

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: September 2, 2004 1:58:19 PM PDT
To: 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>, Plejarens_are_real@yahoogroups.com
Subject: Class is now in session

Class Is Now In Session

Please be seated, class is now in session. As most all of you here are brought together by the common desire to debunk that wily old hoaxer of UFO evidence, Billy Meier, today we will be reviewing some of your papers, the results of your deepest thinking and most probing research into a matter that, strangely, should require no such extensive mental labor since it's obviously a hoax.

Nonetheless, since you've tirelessly and diligently devoted yourselves to the task of preventing anything but the truth from being disseminated regarding such matters, it is incumbent upon me to review and appraise your efforts.

Some of you may not know Kramer here (that's how he refers to himself), the fellow in the front row with a white-knuckle death grip on the front of his desk, the crimson complexion and the throbbing veins in his forehead and neck. At this time I must publicly remind Kramer to take his high blood pressure medication, as I don't wish to be liable for having a replay of Mt. St. Helen in the classroom.

Speaking of Kramer, which, of course, I do only with the greatest fondness, I think it's appropriate to address his paper first, as certain things beg clarification. I present herein a copy of his touchingly irrational eruption for reference. First, it appears to be necessary to point out a couple of items that Kramer has apparently either overlooked or neglected to notice while in devotion to his beloved leader, the "Amazing" James Randi, who, as we shall soon see, is amazing for reasons other than the ones he imagines. I don't know how many of you remember the movie "Dr. Strangelove" but do make a note to pick up a copy for reference.

Now, it has apparently eluded our friend Kramer here that Mr. Amazing or Mr. A for short, his guru and Grand Poobah, has loudly and clearly proclaimed himself to be an expert, a professional skeptic and debunker of hoaxes with a hefty \$1,000,000 award (stashed away somewhere I'm sure) awaiting anyone who can prove a paranormal claim. To make sure that the premise of his expertise is quite clear, Mr. A has established himself in such a manner as to leave no doubt about his pronouncements in such matters, i.e. if something is fake, fraudulent, hoaxed, a façade that even a child can see through, or whatever choice term he applies in his considered judgment of any matters in evidence, then one must take that as representing, no surprise here, his professional and very well informed opinion based on his examination of the evidence according to strict standards.

Conversely, should he apply words like genuine, proof, true, etc. to something under his consideration we should likewise clearly understand his meaning and, even more importantly, know that he has also given full consideration to such a judgment before making it, the stakes being as high as they are and as he has himself defined them.

I trust that all of you deep-thinking, logical and serious investigators in search of the truth can easily follow what we have here. And, I'm sure that you can recognize that it isn't my point of view that we're discussing, it's Mr. A's as dictated by his own protocols and by simple logic itself.

Therefore, when he ascribes such judgments as fake, fraudulent, hoaxed, a façade that a child could see through, etc. to a matter and to its evidence and/or content, we have no doubt as to his position, as to what he is saying. After all, we're not getting the opinion of an uninformed, no-expert person in the street, so to speak, we're getting nothing less than the professional opinion (backed as it is by that \$1,000,000 award) of a self-proclaimed expert, one that must have impressed someone enough to supposedly back him up with the big bucks.

So when Mr. A makes his negative pronouncement on the Meier case and its evidence, as he has in writing, we understand that he has done all of the necessary due diligence and careful research, investigation and examination according to strict standards to support his conclusions, lest they be careless lies and slander, heaven forbid. And when Mr. A states that he never said any such thing, otherwise known as retracting his statement and claims, it should be clear to even the dimmest bulb that for me to point that out isn't a lie on my part but on Mr. Amazing James Randi's.

Logically, therefore, he is a liar. This isn't a wild, irrational, nasty, unsubstantiated (see Kramer's letter below) claim, it's simply an accurate definition of someone who lies. We might add that he's also an incompetent for not having actually reviewed the evidence and put it to the same standard of tests which have already determined its authenticity. Should we assume that his "standards", i.e. his beliefs and prejudices, are higher? Additionally, when his affiliated organization, CFI-West, accepted the challenge to duplicate only one of Meier's photos and one of his film segments, after confidently proclaiming them "easily duplicated hoaxes" and then failed to do so - after three long, long years - it should have dawned on Mr. A that he was in suffering a high degree of credibility incongruity.

