

From: "Michael Duchek" <m_duchek@hotmail.com>
Date: August 28, 2004 7:40:53 PM PDT
To: michael@theyfly.com, nmsrdave@swcp.com, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, jim@cfiwest.org, Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com, derek@iigwest.com, kramer@randi.org
Subject: RE: Another attack dog

Wow! I've never been called an attack dog before. It's almost as exciting as pretending there's a massive international conspiracy against me.

Now really, I simply pointed out that one of the experts you site appears to have retracted his statement, which wasn't a strong endorsement in the first place. And that you, through ignorance or intent, were not acknowledging the retraction. It would seem to me that your attitude calls into question the rest of your supporting statements.

Michael

From: <michael@theyfly.com>
To: <nmsrdave@swcp.com>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, <jim@cfiwest.org>, <michael@theyfly.com>, <Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com>, <m_duchek@hotmail.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, <kramer@randi.org>
Subject: Another attack dog
Date: Sat, 28 Aug 2004 07:26:01 +0200
MIME-Version: 1.0
Received: from mout.perfora.net ([217.160.230.40]) by mc6-f9.hotmail.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.6713); Fri, 27 Aug 2004 22:28:15 -0700
Received: from config16.kundenserver.de[172.23.4.143] (helo=togal2.1and1.com)by mrelay.perfora.net with ESMTP (Nemesis),id 0MKz5u-1C0vkw0GDL-00075T; Sat, 28 Aug 2004 01:28:02 -0400
X-Message-Info: JGTYoYF78jGT3Njs9pOe8P3xj401sEFF
Message-ID: <0MKz5u-1C0vkw0GDL-00075T@mrelay.perfora.net>
X-Binford: 6100 (more power)
X-Originating-From: 28915329
X-Mailer: Webmail
X-Received: from config16 by 12.104.150.75 with HTTP id 28915329 for nmsrdave@swcp.com; Sat, 28 Aug 2004 07:26:01 +0200
Return-Path: michael@theyfly.com
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 28 Aug 2004 05:28:15.0600 (UTC)
FILETIME=[D1940F00:01C48CBF]

Well hi there Mike, just got your email and those of a couple of other fellas who are having a hard time re the Meier contacts. Since I am out of town for a few days presenting the info at an Expo (and don't worry guys, I'm keeping everyone abreast of the entire Randi- CFI-West fiasco) a more detailed response to all the nonsense will be forthcoming, in between radio interviews, etc., of course.

Collectively, the skeptics neither have enough fingers to plug all the holes in the dyke of their crumbling belief system, nor, apparently, collectively sufficient brain power to recognize the factuality of the

Meier case...or the nature of their descent into oblivion.

Don't worry, we'll go over all the facts, science, witnesses, prophecies, standard of proof, and info to sufficiently inform all interested parties and allow them to make up their own minds.

Until then, keep growling and barking. It suits this pack of slandering bullies quite nicely.

MH

Hello all,

I've seen the quotes from Dr. Michael Malin and Robert Post repeated several times in this correspondence, and I have to say they don't appear to be ringing endorsements. They also appear to be selected portions of longer statements, in addition to being many years old. In search of the entire interview, or more recent statements, I came across this in the June 24th, 1987 edition of The San Francisco Examiner:

In an interview with The Examiner, Post recalled that several years ago, Wendelle Stevens visited him at JPL and requested an expert opinion on the pictures. Post acknowledges he was fascinated by the images, but was unable to perform a scientific analysis for two reasons: First, he isn't a photo analyst but rather the operator of a photo processing lab ("like you take your film to K-Mart", he said); and second, the pictures weren't originals but rather copies of originals - perhaps even copies of copies of copies. Such multiple copying tends to obscure delicate details, making it hard to detect evidence of fraud - e.g., threads supporting hubcaps.

In addition, when Post examined some images with a magnifying glass, he realized "a lot of the pictures weren't really photographs at all - they were lithographs," or high-resolution ink prints made from photos - and, hence, were worthless for purposes of analysis. Furthermore, the photos were "a lot fuzzier than the stuff on the lithographs, and I thought that was a little strange."

I have to say I'm underwhelmed by the evidence so far.
Michael

At 09:31 ì 26/8/2004, Kramer wrote:
You ALWAYS TELL... "THE RANDI RETRACTION STORY"?
Really? Then you always LIE. Thusly, YOU ARE A LIAR. By all evidence,
you
are also a sociopath. Your behavior indicates this most clearly.
You are also an EXPLOITED LIAR, as the "very regular media iinterviews"
you
are afforded prove NOTHING other than the intelligence of publishers and
tv
producers who know their audience well enough to understand that having
one
more LYING BOZO making absurd, unsubstantiated claims on tv will
increase
sales and ratings just enough for them to keep their jobs. They don't
care if you
LIE or not, and that's why none of them contact Randi in an effort to
check facts,
as any REAL journalist would. You and your "scientists" are little more
than a
side-show act, and people will always pay to watch silly people saying
silly things.

Kramer,
You must have skimmed over the scientists' names whom Michael Horn
quoted
from, regarding opinions on Meier's photos that they had inspected. But
you've
probably heard of Dr. Michael Malin.

<<Dr. Michael Malin: Principal investigator for the Mars Orbiter Camera
on NASA's Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft at Malin Space Science
Systems (MSSS), San Diego, CA. Analyzed Meier's photographs in
1981: "I
find the photographs themselves credible, they're good photographs.
They appear to represent a real phenomenon. The story that some farmer
in Switzerland is on a first name basis with dozens of aliens who come
to visit him ... I find that incredible. But I find the photographs
more credible. They're reasonable evidence of something. What that
something is I don't know." Malin also said, "If the photographs are
hoaxes then I am intrigued by the quality of the hoax. How did he do
it? I'm always interested in seeing a master at work." >>

And Robert Post shouldn't be marginalized:

<<Robert Post: JPL photo laboratory for 22 years, was the head of that
lab in 1979, and oversaw the developing and printing of every
photograph that came out of JPL at the time: "From a photography
standpoint, you couldn't see anything that was fake about the Meier
photos. That's what struck me. They looked like legitimate photographs.
I thought, 'God, if this is real, this is going to be really
something.'" >>

The inner quotes come from Gary Kinder, author of Light Years, who

interviewed them.

This is not to say that despite the above opinions at the time, these scientists would not now disavow the Meier case if they had come to believe enough of the disinformation that's been around. However, I very much doubt that they'd like to be called "silly scientists" putting on a "side-show act."

I've looked at some of Meier's different photo series and, though no expert in photography, have analyzed them especially with respect to depth-of-field considerations. This consideration alone shows that Meier had photographed large UFO-like objects in the distance, not models. So you might want to browse:
<http://www.tjresearch.info/moretree.htm> and
<http://www.tjresearch.info/hasenbol.htm>
Jim Deardorff

Get ready for school! Find articles, homework help and more in the Back to School Guide! <http://special.msn.com/network/04backtoschool.armx>

Don't just search. Find. Check out the new MSN Search! <http://search.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200636ave/direct/01/>