

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: August 19, 2004 3:52:12 PM PDT
To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.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: Roswell UFO case

Oh, I see, Randi "mentioned" a farce. What kind of a "researcher" are you? Does having no credibility run through the entire skeptic community? He lied, you saw it and now it's business as usual. It looks like you're following in Vaughn's footsteps, all bluster and then a shoddy, obvious, professional failure.

Underwhelmed you may be, considering your lazy approach to research, did you really think you were fooling anyone with what you were leading up to? I suggest that you focus on cute little cliches, perhaps greeting cards...though using the German word for book is a nice (unintentional) touch.

Off with you!!!

MH

OK, I see that Randi mentioned a "farce." But there's very little coherence in that jumbled buch of statements and responses. Perhaps the "farce" Randi was referring to was not the Meier case, but rather your pages and pages of mind-numbing correspondence.

At any rate, I am absolutely, totally, and completely underwhelmed. You have pebbled my world!

May the Farce be with you!

Regards, Dave Thomas

At 03:02 PM 8/19/2004 -0700, Michael wrote:

Gosh, Dave, to the untrained observer that I am, it would appear that you went and did some research (contrary to your stated intentions) but perhaps didn't want to find the one I mentioned.

So, since you seem to want to find the beef without looking for it yourself (is this epidemic among "skeptics"?) let me hand to you on a silver platter the words of the greatly inflated one himself. All you have to do is look up the following (so you don't have to take my word for it that Randi stuck both his feet in his mouth):

April 15, 2003, third large paragraph down.

Please pay ample attention to the emphatic and certain pronouncement by Randi and his assurance that even children can DUPLICATE the photos, which certainly contradicts what he says in this message.

Of course, maybe Randi would now like to, once again, claim that the case is a hoax and...finally prove it.

MH

Here's the situation as I see it, Michael:

On 17 Aug 2004 at 19:09:57, you claimed "Further, James Randi retracted his claim that the case is a hoax (showing some rare good sense)."

On 18 Aug 2004 at 12:06:05, you claimed "I should add that James Randi retracted his claim that the Meier case is a hoax. Now I wonder why he did that?"

When I asked you for evidence for this claim, you told me to go find it myself.

I went and found the supposed "retraction," but have not found the supposed initial instance of Randi labelling the Meier case a "hoax."

To say the least, I'm skeptical of your claim. Randi, whom I met a few weeks ago, is the first to say that reproducing, say, the Meier photos, or Uri Geller's spoon-bending demonstrations, does NOT prove that the claimants are "hoaxers." Rather, he says the following:

**<http://www.randi.org/jr/032604why.html#2>
"Concerning these photographs of purported UFOs produced by "contactee" Billy Meier in the mid-'70s, any mere replication of those photos would mean little toward examining the claim, except to show that they can be replicated. If they are not properly replicated, it merely means they have not yet been replicated, but does not speak at all to the question of whether or not they're faked photos. Replication would show that faking them by this means is possible, but would not show that Meier did it that way. I'm reminded of the circumstances surrounding my exact replication of the Geller "phenomena" at King's College, UK, in July of 1975 ...But, importantly — this evidence — by itself — in no way proved anything about Geller's performance except that it could be replicated by simple trickery!..."**

Now, Michael, you are making the somewhat surprising claim that Randi has indeed proclaimed the Meier case an official "hoax."

It's not my job to go around doing the research to back up YOUR claims. I'm quite busy doing research to support MY investigations. YOU are the one making vague, unsupported claims about what Randi has said.

If you want me to take your assertions seriously, then the monkey's on your back to provide support for these accusations.

In other words, "WHERE'S THE BEEF?"

**Sincerely, Dave Thomas
<http://www.nmsr.org>**

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