URGENT RELEASE: The CIA’s Terence McKenna FOIA request response – POSITIVE affiliation

November 15, 2012
By Jan Irvin

Recently I filed a CIA Freedom of Information Act request on Terence Kemp McKenna with the CIA. The response came back that it’s “classified” information, and that he maintained “an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation”.

A basic glossary is here to help people understand the FIOA.

**AFFILIATION** – A MEMBER OF

**DENY** – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST

**CLASSIFIED** – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).

**RESPONSIVE** – Letters that are NOT classified that the CIA MAY send. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA’s stamp and release date when they’re allowed to be sent out as “responsive” to the FOIA act requests.

**APPEAL** – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”.

**A DENIAL of FOIA RESPONSIVE documents does not mean that they didn’t find anything. It means they found**
request and said that I could **APPEAL** their decision within 45 days. If there was nothing found, there would be no “openly acknowledged Agency affiliation” to reveal, nor would there be a request to deny, much less any need to appeal such! Just some common sense needed here, folks! Basic understanding of the English language is key to understanding this document.

I have been shocked by most people’s complete lack of ability to understand the basic English terms in this document. Hopefully the above glossary helps you and I won’t have to address this nonsense again. **READ and COMPREHEND WHAT you’re reading.**

Download the PDF here: [www.gnosticmedia.com/txtfiles/TerenceMcKenna_CIA_FOIAresponse02.pdf](http://www.gnosticmedia.com/txtfiles/TerenceMcKenna_CIA_FOIAresponse02.pdf)

---

8 November 2012

Mr. Jan Richard Irvin
c/o Gnostic Media
P.O. Box 3819
Cresline, CA 92325-3819

Reference: F-2012-02116

Dear Mr. Irvin:

This is a final response to your 10 September 2012 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for records on **Terence Kemp McKenna**. This also acknowledges the receipt of your 28 October 2012 letter wherein you provided the additional information requested on 28 September 2012. We accepted and processed your request in accordance with the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended, and the CIA Information Act, 50 U.S.C. § 431, as amended. Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.

With respect to any other records, in accordance with section 3.6 (a) of Executive Order 13526, the CIA can neither confirm nor deny the existence of records responsive to your request. The fact of the existence or nonexistence of requested records is currently and properly classified and is intelligence sources and methods information that is protected from disclosure by section 6 of the CIA Act of 1949, as amended, and section 102A(i)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. Therefore, your request is denied pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(3). An explanation of exemptions is enclosed. As the CIA Information and Privacy Coordinator, I am the CIA official responsible for this determination. You have the right to appeal this response to the Agency Release Panel, in my care, within 45 days from the date of this letter. Please include the basis of your appeal.

Sincerely,

Michele Meeks
Information and Privacy Coordinator

Enclosure
Freedom of Information Act:

(b)(1) exempts from disclosure information currently and properly classified, pursuant to an Executive Order;

(b)(2) exempts from disclosure information which pertains solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of the Agency;

(b)(3) exempts from disclosure information that another federal statute protects, provided that the other federal statute either requires that the records be withheld, or establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld. The (b)(3) statutes upon which the CIA relies include, but are not limited to, the CIA Act of 1949;

(b)(4) exempts from disclosure trade secrets and commercial or financial information that is obtained from a person and that is privileged or confidential;

(b)(5) exempts from disclosure inter-and intra-agency memoranda or letters that would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;

(b)(6) exempts from disclosure information from personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy;

(b)(7) exempts from disclosure information compiled for law enforcement purposes to the extent that the production of the information (A) could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings; (B) would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication; (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; (D) could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of a confidential source; (E) would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law; or (F) could reasonably be expected to endanger any individual’s life or physical safety;

(b)(8) exempts from disclosure information contained in reports or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, or on behalf of, or for use of an agency responsible for regulating or supervising financial institutions; and

(b)(9) exempts from disclosure geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.
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1. Ryan Caron on November 15, 2012 at 5:20 pm

I’m confused.

Doesn’t it say “Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.”

Or have I been awake too long?

Log in to Reply

2. Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 7:14 pm

The key words for you guys to attempt to understand here are:

AFFILIATION – A MEMBER OF
DENY – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST
CLASSIFIED – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).
RESPONSIVE – Letters that are NOT classified that they MAY send me. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA's stamp and release date when their allowed to be sent out as responsive.
APPEAL – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”.

Ignore Joseph Pierce, the guy’s too god damned stupid to read English. I delete his vacuous and thoughtless comments as he’s never able to comprehend English.

Log in to Reply

3. Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:36 pm

Your definition of responsive is wrong. It should be:

Responsive records are all records that fit within the scope of the applicant’s access request — these are the records the applicant has described on the Access to Information Request Form.

Log in to Reply

4. Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:49 pm
they sent me some good shit on Wasson.

Log in to Reply

- Barry windham prof of Chinese spanish on November 17, 2012 at 1:50 am

I saw that on their site but to be honest only a lawyer could rely know for sure

- Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 11:03 am

Or someone who trust their own 5 senses, can use logic and critical thinking and look things up. You don’t need to appeal to the false authority of a lawyer. Where did the lawyer get it from…? You can learn too.

- Barry windham prof of Chinese spanish on November 17, 2012 at 1:52 am

And I’m not really a professor just a lame noob on the Internet

- Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 11:04 am

No shit?

- boss baxter on November 21, 2012 at 10:39 pm

Last week I received a email from private researchers with the statements “i’m uneducated, I have no credentials to speak of. all I can do is read.” This is from a Bank of Canada researcher that has scanned numerous 1939 Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Jan you are right critical thinking matched with effort on a specific subject can product better results than a compartmentalized mind. Just make sure to start with lots of GRAMMAR first (my opinion)

- derek _ on November 23, 2012 at 9:41 am

You may be missing the point. Response is defined as an answer. A computer query would produce an answer whether positive or negative. This is a basic operation of boolean logic. This is all fine and great and understood by all of the commenters on this forum, but if you read the rest of the document it states that they may deny existence of such records as noted by section 6 of this document. http://www.archives.gov/isoo/pdf/cnsi-eo.pdf, and section 102A(i)1 of this document… http://intelligence.senate.gov/nsaact1947.pdf.

They both clearly state that if a document is classified, it’s existence can be denied by the Director of National Intelligence pertaining to interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States. Before you throw stones at the messenger, do your research… please?!

Log in to Reply

- derek _ on November 23, 2012 at 9:45 am

Sorry the cnsi-eo.pdf is the executive order. Section 6 that was referred to in the letter is from this link .. http://www.house.gov/legcoun/Comps/CIA49.pdf

2. Mr. E on November 15, 2012 at 5:31 pm

How did you interpret “did not locate” any ‘agency affiliation records’ as “an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation”? 

Log in to Reply

- Mr. E on November 15, 2012 at 7:15 pm

Mr. E, try not to misrepresent the quote. You get morons like Joseph Pierce all excited…

Here’s what it actually says, not your straw man quote that omits key words to make you look smart:

Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started and did not locate any RESPONSIVE records [records they'll send me in a reply].

[...] Therefore, your request is denied pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(3).

You have the right to appeal this response to the Agency Release Panel, in my care, within 45 days from the date of this letter [...] 

(b)(1) exempts from disclosure information currently and properly CLASSIFIED, pursuant to an Executive Order

(b)(3) exempts from disclosure information that another federal stature protects, provided that the other
CIA relies include, but are not limited to, the CIA Act of 1949.

The key words for you guys to attempt to understand here are:

**AFFILIATION – A MEMBER OF**

**DENY – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST**

**CLASSIFIED – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).**

**RESPONSIVE – Letters that are NOT classified that they MAY send me. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA's stamp and release date when they're allowed to be sent out as “responsive”**.

**APPEAL – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”**.

obviously to understand such words requires a very minimum level of understanding of the English language… which, apparently, you don’t have. Maybe you should try to use a dictionary and not intentionally omit words.
I don’t think you gotta read between the lines. The second paragraph explains why their are no results in the first.

Log in to Reply

In addition, requesters who seek records concerning specific actual or alleged CIA employees, operations, or sources and methods used in operations will necessarily be informed that we can neither confirm nor deny the existence of any responsive records.

- directly from the cia foia site

it says clearly there, there are no open affiliations. the second paragraph explains if there are any other records they didn’t tell you about it’s because of executive order (are you going to claim he was working under an exec order next?) or other federal law such as privacy laws or the ones that say the cia is obligated to say “we cannot confirm nor deny” when you ask about people.

