



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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Re: Friedman v Randles - a new trial (was: Libel)

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Friedman v Randles - a new trial (was: Libel)

From: **Steven Kaeser** <skaeser@konsulting.com>
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 16:56:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 22:19:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Friedman v Randles - a new trial (was: Libel)

> Subject: Friedman v Randles - a new trial (was: Libel)
> Date: Fri, 21 Feb 97 13:57:05 -0000
> From: Bob Rickard <rickard@forteantimes.com>
> To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@globalserve.net>

> In the very interesting interchange between Andy Roberts and Stanton
> Friedman about a defamation suit brought against Jenny Randles and a
> Manchester newspaper, Mr Friedman said:
> >Why not post the article and the letter and the apology?

> As the affair was some time ago and probably new to many members of
> this list and as ufology itself has moved on, this list would provide
> an ideal forum of peers. Could we not see the evidence (so many of us
> have not) ... the original article and objections ... and let us judge
> for ourselves. Andy could speak for Jenny (she has no email) Mr Friedman
> would no doubt argue his own case.

While I would agree that it would be to the advantage of most of those here to see the original article, apology, and related information, I'm not convinced that an open ended debate on the merits of this issue will serve much of a purpose. Since both parties involved in this debate are obviously biased, the arguments would likely be both predictable and repetitive.

> This is not a frivolous suggestion as the issues are central to how we
> challenge the opinions of high-profile 'professional' researchers and
> whether they have any right to object to being questioned, and whether
> any of this actually undermines their ability to earn a living or damages
> their reputation.

>
> Bob Rickard - editor
> rickard@forteantimes.com
> FORTEAN TIMES - www.forteantimes.com

One should not be challenging opinions, but the facts that are used to support those opinions. This becomes a different matter when those "opinions" involve character assassination, either directly or indirectly, which can lead to civil suits such as is the case here. We should become involved in some sort of peer review of the facts upon which we base out theories, not a peer review of the personalities involved.

Search for other documents to/from: [skaeser](#) | [rickard](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

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

To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net

Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

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

To find this message again in the future...

Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

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