



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



**Our Bookstore is OPEN**

*Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!*

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1996](#) -> [Dec](#) -> **UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

From: [KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)

Date: Sat, 14 Dec 1996 16:03:45 -0500

Fwd Date: Sun, 15 Dec 1996 13:20:24 -0500

Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

Stan Friedman in his responses to Russ Estes has said:

<>1. I have many times said, there are 2 separate questions: Is Bob Lazar telling the truth about >Bob Lazar? 2. Are there saucers at Area 51? That Bob <is lying about Bob clearly tells us nothing >about whether there are saucers <there. I have had a quiet witness tell me there were saucers >brought there <back in the 1940s. Led Stringfield has told of people saying there were <saucers >there. It is an obvious site for testing of any kind of highly <classified advanced propulsion >system.

Russ Estes responded:

<Mr. Friedman, Your answer brings up another question.

<Are you saying that there have been saucers at Area 51 since the 1940's?

This is a point that needs to be stressed. Here Stan is suggesting that not only is the Operations Manual accurate with its reference to Area 51 in 1954, but is suggesting wreckage was taken there in the 1940s. This sounds suspiciously like an attempt to revitalize the Plains of San Agustin crash. No first-hand witnesses have ever been found, but now we have a "quiet" witness who is telling us about Area 51 in the 1940s. Let's have some evidence rather than this endless stream of unidentified sources.

We are also told that Stan doesn't necessarily believe the tales of crashed saucers at Area 51 in the 1940s, yet he was quick to use this information to refute part of Russ Estes' statements. If he didn't believe it, or thinks it less than accurate information, why bring it up at all? I've heard lots of tales about the Roswell case, Area 51, and from "secret" witnesses, yet I don't use that information to suggest someone hasn't done his homework.

Russ Estes question:

<\* 3. Mr. Friedman, it has been said that you are the only scientist who is in <the field of Ufology (At least on a full time basis). Have you published <your protocols for the research of the phenomenon? If you have, where can I <find them? If not, Why?

Stan Friedman responded:

<>3. I know many scientists involved with ufology. I have no idea how one <would publish >protocols. What I have been doing over several decades <involves many different activities. It is >not like abduction research. I <have published more than 70 papers some quite large, co-authored >a book, <authored another. I think they provide readers with a very good handle on <what I do and >how I do it. .. certainly judging by responses to TOP <SECRET/MAJIC

Am I to take it from the answer here that Stan is suggesting that abduction research is easier than UFO research? Or is he suggesting that abduction

research lends itself to scientific protocols more readily than other forms of UFO research?

I also notice that, as usual, Stan has not answered the question. It was a question about research protocols, not about how many books or articles he had published. Shouldn't a scientist, doing research, establish his research protocols, and shouldn't they be available?

Now he seems to suggest in his new response that if those asking for the protocols aren't scientists then he has no obligation to supply them. When did it become necessary for someone to be labeled a scientist to ask a scientific, and in this case relevant, question? If heaven is filled with scientists with the training and expertise of Stan, it's going to be a very lonely place.

Stan Friedman's response to Russ Estes question: <>5. Obviously if there was no AREA 51 or plans for one as a secret facility <prior to April, 1954, >the Manual could not refer to it. The problem is <getting history on still very highly classified >projects. I have not said <the document is genuine. Read the last paragraph on page 166 of <>TOPSECRET/MAJIC.."authentication will be no easy task, as the results must <be solid enough >to withstand the onslaught of both debunkers and a <government that denies the existence of alien <>craft". Having worked under security with a Q clearance for 14 years and <having visited 15 >archives, I have a reasonably good idea about how <difficult it is to get information on black >programs.

Russ Estes asked: <Mr. Friedman, since you brought it up, How do you define an archive?

It seems that Stan is beginning to agree with us. If there was no facility, then the Operations Manual is a fake. We don't need to worry about debunkers or government agents here. What we need is evidence of a facility at Groom Lake designated Area 51 in 1954 and none has been offered. If it did exist, Stan would have shown it to us by now.

As for these 15 archives, has anyone but me wondered why the total was so LOW? My dictionary defines an archive as "A place where public records and historical documents are kept." Seems to me that I've been in more than 15 archives in the state of New Mexico.

And even if we follow Stan's personal definition of archives, fifteen is still a ridiculously low number.