Log in to Reply

Jan, you are not an educated man when it comes to grammar. the important part of the sentence was left out of your above quote: the full quote is:

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation”

you are hung up on the “would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation” part which is what they searched for. What they found, they won’t tell you one way or the other. there are no responsive results to give you…there are no non-responsive results to give you…this proves nothing.

It merely leaves it an open question if TM did have an affiliation of any kind. We know no more today than we did yesterday aside form the fact that the CIA won’t tell us anything.

I don’t understand the KAboom fucking part?

Log in to Reply

your earlier comments showed you misread the letter thinking it proved something…now you admit the letter says nothing…backpeddel much?

To be honest i wouldn’t be surprised if he was CIA. Only a fool would take anything McKenna said seriously…yes there are many fools. so i guess it’s good there is an attack on him by Jan and others…but there shouldn’t have tobe..

the community that hired him for lectures should never have spent a dime on TM’s horrible scholarship…he used flashy words and they swooned.
It proves a search would reveal an open affiliation and that the records are therefore classified, and if I want them I must file an appeal. Do you know what the word affiliation means? 

Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:11 pm

affiliation

(əfˈɪliəʃən)

[a. mod.Fr. affiliation (Cotgr.), ad. med.L. affirmātiōnem n. of action f. affīliāre: see affiliate1.]

1.1 ‘Adoption; the act of taking a son.’ Chambers. The establishment of sonship.

2. a.2.a Adoption, by a society, of subordinate branches; union of branches to a supreme or central organization.

b.2.b An affiliated part of an organization. Also concr., a particular establishment (e.g. a hotel) that is an affiliated part of an organization (U.S.).

c.2.c Association, connection, esp. in politics. U.S.

d.2.d Relationship, esp. as perceived within a group of similar things thought to have derived from a common source; = affinity 3. Chieflly Philol.

3.3 The fixing of the paternity of a child. Also fig. The fathering of a thing upon any one; and, the assignment of anything to its origin.

4.4 Comb., as affiliation order (see quot. 1914).

Well Jan, if you actually understood real grammar you would realize that the CIA is telling you that they searched for such a relationship and DIDN’T find one.

Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 7:05 pm

Yeah, that’s why it says Openly Acknowledged Agency affiliation, request denied, classified, you may appeal this decision. Do you have a brain cell in your head? RESPONSIVE records are records that are NOT CLASSIFIED.

Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:11 pm

it does not say “Openly Acknowledged Agency affiliation, request denied, classified” You are the one who cannot parse grammar. You above misquote can be rewritten as “Openly Acknowledged Agency affiliation exists, request denied, classified” however, the letter says something more along the lines of “we searched for something which would reveal if we found it but we won’t tell you what we found” this is VERY DIFFERENT from how you portray it.

Also, OMG, Jan writes: “They can’t confirm or deny, but use a double negative – which is an affirmative. There wouldn’t be anything to reveal, nor anything to appeal, if there wasn’t anything there.” Apparently logic has died. If i won’t confirm or deny aliens it does not mean aliens exist…it means I won’t show my cards…this is shoddy scholarship Jan, I’m saddened.

Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:17 pm

That’s called a paraphrase. I like how your second rewording is a nice straw man and omits the key word “affiliation”.

Again, try to see all the words together there. Again, you have to use some logic that there would be nothing to classify or appeal to if there was nothing there. You can’t classify a nothing. You can’t appeal a nothing. Therefore, it exists.

Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:41 pm

actually the CIA CAN classify a nothing.
“Specifically, a FOIA request seeking records which would indicate that a particular political figure, prominent businessman or even just an ordinary citizen has been the subject of a law enforcement investigation may require an agency to flatly refuse to confirm or deny whether such records exist. Such an extraordinary response can be justified only when the confirmation or denial of the existence of responsive records would, in and of itself, reveal exempt information. See FOIA Update, Spring 1983, at 5. This response, colloquially known as a “Glomar denial” or “Glomarization,” was first judicially recognized in the national security context, see Philippi v. CIA, 546 F.2d 1009, 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (raising issue of whether CIA could refuse to confirm or deny its ties to Howard Hughes’ submarine retrieval ship, the Glomar Explorer), but it surely is applicable elsewhere.”

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:44 pm
  Yes, but see, even in their own wording, they still confirm: “in and of itself, reveal exempt information.” You just need to understand the mind of the sophist.

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:47 pm
  Anyway, I’ve enjoyed the later part of this conversation. Chill out next time when you come in.
  I’m going to watch some movie or read and crash.
  Have a good night.

- Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:48 pm
  have a good night

- Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:49 pm
  ps we’re all only giving you a hard time to make sure this is all tight….

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:54 pm
  I know, thank you. But next time please make a more constructive approach. I get a lot of morons and trolls around here. Hard to tell who’s whom. Most people have no want like you to actually study over and debate the words to conclusion. I’ve done this with a couple others and a professor already, but I appreciate the additional approaches. You’ve given me the grammar and logic on this to defend every possible angle.
  Now I suppose I’ll have to file that damned appeal. Even though we were feeling this was enough – their affiliation, denial, classified and appeal rhetoric.
  Again, with the approach, I deal with morons and assholes all day who care nothing for reading first, NEVER check or ask for citations, etc. So when someone like you comes in guns blazing, it’s hard not to classify you as a troll and delete your stuff, like I have to do with all of Joseph Pierce’s posts. the guy cares nothing about truth nor being constructive. Eventually he’ll hopefully get a clue and go away. It’s sad when such people continually return for another beating.

6. Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 7:13 pm
   The key words for you guys to attempt to understand here are:

AFFILIATION – A MEMBER OF

DENY – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST

CLASSIFIED – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).

RESPONSIVE – Letters that are NOT classified that they MAY send me. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA’s stamp and release date when their allowed to be sent out as responsive.

APPEAL – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”.

Ignore Joseph Pierce, the guy’s too god damned stupid to read English. I delete his vacuous and thoughtless comments as he’s never able to comprehend English.

7. eu on November 15, 2012 at 7:29 pm
   Name calling? How very trivial. It’s called a dependant clause. They searched and DID NOT find.

Log in to Reply

Related: Holotropic Breathwork  |  Peyote Stitch  |
Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 7:33 pm

eu, how is it they did not find anything when it very clearly says their search revealed “an openly acknowledged affiliation” and that they cannot send the documents because they’re CLASSIFIED? Did you read the document? Why would they say it’s denied, classified, and that I must appeal if they didn’t find anything? Oh, I get it, you don’t know what the word RESPONSIVE means… duh.

Here’s what it actually says:

**Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation** existing up to and including the date the Agency started and did not locate any RESPONSIVE records [records they’ll send me in a reply].

[...] Therefore, your request is denied pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(3).

You have the right to appeal this response to the Agency Release Panel, in my care, within 45 days from the date of this letter [...]

(b)(1) exempts from disclosure information currently and properly CLASSIFIED, pursuant to an Executive Order

(b)(3) excepts from disclosure information that another federal stature protects, provided that the other federal statute either requires that the matters be withheld, or establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld. The (b)(3) statues upon which the CIA relies include, but are not limited to, the CIA Act of 1949.

The key words for you to attempt to understand here are:

WOULD – the opposite of WOULD NOT;

AFFILIATION – A MEMBER OF

DENY – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST

CLASSIFIED – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).

RESPONSIVE – Letters that are NOT classified that they MAY send me. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA’s stamp and release date when they’re allowed to be sent out as “responsive”.

APPEAL – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”.

obviously to understand such words requires a very minimum level of understanding of the English language… which, apparently, you don’t have.

Log in to Reply

Barry Windham on November 16, 2012 at 10:42 pm

you don’t understand the english language. I will parse the grammar for you:

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal ”

This is where you are confused because you think this means “records that do reveal” however, the word would removes ambiguity because it means “would have revealed had they existed”.

Apparently you are not educated in grammar. Please add this to the context to better interpret the almost ambiguous language they use: “and did not locate any RESPONSIVE records”

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:46 pm

apparently, you don’t understand the citations to (b)(1), etc, citing CLASSIFIED, and MUST APPEAL WITHIN 45 DAYS. Apparently you’re not educated in basic English or word definitions. Now here you’re truncating the quote – as that sentence concludes with “an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation”.

Your argument fails to recognize their statement that the documents are CLASSIFIED.

As I’ve already told you, responsive records are those that are NOT classified.

Log in to Reply

8. sndesign on November 15, 2012 at 7:48 pm

Translation:

This does not bode well for Mr. T (erence)
the letter actually says nothing. Let’s change a few words to help you understand what grammar means:

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an ALIEN COVERUP existing up to and including the date the Agency started and did not locate any RESPONSIVE or NON-RESPONSIVE records”

perfectly valid…letter says nothing.

Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:51 pm

Nice straw man.

Again, you ignore the words CLASSIFIED and APPEAL in 45 days. It’s really basic fucking English here, Barry. Why would they say I have to appeal their decision if there was nothing there? That’s retarded. Obviously there would be no need for stating that the records are CLASSIFIED if there were no non-responsive records. That’s a contradiction, for someone claims to know grammar, but fails in logic.

Barry windham on November 17, 2012 at 1:38 am

Hmmm well I’m no lawyer…you’d have to be one to make sense of all this

Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 8:33 pm

I would like to know Dennis’ part in this if any. McKenna did state years ago that at one point he was being sought after for running hash and it was a good time to leave the states. When he returned and began to write his books did he cut a deal?

Robert Fega on November 15, 2012 at 8:48 pm

Not to discount the affiliations notion above, but what would stop spooks from just making something up? This is, after all, the business they know best.

Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 8:57 pm

It doesn’t matter, as long as they acknowledged the affiliation, denied the request, and stated my 45 days for an appeal. Obviously they’ve got some goodies, but it’s more important that we know of the affiliation itself. No, they wouldn’t just make up that he was affiliated. Why would they? It would only serve to cast more doubt on the CIA itself, much less continuing MKULTRA (sub)projects that they’re (obviously) refusing to hand over documents for…

Dani on November 15, 2012 at 8:59 pm

In 1969, McKenna traveled to Nepal led by his “interest in Tibetan painting and hallucinogenic shamanism.”[6] During his time there, he studied the Tibetan language and worked as a hashish smuggler, until “one of his Bombay-to-Aspen shipments fell into the hands of U. S. Customs.” He was forced to move to avoid capture by Interpol.[6] He wandered through Southeast Asia viewing ruins, collected butterflies in Indonesia, and worked as an English teacher in Tokyo. He then went back to Berkeley to continue studying biology, which he called “his first love.”[6] Note he fled to avoid capture by Interpol but then after a time he casually returns to Berkeley? WTF

Jan Irvin on November 15, 2012 at 9:36 pm

My question is that if this is an openly acknowledged CIA affiliation, then why deny the request?

Dani on November 16, 2012 at 6:41 am

Exactly

Dani on November 16, 2012 at 6:59 am

It’s very simple…If there was no affiliation they would have simply state our records find no affiliation pertaining to your request, period, end of story. They would not go on to state exemptions for denying request. This is not difficult. In the past I have requested files on a state level through the attorney generals
enforcement officials and was given entire files of every statement, names, ss#s, etc. no questions asked, all through a phone call. So again, if there was nothing to find they would not give exemptions for denying request.

Log in to Reply
Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:17 am
Yes, you are correct. I have a letter from another FOIA that I filed and they simply replied that they didn’t find anything.

Log in to Reply
Tyr on November 15, 2012 at 11:16 pm
Keep up the good work, Jan! The weak spirited always attack those who reveal their sacred cows to be common livestock.

Log in to Reply
paul on November 16, 2012 at 1:38 am
Would = IF there were one
Not Would = there is one , and this search (your request) would reveal it if we executed it.

Log in to Reply
Ivan on November 16, 2012 at 2:22 am
Looks to me that what Jan is trying to show everyone is right there in the letter. “did not locate any responsive records.” This indicates one type of records. The kind they CAN share with him. “With respect to any other records,” “the CIA can neither confirm nor deny the existence of records responsive to your request.” This following statement points to “other records”. The kind they CAN NOT share with him, whether they exist or not.

Remember, this is government written correspondence. So just like your small print on the back of your credit card statement, you’re gonna find a maze of words intended to confuse you and make you give up trying to understand what you’re reading.

Keep up the good work Jan.

Log in to Reply
David Llewellyn Foster on November 16, 2012 at 5:01 am
Intriguing business Jan.
Of course any appeal may confront yet more spook-speak. Some advice from a professional lawyer might equip you with the right terminology to negotiate a way through CIA stone-walling. Such a resourceful tactic may dissolve their Kevlar invincibility.

In the UK we live under the Official Secrets Act, that anyone involved in classified government business must adhere to formally. It dates back to 1889 with amendments before and after both wars, with ramifications for all former British territories and commonwealth countries. This is a business that people take very seriously here, both for reasons of patriotism and because if they are found to be in breach of the rules, must face prosecution. Many individuals have had to stay quiet for their entire lives. So this secrecy is not mysterious, but a matter of pragmatic historic necessity with punitive consequences.

The key issue internationally as I see it, is the legitimate scope and reach of state power, that raises complex ethical questions, like how to negotiate governments’ and corporations’ frenzied responses to “whistle-blowing” ~ when one person’s traitor is another’s moral hero/ine.

Log in to Reply
Sashim melzdek on November 16, 2012 at 6:25 am
Wow isn’t this embarrassing.

Log in to Reply
Arturo B on November 19, 2012 at 7:50 am
Yeah, but it’s quite alright though. So you bought into some pseudo-intellectual dweeb’s fantasies and ideas. Perhaps you had purchased many of his books. Perhaps you followed him around the world on his lecture tours and even started to base some of your worldview on his words.

Either way, things happen and the best thing you can do is learn from them, not fight the facts… because that gets tiring and before you know it, you’re just copying and pasting the same substance-free sentence over and over, anonymously in a comment section on the interwebs.

Log in to Reply
ChickenKisses on November 16, 2012 at 8:12 am
translinguistic objects and machine elves would benefit the agency’s agenda.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 8:40 am

  It’s about getting people to believe bs and to take drugs without critical thinking so they can be controlled.

Log in to Reply
- ChickenKisses on November 16, 2012 at 3:53 pm

  If I were to take a guess I wouldn’t say it was anything to do with Terence’s bardic talents but more to do with Terence’s social network.

Log in to Reply
- bigmoose on November 16, 2012 at 9:11 am

  OK Jan can you give us other similar requests & responses that we can compare these to? Most of us are not familiar with the FOIA process and variety of responses. This may be a way to prove what you are alleging. But without comparisons, how can we be sure this is not just a standard request/response with no relevant data. This all seems very speculative.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 12:06 pm

  You’re free to file your own and compare them. Yes, I have others with the same response, others with responses that were filled (“responsive” letters and documents sent to me), and others with responses that nothing was found -- no denial or appeal necessary. I’m not ready to release everything at once, as we’re still doing a lot of research, but Prof. Fikes has just announced one of the others a bit ago at a major anthropology conference today.

Log in to Reply
- Barry Windham on November 16, 2012 at 10:49 pm

  what you need to do is file some of people who you know have no connection and compare them. I bet you will get the exact same language if you do that 20 times.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:52 pm

  Actually, as already repeated on this very page, I have, and no, the responses are NOT the same. A couple of them were, but they were people we expected we’d get classified results from.

Log in to Reply
- Harvard professor of spanglish on November 16, 2012 at 11:55 pm

  ok fair enough…

- Barry Windham on November 16, 2012 at 11:56 pm

  alright now that is important…but once a letter likes this comes back once from someone who is totally mundane it rules out any affiliation…

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:59 pm

  You’d have to define mundane and then prove via the appeal that there is nothing there of importance… that this “mundane” person wouldn’t, in fact, ALSO be an agent, etc.

  Good night, Barry. thanks for the constructive debate.

- Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 12:06 am

  BTW, Barry and the Harvard Prof. are the same person…

18. Bill on November 16, 2012 at 9:14 am

  Jan, thanks for the work you do. Why do you respond to the people who say such idiotic things on here? Don’t waste your time, brother. People that can read and understand the English language have respected your work for many years.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 9:19 am

  Did you ever consider that the people who waste your time and energy on here are getting paid to do it? They could just be morons. I suspect something more sinister (although I have no real evidence concerning your particular case).
Of course.

Log in to Reply

21. Brett MacNeill on November 16, 2012 at 10:06 am

jiving the Psychonautic impulse?

Log in to Reply

22. Frank Serpico on November 16, 2012 at 1:26 pm

C’mon! Get a colorful pied piper to lead the children into psycho-social dead-ends. One sentence.

Log in to Reply

• elly dozer on November 28, 2012 at 4:23 pm

brilliant!

Log in to Reply

23. Jacob on November 16, 2012 at 3:40 pm

They apparently automatically respond “we cannot confirm nor deny the existence of any responsive records”, unless they are already made public under FOIA via inter-agency sharing etc.

