

**From:** Michael <michael@theyfly.com>

**Date:** April 9, 2004 9:27:58 AM PDT

**To:** SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, "ike", derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, randi@randi.org, Plejarans\_are\_real@yahogroups.com, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

**Subject:** Re: [Plejarans\_are\_real] Re: Interim

Thanks Ike, comments below.

Michael wrote:

While you're at it, see when the earliest known info regarding the storm and it's counter-clockwise rotation, [etc.]

Okay. I added those items to my list.

See if you can provide a reasonable, substantiated alternative to their analysis. You can refer to the entire analysis document regarding other film and photo evaluations.

I'll see if I can get anywhere on that after a few other matters are wrapped up.

Before I forget, you didn't comment on the CFI failure and I'd like you to hold their feet to the fire as well as mine and Meier's, it's only fair.

The primary reason I haven't talked to them about anything is they don't have a semi-public forum that I can invade. The secondary reason is, as I have argued before, I think they have satisfied the photo challenge. I will tell them they ought to complete the film challenge; they did agree to that.

MH: Ike, as I presume you've read the photo analysis document on my site, you'll see that CFI-West hasn't done any such thing. I've basically refrained from commenting on their photos based strictly on their appearance to the eye (which is what the skeptics did time and time again, relying on their "opinions" rather than tests) but the one they feature of their model next to a tree in and of itself clearly shows a very small object that can't compare with the Meier photo of a large object taken next to a full-sized tree at a distance. Instead of that kind of a debate, the testing of their photos, according to the standards and parameters that Meier's were, would settle it quite quickly. I have absolutely no doubt that they know that and that it's the reason they (publicly) refused to do the testing. If this was not the case, we could accept any sci-fi movie UFOs as "duplicating" Meier's.

No, I maintain that you do indeed have to demand the fulfillment of the test if you wish to be fair. And, as you rightly state, the submission of the "easily duplicated film". Don't worry about a public forum, I think they read this one and I'll make sure, by my copying this to them, that all the individuals have a copy of your statement holding them to the same standards as Meier.

Michael wrote in a different post:

Since the document begins with Contacts starting in 1975, it is quite simple to prove that the information that I quote from these Contacts was published, even in English, before the events and discoveries actually occurred.

I don't understand the connection between the 1800-page document starting in 1975 and proof of the publication date of these pages.

MH: The 1800 page document is a sequential, chronological compilation of Meier's contacts beginning in early 1975. These individual reports were published in German and disseminated in Europe, they were responsible for bringing attention to Meier, along with his photos and other evidence. They were first translated into English under the control of the investigative team led by Stevens in 1979. From what I understand it took three attempts to get them approved, and even then they were further corrected for accuracy, i.e. to get the exact meaning in German conveyed in English. After getting them translated, Stevens published them in books starting with some in the large photo book, in 1979, that already contained some of the translated material. His Preliminary Investigation report came out in 1981. Stevens then published four books, in 1982, 1983, 1987 and 1988 with the translations of most of the 1800 pages.

It's important to keep in mind that during these times, since he had possession of the 1800 pages of the Contact Reports in 1979, there were no means of electronic publishing, everything was being hand done and processed in very slow, methodical ways. In some of the books Stevens has reproduced black and white photos of Meier's, another step in the publishing process that took more time than it does today. If you remember how time-consuming the older means of publishing were, right down to how much more time it took to erase, correct or re-do the littlest things, you can appreciate the importance of having a document that indeed had been in circulation, in the original language, well prior to the occurrence of events foretold within it. Further, this is even the case with more recent information of Meier's.

(By the way, your post listed "1796" for the third page number

instead of the sequential "1787" . I assume that's just a typo.)

MH: No, it's not a typo. I didn't scan in the several pages of info that Stevens inserted that reported on findings regarding Jupiter that came out in the press later in March 1979 that corroborated what Meier had published in October of 1978. Of course, should you want to see that I could scan it in but it's a hassle. You're going to do your own research and find out what was available when. But, should you want to see it, I'll certainly scan and post it. The hassle isn't the scanning, it's the OCR corrections on the stuff letters/words that come out corrupted probably because the document was typed long ago and it's not as clean and clear as contemporary text.

