

From: <nmsrdave@swcp.com>
Date: August 29, 2004 11:18:30 AM PDT
To: "Michael Duchek" <m_duchek@hotmail.com>, <michael@theyfly.com>, <nmsrdave@swcp.com>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, <jim@cfiwest.org>, <Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, <kramer@randi.org>
Subject: RE: Another attack dog

Since Mike Horn's busy on the road and all, I thought I'd make clear the significance of the tachyon stuff. Horn says Meier's mention of "tachyons" is compelling pro-UFO evidence because no one except the top particle physicists of the day knew about them.

In my letter, I supplied technical references back to 1959 (there could be earlier, possibly), but the real clincher was the James Blish novel from 1970. So there are at least TWO explanations for Meier's mention of tachyons: he heard about them from aliens, OR he read about it in a widely available book (that had been around for 9 years) about a popular TV show from a decade before.

This doesn't prove Meier didn't travel to other stars; it simply shows there's another way Meier might have learned about tachyons, and thus that his mention of tachyons isn't even a little bit compelling.

My 0.02\$, Dave

Michael Duchek <m_duchek@hotmail.com> said:

Wow! I've never been called an attack dog before. It's almost as exciting as pretending there's a massive international conspiracy against me.

Now really, I simply pointed out that one of the experts you site appears to have retracted his statement, which wasn't a strong endorsement in the first place. And that you, through ignorance or intent, were not acknowledging the retraction. It would seem to me that your attitude calls into question the rest of your supporting statements.
Michael

From: <michael@theyfly.com>
To: <nmsrdave@swcp.com>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, <jim@cfiwest.org>, <michael@theyfly.com>, <Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com>, <m_duchek@hotmail.com>, <derek@iigwest.com>, <kramer@randi.org>
Subject: Another attack dog

..