

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>

Date: April 4, 2005 8:33:47 AM PDT

To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, Kramer <kramer@randi.org>, derek@iigwest.com,

Vaughn Rees <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

Subject: Re: Icing on the cake

From: michael@theyfly.com
Subject: Icing on the Ike
Date: March 31, 2005 11:03:05 PM PST
To: Plejarens_are_real_2005@yahoogroups.com

This is another opportunity to answer some more, and some of the same, questions, just what I live for. First, regarding your rationalization regarding hiding behind a screen name, it just means that you and the other anonymous types are either cowards or have forgotten your given names. We all have real names that are known here so that our initials represent those known names. I recommend that it be a requirement. You might also want to know that Jose found a little more info about you here:

http://www.personalsnetwork.net/personals/show_profile/ike42.html

Is this why you prefer to remain anonymous?

Let me say that, as has been pointed out before by both JP and me, the skeptics, in their zeal to discredit Meier (as opposed to actually try to PROVE him wrong) offer a hilarious counter premise, probably without realizing it, i.e. that the man is a super-genius in a vast array of sciences, obscure and otherwise unknown information, technical skills that would challenge a team of able-bodied craftsmen and specialists, etc.

The very notion that he is the real deal is absolutely too threatening to them, a fact that they attempt to mask by never addressing the absence of his prior training, abilities, conspirators, collaborators, financial and technical resources, etc. Only innuendo and insinuations about any and everybody associated with the case and years of research, and the pompous, self-important statements from "Ike" and others about their "needing more proof", etc.

Now this is a game that can be played without end...if we play their game. For they will always ignore the fundamental question, i.e. is the case real or not?

In order to keep their game going the skeptics have to be right EVERY time, Meier only once. So, are ALL of Meier's photos, films, video, sound recordings and metal samples hoaxed? Since none of the skeptics has been able to prove that in the past 30 years, is it fair to say that if not ALL of it was hoaxed then some of it is real?

If some of it is real then the case is real, making it the most important story/discovery in all of human history. It doesn't mean that everything in the case is true. We may be under the impression that our world and everything in it is real, yet not all of it is true. And we already have some good ideas as to why the case may not ALL be true, the bottom line of which is all about our grasping and applying the concept of self-responsibility. And, of course, getting us all to start relating to each other for the common good of our species, not for the Plejaren or any other possibly existing group(s). Again, it's tied into our future survival and not, though it may sometimes superficially appear that way, to show that any of us are always "right" and others "wrong" though that does have some useful elements to engage and draw attention to the matter, as we can see here.

But the logical conclusion, based on our "real doesn't require everything to be true" premise is a fundamental, overlooked point by ALL of the skeptics, for whom the very possibility that the

Meier case is real is absolutely overwhelming.

So I'll throw out a few answers regarding the points raised by Ike below. And maybe Ike and the skeptics will allow some lubrication of their thinking processes, especially in light of the exposure of their assumed "everything has to be true for the case to be real" belief system.

In no particular order, regarding Mt. Chimborazo, let's say that Ike found a Newsweek article, exactly as he claims he did, that shows that Meier was only three weeks in advance in his knowledge instead of the 20+ years that I stated. First, "only" three weeks in advance? Meier has set the bar so high that even Ike, probably without realizing it, falls into the "well, that's nothing compared to years

In advance" trap. Perhaps Ike and any of the other skeptics would like to establish their precognitive abilities by giving us some specific, accurate, three weeks in advance information in a comparably, randomly obscure area. Well, we're waiting. I mean this is the perfect time to come through on that "anybody could have said that" thing. That kind of thing is headline making news...if it happens. So lay it on us, we're all waiting.

And, while I didn't find (and still haven't found) the Newsweek article, using today's best search engines, I don't mind being corrected. The plain, still undisputed fact is that Meier got it right BEFORE even the best date that Ike could find and Meier didn't have computers and internet search engines to do so. Had you thought that one through, laddie?

