

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>

Date: March 10, 2005 7:14:07 PM PST

To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, Kramer <kramer@randi.org>, ike forty-two <ikefortytwo@yahoo.com>, JREF <challenge@randi.org>, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn Rees <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

Subject: More on why their morons

Often, because of our familiarity with, and study of the information in, the Meier case we lose focus of a monumentally important point, i.e. is it true? Because if it's true it's the most important story in all of human history, isn't it? And we also lose track of the intense effort by skeptics, debunkers and other agents of disinformation to take our attention away from not only the truth of the case but what it means to us, what it requires of us as people who wish to help assure the future survival of our race, and facilitate a more gentle change into the future than now awaits us. We can get involved in fighting with them (I know a little about that) and even trying to gently educate them about it, difficult as it may be since we're dealing with people who, contrary to established scientific approach, come to the case with very rigid preconceptions, which they attempt to use to discredit, rather than discover the truth about, the case.

So, I am going to clarify some things, hopefully for the last time. The reason for this is that I once again see postings from an effectively anonymous person who, also once again, impugns the integrity of persons he doesn't know at all and attempts to build arguments on the basis of not only faulty, sloppy thinking but as an agent or extension of a now thoroughly discredited, lying entity known collectively as CFI-West/IIG, James Randi, Skeptic Magazine, etc. I must admit, however, to admiring James Deardorff's continued good will and patience, having exhausted my own with this non-thinking individual.

I speak here of the person who continues to masquerade as "Ike" and wants to safely snipe from the sidelines while risking no personal exposure or responsibility for his drivel. To begin with, has it been noticed by anyone else that Ike presents a logically self-contradictory premise right away when he says that the info is incorrect and, get this now, he can't take Stevens' word for it? Why, if Meier's info is incorrect as he states it is, would he be concerned with either taking Stevens' word for it or corroborating the date of its publication?

Think about that again. Ike says all Meier's info about Jupiter is wrong (or that any that's right must have been hoaxed by him) but he won't take Stevens' word for it and doesn't know how to corroborate the date. Let's deal with the last point first. Hey, Ike, why don't you do the credible thing (for a change) and go talk to the witnesses in Switzerland? And please don't tell me that it would be inconvenient for you, surely not more inconvenient than being a one-armed man, raising three kids, working as a night watchman while "hoaxing" 1,200 UFO photos, films, video, sound recordings, metal samples, dodging would be assassins, etc. That much, and more, we know about Meier, we know nothing about you (as I'll further elaborate later).

But let's return to the other main point of obvious contradiction. If the info is wrong then who cares about when it was published? The fact is that not only is much of the info spot on (and yes, some of it may be still be debatable as to some specific scientific details) but there's absolutely no way for Ike to squirm out of the fact that Stevens had it all three critical days before official confirmation of the pivotally important Io information.

Let's look at that. What indeed is the basis for his effectively calling Stevens a liar, which is exactly what he's doing? Stevens' ability and integrity were good enough for the USAF and the Brazilian Air Force, among other parties. His record of investigation of UFOs goes back to 1947, nearly 60 years, nearly twice the length of time that this Ike would like us to believe that he has been alive. His investigation of the Meier case was at least six years. What nefarious plan does he believe that Stevens was hatching when he conducted the entire Meier investigation, published all of the documentation...and published that troublesome little item regarding his having, on March 9, 1979, the documentation on Jupiter that contained absolutely correct (and previously unknown information) on Io that wasn't officially confirmed until March 12, three days later? What conspiracy was Stevens supposedly involved in regarding this information that, let's remember Meier published on October 19, 1978? And what proof does Ike have to back up his libelous, character-assassinating statements? Where is the motive, the money, etc.?

Why, apart from being a proud, non-thinking skeptic, does Ike try to impugn Meier and Stevens? Perhaps because Ike has to conclude that it's a hoax or lose his mind. If Meier had said that Jupiter was made out of plastic there'd be no need for him to even bother to doubt Stevens but rather to focus on and quickly dismiss Meier's erroneous information. So we come back again to that little annoyingly accurate item about Io. And, of course, to the countless dozens of other prophetically accurate items that Meier published, which have been sufficiently pointed out and are a matter of well-documented record, i.e. already in copyrighted, published books. Then there's the little stuff like all the still irreproducible physical evidence that Ike and the other skeptics would like to just ignore.