“In addition, requesters who seek records concerning specific actual or alleged CIA employees, operations, or sources and methods used in operations will necessarily be informed that we cannot confirm nor deny the existence of any responsive records. This policy is required to protect the confidentiality of such matters where public disclosure of the existence or non-existence of records would lead to the loss or the diminution in value of our intelligence program supporting the nation’s leadership.”

http://www.foia.cia.gov/foia.asp

Also, you can search for “CIA FOIA affiliation response” or akin and get the same letters elsewhere. Perhaps it would help Jan see this by some one else submitting a query using his name…😊

As a side note, I have enjoyed McKenna’s perspectives and mind-mapping since around 2003. I’m not quite sure why Jan has sought to undermine him so strongly. When he accuses Terence of promoting governmental run population control (which he did not, he merely suggested that a movement of mothers in affluent parts of the world choosing to limit their offspring to one child would greatly alleviate resource demand etc — he clearly stated that this would not work via governmental imposition). I happen to partially agree with this notion, although I think many people in the west are already adopting this practice, or akin… and population growth has slowed over the last decade.

Log in to Reply

• Jacob on November 16, 2012 at 3:42 pm

FYI someone has submitted this request for Jan’s name to the CIA, so we shall see! lol

Log in to Reply

• Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 4:45 pm

Well, that would be nice, if you knew what you were doing… but you have to have an OBITUARY to file one. You can’t do it with a living person UNLESS YOU ARE THAT PERSON. Otherwise I’d say send me what you find, but they’ll just deny your request as an improper filing. Try to read the instructions before you send it and waste your and our time with vacuous responses…

Jan is exposing people in the CIA, so he must be one! Yeah, that’s why I give you guys all of my sources to check, that you don’t read anyway.

Log in to Reply

• Barry Windham on November 16, 2012 at 10:52 pm

the point is not that you are in the CIA. The point is that the language of the letter is neutral. It says nothing. If you file one for yourself it will use the exact same language and it will also mean nothing they will search for records that would reveal Jan has an affiliation…and they wouldn’t find anything that is responsive.

Log in to Reply

• Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:55 pm

The language of the letter is that they DO have records that are classified and that if I want them I must file an appeal within 45 days of their mailing.

If I search myself, unless the information they contain is “classified”, then no, I wouldn’t get the same response. I would get either 1) the files, or 2) a letter stating that nothing was found.
You can file one on yourself. You need an obituary to file on someone else.

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 5:02 pm

“specific actual or alleged CIA employees, operations, or sources and methods used in operations will necessarily be informed that we can neither confirm nor deny the existence of any responsive records.”

As a side note, I have enjoyed McKenna’s perspectives and mind-mapping since around 2003. I’m not quite sure why Jan has sought to undermine him so strongly. When he accuses Terence of promoting governmental run population control (which he did not, he merely suggested that a movement of mothers in affluent parts of the world choosing to limit their offspring to one child would greatly alleviate resource demand etc — he clearly stated that this would not work via governmental imposition), I happen to partially agree with this notion, although I think many people in the west are already adopting this practice, or akin … and population growth has slowed over the last decade.

You lie:

Terence “Speaking the Unspakable” (begins at 1 hour 11 minutes – the Q&A):
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1O7hD3X9OM

Terence McKenna from Speaking the Unspakable: Maui. 1994. (“In Praise Of Psychedelics”)

Questioner 1:
Hi, I just wanted to know if you have heard about a book called The Mutant Message?

Terence McKenna:
No.

Questioner 1:
I want to tell you little bit about its because it’s very interesting. I think it follows what you’re been talking about. I love what your ideas about collective consciousness. And I think the book describes an aboriginal tribe in Australia that has been living the way in which you’re speaking, in a collective, and what they’ve come to the conclusion of is that they can no longer procreate. Because they have recognized that they can no longer exist on this planet. And the reason they call it the mutant message is they believe we are a mutant life form on this planet that is destroying it to the extent that they can no longer continue their lineage. And it’s an interesting concept, because it’s the first culture that I know of that has selectively chosen not to breed and along with your concept of raising our consciousness so that we understand the destructive nature of ourselves, what about a parallel vision of reducing our population as these people are. Of consciously choosing not to procreate at this time?

Terence McKenna:

Well it’s interesting that you brought this up. Yes, I’ve been saying for some time that, ***the mushroom pointed this out to me***, if every woman had only one child the population of the planet would fall 50% in 40 years. 50% in 40 years – without war, revolution, coercion, anything else. Now when you suggest this to people they say, well didn’t they try that in China and it failed?. Yes. But you have to think about a couple of things. First of all a child born to a woman in Maui or Malibu or Manhattan, that child will use between 800 and 1000 times more resources in its lifetime than a child born to a woman in Bangladesh. Why do we preach birth control in Bangladesh? We should be preaching it on Maui, Manhattan and Malibu. Because the women in those places are highly educated, socially responsible, global people. And therefore are the population most likely to respond to this suggestion. If 15% of the women in the high-tech industrial democracies were to to limit their childbearing to one child, within 10 years certain pressure indicators on the planet would begin to move away from the red and into the black.

So I think that we have got to think with this question of population. There are clearly too many people. And one woman, one child, you don’t have to be a rocket scientist or a psychedelic advocate, to understand the impact of that. If the population of the earth was cut in half everybody alive would be twice as wealthy. It’s possible in 120 years that we could reduce the world’s population to a billion very healthy, very comfortable, very well educated people.

Ok, that’s part of what ***the mushroom said***. And that may seem radical and some circles, but not here perhaps. It also said something else which I rarely mention, ***but since you brought it up***, there are not only too many people, there are too many men [laughter]. And ***I would be very interested in seeing a set of social policies, tax incentives, medical policies, insurance policies, put in place to limit male birth***. It’s very rare in mammal populations that you have a 50-50 ratio of male to female and in fact it’s well-known that male infants are less robust than female infants. And the reason why we have a 50-50 sexual ratio is because we artificially support males, and withdraw all resources from females. I suspect in the high Paleolithic the ratio is closer to 2 to 1 [unsupported - see citations]. And my supposition and thinking about this is that probably the best ratio is about this is 3 to 1. This is the way to feminize the human race if you’re serious. This is the way to advance women.
tremendously salutary to our problems. I’ve never heard it advocated even by the most radical, lesbian feminist, yada yada. I’ve never heard anyone say male birth should be limited. But it obviously should. And through amniocentesis* and this sort of thing we can steer ourselves toward a population with the predominance of females and those females should have only one child. And 75% of those children should also be female. And I don’t consider myself a gung ho feminist. I mean, ***I’m a feminist*** [feminism has been entirely disproved - see my interview with Karen of Girl Writes What], but I don’t read the literature, or try to understand all of the factions and theories. ***AS A HUMANIST I advocate a reduction in male birth.*** It just seems obvious that that’s the way to go [regarding the current practice of poisoning the male population, see my interview with Curtis Duncan]. If it doesn’t seem obvious to you then let’s have an a public debate about it, and at least make it part of the rhetoric of the culture that this is an option for people to think about.

Terence McKenna quotes:

“The Mushroom said. [...] But since you brought it up. [...] I would be very interested in seeing a set of social policies, tax incentives, medical policies, insurance policies, put in place to limit male birth. [...] This is the way to feminize the human race. [...] I’m a feminist. [...] AS A HUMANIST I advocate a reduction in male birth.”

~ Terence McKenna

He also FAKED his stoned ape theory. [http://www.realitysandwich.com/terence_mckennas_stoned_apes](http://www.realitysandwich.com/terence_mckennas_stoned_apes)


Where do you think those who are adopting this idea got it from? It’s almost entirely out of Esalen.

Try to get your facts straight and understand what HUMANISM, TRANSHUMANISM, FEMINISM and EUGENICS are before you say he wasn’t promoting such things. This was all already cited. Your wasting mine and everyone else’s time with your laziness.


Jan, that response is the same one you would have gotten if you’d put in the FOIA on your mother. Surely you know someone experienced in this stuff who can talk you down off this embarrassing position. It’s true that it’s also the response you’ve gotten for someone who really was doing classified work, but you knew going in that if it was classified you wouldn’t get any documents, right? That’s what this is saying. We have no documents responsive to your FOIA request means we have nothing on him, or if we do, it’s secret. I got the same response on a FOIA for a drunk broad with a chihuahua who was scamming my senile aunt. Seriously, ask an attorney or someone experienced with bureaucracy-speak. That’s a standard we-got-nothing letter.

Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 4:54 pm

Try to use your brains. What do you base this claim on? I’ve actually filed about a dozen FOIA requests and NO, telling me that the search is denied and CLASSIFIED is not what they’d reply with for your mother. Have you ever filed one?

