



Welcome to *Union Street* #56 (Obsessive Press [JG] #158 and Peerless Press [SC] #58), the zine with the transmogriying masthead (expressing solidarity with the baseball players' strike this time). It comes to you from Jeanne Gomoll and Scott Custis, whose address is coincidentally 2825 Union Street, Madison, WI 53704-5136. Phone 608-246-8857. *Union Street* was created on a Macintosh Quadra 840AV, and hardcopy was printed on a Laserwriter IINTX printer. Text was created with Microsoft Word 5.1 and laid out with Aldus PageMaker 5.0. The *Union Street* Logo was designed with Adobe Illustrator 5.0 and Adobe Photoshop 2.5. All contents are copyrighted © by Scott Custis and Jeanne Gomoll, September 1994, for *Turbo-Charged Party Animal* APA #99. Members FWA. This APA supports the baseball players' strike.

Official business

[JG] I second **Bill Bodden's** nomination of Peter Larson. I also nominate **Lilian Edwards** and hope she returns to *Turbo*. I really liked the zines she did for us. Seconds, anyone?

Illicit Passage Update

[JG] Alice Nunn's *Illicit Passage* is now available through Dreamhaven, in Minneapolis. I understand that Greg purchased copies of the book through the distributor who took over the book from the Australian editor. Also, Nunn is looking for an American publisher, and I've lent a copy of the book to **Jim Frenkel**. . . . So, who knows, maybe *Illicit Passage* will eventually be published in the U.S.

Reprint

[SC] This month we are reprinting an article by former *Turbo* contributor Steve Johnson. Comments on the article can be pubbed in *Turbo*, I will see that he sees them, or you can respond to Steve directly at:

Steve Johnson, 702 Eugenia Ave., Madison, WI 53705, 608-231-2040 or on-line at sjohns19@facstaff.wisc.edu

Steve reports that he has taped the SHOWTIME movie on the Roswell incident. Anyone wishing to set up a group viewing of the video can contact Steve.

Bill Humphries

[JG] Great cover, Bill, and a wonderful event to celebrate. I like the acetate layer: it really spiffs up the effect. I think that if ever I steal the idea from you, I would print the text mirror backwards so the type could be sandwiched between acetate and paper cover where it couldn't be rubbed off.

[SC] Thanks from me also for a beautiful cover.

Jae Adams

[JG] Interesting stuff about *The Female Man*, Jae. When I reread *Khatru* — a symposium of women in SF, in preparation for doing the Corflu publication, one of the things I was most struck by was how surprisingly current so much of those 1975 conversations were. Not only was I reminded how little of institutionalized sexism has been swept away in those almost twenty years, but I was stunned at how radical the statements by *Khatru's* participants sounded. I think that many of us are still just as radical, but we have had twenty years of experience with backlash, and so tend to speak more circumspectly, more carefully, or simply rephrase, hoping not to "put off" others by our anger. I think this tendency to speak defensively works to the benefit of the backlash, whose Big Lie—that the problem has been solved; there's no need for change—depends upon the perception that fewer people are justified in their anger. Discrediting or silencing work equally well.

My library is also alphabetized. (And so are my spices.) I too enjoy the strange juxtaposition of authors and titles. Faludi and Faulkner. LeGuin and L'Engle. Keillor and Kafka. Hellman and Heller. Speaking of which, if you ever feel the need to get together with someone to read excerpts of *Catch-22* aloud, I'd love to join you. Have you heard that Heller is publishing a sequel to *Catch-22*?



[SC] Next time I tackle something as challenging as *The Female Man*, I will have to make absolutely certain I'm going to be able to go to the book discussion. I read it just a week before the meeting, but we were unable to go as things worked out. I finished it with a lot of questions and I could have used a discussion to clear up some things. I agree with you and Jeanne that it is a book that still sounds as radical today as ever. Many of the same issues are still with us.

I'm writing these comments a few days before deadline and I just got *Casbah* in the mail today. I haven't read the whole thing, but I turned to Brooks' article right away because of your comments. I agree that his piece is very powerful and well written. His gift for dramatic understatement is very effective in a story like this. I appreciated your comments much more now that I've seen it.

