my coauthor's character and believability, and by extension, my ethics and skill as an investigative writer, was already tiresome two years ago, but to exemplify, this is about the kindest thing the pair have ever posted online about my Larry, passive-aggressive as it may be:

“We are often asked about Larry Warren’s various statements and claims about the Rendlesham Forest incident. Despite some earlier doubts, it does seem clear that Warren was posted to Bentwaters/Woodbridge at the time of Colonel Halt’s incident. Additionally, there is no doubt that he was one of the first whistle-blowers, who played a key part in getting the story out in the early years. We commend him for this. However, his story has changed so many times over the years that we are unable to take him seriously. Moreover, in evidential terms, all the other witnesses were in groups, so each person’s account is corroborated by two or three other people. In contrast, Larry’s story is a single, uncorroborated account. Our best assessment is that he took bits of other people’s stories and cobbled together a fanciful piece of science fiction with him at the heart of the tale. As we continue our *(sic)* to use legal and political channels to try to force various elements within government, the military and the intelligence community to release information about the Rendlesham Forest incident, we regard the Larry Warren story as an unhelpful distraction. He has our deepest sympathy and best wishes, but we think his story is fiction and we believe it is unhelpful to the wider quest for the truth when other people promote his various claims as if they were factual.”

The authors are entitled to their opinions, but it was the their own former Deputy Base Commander who wrote only last October, “The individuals originally involved in the first night/sighting have changed their story numerous times, to the point that one wonders what’s going on.” And contrary to Jim and John’s “best assessment” that my coauthor “cobbled together a fanciful piece of science fiction with him at the heart of the tale,” it is Larry Warren and I who are responsible for making public the best collection of physical, scientific and supporting evidence yet to have surfaced in the overall Rendlesham investigation – and its evidence that is *site-specific* to the *precise* location of the event he ‘claims’ to have been involved in. All the specifics in these findings were presented in detail in my October 2013 column, “Some Reflections on Rendlesham as a Public Event: Thirty Years and Counting.” I hope Jim and John take the time to read it at some point in the future. Nick Pope already has. I hope the reader will too.

To quote Nick Pope, We now come to a difficult point in this book.”

Throughout my reading of *Encounter In the Rendlesham Forest* I came upon numerous, significant factual errors that should never have made their way

into print. Information that had been lifted from *Left At East Gate* was repeatedly convoluted, then used to cast doubt on or otherwise misrepresent Larry Warren. On the occasions a source is given for a *Left At East Gate* based contribution, it is never a correct source. The most repeated source of uncredited information throughout *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* is Larry Warren. What was going on here? What ‘real life’ explanation could account for such behavior? Was Nick Pope really that sloppy a writer? No. No, no chance. I knew he wasn’t Lazy and he certainly wasn’t stupid. Was there some small chance, *any* chance that all these uncredited references to our book could be coincidental? Was all this personal in some way, an attempt by Nick to settle some past dispute with Larry? None of these possibilities seemed very realistic. In time this left me with literally no conventional explanations left to consider, and the few that remained were all particularly sobering. I may never know the answer for sure, but I’m increasingly certain that I think I know what it is. But in the words of my good friend and close colleague Stanton T. Friedman: “Don’t bother me with the facts. My mind is already made up.”

For reasons apparent by now, Jim Penniston and John Burroughs do not like Larry Warren. Some of the reasons as to why they shouldn’t were supplied and encouraged in one form or another by their senior officer and Deputy Base Commander, Charles Halt, who for years had been something approaching a father figure to the pair, and who, after a hiatus of several years, as best I can establish, was supplanted by someone with a more subtle style of supporting their beliefs and feelings toward my coauthor. It’s not unlikely that sometime prior to his joining the pair in their efforts, Nick Pope may have indicated to them, for reasons best known to himself, that he might be available to do so, should the terms he suggested for the writing of such a book be agreeable to them. If this was the case, then you can bet they jumped at the chance.

But what, exactly, is the unifying factor in this anti-Larry Warren alliance? It was that he had done the unthinkable, at least according to the code that these three men live by. Warren had violated his security oath. He had repeatedly broken the orders he had been given by his superiors. He had broken Air Force regulations. He had talked when he had been told to keep his mouth closed. The code of conduct that Pope, Penniston and Burroughs lived by and live by dictates that abide within the military, including, if there is a problem you need to resolve, you keep that problem within the military, and that you never, ever, consider taking it public.