Now, regarding CFI-West, they also blatantly lied (well, look at the company they keep) when they attempted to say that the challenge involved duplicating the "effect" of Meier's evidence, something that I obviously could obtain by watching sci-fi/spaceship movies (none of which would meet the criteria Meier's did either). When Mr. Rees called in to the Art Bell radio show (heard by an international audience between 5 and 10 million people) and absolutely refused to have his quaint little six-pack of UFO model photos tested to the same standard as Meier's were, he effectively sunk the whole skeptical challenge quicker than a birch bark canoe carrying an anvil. By the way, class, has any of you ever seen the film segment that Mr. Rees also promised us, now nearly four years ago? Me neither.

But before we get back to the matter of the Amazing liar, let me inform you that an Academy Award-winning special effects studio (known for stunning sci-fi and spaceship effects, etc.) recently viewed the same evidence that Mr. Rees did and they literally laughed at Mr. Rees's "pin-scratching on the negative" theory. Yes, we do have a few more surprises for the aptly named bozos.

(Somebody please get Kramer a glass of water or a fire extinguisher, the dome could blow any minute.)

Now, you may also recall that, when I listed six specific predictions of Meier's that already recently came true, Mr. A had summarily dismissed the manner by rhetorically

asking how many of Meier's predictions came true, implying that none had. Of course, he hadn't troubled himself to read the documentation regarding dozens more that indeed also came true. No, when you're a true believer, or a true disbeliever in the possibility that anything outside of your rather limited world view is possible, then there's no need to be disturbed by little things like facts, especially those that contradict your prejudiced preconceptions, not to be redundant.

Later, Mr. A states that he never called the Meier case a hoax. Really? What then are we to make of all this, a ringing endorsement? When faced with solid, contradictory evidence, and his own contradictory statements, the pathetic Mr. A's tactic is to simply lie like a bandit, as he repeatedly demonstrates.

Mr. A effects a further irreparable widening of his credibility gap when, during a radio interview by Ed Craft on the Magick Mind radio show, he tells Craft and his audience that the sound recordings that Meier claimed that he and his wife made, in front of some 17 witnesses, including an undercover policeman, were not really examined at highly reputable sound studios, with expert personnel using state of the art equipment, but were actually hoaxes that the investigators brought around to numerous sound facilities until they could coerce one to agree to the otherworldly nature of the sounds! (These guys seem to have a penchant for destroying their credibility in public.)

Considering the ample record of the sound analysis freely available to all, not only does Mr. A come off as an unapologetic liar, he shows himself to be anything but of scientific (and probably sound) mind by attempting to deny the presence of what is there for the whole world to see. Let us please remember that magicians (such as Mr. A) by trade are trained to misdirect attention, to deflect awareness from one hand to the other, so to speak, and to mislead in order to entertain and baffle those unskilled in such arenas.

That one would entrust the examination of, let alone the authority to pass judgment upon, critical, highly controversial evidence, especially when it's authentication spells financial disaster for said "objective" examiner, is another version of the fox guarding the hen house.

But we're not quite done pulling back the curtain on this ersatz wizard or, more accurately, world-class clown. In a flagrant attempt to further distort the truth and shift the focus away from his own shifty misrepresentations, Mr. A creates yet another lie, i.e. he claims that your humble instructor, he who stands before you today, had himself claimed to be in possession of metal alloy samples of extraterrestrial origin. Boldly, Mr. A demands that I turn them over for examination, and prove that they're real. He incites the skeptical hordes to echo the same demand; righteous outrage at my supposed unwillingness to do so, when I never, ever claimed possession of said samples, is trumpeted loudly as, well, as what, further proof that I'm not the one who's a magician?

Of course, one has to wonder why Mr. A, and CFI-West have repeatedly ignored my request that they duplicate the sounds of the UFO that Meier recorded, since it's physical evidence freely available to anyone for the taking. You want the evidence fellows? It's yours, duplicate it, debunk it.