I would very much like to see the *Atlantic Monthly* article you mentioned in your comment to me. Obviously in my current line of work, any study of aggression is going to capture my interest and one that focuses on research done in prisons would be especially intriguing. I'll look for it (I hope it is still on the newsstands, if not, could I borrow it from you if you still have it?) I found all your comments about Matt's experiences interesting and familiar. I came from a small town so I think I had it a bit easier than a lot of big city kids, but I can certainly recall the importance of size in determining the pecking order and the pressure smaller boys were under to figure out a strategy for dealing with it.

Bill Bodden

[JG] Congratulations on your rapid rise within the Steep and Brew hierarchy. You sound sort of ambivalent about the whole thing. Are you glad or are you still looking for something else?

The baseball strike has actually interested me (for its labor-management conflict) more than the game itself ever did. I agree with both you and **Andy Hooper** and sympathize with the players. Did you read the column in *The Isthmus* a month or two ago by the sports writer who suggested that the players should start playing baseball games in the unused (by any pro baseball team) stadium in Florida—renaming their teams, redesigning their logos and uniforms, etc., and selling the broadcast rights to the games to various media? The writer admitted that they'd probably have to spend half the money they made paying off lawyers working on the lawsuits this would entail, but it would, he said, clarify whose activities the fans pay for when they buy tickets—the players or the owners. I laughed. What a great idea. It reminded me of the special strike newspaper published by *The Isthmus's* predecessor, *The Press Connection*. And it makes sense to me: When you're on strike, you shouldn't let people forget what they're missing, but especially, let people know that you love doing the work; that you're striking for a principal.

"Union Straße"?

[SC] How is it that some of the *Magic* cards are worth more than others? They are a set, right? How could some of the cards from a set still have value without the rest of the cards?

Congratulations on the move up to supervisor. What do you think of Ballering? I've heard he's quite a character (which may be good or bad, I don't know which.)

I've found it very frustrating watching the bias much of the media shows regarding the baseball strike. Baseball owners and the media have a lot in common when it comes to labor disputes since the media is dominated by a smaller and smaller number of large corporations. Instead of devoting attention to the owners as well as the players, they have decided to focus on the fans' frustration. A typical approach is to ask a fan what they think of the strike and following that up by asking whether they think the player's make too much money. By continually repeating the "average" salary of the players as \$1.2 million, they never clarify that most of the players actually make far less than that (as your reprint shows). I often have the feeling that the media believe the players should be willing to play for free since baseball is only a game. They would never think to criticize Arnold Schwarzenegger for his salary for playing make-believe.

Today (Thursday 9/15) I heard a disturbing story on NPR. They were saying that the owners figured all along that the players would not back down and expected to lose the rest of this season. Apparently the owners are negotiating with the TV networks to broadcast games next year using minor league players. They are assuring the networks that this would only be temporary until the players union folds. The owners seem to have negotiated in bad faith and were fully prepared to sacrifice the season. I miss baseball, but I'm cheering for the players to hang tough.

So is Lucifer any better tempered when he stops in to Steep and Brew, or does he patronize Victor Allen's?

Vijay Bowen

[JG] I suppose that loud and stupidly drunk women strike a more discordant note with people who hold up for comparison the stereotyped picture of a sweet, sedated, ideal woman. On the other hand, a loud and stupidly drunken male only seems an exaggerated version of the aggressive ideal of a stereotyped man. Of course, it's the stereotypes that cause the problem, not the people who dare to shake them up.

Odd. My brothers, sister and I were also born between September and December. In fact, one of us was born in each month. Mom and dad, on the other hand, were born in May and June.

[SC] I found your discussion of the ILC conference very interesting. Thanks for responding so fully. I am tempted to pepper you again with lots of questions, but since I've done that to you a lot lately, I'll limit myself to just one. What does Eulenspiegel refer to? I was slightly amused at the mental picture I had of the Defenders/NY group. They must be a very happy bunch seeing as how they are Catholics in the leather/levi community, their lives must be full of guilt and frustration.

You seemed to be edging toward comparing this conference to a SF con. Granted that SF cons in my experience have always seemed a little weird, this event strikes me as several magnitudes of weird beyond anything I've yet seen at a con. Still you made it all sound quite reasonable and pleasant, even fun. I could imagine myself attending some of the panels you described. But the constant high level sexual energy that must have permeated the atmosphere almost everywhere would have made me acutely uncomfortable. Not to mention the fact that I would look totally out of place without a major personal overhaul. The Robert Morgan quote was great.