There is no doubt Larry Warren is guilty of all I've noted in the above paragraph. Let me tell you what compelled him, drove him to it: he loves his country, but he does *not* love his country right or wrong. And nor do I, for that matter. This is the 'wrong' at the source of all of his behavior and actions beginning back in late December 1980 when he was nineteen-year-old Air Force old Security Police officer serving his country on an American base in England called RAF Bentwaters. *Wrong* was how he and others were treated and dealt with following the event in question. *Wrong* was what was blocking his efforts to see that the suicide of his roommate did not go answered for. *Wrong* was that the people of the United Kingdom were going to sleep each night with, completely unaware that just beyond some of their backdoors, their nation's closest ally maintained the largest backline stockpile of nuclear ordinance in the entire NATO command, this fully against the treaty terms then existing between the countries, or so I have been led to understand.

These are the reasons Larry Warren violated his security oath, disobeyed his orders, broke the regulations, and ultimately in the course of time, met someone who was willing to write a book with him about it. And in their so doing, brought unwanted attention and embarrassment to agencies, offices, a service branch, and individuals on both sides of the Atlantic. I have done my best to stand by my friend's side throughout all this for more than twenty-five years now and watched as the attacks on his credibility, character, motivations, state of mind and intentions have continued on unabated. And you know what? I have *had* it. "Honor" is not only something that consists of always and only following the orders you are given, whether you wear the uniform of your country or a business suit and involved in the planning and support of your nation's military or intelligence personnel. Honor is also having the courage and clear sense of right and wrong to know that you are willing to put your life, safety, peace of mind and future squarely on the line to fight against a wrong of such significant consequence that you know no amount of going by the books will ever solve or ever make go away. And in this respect, Larry Warren is certainly of the most honorable men I ever hope to meet.

Nick Pope: "Burroughs and Penniston are loyal ex-military personnel who served with dedication and distinction. They have risked their lives for their country and for the ideas of freedom and democracy that they cherish. Despite the frustration they feel at having to leave out parts of the story that

some people might consider important, this isn't negotiable. Values such as integrity, honesty, and loyalty are hard-wired into people such as Burroughs and Penniston. Regrettably, it doesn't always work the other way around. Despite the fact that loyalty should be a two-way street, Burroughs, Penniston, and many of the other young men and women caught up in these events feel betrayed by the chain of command."

I agree with Nick. He, Penniston, Burroughs and Halt have all sworn allegiance to protect, preserve and maintain the safety and security of their respective countries and consider the oaths they as "binding for life." All four men were employed for between twenty and twenty-seven years each by their government's military, Nick's case, by the agency which oversees the military affairs of all personnel serving under Her Majesty's flag. All three have spent the lion's share of their adult lives taking orders, and to the degree indicated by their ranks, giving them as well. All of them are on full, and fully deserved pensions as is appropriate befitting the years of loyal service each have given.

It is not very well known here, but one difference among personnel employed by the American Department of Defense and their UK counterparts at the Ministry of Defence, is that the Ministry assigns an equivalent military rank to its officials and civil servants, one based on seniority, performance levels, importance of assignments, good standing, experience, and I expect, several other factors. At the time of his retirement, Nick Pope was an Acting Deputy Director in the Directorate of Defence Security, and in some circles he is entitled to be addressed by his military rank, that being Lieutenant Colonel Pope.

I can't say with certainty what Nick Pope's opinion of the binary code controversy is, but find it hard to believe that an experienced professional of his stature takes them any more seriously than I do. Was his unwillingness to engage in conversation about the time travel scenario an indication he might have taken the subject seriously? I don't know, but can't help but feel I do. In any event I think that Nick Pope owes me an explanation, not to mention his other readers, and his colleagues and friends in ufology as well.

Let me tell you something about myself that I think you should know. I'm self-educated as an investigative writer, but I was fortunate to have had the best teachers possible, all of them coming into my life in the late Seventies as I began my career in UFO studies. Major (ret) Colman Von Keviczsky

had been a member of the Royal Hungarian Army General Staff during World War Two, during which time he was charged with overseeing all photo-reconnaissance and photo-analysis for their military. Detective Sergeant Pete Mazzola was a highly decorated member of the New York City Police Department, and a crack UFO investigator to boot. Before his untimely death in 1987, he headed a national organization called The Scientific Bureau of Investigation (SBI), the core of its membership being several hundred police officers with a serious interest in UFO investigation located all over the United States. Budd Hopkins, arguably one of the most important personages in the history of UFO studies, was the founding pioneer investigator of the scientific investigation of the UFO abduction phenomenon, and, I'm proud to say, also a self-trained investigative writer. He also founded a nonprofit called the Intruders Foundation (IF) dedicated to the study of the abduction phenomenon, established to offer public education regarding this highly misunderstood subject and to provide assistance and support for those who had actually experienced it. One of the greatest privileges of my life was to work at as his assistant for about half of our thirty-five-year-long friendship. These men taught me how to *investigate* the various aspects of the UFO phenomenon, how to think critically in the process of doing so, and how to present my findings in the most grounded, scientific, and effective manner possible. Yes, I had good teachers, and did my best to learn my lessons.

