

From: "James Randi" <randi@randi.org>
Date: March 28, 2004 5:47:18 AM PST
To: "Michael" <michael@theyfly.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, "James Underdown" <jim@cfiwest.org>, <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <plejarans_are_real@yahogroups.com>
Subject: RE: The Real McCoy

Looks like quantity makes up for ONE good quality reference, here. And we all know how Nippon TV wouldn't ever misrepresent facts, don't we?

James Randi

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael [mailto:michael@theyfly.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 27, 2004 6:40 PM
To: derek@iigwest.com; James Underdown; Vaughn@cfiwest.org; randi@randi.org; SKEPTICMAG@aol.com; plejarans_are_real@yahogroups.com
Subject: Re: The Real McCoy

Derek,

Oh yeah, how thoughtless of me to overlook this when it obviously got you up early in the morning to write about it. And thanks for pointing out how I'm preventing Billy from proving his claim. Why didn't I think about that before?

Okay, how's about this? Regarding how the scientific process works, examination of the evidence in the Meier case was done by renowned scientific experts from:

- IBM
- JPL
- USGS

- NASA
- Nippon TV
- Village Labs
- INTERREPO
- Micor Electric
- SCHORI REPROS
- McDonnell Douglas
- Excalibur Sound Studios
- Photo Color Studio of Zurich
- Naval Undersea Sound Center
- Director of Special Effects, Canadian Film Board
- Design Technology (holds contracts with NASA, Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the U. S. Navy, also do subcontracted work for General Dynamics Engineering)

Some of the equipment used in the analysis included:

Hamamatsu Systems

De Anza Systems

COMTAL

HELL Chromograph DC 300

Zeiss Microscope

YOOL Laser System

Simmons Gamma/Alpha Emission Tube

Grinnel Computer Graphics Terminal GMR-37

Tektronix Computer System 4081=peripherals

Fairchild CCD-2 Digital Camera

Singer zx-2 Digital Camera

CMX-700 & 340; Computer Video Graphics

Now you're going to do what, have someone from a One-Hour Photo place examine your stuff? You want to lecture on scientific process and the scientific method and you don't have a **CLUE** as to what's already taken place here?

Do the words "bozos on the bus" mean anything to you and the rest of them? Do you know just what you're standing knee deep in? Be careful, incompetence can, and often does, lead to incontinence.

MH

From: Derek Bartholomaus <derek@iigwest.com>
Date: Sat Mar 27, 2004 7:11:03 AM US/Pacific

Michael,

It is comments like this that display your lack of understanding as to how the scientific process actually works.

Scientists routinely perform tests on previous claims to see if the original claim is justified.

When a scientist makes a fantastic claim that claim is examined by many other scientists in order to make sure that the claim is verifiable. It is this repeatable testing process that confirms a claim.

Sometimes a fantastic claim is proven to be correct, like the discovery of darmstadtium - Element 110 on the Periodic Table of the Elements. You can read about the original claim and the ten years of subsequent testing that occurred before the claim was validated on the Los Alamos National Laboratory website at <http://pearl1.lanl.gov/periodic/elements/110.html>.

Sometimes a fantastic claim is proven to be incorrect, like the "cold fusion" experiments of Pons and Fleischmann in 1989. You can read a summary of the events at <http://www.encyclopedia.com/html/c1/coldfusio.asp>.

According to you, only Marcel Vogel and a "metallurgist friend" have examined the piece of metal you claim is of a manufactured

extraterrestrial origin. This means that this is still only a claim. It is not proven because no other scientists have examined the metal to either confirm or deny the original claim's validity.

Present the piece of metal for analysis and then once it has been examined and the findings published all of us can stop this debate once and for all. Why do you continue to refuse Billy Meier the possibility to finally prove his claim?

Sincerely,

Derek Bartholomaus

IIG - Treasurer

Lead Investigator - Michael Horn/Billy Meier Response

On Mar 26, 2004, at 9:33 PM, Michael wrote:

Further, once something has been scientifically proved, it isn't required to go and prove it again,