Jim Brooks

[SC] Your zine should only be referred to as an "ass saver" because you needed to submit something to stay in *Turbo*. In any other sense, your zine was an excellent contribution. I liked your approach to catch up comments. The important point you managed to get across was letting us know that you read and care about our stuff. We all know it's tough for you to write your usual volumes of material right now. I'll wait patiently.

I often wish there really was such a thing as the Pun Police.

Hello *Cindy*. Good to hear from you. This apa thing can become addictive. You've been warned.

Bill Dyer

[JG] I attended my high school's 5-year reunion, but even then I realized that I had so completely lost track of my old classmates, that I hardly remembered anyone. I skipped my 20th and 25th. (I don't remember hearing about any others.) Earlier in the year the reunion committee sent me a weird questionnaire to fill out with one-half a line for a description of my career, and most of the rest of the page devoted to questions about and space for information about my spouse, children and grandchildren. It didn't make me want to attend. But I received a copy of the memory book published for the event, and like you, I was surprised by the longish list of classmates who had died already. Several of them whom I knew to be gay, I suspect probably died of AIDs.

[SC] Coincidentally, this summer was also my 20th high school reunion. I didn't go. I haven't gone to any reunions since the 1st year (just a beer party at which I only remember getting drunk.) I did receive the memory book and found it fascinating. I graduated from a class of about 100 people, so I knew everyone. The updates were often amazing. I've been thinking more seriously about going to my 25th now.

Excellent comment to *Lisa*.

Ellen Franklin

[JG] As you talked about visualizing your play, *Daughters of Crazy Mothers*, I imagined a screen behind the stage with projections of appropriate postcards, often striking ironic or discordant notes with the actions or words of the actors.

[SC] Powerful monologue. It reads well just on the page, but only hints at the really strong impression it must make when performed. I hope you continue to work on it and we have a chance to see it sometime as a performance along with the rest of *Daughters of Crazy Mothers*. A great idea for a play.

Women En Large is a beautiful book and you all should be very proud of it.

I'm glad you and *Laura* had such a good time at music camp. So what impact would more Wisconsin women have? Maybe a little less New Age and a little more politically radical?

Cathy Gilligan

[JG] I discovered the sequels to *A Wrinkle in Time* when I reread that book as an adult. And although there are bits in the second book, especially, that I liked, none of them are as good as the first book. In fact, they get progressively more religious as the series progresses, reminding me more and more of C. L. Lewis's books....

[SC] The difference between taking accounting and programming for me is that I've had lots of accounting already. It's mostly review and update rather than learn it for the first time. I may try a programming class again sometime when they change the curriculum. I wasn't very interested in learning Assembler.

Karl Hailman

[SC] I would like to have *Martin Smith's* e-mail address if you have it.

You mean to say the ENTIRE state smelled of fertilizer? Actually, Iowa smells of freshly cut hay and wildflowers. That chemical fertilizer smell occasionally blows up from Missouri.

Pat Hario

[JG] I don't think your co-worker actually gave you their original disk of *SimCity*. You must have been given a copy. *SimCity 2000* is only an add-on to *SimCity*. In order to run the add-on, you must own and still have installed the core program.

I know what you mean when you said to *Kim Winz* that moving into your own house is a weird sort of experience—in that you don't at first feel "at home." For me, however, it didn't come from having seen the house furnished by the previous owner. In fact, *Scott* and I didn't see the inside of our house until it was already completely cleaned out by the children of the original owners. For me, the sudden sense of wrongness (This isn't my house. We made the wrong decision! I'll never feel at home here....) came from the fact that we didn't unpack until a couple weeks after we moved in. We were going to paint first and decided to leave most of the stuff in boxes and the furniture bunched in a corner to make the job easier. I still remember the second day after we'd moved in, sitting with a blanket wrapped around me in the living room on our only living room chair, a box of Kleenex at my side and a big glass of orange juice in my hand. I was really sick. *Scott* was outside shoveling mountains of snow that had fallen during the previous night. I felt miserable. The living room was chaos—boxes everywhere, and I suddenly knew that we should never have moved into this house, that I would always feel uncomfortable. *Scott* came in, exhausted, cold and wet, and, between sobs, I told him the bad news. We'd made a mistake.

