

From: "Jay Olivieri" <j.guru@verizon.net>
Date: September 2, 2004 7:22:01 PM PDT
To: <Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, "Kramer" <kramer@randi.org>, "James Underdown" <jim@cfiwest.org>, "JREF" <challenge@randi.org>, "Dave Thomas" <nmsrdave@swcp.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, "Vaughn Rees" <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, "Michael Horn" <michael@theyfly.com>
Subject: RE: [Plejarens_are_real] Class is now in session

Oh Teacher Mr. Horn,

Can we have those guys be placed in the corner of the class for acting in their insane silly manner with Dounce hats on their heads as punishment??... or maybe we should leave them in the corner for at least 10 yrs for not doing their homework... LOL.

Oh Kramer..... you are not allowed to eat the paper with the hole you just made, you may just CHOKE on it !!

Jay

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael [mailto:michael@theyfly.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 02, 2004 4:58 PM
To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com; Kramer; James Underdown; JREF; Dave Thomas; derek@iigwest.com; Vaughn Rees; Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [Plejarens_are_real] Class is now in session

Class Is Now In Session

Moving on to the next paper, submitted by Mr. Thomas over there in the corner. Mr. Thomas was quite quick to point out that I was "wrong by nine years, etc". Unfortunately Mr. Thomas neglected to actually read the information, not authored by me, but by Prof. Froning. I simply confirmed them earlier this year since Prof. Froning had made some of them at a lecture of mine more than a dozen years ago. To begin with, nowhere did I say that Meier had discussed the tachyon issue in 1979, just that Froning's original comments about it had been made then.

If Mr. Thomas had, heaven forbid, actually researched the Meier information (or at least asked for it to be clarified) he would have noted that Meier spoke about the tachyon-related information in 1975 and that Prof. Froning commented on it in 1979. Mr. Thomas might also have troubled himself to ascertain from Prof. Froning exactly how long he had been involved in the field of study. And nowhere does Mr. Thomas acknowledge Prof. Froning's critical points, i.e. that a one-armed, basically uneducated farmer living in a remote area of Switzerland was not only apparently quite conversation with this rarefied field of study, the figures he gave for flight time were within 20% of Prof. Froning's computations as done with complex calculation formulas well beyond the knowledge of Meier. Additionally, not only did Prof. Froning not assert the likelihood of his figures being more accurate than

Meier's, he stated that he and his colleagues may have made breakthroughs in their understanding of possibilities and ways for traveling faster than light from Meier's information, that's from the information provided by this...farmer.

Does Mr. Thomas himself have any such similar endorsement from respected members of the scientific community, or even from farmers, for his work? Based on the shoddiness and assumptive nature of Mr. Thomas' contribution to this class, I highly doubt it. Further, as has already been mentioned before by Mr. Campbell, the book/documents alluded to by Mr. Thomas are in English and certainly unknown to the majority even of the English speaking world, not being composed of a high percentage of astro-physicists.

Meier had but a very cursory understanding of English during the years Mr. Thomas specified. Access to, interest in and understanding of this highly specialized field of actual scientific study has never been connected to our friendly farmer. Perhaps Mr. Thomas would like to tell us all about these papers since it's fair to assume that he's had them on his desk for decades and has doubtless discussed them with his German-only speaking acquaintances over beer and wurst sandwiches ever since, perhaps as part of his regular October Fest rituals. Do tell us, Mr. Thomas.

Even more importantly, and pardon me for waiting until now to point this out, class, but the mention of tachyons in itself is not the sole remarkable aspect of Meier's information. It was the specific reference to "tachyon propulsion", which, in my cursory read of the articles mentioned, as well as the description of the book's contents, is not specifically the expressed focus of these documents at all, while it was in Meier's information. Even had it been...well, we're waiting for Mr. Thomas to make that case now. Wake us when you're ready.

Now, Mr. Thomas goes on to be critical of my noting Mr. Post's positive comments regarding Meier's photos and, while at once focusing on the comparison to the K-Mart comment doesn't mind using Mr. Post's statements of doubt to support his own skepticism (and perhaps his unproven thread and hubcap premise). Well, I have no problem here with Mr. Thomas' pointing this out, it's just that you can't have it both ways. If Mr. Post was indeed competent enough to have been impressed with what he saw, so be it, and so be it if he found that "a lot", but not all, of the pictures weren't photographs. Apparently some were. (Are we now to believe that, in addition to every other remarkable ability credited to him, that Meier is also a brilliant, one-armed lithographer?) Let's also remember that Mr. Post let his comments stand, as it's a matter of record that he was given the opportunity to revise them, prior to publication by Mr. Kinder.