One of the most important skills necessary in doing the work I spent year after year assigning and reassigning myself came naturally to me. It was the ability to discern patterns in the course of my investigations – whether applied to data accumulated in field, in the numerous details confided to me by abductees and experiences, or in combing through printed material, articles and files, be they historical, scientific, popular or specifically UFO-related in nature. One area where this skill came to serve me particularly well was a project I'd initiated to see if I could find the actual origins of the use of ridicule of UFOs in American newspapers as a means to reduce or destroy public interest in the phenomenon – and, if possible, discern some repeating pattern of reportage in in same, if there was a pattern to find (there was). Among the tasks I took on in the course of this investigation was to zone in on the august New York Times and locate, print out, and read, then reread, then reread again (in chronological order), every single article, editorial, photo caption, and letter to-the-editor the that they had ever published making reference to any term or word I felt might be associated

with the subject of unidentified flying objects. In my first go-round in the late Eighties I accomplished this through the use of the big old cross-referenced ledgers they were referenced in the pre-digital days. Some years later I switched over to computer searches when they became available in the Main Branch of the New York City Public Library's reading room. But why this little side trip down memory lane? Because finding the pattern of reporting that the newspaper (and so many others) used to discredit the UFO phenomenon was not that different than finding and identifying the pattern I observed running through the pages of *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest*. Each point in the pattern involved the use of facts, accounts, experiences and other original material that Larry Warren and I were uniquely responsible for putting on the record.

Would I be unfair to assume, based on everything you've read to this point, that it would have been impossible for Nick Pope to produce the book he did without reading, or rereading the book, *Left At East Gate*, in the preparation of the manuscript for *Encounter in Rendlesham Forest*? I know he originally read it in galley form after Larry and I sent it to him in 1996. And I expect others in the Ministry read it after he did. I had written to him to find out if he wanted a copy, our motive that he might like it enough to provide a liner note for the back of our book. Is there *any* possibility he did not reread the book, or at least refer to it over the past year or so? Could he have instead consistently 'remembered' all of the specific excerpts from *Left At East Gate* he introduces in his book, but not remembered that it was their source, or as coming from other sources? Is there any realistic possibility that each of the crafted mistruths associated with our book could have been the direct result of incompetence, incredibly second-rate research, laziness or stupidity – and I'm not trying to be funny or insulting here. I'm simply doing my best to give him the benefit of *any* doubt, no matter how unlikely, that his motives were not meant to be disingenuous, but rather than in some way, shape or form, accidental. I've tried, and I'm unable to.

No, the repeating pattern is genuine not the product of my imagination, and it works like this: repeatedly take pieces of information specifically from *Left At East Gate* and never once credit our book as their source. Even the single time the author references our book by name, he *still* does not mention it as the source to what it references. On the occasions that he *does* cite a source for information taken from *East Gate*, they are consistently credited to an erroneous source. The tactic of basing accusations, observations and conclusions relating to Larry Warren or to my original

research on incomplete data lifted from us. Labeling factual information taken from *Left At East Gate* as ‘rumor.’ Making believe or choosing to ignore specifics in evidence in our book, then accusing Larry of something that was not true. These are the entries that together form the backbone of this pattern of deception:

1. No source for Pope’s nuclear question posed by Lord Hil-Norton.
Actual source: Larry Warren/ *Left At East Gate* as
2. Erroneous source given for Hill-Norton’s learning of the beams of light being shot into the Brentwaters Weapons Storage Area. Actual source: Peter Robbins/ *Left At East Gate* as
3. Invented details, previously unknown but added to Warren’s encounter account. Completely refuted in Warren’s account in *Left At East Gate*.
4. Invented details, previously unknown but added to Warren’s debriefing account. Completely refuted in Warren’s account in *Left At East Gate*.
5. The author states no one saw Warren in the forest that night. *Left At East Gate* references two who do.
6. The author tells us that no one saw Warren’s witness statement. His debriefing account in *Left At East Gate* fully refutes Pope’s claim.
7. The author ignores the original source of Charles Halt’s belief Warren was not involved. It was personally communicated to me in a phone conversation with Charles Halt, the complete of the call appearing in only *Left At East Gate*.
8. A total lack of truth in stating how Lord Hill-Norton became interested in the possible suicide of an airman stationed at RAF Brentwaters (from *Left At East Gate*) and dismissing the allegation by completely ignoring Warren’s published account.
9. Ignoring the documented eyewitness accounts of two honorably retired UDAF sergeants that appear in *Left At East Gate* to create the impression that Larry Warren was the only person to report same.
10. The decision to include two small paragraphs designed to single out British and American writers, researchers and authors who contributed significantly to our knowledge of the RFI, then to ‘forget’ to include the only Rendlesham coauthor responsible for producing a highly regarded whose book was a major UK bestseller. author I think you get the idea.