Would anyone in their right mind ascribe these tactics to truly objective, credible scientists, to anyone with a gram of integrity?

So, as we clearly expose the pathology of this charlatan, the real hoaxer in the matter, let's recap, for those among you who may not have the attention span to follow the facts, let alone do anything resembling competent investigative research:

1. Mr. A is a self-proclaimed professional skeptic and debunker.
2. As such he must make determinations as to the authenticity of evidence using appropriate professional standards.
3. He refrains, therefore from cavalier issuances of mere unsupported opinion.
4. His high stakes, \$1,000,000 game is at risk should he be wrong.
5. Mr. A issues a cynical, damning evaluation of Meier's evidence, both physical and prophetic.
6. Mr. A subsequently retracts his opinion and claims to have never issued it in the first place.
7. Mr. A declares that the sound analyses authenticating Meier's recordings were fraudulent.
8. Mr. A deliberately declares that I was in possession of material never in my possession.
9. Mr. A is, by definition, a liar.
10. This should cause Mr. A no problems if his value system is based on inconsistency and lies. The same, of course, holds true for his adherents should their priorities be anything other than the truth.

Now, before we finish with the pathetically compromised and deliberately deceptive Mr. A, a further note that tells us everything we need to know about his character. If character doesn't matter, of course you can go back to scribbling or practicing card tricks, neither one of which earns you a grade in this class, however. To continue, you must all be familiar now with Mr. Vogel's research and conclusions regarding the authenticity, and irreproducibility of the metal alloy samples, the ones which the deceitful Mr. A knowingly, falsely attempted to connect to being in my possession.

Isn't it telling that Mr. A took great pains to claim familiarity with Mr. Vogel and had referred to him as "not very bright". For those of you who, like Mr. A, may have spent your childhood, and perhaps a good part of your adult, years practicing various sleight of hands maneuvers, let me inform you that Mr. Vogel, at age twelve, had synthesized the chemicals that produce bioluminescence in fireflies. In addition to holding or co-holding some 32 patents and inventing the magnetic disk coating memory system used in IBM disk memories, Mr. Vogel also created SEM technology (refractive light microscopy) used extensively in the manufacturing of semiconductor technology.

Perhaps the obviously envious Mr. A actually meant that his familiarity with Mr. Vogel was limited to shining his shoes and the "not very bright" referred to the failure of Mr. A to even do that job for him competently.

Now, while it's unnecessary to further dignify Kramer's own unfounded claims, little wonder, sitting as he has been for however long at the feet of a slandering, lying charlatan like Mr. Amazing James Randi, I do hope that he'll get his apoplexy under control and at least try to comport himself with at least some small semblance of intelligence and, dare we ask, professionalism.

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 conversant 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, regretfully 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

YOU ALWAYS TELL... "THE RANDI RETRACTION STORY" ?

Really? Then you always **LIE**. Thusly, **YOU ARE A LIAR**. By all evidence, you are also a sociopath. Your behavior indicates this most clearly.

You are also an **EXPLOITED LIAR**, as the "very regular media interviews" you are afforded prove **NOTHING** other than the intelligence of publishers and tv producers who know their audience well enough to understand that having one more **LYING BOZO** making absurd, unsubstantiated claims on tv will increase sales and ratings just enough for them to keep their jobs. They don't care if you **LIE** or not, and that's why none of them contact Randi in an effort to check facts, as any **REAL** journalist would. You and your "scientists" are little more than a side-show act, and people will always pay to watch silly people saying silly things.

Had he been born and lived in the 21st century, PT Barnum would have been wealthier than George Soros. A sucker born every minute? In this day and age, they're born every millisecond, and there's nothing they won't believe. You're selling snake oil, sir, and you can never keep up with the demand for your product.

And you're so **proud** of that, it disgusts me. You've fooled the media. You and Sylvia Browne and John Edward and James Van Praagh and all the other frauds. Congratulations. You're in good company. What an accomplishment. You've bamboozled the press. Wow. How very rare. You've discovered that they will print anything you say and you can get away with it. That's so **good for you**.

