

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: 8/27/96 Re: MJ-12 Document

From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
Date: Tue, 02 Feb 1999 14:42:01 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 13:24:11 -0500
Subject: Re: 8/27/96 Re: MJ-12 Document

On this repost, it was necessary to point out the shallowness of the counter-arguments of Stanton Friedman related to the alleged and bogus SCEO #092447, and by extension all old and new alleged MJ-12 documents referencing the bogus SCEO#092447.

We also discover that Stanton Friedman had not been entirely truthful in his posts to this mailing list by allowing implications that in the past he had been in a "position" to handle TOP SECRET documents. His past continuous appeals to authority based on his alleged past experiences turned out to be irrelevant since never in his life Stanton Friedman had access to Top Secret documents. He never had a clearance that would have given him access to any such documents and his intellectual dishonesty was exposed in the repost, below.

Ed Stewart

Date: Tue, 27 Aug 1996 03:58:15 -0400
To: ianr@global-data.com
From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ebk@nobelmed.com>
Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 Document

From: egs@netcom.com (Edward G. Stewart)
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 Document
To: ebk@nobelmed.com (UFO UpDates - Toronto)
Date: Mon, 26 Aug 1996 23:58:22 -0700 (PDT)

>From: fsphys@brunswickmicro.nb.ca
>Date: Sat, 24 Aug 96 17:20:56 -0400

>I continue to be astonished by the misrepresentations of Ed
>Stewart with regard to government documents and MJ-12. In his
>latest scornful diatribe he casually ignores and even repeats
>the nonsense of saying that Executive Order is the same as
>Special Classified Executive Order. He repeatedly speaks of the
>TF Memo being labelled as a Presidential Executive order.

>Would everybody please read the short Sept.24, 1947, memo
>again?

>It is not labelled executive order. It is not labelled Special
>Classified Executive Order. It has no number on it.

To paraphrase Dr. Willy Smith in a previously posted analysis supporting the Truman signature to be a photocopy forgery that Stanton Friedman completely ignored in his book and has so far ignored in this message list, Stanton Friedman's above is no

more than another example of his recently acquired propensity to fall for the Cartesian fallacy, i.e., confusing a clear argument with a correct argument. The reasoning is based on faulty premises, and Stanton Friedman's conclusion is unwarranted.

>It is listed in a reference list prepared in 1952 as Special
>Classified Executive Order... The very documents that Ed cites
>make a good case for saying the memo is genuine. I repeat it is
>>false to say it is listed as Executive Order #... It is false
>to say it is labelled as SCEO # or anything else.

Specifically, it is identified in the "alleged" Eisenhower Briefing's ENUMERATION OF ATTACHMENTS as:

"ATTACHMENT A".....Special Classified Executive Order
#092447. (TS/EO)

and not as Special Classified Executive Order dated 092447, which would have been a proper way to identify any kind of classified executive order in briefing a President-elect of the United States. By clearly listing the Truman/Forrestal Memorandum as "Special Classified Executive Order #092447", it

points to the genesis of the Eisenhower briefing as being created by an "outsider" and not an "insider". It is a mistake only an "outsider" would have made.

>Why is that so hard to understand? Why can't Ed deal with
>people pointing out his false claims such as Control Number er
>being required...?? Frankly if it was stamped Executive
>Order... I would agree it was a fraud. But it is not.

Would you agree then that the Eisenhower Briefing is a fraud? It clearly identifies the alleged Truman/Forrestal Memorandum as "Special Classified Executive Order #092447"

>Re Control numbers and Ed Stewart.

>I think Ed would have us believe that if there are no control
>numbers on a document, it must be fraudulent.

Or as previously stated by me, breaches of security. Either way, requiring the genesis and provenance of the documents to be established in lieu of ownership being established. Neither the genesis/provenance of the documents, nor ownership, have ever been established or claimed for any of the MJ-12 documents. The genesis/provenance of the MJ-12 documents seems to be an area that you completely ignore. Care to discuss it? I am prepared.

>His theoretical notions about what should have been done must
>take a back seat to what was done.

Nothing theoretical about my "notions". I have provided the source documentation as to how all TOP SECRET documents were to be handled in the control of the Department of Defense, of which the alleged Truman/Forrestal Memorandum and the Cutler/Twinning memo would have, had they come under the control of the Department of Defense which they would have been upon receipt of the memos by Defense Secretary Forrestal and General Twinning.

>I am glad Ed noted that my quote of Dr. Pankratz was accurate.
>If he had asked, I would have sent him a copy of the letter from
>Dr. Pankratz.

He didn't say accurate, he said "essentially accurate." And let us not forget in this discussion that your source, Dr. Pankratz, is on record from your quote of him as stating that both the Defense and Intelligence communities used serialized control numbers on TOP SECRET documents during the era.

But they are not to be found on the alleged MJ-12 documents, any of them. Even though the alleged Truman/Forrestal memorandum and the Cutler/Twinning memo were allegedly addressed to members within the Department of Defense and the alleged Eisenhower Briefing was allegedly prepared by Admiral Hillenkoetter who at the time was assigned to the Intelligence community.

>I try to deal with the world as it is, not the way Ed wishes it
>had been. Which still doesn't excuse his false claim that the
>list of attachments in the Ike Briefing refers to Executive

>Order rather than Special Classified Executive Order.

Stanton Friedman appears to continue to suggest that there would have been a difference between an Executive Order and a classified Executive Order. Yet, I have introduced documentation from the CIS, the Congressional Information Services, that shows that it made no difference whether Executive Orders were classified or not. Procedures for handling Presidential directives labeled as executive orders were in place, regardless as to whether they were classified or not, and that NO NUMBERING was assigned to them until such time that they would have become declassified. Yet, clearly the alleged Eisenhower Briefing document references the Truman/Forrestal Memorandum as a special classified executive order with a number, EO #092447.