...Luckily I got over my cold. And my second thoughts. I love our house now.

Yes, I too think of the sound of *Rush Limbaugh* as my last warning. If I'm working on the computer and I hear his voice on the TV in the other room, I know it's really late and that I'd better shut things down and get to bed. His voice will also wake me up immediately if I've fallen asleep on the couch and I fumble for the remote control and zap him before he completes his first sentence.



I don't get the feeling that Elk is trying to pressure people into staying with the program and learn how to quilt out of a sense of duty. (Quilt guilt, imagine that!) She seems to be more interested in just getting people to try it a few times, because quilting—according to Elk—seems to be one of those things that one suddenly “catches onto,” and (sometimes) suddenly likes. If you don't, you don't. Certainly you shouldn't feel obliged to quilt. All of you sewing terrorists have done an amazing, wonderful job and have nothing but praise due to you for all the work you've put into the project. I'm just trying to suggest that Elk is anxious that you try it before you give up on the idea.

[SC] I noted with pride your brief salutes to my home state. Thank you. You made the very same trip across Iowa Karl made. Your opinion is obviously much more reliable. “Scenic” is what he must have meant instead of “stinks.” Something wrong with his keyboard I expect.

Andy Hooper

[JG] Interesting idea about a *Turbo* retrospective anthology, Andy. Unfortunately, I'm going to respond with those same old supportive, but noncommittal noises. I'd love to see the project done, but I don't intend to volunteer for another publishing project at this time. Above and beyond my regular jobs and other paying free-lance jobs, there are too many projects of my own that keep getting pushed to the back burner. So, I wish you good luck on the project, Andy, but I'm afraid you'll have to count me out of this one.

[SC] Your reservations about the crime bill were well founded. Three-strikes-you're-out is clearly a political gesture that makes no real sense. We are already in danger of bankrupting ourselves building prisons and this law will add a lot more pressure on already overcrowded institutions. The sweeping additions to the death penalty are also mostly politics. The death penalty is a truly awful and useless practice. The gun control measures were both tepid and doomed. Only the modest funding of a few prevention programs was worth cheering about.

Congratulations on your birthday.

I am also not in a position to volunteer for new projects like an apa anthology at this time.

Bill Humphries

[JG] The catalog you were telling Lisa Freltag about was for a show Scott and I saw at the Boston Museum of Fine Art: “Mark Tansey: Visions and Revisions.” In fact, I now own a book of Tansey's paintings and a great essay by Arthur C. Danto, who you may recognize from the pages of *The Nation*.

Hope Kiefer

[JG] Are diaper wraps like the plastic pants they used to put over diapers? I'm shamefully ignorant about such things, but let me assure you I only ask out of casual curiosity. No actual demonstration is necessary.

Diane Martin

[JG] I don't think I've ever said or suggested that anyone should “put the apa first, or else [they] don't deserve to be in it.” In fact, if anyone did classify the apa as the most important thing in their life—putting their livelihood and personal relationships at jeopardy for the sake of their apazine—it would make me feel rather uncomfortable. I agree with you, it would worry “me to think that some people might put it right up there with breathing. There is just so much more to life.”

I put a lot of things ahead of the apa—first and foremost: paying work. I may not put in as many hours at the DNR as you do at AE Business Solutions, but if you count in all the hours I put in doing free-lance work at my home office, my work hours probably exceed yours. In fact, I put a lot of other things ahead of the apa, too. I put my relationship with Scott way, way ahead of the apa. And then there are various volunteer commitments I make to groups (including SF³ and the Tiptree project) and friends. Last week, work on the letter announcing the annual SF³ meeting effectively postponed my apa-writing and cut short any attempt at many long comments (except for this one to you and one to Pat). A good book will frequently supplant the apa in my priorities.

On the other hand, I put the apa ahead of some things. If I have a chunk of free time, I will usually work on *Union Street* before I watch TV, before I clean the house, do laundry, or iron clothes, before I balance my checkbook, before I work in the garden, and sometimes—like tonight, as I stay up late getting this done—before sleep. Judging from the choices I make, the apa must also hold a higher priority for me than publishing *Whimsey* or writing my TAFF trip report.

