

ROSS COULTHART'S RESPONSE TO MEDIAWATCH

28 August 2023

MEDIAWATCH'S QUESTIONS:

1. Why do you believe David Grusch's Congressional testimony when there is no firsthand evidence?
2. Do you believe alien spacecraft have visited earth?
3. Do you believe the US government has retrieved alien spacecraft and bodies but covered up the evidence?
4. Do you know if an alien spacecraft is secretly held in the US, and if so, why not reveal its location?
5. Have you maintained your journalist objectivity in covering David Grusch's claims?

ROSS COULTHART'S RESPONSE:

- The tenor of these questions suggests that MediaWatch has a pre-conceived agenda in how it will report this issue. This is because MediaWatch's questions are grounded in a false assumption.
- MediaWatch's questions state as a fact that there is no first-hand evidence to support David Grusch's allegations. Contrary to misreporting in some US legacy media, there is first-hand evidence, and it has been presented under oath to the Intelligence Community Inspector General in private hearings (the ICIG is the oversight body for the US' intelligence services). I have confirmed this testimony with multiple sources directly and I have interviewed first-hand witnesses myself directly.
- The current ICIG Thomas Monheim is still preparing his report into Mr Grusch's allegations, comprising both Grusch's complaint about reprisals against him for being a zealous UAPTF investigator and whistleblower and also, most importantly, the Inspector General is investigating Mr Grusch's complaint that there has been a conspiracy within both the US Defense Dept & intelligence community and senior executives in private aerospace to illegally conceal a non-human intelligence [NHI] crash retrieval program and reverse engineering program from Congressional oversight.
- As I have confirmed both with Mr Grusch and Congressional sources, the current ICIG was so concerned about Mr Grusch's allegations, after conducting his own investigations, that he referred all of them immediately to Congress, deeming all of Grusch's complaints "urgent and credible".
- I emphasise, these ICIG investigations included multiple interviews with first-hand witnesses to the NHI crash retrieval and reverse engineering program known to Mr Grusch, as well as other evidence. Other first-hand witnesses have also testified to the ICIG who are not known to Mr Grusch, backing his allegations.

- For David Grusch or any other witness to reveal such first-hand detail publicly would be a jailable offence because the information is protected by high level security classifications. He has made clear there is evidence he wishes to disclose from 40+ witnesses with direct evidence that he collected during his role as an investigator with the UAP Task Force for the Pentagon. There is also other evidence which he is not able to disclose publicly but which he has disclosed in secret to the ICIG, which is authorised to receive such sensitive information.
- I have also confirmed that multiple witnesses have already given evidence under oath in secret to Congress' two powerful intelligence oversight committees, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I have confirmed directly with Congressional sources that this evidence includes multiple direct first-hand witnesses to a still secret and possibly illegal NHI crash retrieval and reverse engineering program.
- As Congress was told nearly a month ago, in the first public hearing into UAPs in 55 years, these witnesses (including whistleblower David Grusch) are not allowed under US secrecy laws to reveal what they know publicly without proper authorisation. They want to testify under oath and multiple senior politicians in both the House and the Senate want that to happen. There is currently a substantial push-back from sections of the intelligence community who do not want this story investigated and large sections of the US media are complicit in letting historical stigma and ridicule towards UAPs hinder the fact that this is a legitimate story with evidence that demands investigation.
- It is a measure of just how seriously David Grusch's allegations are being taken that Grusch is represented by lawyer Charles McCullough who served as the original Intelligence Community Inspector General (ICIG). McCullough sat right behind his client in the July Congressional public hearing because he knows individuals in the US intelligence community and DoD are looking for any opportunity to gag Grusch and other witnesses from revealing what they know by prosecuting him for stepping outside what he has been permitted to discuss within the authority given to him by the DoD's Defense Office of Pre-publication Security Review [DOPSR].
- I have also interviewed first-hand witnesses and several are willing to testify, with the proper security protections and non-reprisal assurances, about their direct knowledge of an NHI crash retrieval and reverse engineering program.
- If you refer to pages 280-281 of my book IN PLAIN SIGHT you will see that I also interviewed a named first-hand witness, Nat Kobitz, who was 'read-into' a secret UAP crash retrieval and reverse engineering program in his senior R&D role as then director of the US Navy's Science & Technology Development office. Kobitz told me he was briefed that the US had recovered multiple NHI craft. On one occasion, he was asked for his expert opinion on a constructed object that he believed was not capable of manufacture using any known terrestrial technology. Kobitz also introduced me to other witnesses from within the US legacy crash retrieval and

