

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](#) -> [Jan](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

08-12-96: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation

From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
 Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 17:23:37 -0800
 Fwd Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1999 04:29:49 -0500
 Subject: 08-12-96: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation

I am taking this opportunity to address both the new MJ-12 papers as promoted by Robert and Ryan Woods and the initial batch of MJ-12 papers with another common problem they both have: the continuous position by Stanton Friedman that TOP SECRET documents do not have to have control numbers. This was discussed at length in 1996 and I am reposting the data that Stan Friedman apparently has forgotten.

On the Art Bell Dreamland Radio Show, 1/10/99, towards the end and top of the first hour:

Stanton Friedman:

It is true of classified material that sometimes it has got a life on it. That is, ten years later it will automatically be downgraded from secret to confidential and five years after that to declassified. The whole security system is a conglomeration. That is, the CIA and the DOD and the other organizations, State Department for example, all deal with classified material but the rules are different. And people, you know, I get so urked when people want to pull things like "Well that isn't the way this was done." One example, the MJ-12 documents, the original ones the Eisenhower briefing documents, so for, someone complained that:

"They obviously must be fraudulent because they don't have top secret control numbers on them."

Well, I did a lot of checking and I also pointed out to the person that in my final report on operation Majestic 12 back in 1990 I had published five formally Top Secret documents that didn't have control numbers on them.

Linda Howe:

Right!

Stanton Friedman.

But, he insisted and I checked with the Eisenhower Library. I checked with the Marshall Archives. The archivist at the Marshall archives said:

" Stan, if they had of used control numbers on everything we still be fighting World War II." (A Friedman Sniker)

Art Bell:

There you are. We are at the top of the hour...

--

First of all, the above only shows the level of Stanton Friedman's ignorance on the handling of classified materials. That is understandable since Stanton Friedman never, repeat never, held a

TOP SECRET clearance or handled TOP SECRET documents in his life and from the reposted message attached it is obvious that until I brought the subject up in 1996 on this mailing list, Stanton Friedman was unaware of any security regulation responsible for the handling of TOP SECRET documents at all!

That was then in 1996, but now in 1999 we hear differently. He projects himself once again as a security expert and he says that for the CIA, the DOD, and the State Department that:

"the rules are different"

That is fantastic to learn! The above implies that since they are different and now that Stanton Friedman tells all of Art Bell's listeners that they are different, he must have researched them and discovered the differences!

Could you please share those differences in the regulations with us and point us to the proper source regulations that do not address the need for TOP SECRET control numbers and registers on TOP SECRET documents? You obviously did not have the time to do so during the Art bell show.

I have shown in the past that DOD does require control numbers on TOP SECRET documents. And when documents come under the control of DOD, as the alleged MJ-12 papers, initial and new, would have of necessity, those would have had control numbers assigned at that time.

I would like to point out that all the agencies Stanton Friedman mentioned on the Art Bell Show as having different rules and implied as having been researched by him were under the executive branch and subject to the same executive orders by the President of the United States. Each agency would have to implement the same directions outlined in the appropriate executive order. In my 1996 post reproduced below, I listed those executive orders.

Also, please provide the name of the archivist at the Marshall library that said TOP SECRET control numbers were not required? Wait a moment. I see that you quote this "source" as saying:

" Stan, if they had of used control numbers on everything we still be fighting World War II." *****

On everything? I thought the point of discussion was only on TOP SECRET documents. So, what is it that this individual said and the proper context and what was he referring to? And who was the person? I would very much like to correct myself if there turns out to be different rules for the handling of TOP SECRET documents within the executive branch of our government. Apparently, you have come across a very knowledgeable source of information that "knows" stuff not readily apparent to the present and past members of the executive branch of our government.

While we wait for Stanton Friedman to verify his research notes, please read the following repost of 8/12/96 made in direct response to Stanton Friedman since he was totally unaware of any regulation requiring TOP SECRET control numbers at that time. Of course now we know differently. That he is aware of the regulations and that there are "several" with relevant differences. As soon as he reveals those to us, we all will be much enlightened due to the diligent and heroic archival research that Stanton Friedman performs.

In case Stanton Friedman is unable to locate his research notes and unable to substantiate the allegations he once more made on the Art Bell show, maybe the MJ-12 promotional team of Woods and Woods would like to enlighten us as to the lack of control numbers on their alleged MJ-12 papers? They are also on record as performing diligent and heroic research on the new MJ-12 papers.