But what a terrible, terribly pity it is for anyone interested in **THE TRUTH**. To be feeding people such abject **FICTION** is not simply a heartless act - it is also a crime of the intellect, waged against your fellow man with no concern for them on any level of comprehension. For shame.

Have you **NO MORALS**, sir?

I suggest you **STOP LYING** about Randi before someone finds out about it, publicizes it, and cuts in on your tv air time. And what would you do then? Go home and bite your pillow?

On behalf of **JAMES RANDI** and **JREF**, I implore you, sir: **TAKE THE**

CHALLENGE !

If your claim is authentic, **WHY WOULDN'T YOU?**

The only defensible reason for refusing is what Dave Thomas suggests: that you **KNOW** your claim is hollow, and could never stand up to scientific scrutiny.

You can keep the effluvium coming, sir, but you talk like a coward, casting insults and lies toward anyone who challenges you. I had better and stronger opponents in grade school. Even kindergarten was far more challenging. All you can do is call names. You TALK of evidence, but you offer NONE for direct scrutinization.

A **MAN** would stand upright, and **PROVE** his claim. You, sir, are just a **LIAR**.

And the only way to clear your bad name, is to **ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE**.

Acceptable responses: I ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE !!!

Typical responses from people who make claims they know full well cannot be verified:

- 1- I don't need your money.
- 2- I don't need to prove anything to you.
- 3- The prize money doesn't exist so why should I (or, the JREF Challenge is sham).
- 4- I won't aid JREF in its publicity campaign.
- 5- Randi knows I'll pass the test so he'll never test me.
- 6- Blah blah blah blah.

The list goes on and on and on. We've heard it all. You're nothing new to us. Keep the **LIES** coming, Mikey. We know you will. It's all you're capable of.

And as long as there are people out there who'll believe anything they hear without asking for **PROOF**, you'll have plenty to do.

I won't justify your inane ramblings any further by responding to them. I won't feed the ravenous army of rats that fester deep inside of you where most people have a heart. There's no way to excise your demons. You were born with them, and you prove with every word that you'll pass away with them, too.

Randi won't involve himself in your mud slinging campaign, as he has responsible people making credible claims (accepting the JREF Challenge and offering up their evidence) to deal with. You have proven yourself to be anything **BUT** responsible. All you have proven is your sociopathic need to **LIE, and there seems to be no end to your campaign in making that known to all those unfortunate enough to be within earshot.**

And **THAT** is the only **PROOF** that JREF has witnessed direct evidence of in **ANYTHING** Michael Horn has to say.

PERIOD.

-Kramer, JREF Paranormal Claims Dept.

...My my, where to begin? Let's start with "Dr. Froning found Meier's account of tachyon propulsion (which was only beginning to be discussed [in 1979] by a very small and select group of theoretical physicists), and his

calculations for above light speed travel to be amazing."

Mike Horn is wrong by 9 years:

http://prola.aps.org/abstract/PRD/v3/i8/p1764_1
Phys. Rev. D 3, 1764–1770 (1971)
[Issue 8 – 15 April 1971]
Quantization of $m^2 < 0$ Field Equations
Bert Schroer

Department of Physics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
15213

Received 20 April 1970

We construct a causal covariant quantum field theory which corresponds to a classical field with $m^2 < 0$. "Pseudotachyons" or "jelly" states lead to a causal screening of "tachyon" states.

©1971 The American Physical Society

Mike Horn is wrong by 9 years:

<http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue118/classic.html>
Spock Must Die!
By James Blish
Bantam Spectra
\$5.50/\$8.50 Canada
Paperback, June 1999
First Published 1970
ISBN 0-553-24634-8

...Spock and Scotty devise a revolutionary plan to use tachyon particles in the transporter process to enable Spock to beam to Organia, even though the Enterprise is still millions of miles away.

Mike Horn is wrong by 6, 13, 17, 12, 9, 8, and finally ***20 years***:

<http://www4.prossiga.br/lopes/prodcien/Classical/classic1.html>

LEITE LOPES, José, FLEURY, N., OBERLECHNER, G. On the classical theory of charged and spinning tachyons. Strasbourg: CNRS, 1973. 15p. (CRN-HE-73-5).