Also, it's wrong accuse Stevens of a hoax unless you can prove it. You should understand that by accusing him thusly you actually imply that he coerced a fair number of credible, respectable scientists and experts to lie and contribute to a hoax. Reason alone should tell you that people don't risk their hard-earned reputations in order to become associated with a hoax, let alone are they anxious to do so for no compensation, as if there can really even be such.

Here's something else to add to your chore list. There are a couple of film clips on my site and the following excerpt below explains why the assertions by skeptics of a "thing on a string" are incorrect. If you dispute it, use the same means of evaluating it as they indicate and, of course, any better scientifically-based one as well.

Thanks Ike, comments below.

Michael wrote:

While you're at it, see when the earliest known info regarding the storm and it's counter-clockwise rotation, [etc.]

Okay. I added those items to my list.

See if you can provide a reasonable, substantiated alternative to their analysis. You can refer to the entire analysis document regarding other film and photo evaluations.

I'll see if I can get anywhere on that after a few other matters are wrapped up.

Before I forget, you didn't comment on the CFI failure and I'd like you to hold their feet to the fire as well as mine and Meier's, it's only fair.

The primary reason I haven't talked to them about anything is they don't have a semi-public forum that I can invade. The secondary reason is, as I have argued before, I think they have satisfied the photo challenge. I will tell them they ought to complete the film challenge; they did agree to that.

MH: I see, as I presume you've read the photo analysis document on my site, you'll see that they haven't done any such thing. I've basically refrained from commenting on their photos based strictly on their appearance to the eye (which is what the skeptics did time and time again) but the one they feature of their model next to a tree in and of itself clearly shows a very small object that can't compare with the Meier photo of a large object taken next to a full-sized tree at a distance. Instead of that kind of a debate, the testing of their photos according to the standards and parameters that Meier's were would settle it quite quickly. I have absolutely no doubt that they know that and that it's the reason they (publicly) refused to do the testing. If this was not the case, we could accept any sci-fi movie UFOs as "duplicating" Meier's.

No, I maintain that you do indeed have to demand the fulfillment of the test if you wish to be fair. And, as you rightly state, the submission of the "easily duplicated film". Don't worry about a public forum, they read this one and I'll make sure all the individuals have a copy of your statement holding them to the same standards as Meier.

Michael wrote in a different post:

Since the document begins with Contacts starting in 1975, it is quite simple to prove that the information that I quote from these Contacts was published, even in English, before the events and discoveries actually occurred.

I don't understand the connection between the 1800-page document starting in 1975 and proof of the publication date of these pages.

MH: The 1800 page document is a sequential, chronological compilation of Meier's contacts beginning in early 1975. These individual reports were published in German and disseminated in Europe, they were responsible for bringing attention to Meier, along with his photos and other evidence. They were first translated into English under the control of the investigative team led by Stevens in 1979. From what I understand it took three attempts to get them approved, and even then they were further corrected for accuracy, i.e. to get the exact meaning in German conveyed in English. After getting them translated, Stevens published them in books starting with the large photo book, in 1979, that already contained some of the translated material. His Preliminary Investigation report came out in 1981. Stevens published four books, in 1982, 1983, 1987 and 1988 with the translations of most of the 1800 pages.

It's important to keep in mind that during these times, since he had possession of the 1800 pages of the Contact Reports in 1979, there were no means of electronic publishing, everything was being hand typed and processed in very slow, methodical ways. In some of the books Stevens has reproduced black and white photos of Meier's, another step in the publishing process that took more time than it does today. If you remember how time consuming the older means of publishing were, right down to having to erase, correct or re-do something, you can appreciate the importance of having a document that indeed had been in circulation, in the original language, well prior to the occurrence of events foretold within it. Further, this is even the case with more recent information of Meier's.

(By the way, your post listed "1796" for the third page number instead of the sequential "1787" . I assume that's just a typo.)

