

FRIDAY JUNE 8, 1990

DEAR STEVE:

Here's a transcript of your talk in the "Scientific Communication" symposium held a little over a week ago.

The transcript is in "raw" form, replete with notations about audience laughter & standard charts. If the article were "cleaned up" some & edited, it'd make a nice, publishable article. Where it might be published, I don't know, except that I think that it should be!

I also have a transcript of your 3-hour presentation at OSU last Fall, and I'll be sending you a copy of that pretty soon.

Take care,

John

J. W. ESHLEMAN
143 BLAKEFORD DR.
DUBLIN, OH 43017

Scientific Misinformation, Disinformation, and Top Secret Information

Stephen A. Graf, Ph.D.

Youngstown State University

About 1981 or 1982 I prodded Dick Malott to get a computer. [Audience Laughter] (Malott: "I'm not going to tell you what he's prodding me to get now.") Now... Well.

Information

The root word here is "information." Information and allow how it's going. I think the little sortie we just had represents that. Dick's computer expertise has really accelerated over the 10-year period that computers have been around. If we look at information, a French economist named George Anderla did some interesting compilations of attempts to index information as it has existed through human history. What he did was to index at 1 in 1 AD the sum total of man's information, and then estimated through numbers of inventions, discovery of elements, and so forth, how that information then grew. It started out at 1 in 1 AD. By 1350 it doubled to 2. In the 1700's it doubled again to 4. And in 1900 it had doubled again to 8. That's where we are picking up the picture. So, this is the 20th Century of information as he indexed it [On yearly standard celeration chart]. So, there's 1900. In 1950 it doubled again up to 16. In 1960 it doubled again. And in -- notice that it has doubled, doubled, doubled, doubled, you keep doubling, and estimates are -- notice now that we are still in the nineties, estimates are that past the turn of the century, within the first decade of that century, information will be doubling something like every 36 hours. [Audience laughter].

Here's some information. Terrorists attacks -- worldwide; accelerating; a little bit of a turn-down there for a couple of years. Things looked good. Looks bad, particularly if you carry that out to the year 2000. That's information.

Misinformation = "Unintentionally incorrect transmission that the

communicator believes to be correct."

What's this intention stuff? [Audience chuckles]. What misinformation really is, is a harmful -- well it's simply a tact, a distorted tact or just an inaccurate tact. So, that's misinformation.

Disinformation = "Intentionally incorrect transmission of serious intent."

Disinformation is a harmful mand disguised as a tact. Let's use these words for a bit ordinary people, regular people: Intentionally incorrect transmission of serious intent. Well, you can get into trouble with disinformation. You can also get into trouble with misinformation. And there are some other ways we can go wrong as well.

Top Secret Information = "Communication, which if disclosed without authority could reasonably be expected to cause damage to the national security."

Well, this is how the government defines it. And notice that they put in the authority part. So that communication that is disclosed without authority could reasonably be expected to cause damage to the national security. Well, a lot of nationality built into there. [Audience question. Cannot decipher]. Yeah, and actually that's the way they work. So they've got stuff which is classified. And then it's rewritten so that it's then disclosed, but now it's been authorized to be disclosed, and goes through millions of pages of that each year.

Okay, those are the basic definitions. Now, I want to step back for just a moment. Back to 1800. First human in history to receive a comprehensively complete inventory of the worlds vital economic statistics: Thomas Malthus. He was a professor at the East India Company College in Great Britain. And based on the data, his conclusion was that worldwide population is growing by multiplying, life support production is growing by adding. Was that misinformation or information? Or if it was information, has it changed across the years? Well, by and large, through most of the 50's, 60's, and 70's national governments acted as if this were

in fact accurate information. There have been other scientists throughout history who have also had some impact on this, philosophers as well. So, what Darwin said, what Marx said, all could be related to that. And the basic statement that it gets at is: To solve the world hunger population, or world hunger problem or other problems, control population. That's the one conclusion which can be drawn from that. That's a fairly serious type of surmise to make, and yet a number of other offshoots of that have been carried on in various guises ever since.

Well, is that misinformation or is that information? Well, let's look at some more data. Here's humans, of the world, birthrate. **[Presented on a yearly standard celeration chart]**. And notice that it's dividing by 1.1 every five years. This comes from M... G... World Game Institute, and was current through the late 70's. That's world population: dividing. **[Sigrid Glenn: "Is that world population, or birthrate?"]**. Uh, sorry, world birthrate. Now, that's going to have an effect on the population. This is per thousand, so this represents in 1978 or so about 37 births per thousand. That's a worldwide birth rate.

Look at production of energy: Humans producing energy in the world is multiplying by 1.1 every five years. **[Presented on a yearly standard celeration chart]**. If you look at these two, then **[a yearly chart of birthrate and energy production]**, you've got energy production going up; birthrate going down. Opposite of what Malthus said, and a completely different situation, and the question is now, are we reacting to that data? Are we aware of that data? Sometimes we're aware of data, but we don't react to it.

Here's a dymaxium map of the world. **[Overhead of the map]**. This is a construction of Buckminster Fuller. And one of the outputs of this particular artifact, was that he saw a worldwide energy grid, where you could set up energy capabilities to every part of the world -- populated world -- for about one cent per kilowatt hour. That hasn't come to pass yet, but the Russians were interested in that back in the 70's. In looking then at this particular conclusion, that we have operated under, that a number of nations have operated under, we have to question whether that is information or misinformation. Information, or misinformation? That's a hot topic. I'm not going to stay on that one very long. Actually, what it boils down to is, information is hard to judge. And in some cases you're

going to get stuck with a situation where it doesn't look like you care what the correct information is, what the information is. What you are going to stick by are your guns, or your beliefs, and you're going to refuse to part with that belief despite the data. That's what Robert Anton Wilson, a guerrilla journalist, calls "fundamentalism."