Ed Stewart

ps. not that it will even be read or noticed, but a cc to Art Bell sent.

Ed Stewart 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.
-----ooOO-()-OOoo----- Alexander Pope, Essay on Man -----
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19960812160716.0067ac30@ultratech.net>
X-Sender: tomt@ultratech.net (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 12 Aug 1996 12:07:16 -0400
To: ianr@global-data.com
From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ebk@nobelmed.com>
Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation

From: egs@netcom.com (Edward G. Stewart)
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation
To: ebk@nobelmed.com (UFO UpDates - Toronto)
Date: Sun, 11 Aug 1996 16:03:26 -0700 (PDT)

Regarding: fsphys@brunswickmicro.nb.ca

> I just wish Ed would put some data on the table... like documented
> protocols about TS documents requiring control numbers.
> Stan Friedman

It appears that nuclear physicist Stanton T. Friedman, the original Roswell researcher with decades of unprecedented personal archival research, as well as substantial archival research in conjunction with co-researchers, is having difficulties accepting a simple statement of fact made by me in an earlier missive to this list. This is good. No claim should be accepted at face value. Just as healthy skepticism is good for science (pay close attention to that process with the current news breaking Mars-life claim for insights into the process as scientists examine the claims for compelling evidence of direct linkage), the process is also healthy and desperately needed within the world of Ufology.

Please note the following:

AR 380-5 Chapter VII Access, Dissemination, and Accountability
Section 3 Accountability and Control

More specifically the above states:

"AR 380-5 7-300. Top Secret information
"DoD activities shall establish the following procedures:

"b. Accountability

"2. Serialization and copy numbering. Top Secret documents and material shall be numbered serially. In addition, each Top Secret document shall be marked to indicate its copy number, for example, copy -1- of -2-copies. Top Secret documents will be numbered in sequence as they are received in a calendar year series. This number will be posted to the document and control register. Changes to controlled documents will be assigned the same control number as the basic document, except that a suffix (such as "Change 4'') will be added. The change will be incorporated immediately into the basic document; a notation will be added to the description block on the document register."

Also, "AR 380-5 7-300. Top Secret information
"DoD activities shall establish the following procedures:

"c. Inventories. All Top Secret documents and material shall be inventoried at least once annually. Within Army, TSCOs will conduct a monthly 10-percent inventory of Top Secret documents. The inventory shall reconcile by the tenth month, the Top Secret accountability register with 100 percent of the Top Secret documents or material on hand. At such time, each document or material shall be examined for completeness..."

Please note also that "AR 380-5 Appendix F Program Evaluation Guide" asks the necessary questions for proper evaluation of existing documents to see whether or not they are in conformity with existing security protocols? There are hundreds of questions that need to be addressed and too long for me to post all here. But of immediate relevance are the following:

AR 380-5 F-6. Classified information access, dissemination, and accountability

- " r. Are copies of classified documents subjected to the same controls as the originals?
- " y. Are all TOP SECRET documents numbered serially?

"ab. Is the two person rule followed in areas where TOP SECRET and Special Access Program (SAP) information is stored and accessible?

"ad. Has an exception to policy been submitted and approved for TOP SECRET and SAP areas where the two-person rule cannot be implemented?"

The "Program Evaluation Guide" shows that the self-evaluation questions are applicable not only to TOP SECRET documents, but also to TOP SECRET (SAP) documents. And no where does it ask if an exception to policy has been submitted and approved for not serially numbering all TOP SECRET (SAP) documents. Whereas the two-person rule for SAP can be excepted under exceptional circumstances, not so for the serialization marking requirement to the actual document and copies of TOP SECRET documents. Even though AR 380-381 ((C) Special Access Programs (U)) is a CONFIDENTIAL classified regulation, DA Pamphlet 380-381 (Security for Special Access Programs) is not, as neither is DoD Directive 5205.7 (Special Access Programs (SAPs)). A Special Access program is any program imposing need-to-know or access controls beyond those normally required for access to Confidential, Secret, or Top Secret information.

Programs which fall under SCI and COMSEC guidelines have separate classified regulations detailing additional security procedures, but the rule of thumb is the higher the security requirement, the higher the control, the higher the accountability. Never is it less control, less accountability. Please note:

AR 380-5 1-205. Sensitive compartmented and communications security information.

"a. Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) and Communications Security (COMSEC) Information shall be handled and controlled in accordance with applicable national directives and DoD Directives and Instructions. Other classified information, while in established SCI or COMSEC areas, may be handled in the same manner as SCI or COMSEC information. Classification principles and procedures, markings, downgrading, and declassification [my emphasis] [*****] actions prescribed in this Regulation apply to SCI and COMSEC information."