Ike's constant innuendo is that Meier and everyone else associated with the investigation of the case is a liar. It's that simple. And it's unbelievably arrogant and distasteful, not only because it comes from some anonymous snipe but because it's absolutely never supported with facts. Because a person finds it "hard to accept" this or that is no justification to effectively slander and libel the good names of people about whom you have absolutely no personal knowledge nor even a shred of evidence as to dishonesty on their part. Try using three of the most useful words in the English language, "I don't know." Go for the big four and you get, "I could be wrong." Practicing phrases that you will have frequent opportunity to use is a good idea in any language.

As for assertions that there's no way to establish the early existence of the content-heavy Contact Reports, nonsense. The Contact Reports were beginning to be published in 1975 in German. Lou Zinstag (sp?) had some of them in her possession in the mid/late 1970s and informed Wendelle Stevens of them, who came into possession of them himself in 1978/1979 and then initiated the earliest translations.

Perhaps even more importantly, there were many people (and I was among them) who had the earliest English translations in 1986 (or before). It was because of the information already in these documents that I started to notice their prophetic accuracy. In 1988 I first noticed the newspaper article about the connection to the ozone damage and A-bomb testing, which was reported as a "new discovery" by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories. Meier was told that information, for the second time in 1975 and the first time in 1953 or 1955, as he recounts in those very same Contact Reports.

Try to grasp this, difficult as it may be, I, and lots of other people, still have those original documents with the 1975-1978/9 contacts. The Livermore announcement, and many subsequent "new discoveries", were already specifically spelled out in those documents. No one, not even the amazing, one-armed Meier who makes you all look like a pack of fantasy manufacturing fools, can go back and insert that information or, as you so idiotically propose, simply put a different date on the documents we already possess.

Now, instead of spouting delusional, irrational assumptions - PROVE it.

In my own Proof Beyond, etc. article I list a number of those items, as well as specific items from other contacts, which indeed are in copyrighted, published books, well before the events actually occurred. Nothing “Nostradamus” about singling out the nuclear power plant near Lyon, nor about specifically mentioning the beginning of human-pig DNA experiments, the spread of Mad Cow to other animals and humans, etc. ALL (and more) of which occurred after originally published by Meier in 1995, then on the internet by 1998 and then in And Still They Fly, in 2001.

And please, the "anyone could have said that" argument doesn't hold. No one did, no one said all of the things that Meier said/published in all of the different fields. Certainly you didn't, nor did the entire combined pack of skeptics. And the connection between petroleum extraction and earthquakes, as published by Meier 29 years ago, was again confirmed as a key contributing factor to earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and associated tsunamis (as was the damming of waters, which was also part of the warning to Meier). Check my home page for four headline “news” stories for the week of Jan. 25, 2005 and you’ll find the links to Meier’s prior publication of that information.

So, since these things were in my possession as well as many other people, you’re either being sloppy or just plain lying. Let us know which one it is.

The enormously broad statement that "every other town in the western world" had all of the items listed lacks specificity, of course, and makes me wonder how someone who issues such broad-brush nonsense can call into question the principals (and the specific information) in this case. And, what specific magazines are you referring to anyway? Did all people in all such towns have access to all such magazines, etc.? And how do you know? You make a lot of assumptions and offer not a shred of proof; and then you think that YOUR “need to know” regarding proof that Meier wrote a given document when he said he did is worthy of comment?

No, you need to substantiate your wild theory that Meier wrote and published that and/or any other document at a time different than he said he did. I suggest that you reread Hans’ explanation.

Let's also consider this, in the past 30 years Meier has been part of a group of approximately 50 people (in total but not at the same time) who have been closely involved in one way or another in this work. Some have stayed around for a shorter time, some for a longer time. Some have remained friends, some have not, some have even conspired with liars and scam artists like Kal Korff to alter Meier's photos.

But one thing hasn't happened in all that time. No one has come forward with falsified documents, not even the most disaffected of Meier's associates. Why is that? What better way to discredit him than to bring forth the hoaxed documents, show the altered ones, show that they were faked, etc.? Could it be, as Hans explained quite clearly (clearly enough for any thinking, reasoning person, that is) that the group members certainly would notice such things, that they wouldn't put up with such a loss of credibility on Billy's part (and consequently their own) and, to the contrary, already have their own original copies to destroy the lies of someone later claiming the hoax?

