

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: September 4, 2004 12:31:45 PM PDT
To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, 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: [Plejarens_are_real] Re: Class is now in session

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

At 09:29 à 3/9/2004, Michael wrote:

>Dave,

>

>You have eyes but you do not see. So, predictably, you miss the

>points...big time.

>

>You are left to your own

illogic and self-inflicted,
denial based,

>prejudicial "thinking".

>

>Michael Horn

>Authorized American Media
Representative

>The Billy Meier Contacts

>www.theyfly.com

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](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

Keay 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

```
> >> Class Is Now In Session  
> >>  
> >> Please be seated, class  
is now in session.  
> >> ...  
> >
```

> > Well, Mike, I'm sorry if I touched a nerve by including the mention of

> > Wendelle Stevens from the THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER article of June

> > 24th, 1987. I didn't need to include that, but the article as a whole is

> > quite relevant to the whole Billy Meier story, which was why I mentioned it

> > earlier. It's online in its entirety here:

> >

> >

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

> >

> > If you have a problem with

what that article said about Stevens,

> > perhaps you should take it up with the author, Keay

Davidson, now at

> the San

> > Francisco Chronicle, "Keay Davidson"

<kdavidson@sfchronicle.com>.

> >

> > As regards Meier's mention of tachyons, it's still a pretty dubious

> > "proof." There's never been experimental confirmation of tachyons, and

> > their very existence would call Einstein's relativity theory into

> > question.

> >

> >

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tachyon>

> >

> > "The property of causality, a fundamental principle of theoretical

> > particle physics, poses a problem for the physical existence of

> tachyons. If a

> > tachyon were to exist and were allowed to interact with ordinary

> > (time-like) matter, causality could be violated ...

At the very least

> > the principle of special relativity would have to be

discarded."

> >

> > That's Meier's reported time happens to agree with a wild speculation

> > from a physicist is not really very compelling, either. This is piling

> > dubious on top of uncertainty.

> >

> > As for your attacks on my credentials, perhaps you'd be interested to

> > know that, unlike you, I've actually been involved in the formal scientific

> > testing of a purported UFO artifact. That was the Roswell "Fragment"

> > of 1996, in which a man who moved to Roswell from Utah gave a piece of

> > material to the UFO museum, telling them he'd been told it was from the

> > Roswell crashed craft.

When the museum people started thinking about

> > how to test the artifact, I suggested a specific material test which could

> > indicate if the specimen was compatible with earthly/solar system

> > material properties, and the museum went ahead and acted on my

> suggestion.

> > They had some tests

performed at Los Alamos National Labs for about

> \$750.00.

> > The specimen was earthly, as it turned out - and later, it was found to be

> > a piece of scrap filched from a Utah artist's studio.

> >

> > The point is, the museum did the right thing, had some real tests

> > done, and learned about their specimen.

> >

> > You could do that too, Mike, if your self-proclaimed status of

> > "authorized American media representative for the Meier

material" is

> genuine and

> > actually GOOD for something. If you are so authorized, then why

> > haven't you hustled the material to a lab as fast as you can? If it's

> Randi's

> > outfit that you're afraid of, I can get you in contact with LANL

> > scientists who have the equipment for such testing.

There may be a

> fee, of

> > course, but it's slow at LANL with the classified shutdown, so this

> might be an

> > ideal time for such a project.

> >

> > If you really want to get the attention of the world's scientists, why

> > don't you try helping to arrange some real testing of the alleged alien

> > material(s)???? If not at JREF or IIG, somewhere?

(Sandia /Los

> > Alamos?)Why do you try to change the subject with megabytes asnd

> > megabytes

> > of arrogant and condescending rants????

> >

> > That, Mike, is the

\$1,000,000 question!

> >

> > Sincerely, Dave Thomas