Russ Estes asked:

<\* 6. Mr. Randle, it quiet obvious that you and Mr. Friedman don't see eye to eye on many subjects. It is also a fact the Mr. Friedman has done some <ground-breaking research on the Roswell case. Why have you not credited him <in either of your books on that topic?

Stan Friedman responded:

<>6. As I have noted and quoted in one of my papers, and as you would have <noticed if you had >read it,I was given a good acknowledgment by Kevin and <Don in "The UFO Crash at Roswell". >Kevin has written more than 2 books about <crashed saucers. Note for example "A history of >UFO Crashes".. Avon.

Russ Estes responded:

<Once again Mr. Friedman, I thank you for your response...but.. This question <was directed to Mr. Randle and was based on your complaints of not being <acknowledged in the bibliographies of his books.

<>By the way Russ, how about telling us about your scientific background ? <Stan Friedman

<Stan, since we are now on a first name basis, I have not claimed to be a <"Scientist" nor did I know that I had to clear my credentials with the <credential desk before asking any questions.<Grin>

<My goal in asking the questions was not to get in on "Friedman bashing" or <duelling. Unless I am reading your answers all wrong, and that could be, what <I am getting from them is a pompous attitude and a condescending manner.

<The fact that the field of Ufology does not have a certifying board for <researchers or any accredited degrees makes the acceptance of standardized <protocols and procedures even more important. Then again, if answers to the <phenomenon is not the goal we have both just wasted some precious time.

<This is not the kind of correspondence that I usually engage in, in an open forum, but due to the tone of your answers I felt it necessary to respond.

<If feelings have been hurt or if my questions are inane, please forgive me.

<R. Estes

Did anyone else notice that Stan's response seemed to be somewhat pompous and condescending. It would seem to me that questions deserve answers and here we haven't gotten any. Once again, I point out that I merely asked for the names of the two question document experts who said the Truman memo was typed on a typewriter that existed in 1947. After several months, we still don't have a clue. I even offered to pay for the copying of the report that Stan must have of their opinions, as long as the experts are not Moore and Shandera. There has been no response to this question.

And there still isn't an answer about Area 51. The record seems to indicate no secret base there in 1954, no use of the term Area 51 before 1954, yet we are still subjected to the idea that something could be hidden there because it was, after all, a secret.

I also find that Russ Estes questions were clear and to the point, offering Stan an opportunity to express his opinion in a clear and concise manner. Instead, he decides to attack someone who is seeking information. Could it be that Stan doesn't have answers to the questions so instead he attacks the questioner. Isn't this forum supposed to be a free exchange of ideas and not an assault on those who ask difficult questions.

I also find Stan's suggestion that I have sufficiently acknowledged his work somewhat ridiculous. He has spent years complaining about the lack of notations in my bibliographies (insert shameless plug here), and yet when Russ Estes stands up for him, he turns it around and attacks Estes. What in the hell is going on here?

Stan castigates Russ Estes for not doing his homework, yet it is clear that Estes has. He makes reference to many of Stan's published work, though that work has been published in limited access journals. The fact that these so-called published papers are not available in the main stream is not Estes' fault. And even though they have been published in limited access journals, it is also clear that Estes had read a number them. The real question is why has Stan reacted with such hostility and venom to what seem to be legitimate questions. Why is it that most of us on this list attempt to share information without the personal rancor and Stan seems to swim in it.

As I was growing up, I remember watching (dare I say it, a science fiction movie), Journey to the Center of the Earth. I was impressed with James Mason writing his learned paper and sending it to his fellows for review. I also hoped to find a circle in which we could engage in intelligent conversation, share ideas, no matter how radical, and test theories about the world in which we live. This list seemed to be an answer to part of that dream. Yet, there are those who seem to want it all their way without supplying proper evidence for their points of view. And when those points of view are challenged, the response is to attack rather than think. Russ Estes now embeds in his questions false assumptions but aren't questions designed to seek answers? Therefore we have no false assumptions, just desire to clarify what has been published in many arenas including Stan's self-published papers.

If we all were to take Stan's advice, we'd all take our marbles and go home and this list would die because it would be only Stan's letters to himself praising his own work.

KRandle

---

Search for other documents to/from: [krandle993](#)

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

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)**  
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

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

To subscribe please send your first and last name to [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

---

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

**To find this message again in the future...**  
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.  
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: [webmaster@ufomind.com](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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