You speculated that I was just trying to make Lynne Anne feel better about not having a “real job” when I told her I thought that her lack of a full-time paying job was irrelevant to the kind of zine she produced. You said this statement did her no favors and made you mad. I'm sorry I angered you, but do you really think I might have done Lynne Ann a favor by suggesting that her lack of full-time employment explains the quality of her apazine? To me, that would be the greater insult because of its implied assumption that her time is less valuable, her choices more frivolous than mine.

I have once or twice begun to write fiction. A few outlines and exploratory chapters fill several manila envelopes in my files, but none of these stories are complete. I would like to have finished one of them. I would like to have had one of them published. But other things, other commitments always push that work aside; I choose to work on something else, finish other things. I suppose I could say that I am too busy to write fiction; that my life is too full to include another project. But the truth is that I make room in my life for the things that matter most to me, and the fact that I haven't finished one of those stories means that there are other, more important things in my life. Perhaps I will eventually take the time to write a story; perhaps it will be a good story. But I don't believe that my job or my freelance work or the time I spend with Scott or any of a hundred things I choose to do instead of writing fiction **keeps me from that** writing. Nor do I feel guilty when I compare myself to someone who does make time in their life for writing fiction. They make their own choices and I make mine.

I wasn't just trying to make Lynne Ann feel better; I really do think that having or lacking a full-time paid job is irrelevant to the production of a good zine. An apazine doesn't gobble up very big amounts of time, relatively speaking ... a few hours out of a month or two. Fitting apaproduction time into one's schedule isn't a matter of quitting one's job, or even of calling in sick. More often, we choose to write our comments rather than go to a movie, read a book, or collapse exhausted in front of the TV after a long day of work. If I won the lottery and quit my job at the DNR, I would certainly rearrange my life's priorities, but I really doubt that writing for the apa would automatically shoot up to the number one or number two slot. Instead, I would probably need to find another kind of work that would give me a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction. The apa would continue to compete for my energies among less important aspects of my life.

At the end of your comment to me, you seem to agree with me on this. Though you might like to produce "greater, more responsive zines," if you had more time, you also admit that you would probably not write more, even if you no longer had to work for a living. So there you are, agreeing with my comment to Lynne Ann. If you, like Lynne, didn't have to punch a time clock, you would probably still produce a zine of the same size and quality as the one you produce now. And I would be saying to you, as I am now, that I thought the fact of your employment or lack of employment was irrelevant to the size and quality of your zine.

...Which is fine with me. Your zines are fun to read; they're interesting, often full of insights. I'm glad you're in the apa, and you misunderstand me if you think I've been secretly attacking you all this time, trying to guilt trip you into writing more.

I believe in praising people who put a lot of effort and energy into their work. That's what I was doing with Lynne Ann. I would rather that she *not* put herself down by thinking the only reason she shines in this particular forum is that she fails in some other. We all choose how to use our time and if we are lucky we are praised for the work we do well.

[SC] I think of the two of us, I have been the more vocal when it comes to complaining about lack of commitment to the apa from some writers. Yes, I'm a cheerleader for the apa. I see that as my job. I'm the OE. I'm supposed to act as caretaker for the apa and speak up when I think something is wrong. When I have several members who repeatedly submit bare minac for

months on end while the waitlist is full of ambitious writers, I feel a need to speak up. You are not one of the writers I have ever felt a need to complain about, in fact I value your contributions very highly. I think all of us do.

Everyone has to find their own comfort level with regard to time and energy committed to this project. We have a lot of busy people in this group. You are not the only one. The apa is not the most important thing in *my* life either. But I believe there is a point where someone's lack of effort is so severe that it has a depressing effect on everyone else. Those people obviously have no time in their lives or real interest in the apa and should step aside for the good of the group. I don't always like what people do with their zines, but the only time I feel compelled to complain in print is if their contributions are so minimal that it hurts the group.

Lynne Ann Morse

[SC] I haven't really much to say in response to you this month. I was amused at your struggles with the post office. They can be a maddening outfit to work with. I hope you had a good time at the calligraphy conference despite the ambivalence you expressed. We miss you too.

Jim Nichols

[SC] Here you are in the "no comment" zone at the end of the apa.

I was amused by your "statistical adventure." The apa does not lend itself easily to examination by counting and measuring, although I engaged in a bit of that myself this month (see business pages.)