And while Mr. Thomas is clearly implying that Meier hoaxed his photos, neither Mr. Post nor any other expert has actually substantiated that claim, certainly not Mr. Thomas either, expert that he isn't. Need we once again drag poor Mr. Rees and his hapless crew in front of the class as the now textbook example of debunkers debunked?

But let's get on to the attempt by Mr. Thomas to discredit the whole matter by bringing up Col. Stevens personal life and the difficulties he had with the law. While I can neither claim personal knowledge as to the truthfulness of the charges against Col. Stevens as opposed to the position he has expressed, which essentially suggest a frame-up, a couple of points do cross my mind. It is well known that this specific type of crime is virtually always committed by those who have a previous record of such crimes and that, upon release into society, such offenders invariably, to an almost statistical certainty, perpetrate such crimes again. Col. Stevens' life record, prior and subsequent to this event, are, to the best of my knowledge, absolutely devoid of such instances or indications.

And, while Mr. Thomas feels that his skeptical position is so weak as to make fair game of what may well, in actuality, be a frame-up, he doesn't likewise mention the charges that were made against Mr. James Randi some years ago regarding his molestation of young boys and/or men, charges which were easily found on the internet. I certainly have no knowledge in his case either if the charges were true, if he benefited from some sort assistance in avoiding prosecution or if his accuser was simply an insane or imbalanced individual as may be the case. Charges of child molestation, an odious crime, are an easy way to attempt to harm – or silence – otherwise innocent people.

The difference here is that Mr. Randi's professional conduct is sufficiently reprehensible as to fully discredit him and render completely devoid of credibility or worth. It isn't necessary to seek to delve into his personal life, which few of us could weather without uncovering blemishes of varying degrees of seriousness. And it is relevant not at all, in either man's case, as to their professional credibility. Mr. Thomas's behavior in this matter simply shows to what depths these bottom feeders will go to discredit a well-documented, substantiated and proven case that contradicts their narrow minded prejudices and vested interests of whatever nature.

Shame on you Mr. Thomas.

And now, class, please take a piece of plain paper and fold it in half. No, Kramer, don't crush it into a mutilated little clump. Take a fresh sheet and fold it, like Mr. Rees over there, who has his own difficulties with diligence and logic. Now, please tear a little semi-circle from the middle of the folded edge of the paper. Kramer, the edge I'm talking about is in the middle of the crease – not on either of the two flaps of paper. Please, I've worked hard enough on your perceptual difficulties already.

Now, hold the paper up close to your face and look through the hole and tell me what you see. Bravo Kramer, that's correct you can only look through the hole with one eye. And looking through the hole with one eye doesn't offer us any perspective, does it? Of course, that's only one distortion of reality effected by our little experiment. How's about - no big picture? That's right, you see, or don't see as the case may be, that when you look through such a narrowly circumscribed aperture you can only see a very small piece of the whole scene. And

that's exactly what the pathetic, boneheaded professional (one really should call them amateur) skeptics do in their hell bent, frantic bid to discredit Meier and his evidence. If Meier had no arms these poor saps would accuse him of faking it all using his teeth.

Naturally, this agenda driven, tunnel vision approach bears no resemblance to anything remotely resembling science. On the contrary, these imbeciles prefer character assassination, innuendo, slander, deception, outright lies and deceit to the truth. And poor Kramer, he calls me a sociopath without morals but offers no proof, obviously. One would be tempted to ask for character references for these characters but it might bear pointing out that one first has to have character in order for it to be referenced.

So, as an exercise in concentration, logic and understanding, I will let you, class, outline the salient (and obvious) points that I have raised pertaining to the scholarship, let alone objectivity and credibility of the above mentioned "experts" though they sit here among you today. I must, regrettably but also obviously, fail the bozos who presented this drivel under the pretense of serious research. I will give a grudging nod to Kramer for almost igniting the paper viewer with the one hole in it when he brought it close to his rather ruddy face. That should qualify as a paranormal feat in itself, one that he can submit to the JREF Paranormal Claims (or is it Clams?) Department. It should be as well regarded, and rewarded, as the truly paranormal claims these idiots offer to explain what baffles them about the Billy Meier UFO Contacts...the most important story in human history.

Class dismissed.

Michael Horn