

From: Michael

To: James Randi ; Vaughn@cfiwest.org ; James Underdown ; SKEPTICMAG@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2004 9:32 AM

Subject: Re: Three more years?"

Dear Collected Skeptics,

Well, well, it's a lengthy rebuttal from the million-dollar man, aka Johnny-one-note or "I can break a wine glass". That's nice to hear, Randi, but you're apparently a little, as they say, unclear on the concept.

Since you have apparently been busy breaking wine glasses, here's an update. Follow along now!

In February of 2001, Mr. Vaughn Rees of CFI West *accepted the challenge to duplicate* Meier's photographic and film evidence after declaring it an "easily *duplicated* hoax". Quite specific, couldn't be clearer. Three years later, attempting to meet the challenge, CFI offered up some nice little photos that, unfortunately, don't come close to *duplicating* Meier's for reasons already made quite clear below. Reminder: CFI, you and a number of other skeptics have stated that the Meier case is a *proven* hoax, fraud, etc. Of course, despite repeated requests for the proof, you have been unable to substantiate your slander. We'll get back to that.

Now, regarding the absurdity and non-scientific nature of your "duplication means nothing" comment, please refer to information regarding the scientific method such as the following (and pay attention to that "test" thingy in 4. and the "modify the theory" item in 5.):

1.1: What is the "scientific method"?

The scientific method is the best way yet discovered for winnowing the truth from lies and delusion. The simple version looks something like this:

1. Observe some aspect of the universe.
2. Invent a theory that is consistent with what you have observed.
3. Use the theory to make predictions.
4. Test those predictions by experiments or further observations.
5. Modify the theory in the light of your results.
6. Go to step 3.

This leaves out the co-operation between scientists in building theories, and the fact that it is impossible for every scientist to independently do every experiment to confirm every theory. Because life is short, *scientists have to trust other scientists. So a scientist who claims to have done an experiment and obtained certain results will usually be believed, and most people will not bother to repeat the experiment.

Experiments do get repeated as part of other experiments. Most scientific papers contain suggestions for other scientists to follow up. Usually the first step in doing this is to repeat the earlier work. So if a theory is the starting point for a significant amount of work then the initial experiments will get replicated a number of times.

Note that it also states that *scientists have to trust other scientists who have obtained certain results, an obstacle for you since you are skeptics, not scientists, while the people who examined Meier's evidence are *scientists* and they have obtained "certain results".

However, the fact that your response alone disqualifies you from being taken seriously as a scientist doesn't relieve you of your obligation to pay up for proof of the "paranormal". Fortunately, there is abundant expert scientific evaluation confirming the authenticity and paranormal nature of Meier's evidence (*Marcel Vogel's conclusions, among others, more than qualify). Implicit in your offer, of course, is that the evidence qualify as paranormal, not that it simply satisfies the fluctuating definitions and demands of pseudo-scientists.

While your error in setting yourselves up as the arbiters of reality and judges of what constitutes proof reflects a great overestimation of your own qualifications, especially in light of your inability to follow the scientific method and to even substantiate your own claims that Meier hoaxed his evidence, as well as your having failed to fulfill the challenge you accepted to duplicate the evidence, you are still obligated to fulfill your promise to deliver the promised financial awards to Meier.

For further clarification, since you seem to have not noticed my repeatedly directing you to test and reproduce the still available sound evidence and the video, etc. (perhaps you've been emptying a few of those wine glasses yourself before breaking them), let me again suggest that you do so (see step 4. above). If that proves too daunting for you, pulling bunnies out of a hat for kids' parties is still an option though I suggest you abstain from emptying and breaking wine glasses prior to performance.

You and CFI West have made a challenge for proof of the paranormal which Meier's evidence certainly fulfills. Your financial awards must be honored, presuming there is honor among you and at the heart of your offer. Rest assured that I will pursue the matter, by all necessary means, until fulfillment of your pledge has been satisfied.

Sincerely,

Michael Horn
Authorized American Media Representative
The Billy Meier Contacts
www.theyfly.com

"James Randi" <randi@randi.org>

Duplication means nothing. Production of genuine evidence does.

I can break a wineglass. I can challenge you to break another in exactly the same pattern. Does your failure to do that, constitute proof that my performance was supernatural? Of course not.

I can – anyone can – produce photos that cannot be exactly duplicated....

James Randi