AR 380-5 derives its authority through DoD Directive 5200.1: DoD Information Security Program, which implements Presidential Executive Orders on National Security Information. Applicable Presidential Executive Orders which have governed the classification program have been:

Executive Order 12958, 1995, Clinton
 Executive Order 12937, 1994, Clinton
 Executive Order 12356, 1982, Reagan
 Executive Order 12065, 1978, Carter
 Executive Order 11652, 1972, Nixon
 Executive Order 10964, 1961, Kennedy
 Executive Order 10501, 1953, Eisenhower
 Executive Order 10290, 1951, Truman
 Executive Order 10104, 1950, Truman
 Executive Order 8381, 1940, Roosevelt

The last significant change on National Security Information occurred when Truman in 1951 discarded references to congressional authority and in essence vested authority solely onto the Executive Branch and brought control of the classification system under the President and the White House, a power that to this day is still solely vested in the President of the United States.

As shown above, not only are control numbers required markings on TOP SECRET documents, but control numbers are also required on TOP SECRET Special Access Program (SAP) documents, TOP SECRET Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) documents, and TOP SECRET COMSEC documents.

Not only are all TOP SECRET documents tightly controlled, but they are also systematically inventoried and validated for completeness every 10 months. The guidelines re-emphasize that one of the items requiring re-verification every year is that all TOP SECRET documents have a serialized control number marking on the document and reconciled with the TOP SECRET control registry.

An alleged TOP SECRET document or manual created in the 40s/50s would have been systematically inventoried and validated for completeness well over forty/fifty times since then. The fact that none of the alleged MJ-12 documents have serialized control numbers strongly suggests that they were never brought under proper control as required by regulations and directives under the authority of Presidential Executive Orders. This suggests that the alleged MJ-12 documents were never under the control of the President of the United States and the Executive Branch of the United States and are simply bogus.

Ed Stewart

```
-----
Ed Stewart - egs@netcom.com - | So Man, who here seems principal alone,
"Here 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 -----
```

Errol Bruce-Knapp (ebk@nobelmed.com)
 UFO UpDates - Toronto - 416-932-0031
 The OnLine Information List Service of MUFON Ontario
 Your participation is encouraged and appreciated

MUFON Ontario's Home Page:
<http://www.interlog.com/~epona/mufonont.html>

The Canadian Ufologist - A MUFON Ontario Publication
<http://www.interlog.com/~lourenco/ufologist.html>

Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 17:23:37 -0800
 From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
 To: updates@globalserve.net
 CC: artbell@aol.com
 Subject: Repost #3 MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation

I am taking this opportunity to address both the new MJ-12 papers as promoted by Robert and Ryan Woods and the initial batch of MJ-12 papers with another common problem they both have: the continuous position by Stanton Friedman that TOP SECRET documents do not have to have control numbers. This was discussed at length in 1996 and I am reposting the data that Stan Friedman apparently has forgotten.

On the Art Bell Dreamland Radio Show, 1/10/99, towards the end and top of the first hour:

Stanton Friedman:

It is true of classified material that sometimes it has got a life on it. That is, ten years later it will automatically be downgraded from secret to confidential and five years after that to declassified. The whole security system is a conglomeration. That is, the CIA and the DOD and the other organizations, State Department for example, all deal with classified material but the rules are different. And people, you know, I get so urked when people want to pull things like "Well that isn't the way this was done." One example, the MJ-12 documents, the original ones the Eisenhower briefing documents, so for, someone complained that:

"They obviously must be fraudulent because they don't have top secret control numbers on them."

Well, I did a lot of checking and I also pointed out to the person that in my final report on operation Majestic 12 back in 1990 I had published five formally Top Secret documents that didn't have control numbers on them.

Linda Howe: Right!

Stanton Friedman:

But, he insisted and I checked with the Eisenhower Library. I checked with the Marshall Archives. The archivist at the Marshall archives said:

"Stan, if they had of used control numbers on everything we still be fighting World War II." (A Friedman Snicker)

Art Bell: There you are. We are at the top of the hour...

--

First of all, the above only shows the level of Stanton Friedman's ignorance on the handling of classified materials. That is understandable since Stanton Friedman never, repeat never, held a TOP SECRET clearance or handled TOP SECRET documents in his life and from the reposted message attached it is obvious that until I brought the subject up in 1996 on this mailing list, Stanton Friedman was unaware of any security regulation responsible for the handling of TOP SECRET documents at all!