Not surprisingly, this particular sentence in *Encounter In Rendlesham Forest* struck me with particular resonance: “Part of the job of a good intelligence analyst is to look for pieces of apparently separate information that, when linked, form a single, coherent picture,” and in the course of carefully reading this book, a “coherent picture” emerged, and in no uncertain terms.

How could someone make so many factual errors, all of them related to a single information source? I’ve known Nick Pope for about seventeen years. I’ve repeatedly been his guest in London, commiserated with him, celebrated with him, gone drinking with him and had long talks with him over the years, and know him to be well-educated, naturally perceptive, obviously well-trained, this exemplified by the important and highly specialized work he did within the Ministry where he rose to significant rank before retiring. Nick is a fully professional writer, a consultant for mainstream media and television projects, accomplished public speaker and one of the very few people who works within the field of ufology who is also regularly employed by the print media in the UK. I also know that he loves his country as much or more than and Briton I have ever met and regards the security oath he swore as “binding for life.”

I also know that certain information included in *Left At East Gate* caused significant embarrassment to Her Majesty’s Government. Could this be the, or a cause of the disinformation he built into his book? If this be so, was his behavior the manifestation of personal initiative, or of a ‘suggestion,’ or an order? Of course Nick is now retired from the Ministry of Defence. Even so, there are some positions one never fully retires from, perhaps becoming something of ‘an asset in place,’ ready to continue one’s service to the institution and ideas you swore an oath of allegiance toward many years past? The answer? I have no way of knowing.

Conclusions

In using the basic framework of the experiences, views, and information supplied to him by two understandably angry, damaged, and hurting men looking only to tell the story of the authentic UFO incident they were involved in, and their experiences in its aftermath, Nick Pope was, in Jim and John's abbreviated words: "handed a stage or platform ... that ... needed to be rebuilt," and rebuild it he did, either of his volition or that of others, into something only suggesting a conscious intent to deceive rather than to inform. As we know, disinformation is simply: "false information that is given to people in order to make them believe something or to hide the truth." The book he oversaw the writing of does of course give Penniston and Burroughs the opportunity they had so long been seeking to tell their story, but at what cost?

Where do Burroughs and Penniston fit into all this? I don't believe they do, except at most as unaware enablers. I keep hoping I'm wrong about all this but see no real alternative to the one I've expressed here. John and Jim see themselves as united with Nick in several definitive senses. Their shared patriotism, if for different nations, Pope's likely sincere desire to support them in their quest for their records and for the justice they deserve from the Air Force and the Veteran's Administration. Then there's the shared understanding that Larry Warren is a dangerous loose-cannon, and John and Jim's now-arcaic notion that Larry's account, as documented in *Left At East Gate* "is unhelpful to the wider quest for the truth."

I'm quite certain that Jim and John believe their writing partner stands with them on this, and Nick, I'm sure, has never given them cause to suppose otherwise. I think that what actually lies behind everything Nick really believes, but can never express about Larry Warren anymore, or for that matter, me, was best expressed in something he wrote seventeen years ago. It was back when he still had the courage to speak the truth, and for some reason was permitted to by the MoD. What a shame those days are gone forever. I know I'll always miss parts of them: "Larry Warren and Peter Robbins have done an excellent job in blowing the lid off a UFO case that could be bigger and more sinister than Roswell. There is much in this book that will make you angry, and rightly so. It raises serious questions about just how far certain people will go to prevent the truth about UFOs ever becoming public knowledge. This book is meticulously researched, gripping, provocative, and will undoubtedly lead to some long overdue questions

being asked at the highest levels. This is a sensational book, and no matter what the skeptics and debunkers may try, this story is not going to go away.” And indeed, the skeptics, debunkers, and others are still trying.