

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: March 31, 2004 11:22:16 PM PST
To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, "ike", derek@iigwest.com, randi@randi.org, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, Plejarans_are_real@yahoogroups.com, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>
Subject: Re: okay

Ike,

It's really simpler than that. Randi, who has made a challenge ostensibly backed by a large amount of money, pronounced the Meier case/evidence a hoax. Let's remember that this is about evidence of the paranormal. It is logical to assume that, knowing the implications of making a judgment one way or the other, it would be construed as an "official" one by him. After all, what credible person, what scientist, would ever judge something without evaluating the evidence? There's even more to this point that I'll be pursuing later but suffice it to say that he's put himself in a rather, shall we say, interesting position.

And, of course, he complicates matters further by now retracting that official claim of his. Perhaps you're familiar with that old folk tale about being stuck to the tar baby?

As for CFI-West, let's also remember that they claimed that the case was an "easily duplicated hoax" and, it's more than reasonable to assume, that in the three years that they've been feverishly working to discredit a one-armed man's evidence they were fully aware that they introduced their offer regarding the \$5,000. Had they not been confident, as it turns out unfoundedly so, that they could duplicate the photo evidence they certainly wouldn't have put forth their offer, knowing full well that they couldn't ethically refuse to pay by saying, "Well, sure we failed and the evidence is paranormal by definition, and we offer \$5,000 for proof of that but we won't count this one because we failed."

If CFI-West didn't intend to meet the challenge they wouldn't have posted their quaint little photos of models.

**Regarding the huge credibility issues pertaining to Randi, coincidentally there's a quaint little article that will show that he tries to pull his phony, unethical garbage on people more often than may be known:
<http://rense.com/general50/james.htm>**

And, I find nothing illogical at all about holding people to their word, maintaining ethical standards of conduct, being accountable, etc.

Perhaps when you also realize that the other physical evidence freely available, the sound recordings, have been deliberately avoided by Randi and CFI-West because it's current, testable and they darn well know that they can neither duplicate nor explain it. Regarding logic, ethics, definitions, etc. a thing either is or isn't paranormal by definition and these sleight-of-hand artists are stuck and they know it, which is why they've engaged a good number of people to try to change the nature of the challenge.

I'll leave you with this. We have published documents and books with specific, prophetically accurate scientific information that was published years, even decades before "official" discovery and you should know that these clowns simply pretend that it doesn't exist. Read the free docs on my website, like Proof Beyond A Reasonable Doubt.

Hey, it's late here and I'd much prefer to string this all together a little more clearly because this is quite important.

I think my logic will be shown to be a bit better than you think it is.

MH

--- Michael <michael@theyfly.com> wrote:
you make my points for me, i.e. "by what standard" and "what is it about them" let me point out that those standards are clearly spelled out in the report

The problem is that when the challenge was made, the standard that would be used to evaluate the results was not specified. (I base this on my reading of the history of correspondence with CFI-West here: <<http://www.iigwest.com/horn.letters.html>>.) Now the two sides are proposing different standards... which isn't too surprising when you think about it.

Despite your claims that the \$5,000 and \$1,000,000 prizes are at stake, there actually isn't anything riding on the challenge, so I will be surprised if anything further comes of it. The believers will claim it is a victory for their side, and the skeptics will consider it to be yet another case of a paranormal claimant who can't prove his claims to their satisfaction. Yawn.

ike42