More data. Government agencies: Types of secrets: Secret, Confidential, Top Secret. This was 1989, reported by the Information Security Oversight Office. And this represents -- this line up the chart represents another times up. So this is starting out at 1 million. So, Top Secret documents generated by various agencies of the United States government in 1989, about a million top secret documents. Confidential -- that's the lowest rung on the ladder; confidential -- lowest rung on the ladder, between one and two million. Secret -- second rung on the ladder, about 5 million. Top Secret, about one million. It turns out that there is another category above Top Secret that they don't even count. **[Audience chuckles; end of side of tape; turned over to next side].**

By millions, so it's starting with a million. Government agency classifying secrets: going down. Sounds good.

What brought that about? Well, some people give credit to the Freedom of Information Act, 1966, amended 1974. And it was specifically set up as an Act of Congress to increase public access to government records.

Now, this is one dot here. **[Presented on a standard celeration chart].** I want to point it out so you can see it. This is the U.S. government releasing -- it's cumulative release of UFO documents, in pages. And this was as of 1983. And this represents some 3,000 pages of UFO documents released. Now, purportedly there are some 10,000 pages which were applied for and not released.

The Freedom of Information Act means that you can't just go willy-nilly, and say, "Hey, give me all the UFO stuff you've got. You've got to be specific. You can actually use the National Enquirer, if they give a date, you can say "Okay between November 11th and 13th, 1974, what do you have on this particular topic?" That's how you have to sort of go about it. And, once you've gotten that request in, in a number of cases what

happens is you get a reply back that they're not releasing any information. Or, in some cases that they don't have any information on that. In fact, what has happened is the FBI for example has made a statement: "The Bureau does not investigate UFOs." Subsequently, there were some 175 documents filed for through the Freedom of Information Act, topic UFOs, from files of the FBI. That's a little strange.

What do we mean "UFOs"? What is this going on? Why is the government not telling us about it? Well, First Rule of Counter-intelligence is: "Always appear to know everything." I'm not sure the government even knows that, to follow that, because they appear to know nothing about UFOs based on what they say. But there does appear to be a cover-up or a conspiracy, or some sort of disinformation program that applies to UFOs. Official denial -- just to document, just say, "We don't know anything. We don't have any records about that. We don't know anything about it." Also, pressure on individuals, has been reported, not to say anything about certain events which have happened. Convenient explanations: "Okay, the guy was crazy. Anybody who could see something like that was crazy." **[Audience laughter]**. Or, that "that was the Moon." Or "that was Venus," or "that was one of our satellites reentering." Well, yes, in fact those things do happen. And for the most part that probably will take place, but take the place, or actually represent what 95% of the reports actually are.

Other strange thing of it though is that the phenomenon negates itself. We don't expect that. We wouldn't operate that way if we were contacting some civilization. Notice, I'm not saying these are extraterrestrial things, or anything like that. All I'm saying is that is if we were doing something similar to what seems to be happening here, it's not the way we would work, because we wouldn't, or I don't think at this point we would be so secretive. We wouldn't be so absurd as to do things which seem to negate our own existence, and so, that's strange.

Just as a sample, here was something cited in the UFO evidence published in 1964 of people reporting UFOs. Were these crackpots? Well, this particular list -- notice it shows a little wave here of acceleration and deceleration over a particular period of time -- Air Force, Army, Navy, Marine personnel, pilots, aviation officials, scientists, engineers, officials, and lastly, respectable citizens **[Audience chuckles]**. They were

the -- the bulk of this is made up of very highly scientific individuals.

I've looked at a little UFO data, and I don't want to spend much time on it. **[Graf presents the following data on yearly standard celeration charts:]**. There's electromagnetic cases; radar cases; contactee books; animal mutilations; nocturnal light cases; daylight disk cases; close encounter cases; crash and retrieval cases; physical trace cases; physiological effects; psychological effects; occupant cases; abduction cases **[Audience laughter]**. Here's the summary of those cases. **[Presented on a yearly standard celeration chart]**.

Okay, and these are reports of these cases, not the number of cases themselves.

What's it all mean? **[Audience laughter as Graf puts up picture of aliens on overhead]**. I really don't know. But the thing is, is that are we seeing what is actually going on, or are we a product of, or are we getting the products of disinformation. That is, we have gotten to the point where a number of us steadfastly refuse to believe in the phenomenon because we have been manipulated through a system of disinformation. There are a number of people who are currently in a position to do something about this or trying to do something about this. And I don't really know much more to say about it, except that it is kind of interesting.

Information -- gee, I hope it keeps growing, because this is something that seems to me is something that we should be informed in. One final point on disinformation: Computer viruses, example of disinformation. Misinformation? Tough to tell whether you have got the truth or just think you have got it. Ambrose Bearson (sp?) said it's not what we know, or it's not what we don't know that sticks us in the end, it's what we think we know that isn't so. Thank you very much.

Reference to use when referring to this paper:

Graf, S.A. (1990, May). Scientific misinformation, disinformation, and top secret information. Paper presented in J.W. Eshleman (Chair) Scientific Communication In Behavior Analysis: New Technologies, New Issues, New Concerns, Symposium presented at the 16th annual convention of the Association for Behavior Analysis, Nashville, TN.