Apas live or die by their comments. Contributors need feedback, but I believe the quality of comments is more important than the quantity. Simply deciding on a strategy that will generate large numbers of comments will probably not be satisfactory in the end. Writers need to know that what they are saying is being read and cared about. It doesn't take a lot of space or time to write those kind of comments, just a bit of effort.

YCT me, events have rendered this WisCon discussion mostly moot. Sorry if I pressed you a bit hard to give us your view.

Jeanne & Scott
23 September 1994



An Evening with Donald Schmitt

SHOWTIME Premiere of Roswell: The Human Side to an Extraordinary Story

by Steven Vincent Johnson

On July 31, 1994, on a beautiful Sunday afternoon, a small group of nondescript supporters gathered at the private quarters of Donald Schmitt, co-author of the recently published book "The Truth about the UFO Crash at Roswell." We came in peace, to watch the premiere showing of "Roswell," an exclusive made for cable TV SHOWTIME docudrama concerning the alleged crash of an extraterrestrial craft in the deserted fields of New Mexico back in July 1947. It would appear that the Roswell incident has reached a legendary status in our society. As the magical hour approached everyone jockeyed for optimum seating in the living room next to Mr. Schmitt's TV. I was no different, having found a comfy spot at the end of a couch worth defending.

It should be noted that the SHOWTIME "Roswell" movie follows the time line of their previous book "UFO Crash at Roswell" which was first published back in July of 1991. Randle & Schmitt's more recent book "The Truth about the UFO Crash at Roswell" published earlier in 1994 has changed the chronological time line of certain events somewhat, the result of face-to-face interviews with additional witnesses whose testimonies, I believe, have been collaborated by independent sources.

I suspect there were many present in Donald's living room who over the years had done what they could to lend logistical, intellectual, as well as emotional support to the Randle & Schmitt team. The dynamic duo's investigations have been all-consuming with no sign of letting up. There have been the inevitable problems introduced by debunkers, hoaxers, as well as what appears to have been deliberate attempts to mislead them down paths that would have cost them considerable time and money chasing after mirages. Mr. Schmitt more than once has made the comment that there are many in the business of UFOlogy who, if truth be told, don't want the Roswell incident solved primarily because a considerable amount of investment money has been tied up in perpetuating the mystique of an unsolved mystery, or because it would be the death of alternative pet theories.

There have also been a few odd stories Donald Schmitt has mentioned which probably will never make into print primarily because of their anecdotal nature. For example, there is the curious story concerning Kevin Randle's missing galley sheets to their most recently co-authored book, "The Truth About the UFO Crash at Roswell." Randle and Schmitt live in separate states, and thus, mailed the final corrections to their galley sheets independently to the publisher. They both took diligent care in packaging and mailing the manuscripts. Donald

Schmitt's package made it to the publisher successfully. Unfortunately, Kevin Randle's manuscript didn't. A postal investigation turned up nothing. In the end, the post office inferred that someone had to have entered the building and had to have "walked away" with Randle's package. Perhaps the revised manuscript really had been "lost," the result of ineptitude on the part of our Post Office. On the other hand, who might possibly be interested in getting their hands on a manuscript that deals with the names of a new batch of Roswell witnesses. More specifically, who might be interested in previewing documented accounts of government suppression and threats directed at witnesses who were involved in recovery operations concerning a crashed extraterrestrial craft and recovered alien bodies. Now, whoooo might that possibly be!

On the lighter side, Mr. Schmitt pointed out his cameo role in the "Roswell" movie where in a couple of brief scenes he got to play an overworked bartender for the 509 bomber squad reunion. Of course, anyone who reads "UFO a forum on extraordinary theories and phenomena," Vol. 9, No. 4, 1994, already knows this little bit of trivia! (See page 29 for details.) There is, however, another brief scene worth noting! Schmitt pointed out a pair cadaver feet briefly seen laying on a gurney in Roswell's morgue. You guessed it, they belong to Mr. Randle who is still very much alive and kicking, fortunately! (I wonder what the going union scale is for "dead feet.")

At the end of the presentation we did our best to show our appreciation with a round of applause a few rousing cheers. Afterwards, Mr. Schmitt tried answering our questions concerning the latest developments. He mentioned that within the past two months they have discovered the names of two dozen additional military personnel who claim to have been involved in the Roswell incident. Apparently, more witnesses are beginning to feel confident enough to come out of seclusion because of what they have read and/or heard about the Randle & Schmitt team. Their most recent book lists the names of approximately 500 individuals who claim to have had first and second hand knowledge. Concerning all of the listed witnesses, Schmitt and Randle have made it a point to interview each and every individual, face to face.

