

One can see that they are from different typewriters, and there are many differences between the memos even though conveying basically the same type of information. There is no rule that people in government must use a particular format for internal documents and they certainly don't stick to one.

If one looks at the original of the Cutler Twining memo, one is struck not only by the fact that it's in blue ink, apparently from carbon paper, but that there is a short red pencil mark drawn on a slant through the security marking. Of course, in a xerox copy it's hard to tell that it is pencil, and it is certainly impossible to tell that it is red. During a visit to the Eisenhower Library I noted in a file consisting mostly of original documents, that in a number of cases I found slant red pencil marks through the security markings. I asked the archivist if there was any significance to that because I suddenly recalled the Cutler Twining memo. Obviously the copy I had with me was xeroxed. His response was "Oh, yes," they have been orally instructed that when they are going to declassify a document, put a slant red pencil line through the security markings on them. Now this certainly suggests that this was found in a legitimate file. Whoever planted it at the National Archives was apparently well aware of this rule of thumb of putting the slant red pencil line through the security markings prior to declassification. It would have been a perfectly natural thing for somebody who is accustomed to dealing with such matters to do, such as the members of the many four-man teams of declassifiers.

Klass and others have also tried to point to spellings of various words as proving that somehow the document was forged. One example is the word travelling with two "l's" and the fact that in one printed paper of William Moore's the word was spelled that way. Klass neglects to mention that in the original, as Moore has demonstrated by providing copies, it was not done that way. That was an editing change by the editor of the publication. Again, let's suppose it was done that way. How in the world does that prove the document was a forgery? A second problem suggested by Klass was that since the document uses the term Air Materiel Command, and since Moore spells it "incorrectly" with the iel as well, therefore, obviously the document's a fraud done by Moore. As it happens the correct spelling as noted on many documents and in many books is indeed Materiel.

Another concern about format and style is the use of the term "executive order 092447". People have checked a whole host of available executive orders, including those proclaiming various special days, and find that this number doesn't fit in that numbering system at all. Obviously it's the date of the Truman Forrestal memo. Now this bothers some people. The problem here again is that if the briefing is genuine and was done for November 18, 1952, then that could be the first use of the term Executive Order. If the Truman Forrestal memo is genuine, or at least its contents are genuine, then one would might well suggest that when the memo was put out, it was not thought of as an executive order in the official sense. They had no idea of the scope of the