The entire point of the filing is their admission of an openly acknowledged AFFILIATION – not a mother, and CLASSIFIED. In other words it clearly says one of the searches revealed an openly acknowledged CIA affiliation, therefore my request is denied and that the information is classified and that I may appeal their decision. Maybe you don’t know what these words mean, but I posted them above.

Maybe you can show how this is a response to anything and show how it’s in fact incorrect and the word definitions are wrong.

DENIED, CLASSIFIED and APPEAL is not a standard “we got nothing” letter. I’ve gotten those too on other requests. Not the same.

Jan, I read and reread that letter a number of times. Unless there’s another letter you’re not showing, they have only stated that they have no documents responsive to your FOIA request. That’s it! The rest of it, the wording, the content is just pro forma, cover-the-bases language.

I was paid a lot of money for many years to read this kind of stuff for people.

Different agencies and different department heads use differing language that all amounts to the same thing. If they have anything, they send you copies of it with whatever they don’t want you knowing redacted, using
If they don’t have anything they send you a letter like the one above. That covers the bases in case they do have something the writer doesn’t know about... or can’t acknowledge. The CIA is the most likely to use language like this because, I suppose, they actually have information on EVERYONE... and don’t want to admit it.

Seriously. If this is the only response you got, it ONLY means they have nothing for you. It doesn’t say ANYTHING about Terence.

If there was something before this that I missed, I’m sorry, but if this is the only response you got back from your request, they’re just telling you they’ve got nothing for you.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 9:50 pm

Yeah, that’s why it’s classified and to file an appeal regarding their decision. How do you miss that if you’ve read so many documents for OTHER things? It just means that they can’t send the documents because they’re classified and would reveal an agency affiliation.

How many times have you ever been told to file an appeal for something that isn’t there?

And yes, I know what a FOIA looks like when documents come back from it. Thanks. I’ve filed a few.

Log in to Reply
- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 10:27 pm

Here’s a site describing how to follow up on the appeal with a Mandatory Declassification Review, stating that the reason for an appeal is that there IS something. Hence, again, why (b)(1) “classified”. [http://nsarchive.wordpress.com/2012/02/10/the-cias-covert-operation-against-declassification-review-and-obamas-open-government/](http://nsarchive.wordpress.com/2012/02/10/the-cias-covert-operation-against-declassification-review-and-obamas-open-government/)

- Barry Windham on November 16, 2012 at 10:55 pm

ok so you now admit the letter says nothing positive only that they are covering something up?

The point is that they are not showing you their cards. Yes, you can infer from that a conspiracy...but it does not logically necessitate a conspiracy. You are using a very slippery logic here. You cannot take them not showing you any cards and say it proves anything other than that they won’t show you their cards…

- Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 11:00 pm

I acknowledge that the Agency very clearly states that “A search would reveal an openly acknowledge Agency affiliation” – and I fully intend to do what I can to find out what that affiliation is.

obviously they’re trying not to show their cards, but they reveal a couple of things 1) that there’s documents 2) that there’s an open affiliation, and 3) that it’s classified and they don’t want me to see it.

Now being that this is all related to MKULTRA, their secrecy after being exposed nationally on this very topic should raise quite a concern and uproar. And if you go through the database listed on the front page, as well as my articles on Wasson and Darwin, Huxley, McKenna, you’ll see that there is much more going on.

Try not to skip any citations.

- Barry windham on November 17, 2012 at 1:45 am

Ok I will admit that your other research is relevant and you have to take it all together to build context

25. Sashim meldek on November 16, 2012 at 5:35 pm

It is not saying it found anything, and it’s not saying it didn’t find anything.

So...

Log in to Reply
26. Earl Thornton on November 16, 2012 at 7:46 pm

Great work Jan, as always. This helps to put T.M.’s other relationships in perspective, and connects other dots we have found over the years. Smells like a ‘smoking gun’ to me. Bravo. Thank you.
27. Sashim melzek on November 16, 2012 at 8:37 pm

Nope. You’re still wrong.
Feel free to post the documents when you get them though.

Log in to Reply

28. Sashim melzek on November 16, 2012 at 8:39 pm

Well I don’t think there is any chance in you admitting that you’re wrong.
So feel free to show us the documents when you get them.

Log in to Reply

29. wonderkin on November 17, 2012 at 8:46 am

I don’t understand, Jan. No matter how many times you copy and paste AFFILIATION DENY CLASSIFIED. The language is very clear.

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.”

Our processing included a search. A search for what? Records. What kind of records? Records that would reveal a blah blah blah. Did we find any records? No records that we are willing to share with the public.

This isn’t a declaration of an openly acknowledged affiliation.

They were looking for records that might reveal such an affiliation and did not turn up any responsive documents. Now we all know what responsive means thanks to you.

In the second paragraph they basically gave you the Donald Rumsfeld runaround. And sure, they cited b(1) as a reason for not giving you a direct answer. That’s not an admission. It’s ambiguity.

“The fact of the existence or non existence of these documents is classified.” Basically they said, ‘We didn’t find anything marked responsive, and since we’re the CIA and you’re a citizen, that’s all you get to know. Deal with it.’

I’m kind of baffled you think you’re breaking a major story here. Why don’t you post the original letters you sent to the CIA with this? You sent at least two it seems.

Log in to Reply

Log in to Reply

30. wonderkin on November 17, 2012 at 8:54 am

Also, your APPEAL would maybe only net you a confirmation of “the fact of the existence or non existence of records”

So I would expect a very disappointing and equally ambiguous letter 46 days from now.

Log in to Reply

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 11:03 am

We already know the records exist, otherwise they wouldn’t be classified.

Log in to Reply

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 11:02 am

It’s already explained. Try to understand what responsive records are and what it means to be classified. It’s not a declaration, no, it says that a search would reveal an openly acknowledged affiliation.

Classified means that they have to have documents to classify, therefore, they have the documents. You can’t classify something that doesn’t exist, so therefore, they obviously exist. Try reading the rest of the work on Mckenna, Wasson, Huxley et al. Thanks.

Log in to Reply

robert42 on November 17, 2012 at 10:39 am

I’m inclined to think that there was an affiliation.

But I can see the rationale for them to respond as though there were withheld records even when there were none, and to spend money on lawyers to fight any appeal:

Consider two generic FOIA cases (for simplicity, let’s assume that these are the only two cases that were ever filed):

Case A: There are withheld records.
And also assume that they don’t want to reveal, even indirectly, that there are withheld records in case B.

Then it follows that they have to give the exact same response in both cases. For example, if they respond in case A with “no records exist,” but in case B they offer the option of an appeal, and they fight any such appeal, then the applicants in case B, looking at the response in case A, would reasonably conclude that there is something being withheld in case B.

Only by offering the appeal option and fighting any appeals, in BOTH cases, can the agency prevent such “information leakage.”

Log in to Reply

robert42 on November 17, 2012 at 10:44 am

Gah, I mixed up my cases! If Case A is “there are no withheld records” and Case B is “there are withheld records” then the rest of my message above makes sense.

[Note to self: proofread what you write before clicking "post comment."

Log in to Reply

MarkDuran on November 17, 2012 at 12:20 pm

Barry and Sashims’s premises: since it is UNTHINKABLE that Terrence McKenna had any affiliation whatsoever with the CIA despite his associations with particular individuals who did (“guilty by association fallacy” may apply if it had been one or two people), we are not to suspect that any letter from said agency would attempt to mislead, or obfuscate any such requested information.

Premise two: The CIA would not, and is CERTAINLY NOT in this case using intentionally misleading language in any correspondence with the who they regard as the “public.”

I suggest premise one (Terrence is not a affiliated with CIA) and premise two (CIA wouldn’t use intentionally misleading language) are unsustainable.

Result: reliance on sophisticated language and logical fallacies (+trolling) is necessary to muddy the waters here.

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 17, 2012 at 12:21 pm

Very well said.

Log in to Reply

robert42 on November 17, 2012 at 12:58 pm

OK, then they used misleading language.

Which means, the response is “stonewalling.” (A conclusion that I don’t like, but my reasoning and yours lead to that conclusion).

Log in to Reply

robert42 on November 17, 2012 at 5:05 pm

Hmm, I see that in an earlier response, Jan says “I have a letter from another FOIA that I filed and they simply replied that they didn’t find anything” which kind of blows my reasoning out of the water. I fell into the trap of putting logic before facts. Fact: They will say that there is nothing if there is nothing.

