



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[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](mailto:ufoindex@jps.net)>  
Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 22:39:26 -0800  
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 Feb 1999 07:47:08 -0500  
Subject: Re: 8/27/96 Re: MJ-12 Document

>From: Stan Friedman <[fsphys@brunnet.net](mailto:fsphys@brunnet.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: 8/27/96 Re: MJ-12 Document  
>Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 17:33:43 -0400

>>Date: Tue, 02 Feb 1999 14:42:01 -0800  
>>From: Ed Stewart <[ufoindex@jps.net](mailto:ufoindex@jps.net)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: 8/27/96 Re: MJ-12 Document

>Let us get facts straight:

Since Stanton Friedman seems to be interested in "let us get facts straight", a few corrections are in order because everytime Stanton Friedman speaks on security matters, only his ignorance and lack of relevant information becomes apparent.

>1. I have never claimed to have had a TOP SECRET Clearance  
>although I did have a Q which gave me access to Secret  
>Restricted Data.

A 'Q' only allows an individual access to nuclear data irrespective of what level clearance an individual has. A 'Q' by itself did not give Stanton Friedman access to Secret Restricted Data as alleged. To have access at that level, Friedman would have required a Secret clearance independent of 'Q'.

Irrespective of the above, if Stanton Friedman had done his homework and researched that he alleges to have done after visiting 18 archives, he would have known that Top Secret documents have their own rules of handling. Any personal/virtual experience that may have been gained being exposed to confidential or secret documents is totally irrelevant to what is required securing Top Secret Documents. Stanton Friedman did not even know the regulations and executive orders that were applicable until I posted them to the list. It has been intellectually dishonest of Friedman to posture that his past "experience" working for various defense contractors was the basis for his professed "authority" on Top Secret documents. He brought that intellectual dishonesty to this mailing list when discussing Top Secret document procedures when he alleged and alluded to creating documents with no control numbers. That is a fact that is now part of the archive and can be independently verified by anyone on the internet.

Also, Stanton Friedman elevated himself, from simply being intellectually dishonest when he states above:

"I have never claimed to have had a TOP SECRET Clearance"

Yet, from page 138 of [\\_Crash at Corona\\_](#), Friedman claims:

"Both authors handled materials classified top secret and higher, Friedman when in the nuclear industry and Berliner when in the air force."

The logical inference is that Friedman had a TS clearance. Otherwise, he wouldn't have been authorized to "handle" "top secret and higher" materials. Not only does Friedman infer that he had a TS clearance, he also infers that he had clearance for Top Secret/code word materials (as in "higher" than TS).

That is a fact that is now part of the archive and can be independently verified by anyone on the internet.

>2. I have seen loads of formerly TOP SECRET Documents during my >many visits to Archives (18 at least count)

So what? You never bothered to research what regulations were applicable to those documents when they were classified Top Secret for at least 20 years that you claim to be doing archive research in 18 different archives. I had to post that info to this mailing list because you were pleading ignorance of the fact and alluding to your "authority" on the subject which everybody now knows was a false appeal to authority that you never had. That is a fact that is now part of the archive and can be independently verified by anyone on the internet.

>3. I published in my "Final Report on Operation Majestic 12" 5 >formerly TS documents which did not have Control numbers, >whether Ed Stewart likes it or not.

It is not relevant what I like or not. The fact these Top Secret documents don't have control numbers indicates that proper procedures were not followed and are suggestive that the documents are either breaches of security, as previously explained, or bogus. None of those five documents originated from the same place as the Cutler-Twining memo; that is, none of those five documents was found among the TS records in Record Group 341 (Air Force Headquarters). Friedman's argument is irrelevant, and deliberately misleading. In over twenty years of archival "research", Stanton Friedman was not aware of the mentioned inconsistencies to ever research the genesis or provenance of those documents any further. As a matter of fact, when it comes to the genesis and provenance of the alleged MJ-12 documents, Stanton Friedman runs for cover and becomes "unavailable". Since the introduction of the alleged MJ-12 documents by Moore, Shandera, and Friedman, Friedman has refused to research and discuss the genesis/provenance of these alleged government documents. Yet, with no ownership ever having been established, that should be the first priority of anyone trying to authenticate the MJ-12 papers.

>4. Judging by the Cutler Twining Memo, we are dealing with a >NSC/MJ-12 Special Studies Group. This is not part of the >Department of Defense. The NSC serves the President.

So what? What you say has no relevance to anything under discussion. Your statement above employs circular logic. You are using a bogus document that at best is highly suspicious to make an assertion for the alleged validity of your statement which in itself is not relevant even if true. First of all, the fact that if the alleged Cutler Twining memo was an NSC document, it would have had to be declassified by the NSC in the first place before it could have been "mysteriously found" in the archives by your research associate William Moore. No such documentation exists, therefore supporting the alleged document to be bogus. Second, even you have admitted in the past that the alleged document had to have been improperly "placed" in the archives and then "mysteriously found by William Moore" on cue. The National Archives is on record as the alleged document not belonging where it was allegedly "found" and is on record as to its improprieties.