And that also other Presidential instruments were in effect at that time that the President of the United States could have used, and in fact did use, which had no requirement by law that anything labeled executive order did - whether it was classified or not, special or not.

If the alleged Truman/Forrestal Memorandum was meant to be a "Special Classified Executive Order", it would not have been identified as #092447, but identified without any reference

to a #, which supports the alleged Eisenhower Briefing document as being prepared by an "outsider" and not an "insider", in other words BOGUS. The alleged Eisenhower Briefing document does not identify the alleged Truman/Forrestal Memorandum as Special Classified Executive Order of 092447, nor does it identify it as Special Classified Executive Order dated 092447, but it clearly identifies it as #092447, giving it a number

which is in total contradiction to established procedures and in place for handling any Presidential instrument labelled or suggestive that it was any kind of an executive order, classified or not, special or not.

And if the alleged Truman/Forrestal Memorandum was not meant to be an Executive Order, classified or not, special or not, it would not have been identified as "Special Classified Executive Order" in the alleged Eisenhower Briefing document, but identified as any one of the other numerous Presidential instruments available at the time - which were used and just as appropriate for the execution of the order without incurring the requirement by law that any Presidential instrument identified as an executive order, classified or not, special or not, had to conform to the Federal Register Act of 1935.

>Ed Stewart's analogy to Vince Tensor about each document
>being a book in a library is only true for documents that go
>through a central Document Control System.

ALL Department of Defense activities were required to number ALL Top Secret documents and material serially, as well as marking the copy number, such as 1-of-1, or 1-of-2, as they were received in a calendar year series. It was required for that number to be posted to the document, as well as to a control register. That is a fact of life.

Any found without such a serialized control number were either security breaches or "documents" that never came under the control of the Department of Defense and should be automatically suspected of being bogus until such time that the genesis/provenance of the documents are established and the "owners" of the documents identified and on record as being the "owners". The MJ-12 documents have no genesis or provenance to them and no one has claimed ownership. Until such time as the genesis or provenance of the documents is clearly established, they should be considered nothing but BOGUS.

>Many classified documents-- from General A to General B,
>from me to my boss.. from him to his boss did NOT go

>through a central document control and therefore did NOT
>have control numbers.

But not all "classified documents" are TOP SECRET. The documented requirement applies to all TOP SECRET documents only. If all that Stanton Friedman ever handled in his "career" were SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL material, his statement above is

intellectually dishonest since what we are discussing are TOP SECRET documents and not "classified documents" in general.

I find the above extraordinarily interesting if Stanton Friedman here is suggesting that he has handled TOP SECRET documents in his career in classified programs.

I have in my possession a letter dated Feb. 14, 1990 from Stanton T. Friedman addressed to "Mr. Dennis Stacy and Mr. Walter Andrus" with CC to "William Stephenson, ESQ, and miscellaneous [SIC] others" not identified by name.

I quote from Stanton T. Friedman's letter:

"4. ... Again the facts is that I held a Q and SECRET clearance *****
for 14 years, handled loads of classified materials, and have visited many classified facilities."
--- Stanton T. Friedman, from letter of Feb.14, 1990

Stanton T. Friedman, by his own admission, only had a SECRET clearance, not a TOP SECRET clearance. Maybe he would like to explain what relevance his statement above regarding "from me to my boss..." has to do with this discussion, or for that matter, his continued appeals to authority based on his "experiences" handling classified documents since apparently Stanton T. Friedman did not have a TOP SECRET clearance which means he would never have seen a TOP SECRET document, would never have produced a TOP SECRET document, would never have handled a TOP SECRET document, nor would ever have been allowed anywhere near any classified facilities that required a TOP SECRET clearance for access during his "14 years" working on classified programs while in industry. In other words, Stanton T. Friedman's continued appeal to authority regarding his experiences in classified programs over 14 years in industry not only constitutes a logical fallacy, i.e. appeal to authority, but also constitutes intellectual dishonesty if his clearance was indeed simply SECRET and not TOP SECRET. Of course, the possibility also exists that maybe Stanton T. Friedman was simply being shy and simply guilty of understatement when he wrote to Dennis Stacy, Walter Andrus and et al identifying his previously held clearance level as only SECRET and not TOP SECRET on his letter to them dated Feb. 14, 1990.

>Perhaps there are others seeing this
>discussion who created TS documents and could join in here??

Certainly it wasn't nuclear physicist Stanton T. Friedman. I have already indicated an individual who is not on this mailing list who held the following positions in his military career: TOP SECRET CONTROL OFFICER, TOP SECRET DESTRUCTION OFFICIAL, SECURITY MANAGER, CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT CUSTODIAN, COMSEC CUSTODIAN, and held a CRITICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS POSITION. As it so happens, that individual (who Stanton Friedman has met at the Connecticut UFO Conference in 1995) will be spending a week with me (together we will be visiting many Northern California libraries, historical societies, universities, and archives). I will ask him to post to this List regarding the MJ-12 documents and his problems with the alleged documents based on his personal experiences holding the above jobs while in the military. Stanton Friedman already knows what his position is on the MJ-12 documents.

Ed Stewart

Ed Stewart - egs@netcom.com - | So Man, who here seems principal alone,
"There is | Perhaps acts second to some sphere unknown.
Something Going On!" ,>'?'<, | Touches some wheel, or verges to some goal,
-Salvador Freixedo- (O O) | 'Tis but a part we see, and not a whole.
-----oo00-(_)-00oo----- Alexander Pope, Essay on Man -----

Search for other documents to/from: [ianr](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.

To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net

Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...

Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).