Mr. Schmitt mentioned that they have acquired the services of a very large and well known law firm located in Washington (name withheld by Schmitt). The firm's function would be to legally represent a number of key first-hand Roswell witnesses should it be deemed necessary to call a press conference and go public in order to

challenge the speculated future possibility of governmental denial and charges of falsehood. Mr. Schmitt elaborated that apparently there have been a number of military witnesses who have wanted to go "public" for some time. He mentioned that every time word got out that these individuals were thinking about going public they were "visited" and warned that they would have the entire bulk of their past history erased, disproving that they had ever existed in the military, and thus, making it next to impossible to verify their claims.

It is hard for many of us to believe that this kind of threat could be implemented or even be considered feasible in this modern age of alleged "Freedom Of Information." Never the less, it helps to understand that citizens both believed in and followed the orders of their government with a great deal more respect forty five years ago as compared to what our current eroded attitudes have become. It is also important to realize that most of the Roswell witnesses were geographically separated from each other after the event had been more-or-less contained. Mr. Schmitt implied that for the past forty years most have remained psychologically isolated having no one to talk to, that is, except for an occasional visit by "officials" making sure they remained motivated to stay silent.

Donald Schmitt stressed he was happy that a key point at the conclusion of the movie had been enacted concerning the concept of "disinformation." It has been theorized by many that an official program of disinformation, as dramatically enacted by the Chiefs of Staff, or as the Schmitt & Randle duo have called it in their book, "The Unholy Thirteen," may have been implemented as early as 1947. As depicted in the SHOWTIME movie, it has been theorized that disinformation tactics would allow accurate information to be released to the public primarily through sources whose credibility had been made out to be questionable and unreliable. Meanwhile, the media would be simultaneously bombarded with a flood of inaccurate data making it virtually impossible to uncover the truth.

Several in the living room asked Donald Schmitt to express his personal feelings about the movie's speculative and dramatic conclusion. Near the movie's end there were a number of enacted scenes concerning "captured" extraterrestrial beings interacting with government top brass. Mr. Schmitt mentioned that he would have preferred that the SHOWTIME movie had toned down the "live" extraterrestrial special effects scenes since the enactments for the most part revolved around second hand accounts. However, Schmitt mentioned that the SHOWTIME producers did honor their requests by keeping scenes of "live" alien beings down to a minimum. For the technically curious, it apparently took the rehearsed skill of five hidden puppeteers working levers and cables

in order to animate the alien who "communicated" with Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal.

Near the end of the movie there is an enacted dramatic incident of the speculative kind involving the Secretary of Defense, who back in 1947 was James Vincent Forrestal, and a live "captured" extraterrestrial. Apparently, there have been a number of controversial rumors suggesting that Forrestal had been deeply involved in the extraterrestrial equation. Prosaically speaking, it certainly would have made logical sense to assume that our nation's Secretary of Defense would have been personally involved with discussions and/or interactions concerning ultra-secret extraterrestrial meetings - had contact actually been established. Tragically, Forrestal allegedly committed suicide on May 22, 1949 by jumping out of a window at Bethesda Naval Hospital where he had been held for treatment of emotional exhaustion which included paranoia and suicidal tendencies.

Why Forrestal needed treatment to the point that he was essentially isolated from most of his family and friends, as well as why he had become emotionally unstable, paranoid, and suicidal in the first place, has been debated for decades by a number of prominent UFO investigators. Forrestal was (and still is, I believe) the highest ranking U.S. government official to have allegedly committed suicide, an incident that did not escape the attention of communist block countries who attempted to milk the embarrassing situation for all it was worth. Apparently, there are some who knew him closely and who remain convinced that his death was not accidental or suicidal, or at least that his death had been desired by some who, in 1949, possessed a considerable amount of power in the United States.