reverse engineering program who spoke to me in confidence. Some of those original witnesses are among the people now willing to testify under oath to Congress.

- From the tone of your questions, you appear to errantly assume that much of what is written in US mainstream media on this subject is accurate*, for there have been assertions that there is no first-hand evidence presented to support Mr Grusch's allegations or a lack of credible evidence. Those assertions are wrong. Most media continue to misunderstand and misreport the process still on-going before secret congressional hearings and inside the ICIG's ongoing investigation.
- Moreover, as my journalistic colleagues Leslie Kean and Ralph Blumenthal reported in early June, David Grusch's allegations were indeed backed by corroborative insider witnesses. Their article states: *"...intelligence officials, both active and retired, with knowledge of these programs through their work in various agencies, have independently provided similar, corroborating information, both on and off the record."* This is corroboration of my own experience with first hand witnesses.
- Retired Army Karl Nell went on the record to The DeBrief, stating of Grusch, *"His assertion concerning the existence of a terrestrial arms race occurring sub-rosa over the past eighty years focused on reverse engineering technologies of unknown origin is fundamentally correct, as is the indisputable realization that at least some of these technologies of unknown origin derive from non-human intelligence."*
- In the same article, a serving intelligence officer, Jonathan Grey, specializing in UAP analysis at the National Air and Space Intelligence Center [NASIC], stated: *"A vast array of our most sophisticated sensors, including space-based platforms, have been utilized by different agencies, typically in triplicate, to observe and accurately identify the out-of-this-world nature, performance, and design of these anomalous machines, which are then determined not to be of earthly origin."*
<https://thedebrief.org/intelligence-officials-say-u-s-has-retrieved-non-human-craft/>
- Your questions make the mistake of asking if I *'believe'* that NHI 'alien' craft have been retrieved by the US Government and are currently the subject of a secret reverse engineering program. Belief is an expression of religious faith; it is defined as *'an acceptance that something exists or is true, especially one without proof'*. So, in answer to your question on 'belief', my belief is irrelevant. It is not the case that there is no proof at all behind Mr Grusch's allegations, as your questions on 'belief' imply.
- What I am doing as a journalist is investigating those allegations and I have verified them, as have other journalists, forming a view on the basis of interviews with multiple corroborative direct/first-hand witnesses. Like many scientists, senators, Congressional representatives and insider witnesses, I think it is long overdue for this issue to be properly investigated and Mr Grusch's allegations should be tested by a formal public and well-resourced inquiry.

- The nature of your negative questions suggest that you are prejudiced by the decades of stigma and ridicule into a view that there is no basis to Mr Grusch's allegations. Yet, even the Senate Majority Leader, Chuck Schumer, one of the most powerful people in the US Congress, has backed extraordinary legislative amendments that would compel disclosure of NHI – non-human intelligence – and NHI technology held by the US Government or private aerospace. Perhaps you should be asking yourself why such a senior Senator is referring to a 'Non-Human Intelligence' over 20 times in a bill before Congress. This proposed legislation received the support of much of the bipartisan leadership of some of the most powerful senators in the Congress. What is driving that legislation is a realisation among senior Congressional leaders that the US Congress has very likely been lied to and misled for decades, as Mr Grusch alleges.
- In conclusion, your questions convey an explicit assumption about a lack of first-hand evidence that is totally false. I have set out here the accurate information, with little expectation that MediaWatch will fairly or accurately report it. The information I have detailed here should give you cause to question your snide inferences in your questions about my objectivity, and perhaps you should be questioning your own objectivity in how you report this story.
- My response will be posted online so that the millions of people worldwide who want objective coverage of UAPs, including senior Congressmen, staffers and Senators, as well as potential whistleblowers, can assess the fairness of the ABC's reporting. There has been a critical failure to date by legacy mainstream media to properly understand or engage with this extraordinarily important story.