Log in to Reply

Mark Thurman on November 18, 2012 at 3:07 pm

Ugh, could you cite that response exactly, or direct me to it?
Your argument is: Since Jan supposedly had made a claim to having already received response from the CIA to the same request prior that definitively confirms the negative, than the alleged second response (presented here) should therefore be dismissed although it can be confirm the positive.
I guess according to your argument the conclusion be drawn that Jan is intentionally misleading us.
I guess also this rests on Jan’s having said what you’ve claimed he has, and to what extent you’re paraphrasing his words (+ the context it was said in is intact).
Even if that’s the case however, I don’t think it should result in throwing out this response presented here.

Log in to Reply

Mark Thurman on November 18, 2012 at 3:12 pm

“…than the alleged second response (presented here) should therefore be dismissed although it can be BE SHOWN TO LOGICALLY confirm the positive.”
“I guess according to your argument the conclusion THAT SHOULD be drawn IS that Jan is intentionally misleading us.”
Sorry should’ve proof read.
I am not saying Jan is misleading us. In fact, if you reread my comments immediately above, I erroneously reasoned myself into a corner, corrected myself by putting grammar before logic, and ended up agreeing with his position.

MarkDuran on November 19, 2012 at 9:42 pm

robert42

“I am not saying Jan is misleading us. In fact, if you reread my comments immediately above, I erroneously reasoned myself into a corner, corrected myself by putting grammar before logic, and ended up agreeing with his position.”

Oops! Sorry Robert42.

alyoshablue on November 17, 2012 at 7:32 pm

I hope the spirited debate in this comment section is just that, spirited, and people don’t have to degrade others to get their point across. Regardless, I’d like to add my 2 cents.

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive letters.”

1. This information may not be openly acknowledged. Therefore, the search would conducted on irrelevant information. As a result, their writing could be taken at face value.
2. Let’s assume we skip my first point and continue to the Responsive issue – obviously, if there was an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation, anything they want to share with you would be considered responsive. As the excerpt above reads, thus far, they have only verified that they did not locate that which they wish to share.

So at this point, we don’t know if there is a distinction between the condition of (1) an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation and (2) a clandestine Agency affiliation, or if such distinction does exist. Further, we still don’t know if they have information pertaining to TM.

“With respect to any other records, in accordance with section 3.6 (a) of E.O. 13526, the CIA can neither confirm nor deny the existence or nonexistence of requested records, the fact of their existence or nonexistence is itself classified under this order or its predecessors.

1. My initial questioning of their categorization of openly acknowledged Affiliation may seem relevant here, as they have identified “other records.”

So at this point, we really can’t discern if there is relevant information, outside of an openly acknowledged Affiliation with the CIA. Nonetheless, that does not exclude any relationship. I would speculate, that since the CIA responded to Jan’s request, issuing a “confirm or deny” statement, in addition to the statement provided in the first paragraph, is indicative that they are classifying the information and not willing to share it. The “confirm or deny” response is a response, nonetheless, and would not be offered in addition to a seemingly sufficient response, as given in paragraph one, had there not been information in the “other information” category.

Pertinent Reading:

E.O. Sec. 3.6 (a) An agency may refuse to confirm or deny the existence or nonexistence of requested records whenever the fact of their existence or nonexistence is itself classified under this order or its predecessors.

Protection of Nature of Agency’s Functions

Sec. 6. [50 U.S.C. Sec. §403g]

In the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order further to implement section 403-1(i) of this title that the Director of National Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Agency shall be exempted from the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the Act of August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 956, 957; 5 U.S.C. §654), and the provisions of any other law which require the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency: Provided, That in furtherance of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make no reports to the Congress in connection with the Agency under section 607 of the Act of June 30, 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. §947(b)).

32. Jimothy Jones on November 17, 2012 at 11:08 pm

Jan keeps juxtaposing this statement “openly acknowledged Agency affiliation” with this statement “properly classified”. This is being used out of context…..

Both statements are in separate paragraph, and are not referring to one another.
records”could mean anything, they could be agency monitoring files on McKenna, they are not referring to the search conducted that would reveal “an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the agency started” which is in a different paragraph and context. 

Additionally, Jan should include a copy of the FOIA request he sent, we would likely see that “openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the agency started” are his words used in the filing of the request.

Juxtaposition — logical fallacy on the part of the observer, where two items placed next to each other imply a correlation, when none is actually claimed.

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 18, 2012 at 3:32 am

Nice straw man. You omitted “responsive”. Therefore, “properly classified” wold be non-responsive.

Log in to Reply

Paul on November 18, 2012 at 6:40 am

Well, I admit that “responsive records” is an unusual term. I am not sure that Jan is interpreting correctly, but I don’t know. Legal wording can be tricky. I don’t think it is a matter of “you can understand it yourself if you look carefully at the grammar.” If you are not steeped in the legal culture, you really have no foundation for definitively interpreting a phrase like “responsive records” in my opinion. And they might be using that particular phrase in order to wiggle out of something or other in the event of a mishap. In other words, some lawyer might have wanted an intentionally nebulous phrase there.

Well, let’s see if the appeal turns up anything.

Log in to Reply

Graham Le Saux on November 19, 2012 at 6:19 am

I see you have not posted my perfectly reasoned comment. You fucking squaddil little hypocrite. Grammar expert, my fat arse you are!

Log in to Reply

greg bell on November 22, 2012 at 4:41 am

What they said:

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.”

What they probably meant:

“Our processing included a search for records that WOULD HAVE REVEALED an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.”

In my opinion, this says “we did the search you wanted… and it did not locate any responsive records”. It would have revealed records on the agency affiliation but didn’t, at least not any we can tell you about.

How you’re interpreting this, Jan, is that the search DID reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation. I see how you would read that from “would” but I don’t think that’s correct.

This is where you and some dozens of participants here differ. I think attacking all the people trying to help you by pointing out your misinterpretation is bad form. I think they’re right. (Commence your attack on me – make sure to assume/imply low intelligence, poor education, ignorance of the trivium, and an inability to grasp the most basic elements of language).

Log in to Reply

Tony Lutz on November 24, 2012 at 7:52 am

An interesting article. There certainly is much disagreement being put forth!

I mostly read comments to learn. I did read all of them above.

I’m reminded of one of my favorite comments:

“He who complains has already lost.”

That being said, as a result of reading this article a few days ago, I did make note of Mckenna’s response when asked, “Why aren’t you in jail?”

among others, “perhaps I’m sanctioned…”

Related: Holotropic Breathwork | Peyote Stitch |
Here is the link to the video.
Terence Mckenna why I’m not in jail
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HDYdN3j2eTg&feature=related

Thanks for your time & efforts, and keep up the good work!

Log in to Reply

38. Paul Short on November 25, 2012 at 7:31 am

Wow @ the people trying to debunk the wording of a straightforward letter that even had relevant explanations attached.

I read the letter and the explanations and before even reading the comments came to the same conclusion Jan did about it’s meaning.

“He whose facts piss in the most cornflakes gets the most backlash.” I guess.

I’m beginning to think that an accurate metric to use when gauging truth is the degree to which trolls respond and stay with the attempted debunking of the obvious.

Log in to Reply

→ Paul Short on November 25, 2012 at 12:02 pm

Metric #2 = Ad hominems…

Log in to Reply

→ Graham Le Saux on November 25, 2012 at 1:23 pm

I would otherwise agree except you have made absolutely no attempt to explain the reasoning for your agreement. Besides that, you introduced ‘ad hominem’ first by invoking the unnecessary and prejudicial descriptor ‘troll’. Isn’t that got something to do with ‘appeal to ridicule’? I look forward to your own presentation of logic and reasoning in support of ‘Positive Affiliation’.

Log in to Reply

→ Jan Irvin on November 26, 2012 at 3:14 pm

A troll is not necessarily an ad hominem. Calling someone a thief isn’t necessarily an ad hominem. There are facts of these things. There are many trolls. Take you for instance. You’ve been asked to leave because each time you come here you name call and act intellectually bankrupt. I’ve deleted your last post with your name calling at Paul.

if you’re unable to think without fallacies and name calling then you’ve nothing of value to contribute here, as I’ve already shown.

Being that most trolls around here are apparent by their complete refusal to read and study all of the material and evidence before spewing their unfounded opinions, usually based on some form of name calling, etc. such as yours – they’re easy to identify. Their attacks are nearly always thus straw man arguments and based on little or nothing provided, or focusing on one small piece of evidence while ignoring the rest – such as you do.