On the Classical Theory of Charged and Spinning Tachyons*

N. Fleury, J. Leite Lopes, and G. Oberlechner

...The possibility of a theoretical description of particles with velocity higher than that of light-the tachyons-has been discussed by several authors in the last ten years [1].

[1]- S. TANAKA, Progr. Theor. Phys. 24, 171 (1966); O. M. P. BILANIUK, V.K. DESHPANDE, and E. C. G. SUDARSHAN, Am. J. Phys. 30, 718 (1962); G.

FEINBERG, Phys. Rev. 159, 1089 (1967); M. BALDO, G. FONTE , and E. RECAMI, Lettere Nuovo Cimento 4, 241 (1970), and references therein; H. K. WIMMEL, Lettere Nuovo Cimento 1, 645 (1971); B. SCHROER, Phys. Rev. D3, 1764 (1971).

... Finally, the tachyon transcription of the Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi [2] classical spin equation is given for tachyons.

[2]- V. BARGMANN, L. MICHEL, and V. TFLEGDI, Phys. Rev. Letters 2, 435 (1959).

But wait - there's more!

At 08:24 AM 8/23/2004 -0700, Michael wrote:

Robert Post: JPL photo laboratory for 22 years, was the head of that lab in 1979, and oversaw the developing and printing of every photograph that came out of JPL at the time: "From a photography standpoint, you couldn't see anything that was fake about the Meier photos. That's what struck me. They looked like legitimate photographs. I thought, 'God, if this is real, this is going to be really something.'"

OK, let's take a second look at Robert Post.

http://j_kidd.tripod.com/b/125.html

...
"Light Years" also quotes authorities such as Robert Post, head of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, as saying: "From a photography standpoint, you couldn't see anything that was fake about the Meier photos... I thought, God, if this is real, this is going to be really something."

Or is it? In an interview with The Examiner, Post recalled that several years ago, Wendelle Stevens visited him at JPL and requested an expert opinion on the pictures. Post acknowledges he was fascinated by the images, but was unable to perform a scientific analysis for two reasons: First, he isn't a photo analyst but rather the operator of a photo processing lab ("like you take your film to K-Mart", he said); and second, the pictures weren't originals but rather copies of originals - perhaps even copies of copies of copies. Such multiple copying tends to obscure delicate details, making it hard to detect evidence of fraud - e.g., threads supporting hubcaps.

In addition, when Post examined some images with a magnifying glass, he realized "a lot of the pictures weren't really photographs at all - they were lithographs," or high-resolution ink prints made from photos - and, hence, were worthless for purposes of analysis. Furthermore, the photos were "a lot fuzzier than the stuff on the lithographs, and I thought that was a little strange." For that and other reasons, Post began "to think, 'Nuts, maybe this guy is just a con man.' That's not the kind of guy I want to have anything to do with." In 1983, Stevens was convicted of child

molestation in Pima County, AZ. He is now serving time in the Arizona State Prison and declined to be interviewed. But he did send The Examiner a cryptic letter in which he said a "number of high officials...have taken a personal interest in some of the things we were doing, but they could neither support nor tolerate them officially."

Stevens' conviction triggered a wave of paranoia among Meier buffs. Some phoned Vicki Cooper, editor of California UFO Magazine in Los Angeles, and said Stevens "was 'set up,' that certain witnesses were being killed," said Cooper, who is not unsympathetic to Meier's claims. "I was discouraged and disgusted with the people I was talking to."

...

Well Mike, if that's the quality of your so-called "evidence" - missing the first mention of tachyons by at least 2 decades (20 years = 1979-1959 if you need help on the math), and relying on confirmation by Robert Post, who ended up concluding "Nuts, maybe this guy is just a con man,"

... well ...

I can see why JREF's prize requires the actual performance of real testing, with agreed-upon protocols, and not just reliance on old and possibly dubious analyses.

Mike, I can sure see why you're afraid to put your evidence to the test. It's a lot easier to defend it by just calling skeptics names than by actually testing it, eh?

Sincerely, Dave Thomas