And, as already mentioned, there are too many people already in possession of the widely scattered documents (in at least two languages) for such preposterous - and plainly desperate - accusations to have any credibility.

I suggest that you also don’t attempt to smear these people, all of whom use their real names and many of whom have already passed lie detector tests, as has Meier and even his now ex-wife, that completely confirmed their honesty and truthfulness. Believe it or not, and more important

than the “case”, we consider ourselves to be truthful people who value certain things more than “being right”, fame, money, etc. I can’t speak for everybody but I will speak from my own personal experience and knowledge of the people that I have met, which includes Meier, Stevens, the Elders, Froning, and a couple of dozen of the people/witnesses in Switzerland, you know, the ones who use their real names and tell the truth as they know it.

Again, in case you lose sight of it, the real point in all of this is simply this: Either the case is real or it isn't. A preponderance of still irreproducible physical evidence, an abundance of specific, prophetically accurate information, 120+ witnesses (including a retired UN diplomat) and five other photographers present proof beyond a reasonable doubt as to the authenticity of the Meier case. And you haven't made a dent in that.

BTW, consistent with its accepted definition I used the word publishing, as in making and disseminating copies of the reports.

Regarding CFI-West, no, they didn't meet the photo challenge. In order to have done that they would have to submit their photos for the same tests Meier's were and get the same results, at minimum, i.e. that the objects in their photos are the same size and display the same characteristics and meet the same standards as Meier's. They were the ones who called Meier's photos "an easily duplicated hoax", which assumes that they are models (as Vaughn Rees indicated when looking at Meier's films). They have not established, in any way, that Meier photographed models...only that they have.

Why aren't you and all of the folks who INSIST on Meier submitting photos/negatives for more "testing" demanding that CFI-West be the one to do so? After all, Meier's photos ALREADY were tested, the parameters easily found at my site, and other photo experts viewed them as authentic as well. And considering that the standards used to test Meier's photos, good as they were, are 20 years old, surely CFI's photos could “fool” the test as you presume Meier's did. The real issue with the photos is clearly CFI-West's refusal to have THEIR photos tested, not Meier's. So, for all you guys who “simply want to offer free services to analyze Meier's photos”, make that offer to CFI and let's see what the results are.

The skeptical agenda is ALWAYS to have you play their game by their rules, as if they were even qualified to have established either. It's funny how absolutely little we hear of these “experts” being called to give their “professional” opinions anywhere; considering how much they think of themselves, surely they should be making front page news all the time. So, in case it isn't clear, Meier's physical evidence has ALREADY been evaluated and authenticated by credible, qualified experts in their fields. If you REALLY want to “test” something, for the millionth time I offer you the sound recordings to “test” and, even more importantly, to duplicate.

Now get on with it before we hear another pretentious word about what you “need” regarding Meier's proof. What WE need is YOURS and that's the way this game will go from here on.

Regarding James Randi, he said, in writing, that I claimed to be in possession of the metal alloy samples. If you don't find where I said that (since I never did) will you join me in using a word that describes people that lie, in referring to Randi? Let me help you out, people who lie, are liars. James Randi is a liar and a defamer of people whose accomplishments he could never hope to achieve. Clear enough?

About Jupiter, Meier may have gotten some information wrong, may have been given wrong information, misunderstood, written it down wrong, had it mistranslated, etc. But the inescapable fact is that he got critical information right and, as we do maintain, before it was “officially” discovered or known. Your only answer is that you distrust Stevens, a man you've never met,

spoken at length with, taken the measure of, etc. Pardon me but that is a despicable punk attitude. Back it up or take it back. And, repeat after me, "I don't know."

