

From: "Robert Sheaffer" <roberto@debunker.com>
Date: May 25, 2004 11:05:40 AM PDT
To: "Michael" <michael@theyfly.com>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, <randi@randi.org>, <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, "James Underdown" <jim@cfiwest.org>
Subject: Re: UFO case

Michael,

While I haven't been following the details of your disputes with other skeptics, I have learned a bit about it since receiving your note. Randi says that you've misrepresented his statements and his position. I have no wishes to "debate" with someone who does that. Apparently your concept of "proof" for Meier's claims is fundamentally different from the kind of "proof" that normally prevails in science. Also, the reporter who interviewed us both in Eugene expressed to me the opinion that you ranted on, and on, and on, making very little sense, exactly the same opinion that I have heard from several skeptics.

Furthermore, as the "Authorized American Media Representative" of Billy Meier, your role is to "promote" and "advance" the claims of Mr. Meier, and not to "critically evaluate" them. Your acceptance of this role serves as proof that you have no intention of examining Meier's claims objectively, but must champion them regardless of the facts. In such a situation, what is the point of "debate"?

It is not as if no one has ever taken the time to examine or refute Meier's claims. Kal Korff has invested great amounts of time in looking into Meier's photos and other claims, even travelling to Switzerland to learn what he could (of course, Meier absolutely refused to meet with him). Even Stanton Friedman, who believes and promotes all manner of flimsy UFO cases, can see through Meier's claims and thinks that he is a big phony.

In view of all of the above, and given that my time is limited, there is simply no point in engaging in what you call "debate" about the tired, old, solidly-debunked UFO claims that you are "authorized" (paid?) to promote. I have no desire to see my views misrepresented, although I suspect that this is already bound to occur no matter what I say.

You are already on record promoting Meier's claim that on or near Sept. 29, 2004, the asteroid Toutatis will suddenly 'veer off course' during its close approach, and threaten the earth. If this happens, I will change my opinion about the validity of Mr. Meier's UFO claims, and join with you not in pointless "debate", but in an attempt to uncover the truth.

sincerely,

Robert Sheaffer - user name roberto, domain debunker.com - Skeptical to the Max!

**Visit the Debunker's Domain - <http://www.debunker.com>
Resources Debunking All Manner of Bogus Claims**

Also: Skepticism / Astronomy / Opera / more

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

From: "Michael" <michael@theyfly.com>

To: <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>; <derek@iigwest.com>;

<roberto@debunker.com>;

<randi@randi.org>; <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>; "James Underdown"

<jim@cfiwest.org>

Sent: Friday, May 21, 2004 11:48 AM

Subject UFO case

Hi Robert,

I am the man quoted in the Register-Guard newspaper article (May 15) regarding the Billy Meier Contacts from Switzerland, ongoing for 62 years, and I would be delighted to engage you in a debate on the case. May I suggest that if we do engage in a debate that you familiarize yourself with the failure of CFI-West to duplicate even one of Meier's photos and one of his film segments (taken during the pre-computer era between 1975 and 1978), a challenge they accepted in February 2001 after declaring Meier's photographic evidence an "easily duplicated hoax". (They have a complete, masochistic webpage documenting our correspondence.)

After more than three years, they finally posted some photos of a suspended model but refused to submit the photos to the same scientific testing standards Meier's were in the 1980s. The lead investigator from CFI-West, Vaughn Rees, publicly refused (in front of millions of people) during my four-hour interview on the Art Bell radio show, March 7-8, to such testing. Gee, I wonder why? A 23-page overview of the photographic analysis is freely available from my website, as is a sound recording of the UFO and an analysis of those sounds. All physical evidence remains irreproducible to this day.

Additionally, noted skeptic James Randi retracted his claim that the case is a hoax.

When you visit my webpage and see one of the film segments, please refer to the paragraph below should you be tempted, as skeptic Dr. Steven Novella was, to offer a "thing on a string" theory. I shall also soon be posting an article quoting the (rather self-impressed) Dr. Novella in one of his finest moments when he actually gives two additional, precise reasons why the film is authentic. Another slanderer of Meier and the case, Michael Shermer, has been conspicuously derelict in backing up his aspersions, contenting himself perhaps with playing the expert to lesser informed audiences.

Naturally, if you do wish to enter this debate, I would expect you to back up any claims of "hoax" or similar. And, of course, should you be unable to credibly do so, you'd have to publicize that as well. Please let me know if you are up for the interaction.

Sincerely,

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