As you clearly have nothing constructive to offer, and you’ve probably read little or none of the papers here that we’ve provided and are discussing, as well as the videos and database with over 6000 citations, your opinions mean little or nothing. Get studied, offer the group something intelligent based on putting grammar first and having looked at all of the evidence presented and then maybe you’ll sound like anything other than a barking dog with some agenda to protect.

Again, Graham in the UK, I’ve already asked you to leave. Do you think you’re capable of leaving intelligently? Or do I have to actually block you? Your name calling, leaping to conclusions, et al, is uncalled for. Trolls are trolls. You have been only here to lie and spew garbage that you pull out of your ass. If you’re incapable of going point by point through the research in context, without name calling and straw man arguments or other fallacies then your opinions aren’t welcome here.

Your introduction here was a joke and you’ve shown us the type of person you are as well as your inability to think and act rationality based on the evidence and conversations provided. Kindly leave.

Log in to Reply

→ ell dozer on November 28, 2012 at 4:33 pm

I always figured if you identified with the name being called, that it was obvious that you were–said name. But yes–it does make for poor communication and I am guilty as well.

After all, only someone who is offended at being called a “sheep” or “dupe”–isn’t really sure yet–wether they are a sheep or not.
39. Robert Sterner on November 25, 2012 at 1:00 pm

Your Awesome Jan. Use these morons as an anvil. Pound away dude, you rock. Love Sissaly

Log in to Reply

40. David Timms on November 25, 2012 at 4:25 pm

Is Dennis Mckenna aware of this inquiry? If so, what does he make of it?

Log in to Reply

Jan Irvin on November 26, 2012 at 3:01 pm

Yes, he named called and refused to look at any of the evidence and dodged my questions.

Log in to Reply

41. Phillip Longo on November 26, 2012 at 7:45 am

I’ve recently inquired about this individual and became increasingly skeptic of his ideology as he continually contradicts himself and weaves truth with fiction. I believe he is appealing the a commoner, idiot if you will. The “big words” impress small minds who may feel empowered by group ideology. So, if the CIA had a file on him, rightfully so, however I would lean towards the idea that he was a plausible sociopath. Also, consider the majority of his audience. Another wacko of interest would be Alex Jones and his freakish cult.

Log in to Reply

42. David Timms on November 26, 2012 at 9:32 pm

Is Dennis Mckenna aware of this recent inquiry? If so, what does he think?

Log in to Reply

43. robert42 on November 30, 2012 at 10:51 am

Elly, his being a dupe does not preclude CIA affiliation.

Log in to Reply

44. Dan Tumult on December 3, 2012 at 6:18 pm

Jan,

Saw you last year at the Free Your Mind conference. Loved your presentation. I have long wondered about the psychedelic movement and its potential to be co-opted and used negatively. It seemed obvious to me that Leary and (to a lesser obvious extent) Huxley were negative in some way. I’m sure I had a similar reaction as you with McKenna, the suspicions being harder to believe at first. I have a few questions in order to open this dialog further.

Firstly, about this letter of confirmation. Maybe I don’t understand, but, given the reply, isn’t it possible that they have classified files on McKenna but that he was not an agent for them? He was a large enough figure to have a light shined on him, after all.

But assuming he was purposely behind this whole “pumping up” of the 2012 thing and assuming he was indeed a eugenist, this brings me to several questions. I don’t expect you to have every part of this thing understood perfectly but I’d like to see what you think. One thing that is puzzling, is why would they try to use him to promote these things when the bulk of his speech is sort of fanciful, mystical self-esteem boosting? I still feel empowered when I hear a lot of it. Is this mere distraction? When McKenna says things like fuck TV, make your own art, you are the most important people on the planet- how can this factor into a larger, negative plan?

The other issue I have is with what I perceive as the sincerity of his quest, particularly concerning ayahuasca. Now, maybe he meant all of these things sincerely and maybe he believed in the power of DMT but only for the elite and only for the few. If this is the case, perhaps the common man should think twice about listening to him, though, I still have to think that one can simply apply these concepts to the wider margin and this doesn’t make them worse for the wear.

Now, pragmatically, why would something with innate spiritual capabilities like mushrooms be able to really serve any agenda not of a true spiritual nature? Couldn’t this backfire? I mean, if you connect to the spirit with it, how can anyone else “hijack” that? Do they have such utter faith in their means of manipulation (i.e. HAARP, ELF, whatever it may be) that they would allow the promotion of something like that? Do they really think they can subvert it? I am willing to accept such an answer but I am really interested in how this would work.

I could talk about this ins and outs of this for hours but I think that’s more than sufficient to start. Any ideas you have that may clarify things would be great. Thanks for looking into such arenas that desperately need consideration and thanks for bringing an open mind to them instead of layers of unnecessary preconceptions.

Log in to Reply

45. David Halliday on December 11, 2012 at 9:51 am

Jan, I still don’t understand how you get a confirmation from this. To me it says that there are two types of records,
for all classified files, they cannot confirm nor deny their existence. They are not denying you classified files on Terence, they are telling you that you cannot have ANY classified files.

I do not understand the appeal though. Maybe your have a right to appeal any decision? If they have the right to stay silent on whether or not the files exist, what is there to appeal?

Thanks for your time if you choose to respond,
David Halliday

Log in to Reply

Ps, thanks so much for turning me on to the Underground Grammarian

Jan Irvin on December 11, 2012 at 12:24 pm

See the arguments already repeatedly discussed here. You can’t classify something that doesn’t exist. They’re simply saying that they don’t have anything they want to send.

Log in to Reply

Sashim Melzdek on December 18, 2012 at 2:47 am

I’m not a troll, and I could care less if Terence McKenna was involved with the CIA. I just don’t understand how your gathering that this request you filed is admitting anything. It’s not.

Log in to Reply

Jan wrote:

“See the arguments already repeatedly discussed here. You can’t classify something that doesn’t exist. They’re simply saying that they don’t have anything they want to send.”

They say in the letter that the fact of the existence or non-existence of such records is classified. So it seems that they can classify something that doesn’t exist.

Log in to Reply

Team Daemon on December 20, 2012 at 1:49 am

“To be clear, it’s saying that A SEARCH TURNED UP AN OPENLY ACKNOWLEDGED AGENCY AFFILIATION AND DID NOT FIND ANY RESPONSIVE LETTERS.”

No, it doesn’t say that they found an openly acknowledged affiliation, it just says that they searched for an openly acknowledged affiliated, and did not find any non-classified records. They then go on to explain about how the fact of the existence or non-existence of these records is itself classified. So in the end they are not telling you anything.

By the way are you just deleting my comments?

Log in to Reply

Ooops, no you’re not. Sorry I couldn’t find them. Still, I think the onus of proof is on you in this case.

Log in to Reply

Okay let’s look at the grammar of this sentence:
to and including the date the Agency started its search and did not locate any responsive records.”

So the key word here seems to be “would”. You interpret this sentence to me that their search *would* reveal an openly acknowledged relationship, BUT they will not tell you because that is classified. If this is a positive acknowledgement of such an affiliation, however, could it really be “up to and including the date the Agency started its search”? How many years has Terence been dead? Could he have had an affiliation with the agency in the years following his death? Probably not. In the language of this letter “would” seems to be more of a hypothetical qualifier. As in, such a search *would* have revealed such an affiliation *IF* such an affiliation was “responsive” aka not classified. In any case, the letter makes no positive statements of any kind regarding Terence’s affiliation. I think it’s reasonable to infer that they have classified files on Terence. But that single line of bureaucratic legalese is no basis for making such a far-reaching accusation. Just for the record I support this line of inquiry and greatly appreciate the new information on Wasson. It would be a shame to ruin it by going out on a limb based on confirmation bias.

That being said, do you really think that the CIA would compromise their security of information through an oversight in legal bureaucracy? Furthermore, how do you even trust the things you’re getting from the CIA? Shouldn’t you expect them to selectively release information in a way that serves their agenda? I mean, because they are the CIA and answer only to their elite overlords, demonstrably above the law? I am curious about your thinking on this issue as you are researching this subject.

Log in to Reply

52. Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 12:03 pm

And how is that, Slomo? Would you provide an example? Some citations? I’ve provided mine, and I provide critical thinking – see the trivium, and I show people how control systems work. If you don’t have anything constructive or intelligent to offer, then refrain from commenting and don’t return. I’m sick and tired of intellectually bankrupt people as yourself with their vacuous comments.

Log in to Reply

53. Jan Irvin on November 16, 2012 at 12:23 pm

Yes, Slomo, read the fucking English. It’s not in Hebrew.

Here’s what it actually says:

Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged Agency affiliation existing up to and including the date the Agency started and did not locate any RESPONSIVE records [records they’ll send me in a reply].

