

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

**Date:** March 31, 2004 1:36:52 PM PST

**To:** SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, "ike", derek@iigwest.com, randi@randi.org, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, Plejarans\_are\_real@yahoogroups.com, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

**Subject:** Re: Logic 101 repeated

Ike,

Instead of badgering me to do your homework please refer to the photo analysis document (Photographs of Spacecraft) on the "8mm Films" link on my site.

But, since (much to the dismay I'm sure of the phonies who can't duplicate them) you make my points for me, i.e. "by what standard" and "what is it about them" let me point out that those standards are clearly spelled out in the report, as they are in the sound analysis report, as they were in the metal analysis.

Your specious argument, and attempts to obfuscate the issue notwithstanding, there is nothing further to "prove" to a bunch of illusionists who have **FAILED THE CHALLENGE THEY ACCEPTED**. And after three years yet!

Keep tap dancing though.

MH

--- Michael <michael@theyfly.com> wrote:

Please note, CFI-West ACCEPTED the challenge to duplicate Meier's

"easily duplicated hoax" UFO photos. They have failed. AFTER MORE THAN

THREE YEARS THEY HAVE FAILED.

By what standard have they failed to duplicate the photos? They created some real-looking UFO photos. <<http://www.iigwest.com/ufopix.html>>

If Billy Meier had posted those exact photos, what is it about them that would make you question their authenticity? If there is nothing, then these photos duplicate Meier's.

And they have publicly REFUSED to have their photos tested in accordance with the same scientific standards as Meier's were.

What is the reason to test the photos? Billy Meier's photos were tested primarily to prove that he hadn't used any double exposure or film processing tricks. CFI-West knows that they haven't done anything like that that, so testing the film is pointless. Besides, not all of Billy's photos were subjected to detailed scientific testing (the photo analysis report doesn't actually say how many were tested; it sounds like it was just a representative handful), but you (presumably) accept all of Meier's photos as genuine, so the detailed testing is clearly not a requirement for duplication.

The good news for you is that you *are* in a position to ask for more work from them to complete this challenge: the guy you talked to from CFI-West originally said he could duplicate one photo and one movie, right? They have completed the photo part, but they are still on the hook for the movie. If your goal is to make them waste their time in pointless exercises (which it seems to be), you should tell them they appear to have completed the photo part of the challenge but you're still awaiting their movie. There is no risk to you in doing this. Nobody has claimed that duplicating Meier's photos means that Meier's photos aren't genuine; it only means that similar photos can be produced by means of trickery (which everyone already

knew).

Insisting that they do a bunch of pointless tests on their film (which was never part of the original challenge) will just make them write you off as an irrational sore loser (which they probably have done already) and they will quit wasting their time on anything to do with you.

In any case, you have no basis for claiming that any prize was riding on this challenge. It never was and never would be. The prize will only be awarded to a person whose paranormal claim is proven true, not to someone whose claim is not disproven. There is a difference. It appears that you do not understand that difference.

[Randi] CLAIMED that the Meier case/evidence was a hoax. He based that claim (we have the correspondence) on the photographic evidence. Now he has RETRACTED that claim. Seems pretty clear that if he retracts the claim, as he just has, he is now saying that the case is NOT a hoax. Unless of course you THINK he's saying that he retracts the claim that the case is a hoax...but that means that he's saying that the case is still a hoax. If so, take it up with him.

Now you're offering the long form of the same flawed argument. The flurry of words might confuse some people (you, for instance), but the argument is the same illogical sequence. Very few

people will take  
you seriously if you keep up this tactic. I hope. ;)

First of all, Randi did not retract a claim of hoax.  
What you  
characterize as a retraction is Randi saying that he  
never said the  
case was a "hoax". Saying "I never said that." is not  
the same as  
retracting a claim.

Second, even if he did retract his claim, a retracted  
claim is just  
that: a retracted claim. It is not the same as making  
a new claim  
that is the opposite of the original claim. If I were  
to say "Michael  
Horn is a dishonest idiot." and then "I retract my  
previous  
statement.", it would not mean that my position is  
"Michael Horn is  
NOT a dishonest idiot.". All that would be known  
about my position is  
that I am not saying Michael Horn is a dishonest  
idiot. Do you see  
the difference? A retraction is not a reversal.

If the case is not a hoax it is paranormal by  
definition.

Yes, that is true. But this leads to a third problem  
with your  
argument: a person, even James Randi, saying that  
something is  
paranormal doesn't make it so; tests must be performed  
under  
controlled conditions to verify any claim. Do you  
understand that?

No matter what has been said by anyone, the evidence  
still has to  
undergo formal testing before any prize money is due  
to anyone.

ike42

Disclaimer: I do not have any affiliation with CFI-West, JREF, Skeptic Magazine, or any other "skeptical" organization.