MH: No, it's not a typo. I didn't scan in the several pages of info that Stevens inserted that reported on findings regarding jupiter that came out later in March 1979 that corroborated what Meier had published in October of 1978. Of course, should you want to see that I could scan it in but it's a hassle. You're going to do your own research and find out what was available when. But, should you want to see it, I'll certainly scan and post it. The hassle isn't the scanning, it's the OCR corrections on the stuff letters/words that come out corrupted probably because the document was typed long ago and it's not as clean and clear as contemporary text.

Also, it's wrong to accuse Stevens of a hoax unless you can prove it. You should understand that by accusing him thusly you actually imply that he also coerced a fair number of credible, respectable scientists, experts and facilities to lie and contribute to a hoax. Reason alone should tell you that people don't risk their hard-earned reputations in order to become associated with a hoax, let alone are they willing to do so for no compensation, as if there can really even be such.

From page 9 of the accompanying Photographic Analysis document, regarding the film clips seen above, "In the 18 March sequence Meier filmed the spacecraft circling a large tree in front of a farmhouse. The sky was overcast with a low ceiling, and occasionally light snowflakes fell. The motion of the spacecraft looks suspiciously like it is tethered from above as it appears to circle the tree and then to swing back and forth over the tree, except that on three occasions the spacecraft changes its motion abruptly with no change in the tilt of the vertical axis of the ship. If it was in fact tethered, one would expect the vertical axis to tilt as the tether point above was moved. In another measurement it was found that the tilt angle of the vertical axis in one oscillation sequence was sufficient that the axis crossed within the frame and would have put the tether point within the picture. No tether point source was revealed, in one of the final oscillation sequences the object appeared to pass directly over the top of the tree, and it is clearly seen that the tree was swept over in the direction of the spacecraft, or appeared to follow the spacecraft as it passed. Clearly no model could have produced this effect. When we revisited the scene we found that the tree had died and was cut down."

Good luck,

MH

ike42

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor -----~-->

Buy Ink Cartridges or Refill Kits for your HP, Epson, Canon or Lexmark  
Printer at MyInks.com. Free s/h on orders \$50 or more to the US & Canada.

<http://www.c1tracking.com/l.asp?cid=5511>

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/mOAaAA/3exGAA/qnsNAA/wpWoIB/TM>

-----~-->

---

For more detailed Informations on Billy Meier Case please visit Official FIGU Website:

<http://www.figu.org>

(Switzerland)

\*\*\*\*\*

Figu Study Group Website in U.S.A

<http://www.billymeier.com>

\*\*\*\*\*

Hans Georg Lanzendorfer's website in German Language: Billy Meier - neither a Guru  
nor a Great Master: Billy Meier - weder Guru noch grosser Meister:

<http://www.lanzendorfer.ch/>

\*\*\*\*\*

For official and well detailed documentation of technical and true scientific analyses of  
real metallic samples and sounds visit Michael Horn's Website "And Yet They Fly"

<http://www.theyfly.com/>

\*\*\*\*\*

The most complete and detailed study on Talmud of Jmmanuel: Dr. Jim Deardorff's TJ  
website: <http://www.proaxis.com/~deardorj/>

and bookmark its newer address: <http://www.tjresearch.info>

Learn more about Creational Laws here on this Webpage:

<http://www.avilabooks.com/Jmmanuel1.htm>

THE KEY SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF JMMANUEL

By Dr. Dietmar Rothe, Ph.D.

a transcript of a presentation Dr. Rothe gave at the International UFO Congress  
Summer Seminars on 17th of September 2001 at Laughlin, NV.

The material is copyrighted. © All rights reserved by the author. Dr. Dr. Dietmar

Rothe. The web page is intended for your personal education and enjoyment only.

Copying and distributing any part of that material requires written permission from the  
author.

Billy Meier: An English-Language Bibliography  
<http://www25.brinkster.com/chancede/Meier.html>  
by David E. Chance: [chancede@slu.edu](mailto:chancede@slu.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*

Another Figu Friends JPLagasse and J. TruthSeeker: <http://www.eduardmeier.org>

Links edited by J. Olivieri  
on January 3/10/2004  
Thank you for your membership.  
Yahoo! Groups Links