So now it's time to turn the spotlight on Ike, who wishes to dismiss the importance of being an accountable human as opposed to a coward. We are not anonymous here, we are up front about who we are and what we are doing. So, in the spirit of fair play, allow me to point out that we have absolutely no reason to believe any of the following about "Ike":

- That he is not associated with, and/or in the employ of, CFI-West, Randi, etc.
- That he spent the time he said he did researching Meier's information.
- That he accurately represented the information that he said he found.
- That he is a 33 year-old computer programmer.
- That he is married and has a baby.
- That he knows how to think.
- That he lives in Utah.

And let's see if he meets some reasonable expectations for credibility in a critic. He says that there is no way to independently confirm the date of publication of Meier's info. Here's a guy who claims to have gone to great lengths in researching info, at least for a few days, wouldn't one way be to do what I suggested above, i.e. go over and actually talk to the witnesses, etc.? Has Ike attempted to meet Stevens, Meier, Froning, any of the 120 other witnesses (including Phobol Cheng), and the five other photographers? Regarding his pompous presumptions regarding Meier's access to the information and the nature of the village in which he lives, has Ike seen the village, documented the availability of the publications, facilities and scientific information he claims Meier had access to, etc.? What is his basis for effectively expressing distrust of, Stevens' associates, such as Maj. Pestalozzi or O. Richard Norton, or of Lee and Brit Elders, whom I have known for nearly 20 years? Has he met and interviewed them? What reason does he have to also imply that they (and people like Vogel, Gentleman, Ambrose, Rognerud, etc.) are all liars? Why has Ike ignored the blatant failure of CFI-West to meet the challenge they accepted? Why has he not renounced Randi as a despicable, bold-faced liar?

Just for the record, here is a rehash of the important facts regarding the utter destruction of the credibility of the professional skeptics, so far not dealt with at all by Ike. In February of 2001, I met with Vaughn Rees, case investigator for CFI-West, the Los Angeles-based professional skeptics organization associated with the likes of (the publicly self-admitted liar) Kal Korff and James Randi, as well as Skeptic Magazine and Michael Shermer. I presented Meier's photographic and film evidence to him and was informed by Rees that it was "an easily duplicated hoax", those are his *exact* words. I challenged Mr. Rees to duplicate one of Meier's photos and one of his films, a challenge he gladly accepted. He told me that he already had a 35mm camera and knew where to obtain an 8mm camera. He told me the film segment that he could duplicate (the one that's on my DVD) was an example of "scratching on the negative with a pin" to produce the two lights that alternately flash on in this broad daylight, close-up of the UFO.

All of this is factual and hasn't been disputed by Rees to this day with one exception. He changed his story when he called into the Art Bell radio show (March 7, 2004) to argue that he had "duplicated the *effect*" of Meier's photos, a lie that was also demolished when Art Bell asked Rees to submit his photos to the same standards of testing that Meier's were and which authenticated his as real, large unknown objects, i.e. UFOs. Please understand the following: Rees *refused* to have his six little photos of model UFOs, which took three years to produce (during which comparable period of time Meier took 1,200 photos, many sequence shots of up to four craft), tested. End of challenge, end of CFI-West, Randi, Skeptical Magazine, Shermer and Korff credibility, end of story...almost. CFI-West still hasn't submitted a film that duplicates Meier's "easily duplicated hoax" either. And this abysmal failure is from an organization that prides itself on debunking hoaxes, on showing how they were accomplished.

Now, since CFI-West has among their associates a significant number of magicians and illusionists, and apparently few real scientists, it's important to note a couple more things. First, Rees *lied* when he said that the challenge was to duplicate the "effect" of Meier's photographic evidence. Anyone can do that by getting a sci-fi space movie and seeing that there are UFOs, spaceships, etc. in abundance, not real ones but models and special effects to produce the images, i.e. the "effect". And, being the patently dishonest pack of poseurs and phonies that they are, instead of living up to any part of the challenge they attempted to pull off another lie by utilizing another standard magician's trick, i.e. distract from their failure and their lies.