[...] Therefore, your request is denied pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(3).

You have the right to appeal this response to the Agency Release Panel, in my care, within 45 days from the date of this letter [...] 

(b)(1) exempts from disclosure information currently and properly CLASSIFIED, pursuant to an Executive Order

(b)(3) exempts from disclosure information that another federal statute protects, provided that the other federal statute either requires that the matters be withheld, or establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld. The (b)(3) statutes upon which the CIA relies include, but are not limited to, the CIA Act of 1949.

The key words for you to attempt to understand here are:

WOULD – the opposite of WOULD NOT.

AFFILIATION – A MEMBER OF

DENY – REJECT OR TURN DOWN THE REQUEST

CLASSIFIED – SECRET OR HIDDEN – SEE (b)(1).

RESPONSIVE – Letters that are NOT classified that they MAY send me. Such responsive letters are marked with the CIA’s stamp and release date when they’re allowed to be sent out as “responsive”.

APPEAL – this means to appeal their decision to deny my request and not provide the documents they don’t consider “responsive”.

obviously to understand such words requires a very minimum level of understanding of the English language… which, apparently, you don’t have.

Log in to Reply

54. 53.

55. Sashim melzdek on November 16, 2012 at 6:20 pm

Related: Holotropic Breathwork | Peyote Stitch |
So…

To be clear, it's saying that **A SEARCH TURNED UP AN OPENLY ACKNOWLEDGED AGENCY AFFILIATION AND DID NOT FIND ANY RESPONSIVE LETTERS. RESPONSIVE, AS DEFINED ABOVE, DOES NOT MEAN THAT THEY DIDN’T FIND ANYTHING. HENCE WHY IT SAYS REQUEST DENIED, “CLASSIFIED”. RESPONSIVE MEANS THINGS, LETTERS, THAT ARE NOT CLASSIFIED THAT THEY CAN SEND, or “RESPOND” with. IT’S CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, AS IT SAYS, REPEATEDLY, ABOVE.**

It amazes me that you people can’t understand “AN OPENLY ACKNOWLEDGED AGENCY AFFILIATION” – Request DENIED, CLASSIFIED, and you must APPEAL to get the information. It even spells it out for you above. How do you confuse this and ignore it?

So?

am i the only one who fins it ironic that most of Jan’s audience has the grammar skills required to parse this letter and understand that this letter says nothing. Meanwhile, Jan lacks the education and grammar to understand the letter. When Jan’s the one always saying the mantra “study your grammar”.

“Our processing included a search for records that would reveal an openly acknowledged ALIEN INVASION existing up to and including the date the Agency started and did not locate any RESPONSIVE records (nor any non-responsive records)”

Parse that! There does that help you understand it?

Jan, are you going to appeal?

For God’s sake! this is beginning to sound like the Mossad on high midrashic heat in here. Enough already! Or we’ll have to call on Jackie Mason and he’s retired. I want to stir the chicken soup and add an extra catholic ingredient to the kosher schmaltz. Affiliation is an interesting word. How many American patriots would relish recognition by “their” sacred Agency? I’d bet almost anyone who considered themselves to be a loyal citizen ie most. The exemptions would be those dissident individuals who considered CIA/NSA etc as rogue elements, and by acting as non-complicit were demonstrating themselves to be more patriotic than those who blindly followed the badge carriers without question (like a religion.) There is a danger here that we might confound authority with law. Law is made by elected officials, authority is exercised by non-elected paid employees. We should respect law and due legal process, not the fetish that is institutionalised authority by default. FOI is by definition an ethos of access and transparency. Secrecy means deception by any means. So, if CIA want to keep a secret or want us to think there are secrets, to keep us preoccupied and distracted, then they will use any means to blag, scam and blind us with their sciences of professional “intelligence.” As Alan Watts once wrote: “Does it matter”…when we may have better things to do with our time and intellect? How affiliated do we want get? What if those to whom we are invited to express are desire to affiliate with are actually trapped in their own prison of exceptionalism and institutionalised bullshit? What if Terence McKenna thought he was a Trojan Horse loaded with alien virtual junk DNA and was about to infect the entire intelligence establishment with a truth pathogen? Will we ever know?

You are having such a hard time here on this one Jan, because you are wrong regarding this letter, although you still might be right about TM from other sources. In fact you only dig yourself deeper into your hole with your abuse to everyone. The statement regarding APPEAL is not – as you require it to be – an admission that they do have some dodgy secret data but aren’t telling, it is simply a legal statement regarding process: no more, no less. It is based on the principle that without appeal there is no law. And lawyers at the CIA aren’t that stupid. Presently you come across as a manic depressive cowssure kid who’s so excited that he can’t believe that he’s really now himself in contact with the CIA! Anyway, rather than continue to make a fool of yourself, why don’t you generate a letter of appeal, state your reasons as requested, and see what they say. Only then can you really be sure yourself, otherwise you have only gone half way with the process. You could even post it here first so we could see it too, even contribute any of our own data. That would really put your expertise in grammar, logic and syntax to the test. Or maybe when it come’s down to it, you really haven’t really got such good reasons after all?
Perfectly reasoned, with your name calling, etc. How so?

For your information, if they had nothing, it couldn’t be classified. It’s simple logic that you can’t classify nothing, even if you use sophist tactics to pretend that you don’t have anything. “As search would reveal an openly acknowledge Agency affiliation” is a clear statement, regardless of their own politician back peddling.

For your information, I’ve been in contact with the CIA for nearly a year, so nice appeal to ridicule. Your statement is false and based on ignorant assumption.

My FOIA letter is just a basic FOIA letter. Other requests where they didn’t find anything, come back saying so. Additional requests where they did, came back filled. They’ve even been nice enough to send me letters about others doing the same searches and how they’ll make exact copies of the other inquirer’s searches for me. So your logic and assumptions don’t follow.

I’m wrong on this one? How so? The onus of proof is on you to explain the words affiliated, and classified and responsive.

How am I abusing people? You mean the people who come here trolling and name calling and rarely, if ever, read or understand the words they’re reading before they comment? How am I abusing them by pointing out their double standard, hypocritical logic such as yours?

Of course it’s dodgey, and of course it says the information is classified. You can’t classify a nothing, it’s just common sense, and the word affiliation is very clear too.

Without an appeal, there is no law? How does that work, when their entire practice is based on a false appeal to authority in the first place? Actually, they’ve already sent me documents before without any appeal, so your faulty logic does not follow.

But as I was busy yesterday and don’t loom over my keyboard to approve the next thoughtless, name calling comments of someone who can’t grasp English, and then needs to come here and name call more and spout his “logic” when i was sleeping and away from home, needs to learn to use some the very thinking he accuses me of. Are you so excited to be posting here your first time, without studying the rest of the material and database here, that you just felt the need to spew your unresearched thoughts all over us? Thanks, but no thanks.

I’m glad you think you have the ability to judge me and my personality based on some trolls, like your own, on the site. Several of these guys have been around trolling for years, so it’s none of your business how I treat them, nor is it your faulty place in logic to use your circumstantial ad hominems in attempt to judge me just to spew your own ego on my site — where this is clearly your first time here and you’ve obviously studied NONE of the other related work, especially the trivium, which would have made you think before posting your diatribe.

Don’t come here name calling at me and then telling me that I abuse everyone. I’ve got to deal with a number of such morons every day who think they have critical thinking, but when it comes to it display no sign of it what so ever.

The form I filed with them is standard and simply requests any and all data on Terence Kemp McKenna. Again, all replies from them are not the same. You base this claim on nothing, as I’ve already had many replies from them. And, as I said, unlike your faulty logic and judgments, leaping to conclusions without facts, I’ve been in touch with them for nearly a year and your free to file a number of them yourself to see if they simply reply with a statement of appeal and classified for anything, or, that you don’t know shit and are pulling things out of your ass to sounds smart and push your own ego where you’ve never studied a thing and just came here to spout your vacuousness.

As this was your first post, you’re banned. I don’t have time to waste with you.

Log in to Reply

61. Graham Le Saux on November 19, 2012 at 2:57 pm

You are disgusting.

Log in to Reply

62. elly dozer on November 28, 2012 at 4:27 pm

so crazy that people are seeing black when the words are white, and yet its right in front of their nose and not even occulted!

Too many Dupes, not enough Adepts!

Log in to Reply

63. elly dozer on November 28, 2012 at 6:18 pm

bah.

No, Its way more probable that he was a dupe megafone for fanatical non-logic, overly emotional control hungry Military Industrial Complex via mind-control and social manipulation.
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