That was then in 1996, but now in 1999 we hear differently. He projects himself once again as a security expert and he says that for the CIA, the DOD, and the State Department that:

"the rules are different"

That is fantastic to learn! The above implies that since they are different and now that Stanton Friedman tells all of Art Bell's listeners that they are different, he must have researched them and discovered the differences!

Could you please share those differences in the regulations with us and point us to the proper source regulations that do not address the need for TOP SECRET control numbers and registers on TOP SECRET documents? You obviously did not have the time to do so during the Art bell show.

I have shown in the past that DOD does require control numbers on TOP SECRET documents. And when documents come under the control of DOD, as the alleged MJ-12 papers, initial and new, would have of necessity, those would have had control numbers assigned at that time.

I would like to point out that all the agencies Stanton Friedman mentioned on the Art Bell Show as having different rules and implied as having been researched by him were under the executive branch and subject to the same executive orders by the President of the United States. Each agency would have to implement the same directions outlined in the appropriate executive order. In my 1996 post reproduced below, I listed those executive orders.

Also, please provide the name of the archivist at the Marshall library that said TOP SECRET control numbers were not required? Wait a moment. I see that you quote this "source" as saying:

"Stan, if they had of used control numbers on everything we'd still be fighting World War II." -----

On everything? I thought the point of discussion was only on TOP SECRET documents. So, what is it that this individual said and the proper context and what was he referring to? And who was the person? I would very much like to correct myself if there turns out to be different rules for the handling of TOP SECRET documents within the executive branch of our government. Apparently, you have come across a very knowledgeable source of information that "knows" stuff not readily apparent to the present and past members of the executive branch of our government.

While we wait for Stanton Friedman to verify his research notes, please read the following repost of 8/12/96 made in direct response to Stanton Friedman since he was totally unaware of any regulation requiring TOP SECRET control numbers at that time. Of course now we know differently. That he is aware of the regulations and that there are "several" with relevant

differences. As soon as he reveals those to us, we all will be much enlightened due to the diligent and heroic archival research that Stanton Friedman performs.

In case Stanton Friedman is unable to locate his research notes and unable to substantiate the allegations he once more made on the Art Bell show, maybe the MJ-12 promotional team of Woods and Woods would like to enlighten us as to the lack of control numbers on their alleged MJ-12 papers? They are also on record as performing diligent and heroic research on the new MJ-12 papers.

Ed Stewart

PS. not that it will even be read or noticed, but a Cc: sent to Art Bell . --

Date: Mon, 12 Aug 1996 12:07:16 -0400
To: ianr@global-data.com
From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ebk@nobelmed.com>
Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation

From: egs@netcom.com (Edward G. Stewart)
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 - An Estimate of the Situation
To: ebk@nobelmed.com (UFO UpDates - Toronto)
Date: Sun, 11 Aug 1996 16:03:26 -0700 (PDT)

Regarding: fsphys@brunswickmicro.nb.ca

> I just wish Ed would put some data on the table... like documented
> protocols about TS documents requiring control numbers.
> Stan Friedman

It appears that nuclear physicist Stanton T. Friedman, the original Roswell researcher with decades of unprecedented personal archival research, as well as substantial archival research in conjunction with co-researchers, is having difficulties accepting a simple statement of fact made by me in an earlier missive to this list. This is good. No claim should be accepted at face value. Just as healthy skepticism is good for science (pay close attention to that process with the current news breaking Mars-life claim for insights into the process as scientists examine the claims for compelling evidence of direct linkage), the process is also healthy and desperately needed within the world of Ufology.

Please note the following:

AR 380-5 Chapter VII Access, Dissemination, and Accountability
Section 3 Accountability and Control

More specifically the above states:

"AR 380-5 7-300. Top Secret information
"DoD activities shall establish the following procedures:

"b. Accountability

"2. Serialization and copy numbering. Top Secret documents and material shall be numbered serially. In addition, each Top Secret document shall be marked to indicate its copy number, for example, copy -1- of -2-copies. Top Secret documents will be numbered in sequence as they are received in a calendar year series. This number will be posted to the document and control register. Changes to controlled documents will be assigned the same control number as the basic document, except that a suffix (such as "'Change 4'") will be added. The change will be incorporated immediately into the basic document; a notation will be added to the description block on the document register."