As had been suggested by the SHOWTIME movie there has been a lot of speculation concerning an alleged Forrestal "diary." For those who would like to do a little scholarly research of their own, there exists an excellent biographical book on Forrestal titled "James Forrestal, A study of Personality, Politics and Policy" by Arnold A. Rogow. (I believe it was published back in the 1960s and, thus, may be somewhat hard to find. Ask your local librarian or professional book locator for help!) The author, Rogow, writes in the biography the following series of puzzling events as well as recovered official documents on page 47:

... on White House orders a number of papers and documents were removed from Forrestal's files, either for "security" reasons or other reasons. Although evidence is not conclusive, it is probable that certain individuals, for a variety of reasons, were reluctant to make Forrestal's private papers available until they had been properly "screened." Two such individuals, apparently, were President Truman and [the next] Secretary of Defense Johnson. In a memorandum to the President of August 27, 1949, Johnson wrote:



I am glad to be able to advise you that the individuals who were in the best possible position to know the truth or falsity of the rumors about the Forrestal "diary," the Forrestal "recordings" of telephone conversations with you, etc. have assured me that there is absolutely no truth whatever to the stories which you and I have heard.

Specifically, I have received categoric assurances to the following effect:

- 1) There was never a recording device on Forrestal's White House' Phone.
- 2) No conversation between you and Forrestal was ever recorded, either by machine or otherwise.
- 3) There was never an occasion when a secretary or anyone else was permitted to pick up the extension "phone and "listen in" on conversations between you and Forrestal.
- 4) There was never a volume that could accurately be described as a Forrestal "Diary."

FOOTNOTE: In a letter to the present writer [Rogow], Johnson declared that he had no recollection of this memorandum, and therefore could not comment on its significance or discuss the context in which it was written.

It should be mentioned here that nowhere in Rogow's book that I'm personally aware of is there any mention of rumors concerning crashed extraterrestrial craft and/or alien bodies. Never the less, I personally find it rather odd and somewhat unconvincing that Johnson claimed he could not "recall" the contents of the memos he had written to Truman which likely had to have been of a (difficult to forget) sensitive nature. The reader is invited to draw their own speculations.

* * *

Most curiously, at the same time that Shmitt and Randle's latest Roswell book hit the book stores, another prominent book on UFOlogy was published and widely distributed. It is titled "Watch the Skies, A chronicle of the Flying Saucer Myth" by Curtis Peebles. Mr. Peebles's book was published by the Smithsonian Institution, which has affiliations with the government. The book is packed with a number of delightful tales and stories that leads the reader to the assumption that the UFO phenomenon is largely the result of misidentified aerial phenomenon, mis-communication and unsubstantiated rumors, and just plain out right chicanery. Peebles discusses the Roswell

incident briefly, explaining the event away in a few pages as a "balloon." The book was reviewed in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 29, 1994 by Carl Sagan who concluded near the end:

It would be a healthy sign for the United States if books like Peebles's were commonly found in school bookbags, excerpted in supermarket weeklies, and made into television specials.

Meanwhile, in a magazine called "UFO a forum on extraordinary theories and phenomena, Vol. 9, No. 4 1994, George W. Early, UFO's Opinionated Oregonian, (TM), made the following comment about Peebles's book (See pages 40-41):

Unlisted, and hence clearly not consulted, was anyone from CUFOS, MUFON or FUFOR (Center for UFO Research, Mutual UFO Network and Fund for UFO Research, respectively). MUFON's Walt Andrus told me that when Peebles used quotes from MUFON sources, "They are from published papers. He never spoke to anyone." While this does ensure accurate quotations, it also eliminates the danger of having one's preconceptions challenged by discussions with real people.

* * *

It was late in the evening when we left Mr. Shmitt's house. I think most of us felt reasonably confident that an important historical event had been accurately enacted on the screen in the creative guise of a docudrama. It would appear that we may have a sociological mystery of modern mythic proportions in the process of unraveling before our eyes. Is it really possible that over forty five years ago a craft of unknown origin crashed in the remote deserted fields of a sheep rancher in the sparsely populated state of New Mexico? How after all these decades could such a momentous event be kept a secret from the world? Is this actual fact or enacted Myth. In the end, perhaps the fiercely sought after hard-edged facts CAN'T be separated from the subjective and deeply personal mythic interpretations due to the extraordinary nature of the incident and the experiences they have generated.

It is hoped that the recent Roswell books by Donald Schmitt and Kevin Randle, the earlier publication by Charles Berlitz and William L. Moore titled "The Roswell Incident," and the newly released SHOWTIME movie, "Roswell," may help answer some of these riddles once and for all.

I'm sure there is more to come!