Ross Coulthart

www.NeedToKnow.Today

@RossCoulthart

*One recent story by the Washington Post illustrates just how unfairly some of the US mainstream media is misreporting the UAP issue:

- In an interview on News Nation, I called for an investigation into how the intelligence community attempted to smear whistleblower David Grusch because personal health details of mental health treatment for his PTSD were provided to a journalist.
- Mr Grusch is a decorated veteran with distinguished service from his time in Afghanistan. During our vetting of Mr Grusch for my June News Nation interview, he had freely volunteered in interview that he had suffered PTSD and suicidal ideation after suffering the loss of a close friend and military colleague from suicide. His wife had called Police because of her concerns her husband might harm himself in his grief at the loss of his close friend. Grusch knew there were sensitive records held by Police recording his PTSD and suicidal ideation and his subsequent transfer to a

psychiatric facility for treatment. He also knew that under US HIPAA laws such files should not be released under FOIA because they contain sensitive private medical information.

- Earlier this month, Grusch became aware that a web-based publication called The Intercept was preparing a 'hit piece' on him, implying that his PTSD treatment somehow made him an unreliable witness. Such an assertion would be vigorously disputed by his treating doctors and a gross slur on the 20+% of US military veterans who suffer with PTSD. It should be noted that Mr Grusch had always fully disclosed his PTSD to DoD security and they had adjudged there was no basis for his extremely high-level security clearance to be taken from him because of this incident and hospital treatment. Sadly, PTSD is a big issue for many veterans both here in Australia and the US. It is no basis for an assertion that a witness is inherently unreliable.
- When he became aware of The Intercept's story, Mr Grusch checked with County Police, whom his wife had called when he was suffering his PTSD episode at home, and they assured him categorically that there had been no media request for any files on the incident and none had been provided from their office. He, not unreasonably, concluded that his personal medical information had been leaked from within the intelligence community.
- It did subsequently emerge that the Police who assured Mr Grusch his files had not been released had either not checked properly or given him false information. Files detailing his PTSD and his transfer to a short stay psychiatric hospital had been released to The Intercept's reporter under FOIA – an issue that Mr Grusch still contends was an improper release of his personal medical history under US HIPAA privacy laws. News Nation prominently and expeditiously corrected the facts surrounding where the files originated.
- However, my expressed concern that Mr Grusch was smeared by a leak from the intelligence community still stands – because that is demonstrably true.
- It subsequently emerged that the Intercept reporter boasted in a TV interview that he did in fact receive a tip from sources within the intelligence community that led him to Mr Grusch's personal medical files held by Police. This is now the basis for a complaint by Grusch that his personal medical history was used by members of the intelligence community in what was ultimately a fruitless attempt to smear him, that backfired.
- The subsequent Washington Post report made much of News Nation's correction but made no mention of the admission made by the Intercept's reporter that the tip that led him to the documents he used to smear Mr Grusch came from the intelligence community. It also failed to report that Police had given Mr Grusch false information which led him to the conclusion the leak came from within the intelligence community.

- *As News Nation told the Washington Post, its story was a "...a distraction from a disgusting attempt to discredit a decorated veteran who served in the United States Air Force and suffered from PTSD, and a larger effort to minimize NewsNation's exclusive reporting on an alleged secret military operation which has led to a congressional hearing on UFOs."*