Also,"AR 380-5 7-300. Top Secret information
"DoD activities shall establish the following procedures:

"c. Inventories. All Top Secret documents and material shall be inventoried at least once annually. Within Army, TSCOs will conduct a monthly 10-percent inventory of Top Secret documents. The inventory shall reconcile by the tenth month, the Top Secret accountability register with 100 percent of the Top Secret documents or material on hand.

At such time, each document or material shall be examined for completeness..."

Please note also that "AR 380-5 Appendix F Program Evaluation Guide" asks the necessary questions for proper evaluation of existing documents to see whether or not they are in conformity with existing security protocols? There are hundreds of questions that need to be addressed and too long for me to post all here. But of immediate relevance are the following:

AR 380-5 F-6. Classified information access, dissemination, and accountability

- " r. Are copies of classified documents subjected to the same controls as the originals?
- " y. Are all TOP SECRET documents numbered serially?
- "ab. Is the two person rule followed in areas where

TOP SECRET and Special Access Program (SAP) information is stored and accessible?

"ad. Has an exception to policy been submitted and approved for TOP SECRET and SAP areas where the two-person rule cannot be implemented?"

The "Program Evaluation Guide" shows that the self-evaluation questions are applicable not only to TOP SECRET documents, but also to TOP SECRET (SAP) documents. And no where does it ask if an exception to policy has been submitted and approved for not serially numbering all TOP SECRET (SAP) documents. Whereas the two-person rule for SAP can be excepted under exceptional circumstances, not so for the serialization marking requirement to the actual document and copies of TOP SECRET documents. Even though AR 380-381 ((C) Special Access Programs (U)) is a CONFIDENTIAL classified regulation, DA Pamphlet 380-381 (Security for Special Access Programs) is not, as neither is DoD Directive 5205.7 (Special Access Programs (SAPs)). A Special Access program is any program imposing need-to-know or access controls beyond those normally required for access to Confidential, Secret, or Top Secret information.

Programs which fall under SCI and COMSEC guidelines have separate classified regulations detailing additional security procedures, but the rule of thumb is the higher the security requirement, the higher the control, the higher the accountability. Never is it less control, less accountability. Please note:

AR 380-5 1-205. Sensitive compartmented and communications security information.

- "a. Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) and Communications Security (COMSEC) Information shall be handled and controlled in accordance with applicable national directives and DoD Directives and Instructions. Other classified information, while in established SCI or COMSEC areas, may be handled in the same manner as SCI or COMSEC information. Classification principles and procedures, markings, downgrading, and declassification [my emphasis] [*****] actions prescribed in this Regulation apply to SCI and COMSEC information."

AR 380-5 derives its authority through DoD Directive 5200.1: DoD Information Security Program, which implements Presidential Executive Orders on National Security Information. Applicable Presidential Executive Orders which have governed the classification program have been:

- Executive Order 12958, 1995, Clinton
- Executive Order 12937, 1994, Clinton
- Executive Order 12356, 1982, Reagan
- Executive Order 12065, 1978, Carter
- Executive Order 11652, 1972, Nixon
- Executive Order 10964, 1961, Kennedy
- Executive Order 10501, 1953, Eisenhower
- Executive Order 10290, 1951, Truman
- Executive Order 10104, 1950, Truman
- Executive Order 8381, 1940, Roosevelt

The last significant change on National Security Information occurred when Truman in 1951 discarded references to congressional authority and in essence vested authority solely onto the Executive Branch and brought control of the classification system under the President and the White House, a power that to this day is still solely vested in the President of the United States.

As shown above, not only are control numbers required markings on TOP SECRET documents, but control numbers are also required on TOP SECRET Special Access Program (SAP) documents, TOP SECRET Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) documents, and TOP SECRET COMSEC documents.

Not only are all TOP SECRET documents tightly controlled, but they are also systematically inventoried and validated for completeness every 10 months. The guidelines re-emphasize that one of the items requiring re-verification every year is that all TOP SECRET documents have a serialized control number marking on the document and reconciled with the TOP SECRET control registry.

An alleged TOP SECRET document or manual created in the 40s/50s would have been systematically inventoried and validated for completeness well over forty/fifty times since then. The fact that none of the alleged MJ-12 documents have serialized control numbers strongly suggests that they were never brought under proper control as required by regulations and directives under the authority of Presidential Executive Orders. This suggests that the alleged MJ-12 documents were never under the control of the President of the United States and the Executive Branch of the United States and are simply bogus.

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](#).