What is relevant and important is where the record allegedly was "found" by Bill Moore and/or Jaime Shandera. If one or the other didn't plant it in the Archives, it would have had a TS control number assigned to it. The number would have been assigned by the Air Force, not the NSC or White House because of the location it was "found". Of course, Friedman contends somebody on the Air Force declassification team planted the memo in the Archives for Moore/Shandera to find. It doesn't seem to

matter to Friedman that the records in question were reviewed for declassification by Air Force and National Archives personnel both, and at no time did the memo surface -- and it would have surfaced because NSC materials require special handling. And, by Friedman's own admission, Moore and Shandera were the first researchers to review these records following declassification review. How odd! You won't research the genesis/provenance of this alleged document even though all the leads point to none other than your own research associates. Despite the improprieties with the Cutler Twinning memo, you conveniently "forget" that the NSC is part of the executive branch of the government and the applicable National Security Information Program executive orders that apply to the Department of Defense would also apply to the NSC. In other words, the argument for control numbers of Top Secret documents would still be valid either way making your statements above irrelevant and further evidence the Cutler Twinning memo is bogus.

>5. It is simply too bad that Ed doesn't like my arguments. I  
>deal with the real world as it is and as it is testified to be  
>by Archivists who handle classified and formerly classified  
>documents all the time. I realize that Ed believes he knows  
>more than they do and assumes that the rules about such matters  
>are identical and always adhered to in all governmental  
>agencies. This is false.

Whether I like or dislike your proclamations is irrelevant. I have provided documentation that can be independently verified as to source, validity and context by anyone that is serious enough to verify my statements. What you allege above is entirely new. Name the alleged archivists that support your arguments for the alleged validity of the MJ-12 documents and provide copies of whatever letters you have substantiating this claim of yours instead of alleging general proclamations. I have copies of the archival letters received on MJ-12 by many of the researchers going back to the 1980s. Not one archivist is on record supporting your arguments.

>6. I have on several occasions found "classified" documents in  
>boxes that had supposedly been declassified. They were  
>sometimes not marked declassified. That is the real world

So what? What relevance or linkage does the above proclamation have to do with the MJ-12 documents? I have on several occasions shown you to be intellectually dishonest, not only here but also in your book. Now, that is a fact, relevant to this discussion and unfortunately the real world.

>7. Perhaps to soothe Ed I should have said when a memo goes from  
>an individual to his boss instead of from me to my boss so no  
>one could even think I was talking f my handling TS material..  
>As indicated.

The fact remains you didn't. You were got caught red-handed posturing on this mailing list alleging to be an authority based on your "experience" which you never had and are not!

>8. Ed tells us that a TS Executive Order doesn't get a number  
>until it is declassified.

No! I don't!

I cited and quoted the Congressional Information Service as the source and it did not differentiate to levels of classified executive orders. If you would have read the quoted source carefully, you would see that it applied to any classified executive order, not just Top Secret. If you don't wish to independently verify the source documentation yourself, at least make the proper attribution instead of paraphrasing what amounts to be false statements and attributing them to me.

>Since there is no indication that the  
>Truman Forrestal memo was declassified, could that not easily  
>explain why it did NOT have a normal number on it and the term  
>"special classified executive order" ( which seems to me a very  
>accurate description) was used to give it a useful  
>identification in a listing on a preliminary Briefing document.

The document has been shown to be bogus in various independent ways previously by different researchers. Live with it. It is

the real world. Bogus documents don't get classified or "declassified". The easiest explanation already has been provided for its improprieties. It has been shown to be bogus. No need to elicit a larger conspiracy.

>I use the date when I invoice people as part of the invoice >number. The State Department uses the date as part of their >filing system number for a document.. I am sorry that doesn't >meet with Ed's approval, but that is the way it is.

It is irrelevant whether it meets with my approval or not. A pound sign #\_ means number, not date. A pound sign #\_ was used. That is the real world! Not Stanton Friedman's alleged accounting techniques, or the alleged State Department procedures. Both are totally irrelevant to his argument for the validity of the alleged MJ-12 documents.

>9. Obviously it would be useful if we had formerly highly >classified Briefings and special classified executive orders for >comparison. I have been unable to obtain even the 4 briefings >known to have been given by DCI Walter .B. Smith to Ike between >Nov. 4, 1952 and Jan. 9, 1953.

So what? The above is simply posturing without being able to show linkage or relevance to any argument related to MJ-12 discussions. No linkage has ever been shown by any MJ-12 supporter to any real document, person, resource or organization as having any connection to MJ-12. That is a fact and that is the real world.

>Perhaps Ed with all his knowledge >about such matters can find some good examples.

I have provided source documentation information to this list that can be independently researched and verified by any inclined list reader. The documentation provided supports my argument that the MJ-12 documents are bogus. All you have done is posture, display your ignorance on security procedures, and display a contemptible level of arrogance by attempting to pass off your intellectual dishonesty as alleged valid "research". You have been doing this to the ufological community for years. No more.

Ed Stewart

-----  
Ed Stewart [ufoindex@jps.net](mailto:ufoindex@jps.net) | So Man, who here seems principal alone,  
There Is Something | Perhaps acts second to some sphere unknown.  
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 -----

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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