To do this they attempted to shift the focus (watch this hand over here) to the metal alloy samples and demanded that I produce for testing the samples that they said I claimed to have had. Randi himself put that in print, that I claimed to have the samples. The thing is, of course, that I never said that I had the samples...never. Why would I? I don't have them. So, once again, they lied. Get this straight, they *lied*. Can you think of any credible scientists who would resort to blatant public lying, especially when it's so easy to show that they're lying, when they would be completely unable to substantiate their lie? Please keep in mind that I have good reason to detail the genesis of Ike's appearance and his credibility. Ike came to all this through CFI-West and associates and, to this day, even though we know the names of the incompetent skeptics and the arrogant magicians here, we don't know anything about Ike except his suspect affiliation with them. Why should we believe anything he says?

Back to the skeptics. CFI-West and Randi ignored my repeated offers to download and test the free sounds. They wouldn't even acknowledge the offer, let alone the existence of, and documentation pertaining to, the sound analysis or the photographic analysis. Instead they simply *lied*. Great character, credibility and integrity from the slime bags

who've been slander and vilifying Meier. And this is the group that Ike's associated with; let him *prove* otherwise.

Oh yeah, Randi retracted his claim that the case was a hoax after Rees humiliated himself and CFI-West in front of five million listeners to the radio show. Then, of course, he said that he never claimed the case was a hoax despite the fact that his statement to that effect is in writing.

So we return to the real main points regarding the Meier case, is it true and what does it mean to us, what do we do about it if it is? I also suggest that the time for "entertaining" skeptics is over. It was necessary to flush these slugs out of the garden because they have done enormous harm by distorting, tarnishing and delaying the truth. Because of the bloated egos of a bunch of know-it-all party magicians many people never, or only very recently, found out about this case partly because of the undue influence the well-funded, pseudo-scientific, lunk-head organizations like Randi's have enjoyed. Of course, much of the responsibility is on the individual to ferret out information and not fall for the noise of dubious "experts", of which there are plenty in the media as well.

Michael Horn wrote (several weeks ago. Sorry for the slow reply):

- > According to Mr. Ike, the info regarding the
- > discoveries on and about Jupiter were confirmed by
- > the probe on March 5, 1979, with confirmation
- > regarding the specifics about Io not confirmed until
- > March 12.

You keep talking as if all the information was confirmed. You are ignoring the info that was contradicted by the probes' findings. If the info is wrong, does it even matter what the dates are?

In any case, my point is that there doesn't appear to be a way for a person to independently confirm when Meier wrote this information. Taking Stevens' word for it isn't good enough for me.

- > And I have to point out that you are still impugning
- > the integrity of Stevens, Vogel and Norton and
- > Pestalozzi without offering any substantiation. Are
- > your own credentials as substantial as theirs?

No, my credentials are not as substantial as theirs.

> Can you prove it?

Yes. I have no credentials and they have some. Therefore, my credentials are not as substantial as theirs. QED.

> We know a lot about Stevens and Vogel but only know
> that there's an "Ike" out there who has cast
> aspersions about people and their work while
> remaining effectively anonymous.

The difference is that the things I say have nothing to do with my expertise or reliability. Anyone with a reasonably good library at their disposal can verify all the evidence I cited and draw his own conclusions.

> One has to put the information into context with
> known, established facts regarding Meier's life and
> accompanying conditions.

It seems that you are suggesting that citizens of rural Switzerland in the 1970's only had access to news of the world from the town crier several months after the events. That's ridiculous.

> I maintain that Mr. Ike, who should also now put his
> full identity on the table as all of ours are, has
> only further validated, through his lack of
> thinking, logic and reasoning, Meier and his
> enormous amount of accurate information.

If I believed that my identity mattered in the slightest, I would already have made it known. As it is, I value my privacy and I don't see any reason to post my name, address, and phone number here. I assure you all that I am not anyone you've ever heard

of. I am a 33-year-old software developer in Salt Lake City, Utah. (No, I'm not Ken Jennings.... I think he's only 30 or 31.)

ike42