

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: September 7, 2004 12:44:55 PM PDT
To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, Kramer <kramer@randi.org>, Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com, JREF <challenge@randi.org>, Dave Thomas <nmsrdave@swcp.com>, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn Rees <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>
Subject: Re: Class is now in session

Students, do we see a pattern of consistent avoidance, of NON-RESPONSIVENESS to the facts, coming from these posturing clowns in dealing with the facts of the case? Of course! That's what this pathetic bunch of slandering liars specializes in. They certainly can't explain the Meier case in its component parts, nor in its totality. They accept the challenge to duplicate ONE of Meier's photos and ONE of his films and the whole pack of incompetent, blustering nincompoops can't even do that...in THREE YEARS! Then they go international with their refusal to even test their little photos. Pure genius!

But watch them dance, see them lie and slander. Is there a scientific mind anywhere in the whole lot of them? Do we find an iota of integrity, professionalism or credibility? Obviously not.

And they look like a bunch of monkeys trying to figure out how Meier - with only one hand! - has them tied in their knots of denial. As said before, if Meier had no hands they accuse him of doing everything with his teeth!

Bozos all and they don't know when the game's over.

MH

Like Michael Horn, I'd like to thank Jim Deardorff for his thoughtful letter. I've never seen as clear and reasonable an explanation of the UFO cop-out position.

Sincerely, Dave Thomas

Jim,

Thanks for so clearly and reasonably explaining those points. That Meier has long since tired of the amateur "debunkers" and their fearful and malicious efforts to prevent their paradigms from imploding is painfully obvious. Likewise, that they continue to attempt to slander persons associated with the case brands them forever as banal guttersnipes for whom truth is a nasty inconvenience.

As usual, no response, let alone rebuttal, to the clear, factual expository and conclusion that Mr. James Randi is a scurrilous liar and fraud.

MH

Jim Deardorff wrote:

Dave, let me add my two cents here, also.

That science writer who wrote the article in:

<http://www.ufo.net/ufodocs/text.documents/u/ufo-art1.txt>

wasn't allowing any alternative explanations to be heard. Wendelle Stevens appears to have been under strict orders to not speak out on just what happened that day, and it was, or would have been, simple for underground military/governmental agents who were involved in keeping important UFO events covered up or marginalized to drum up false charges to which Stevens would have to plea-bargain in order to avoid a life sentence. All that most of us know is that he had apparently allowed some neighbor girls to skinny dip in the swimming pool in his back yard. He is not known to have been involved in any sexual offenses before then, or since then. Only if a science writer is ignorant about the reality of the UFO phenomenon and of how seriously those in the government who are "in the know" feel about it, would he not know their need to get some sort of hold over Stevens by which they could falsely discredit him. This side of the story was entirely left out.

And Davidson used pejorative language such as unjustifiably calling Meier's reports "tales"; he falsely stated that Meier had said that the UFOs he had photographed resembled hub-caps, while it was some others who said that, who seemed never to wonder why the "hubcap" was nearly as wide as the width

of the abies-alba fir tree about which it had hovered and posed on all sides, which fact Davidson, if he knew about it, stayed silent on; he said that the tape-recorded (beamship) sounds by Meier (in the presence of many witnesses to it and to its extremely great intensity) resembled sound effects from old science-fiction films, which is patently untrue; and so on. It just doesn't do science any justice to trot out a totally biased account like that of Davidson's.

Regarding what Billy Meier was told about tachyons, or what he was told about who-all have been contacted by ETs and who have not, don't forget that there Billy is just repeating what he learned from his ETs. Some of what he learned may have been misinformation, designed to be passed on to skeptics who need

some items to latch onto with which they can debunk Billy, and which may let them get by with ignoring the evidence indicating that his contacts did occur, and that his photographic data and other data are very real.

So why confuse the events of Meier's contacts for which he collected evidence of their presence with statements coming from his contactors? This is another alternative that apparently did not occur to Key Davidson -- that the key aliens involved in the UFO phenomenon are more ethical than to want to rush our science and society into any sudden realization of their presence and reality. It is simple then for these ETs to outwit and dupe those scientists who know no better than to assume that everything an ET tells his contactee must be the truth or else it must represent lies invented by the alleged contactee.

Concerning why Michael hasn't arranged for "some real testing of the alleged alien

material(s)," I rather doubt that he would get Meier's permission for this. That's because Meier did give quite a lot of material to Stevens for this purpose, back around 1979-81, and if the test results from those years weren't believed, he may feel, why would further tests be believed either? Meier never received most of this material back, as it tended to get "lost" one way or another. Some 25 years have since gone by, and Meier has, I believe, long since stopped caring about any need to prove that his contacts were and are real.

But then, if some way could be arranged for ensuring that a lab which would do a comprehensive test would not be surreptitiously informed as to what it was all about, and would honestly report its findings and not stay silent, then who knows -- Meier might surprise me. But who could guarantee that the lab(s) involved would not be informed on the side by one who wished to warn them that their reputations could be in very serious jeopardy if they were to write out the truth of their findings? Just like Marcel's reputation was probably besmirched by those who did not like what he had to say about the alloy sample of Meier's that he analyzed.

Jim Deardorff

"Life is too short to occupy oneself with the slaying of the slain more than once." - Thomas Huxley