There is absolutely no evidence of any deliberate attempt on Stevens' part to falsify anything; a man with a highly successful, decades long military career, trusted by both our and other countries for his expertise and dependability, and this pipsqueak is taking potshots at his character, which is exactly what you're doing. "You" have no reason to trust him? Whoever in hell you are, you owe him and a few other people an apology, or is that a foreign concept to you, snipe? When I call a person a coward, like I do you and a few others, it's because they demonstrate cowardice. When I call someone a liar, like Randi, it's because they lie. At least people like Vaughn Rees and others, with whom I disagree enormously (and have accused them of being bozos) well, at least they aren't liars, just wrong and incompetent.

Where is the EVIDENCE that Stevens would engage in a credibility destroying elaborate conspiracy after putting years of his time into the investigation along with his own money. Since he was the one who had models built and then photographed to see IF Meier was hoaxing, why would he then want to discredit himself and his investigation, which he funded himself? Now I'm really sorry to be offering a logical argument but this is the real world, people do things for reasons, people have motives, etc. So, where is the EVIDENCE, where is the EVIDENCE?

Oh there are lots of questions that would have to be answered and accompanied by proof, such as how would he know, years before, which specific items would become a hot topic of debate...and which wouldn't? Why did he show the Jupiter and specific predictive information to Norton and Pestalozzi and have them sign off on it before putting it away? Could he have anticipated libelous little guys like you who would hurl unfounded accusations at him rather than admit that there were some things they could neither explain nor debunk?

And what about the Venus information? I'm surprised that you haven't gone after him, Meier and the USGS on that, especially considering that here again it's claimed that Meier was ahead of the "official" discovery.

So let me also be clear about me and my research. I am fully capable of missing something and of making mistakes. I have never, not once, deliberately stated a falsehood regarding the Meier information nor the results of my research. The overwhelming preponderance of a wide range of evidence, culled from a large body of an even larger body of information (most still in German) that is, to any reasoning person, unalterable, is unique in its specificity and accuracy. The work of people like James Deardorff, who (among other things) took the trouble to have the tree in Meier's photographs identified, which ruled out a hoax, contributes further weight to Meier's case being REAL.

And we return to that point for it IS the point from which all other considerations will follow.

The case is either real or it isn't. If it's real it's the most important story in all of human history. You either do or don't have the capacity, willingness and intention to comprehensively consider the overwhelmingly convincing evidence and see if it suggests "real" or "hoax". You either will or won't approach the case to discover IF it is real and not operate from obvious prejudice, as evidenced by your resorting to sly innuendo and defamation in order to avoid what is otherwise the inescapable (and for you uncomfortable) truth.

And finally this little thought. Since your tactic has been to discredit everyone, including especially the main witness and other eyewitnesses, it logically follows that even if you yourself (along with everyone of the other skeptics) were to see and even photograph these UFOs, you would have to discount the entire experience due to your already established point of view that eyewitness testimony is unreliable and that photographs (including your own) can be hoaxed.

Therefore, since you would, even in your own eyes, have no credibility as a witness...why should we bother to attempt to prove anything to you as someone who, by their own definition, as you would put it, we would have no reason to believe?

Michael Horn

Michael Horn wrote:

> A falsification of the contact reports and the
> prophecies would also mean that he would have had to
> have prepared countless typed pages with gaps in the
> text to make the retrospective inclusions
> possible. In the case of a falsification he also
> would not have knowledge of which coming event to
> insert in which contact report, so it would not be
> possible for him to determine the free place for the
> insertion. Quite aside from this, it is generally
> known that by inserting (something) the text can be
> disrupted over several pages away. Falsifications or
> retrospective inclusions would therefore mean that,
> in the meanwhile, he must have had to have
> repeatedly, with his typewriter, copied uncountable,
> already available pages.

Yeah, that certainly sounds hard to manage. However, I don't think I ever suggested the mechanism by which I thought information was retroactively "predicted".

What I actually think is that Meier typed everything in a contact report at once and simply put an old date at top of the page. Is there something about his typewriter that makes it insanely complicated or physically impossible to type "19 October 1978" in March 1979?

ike42

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Small Business - Try our new resources site!
<http://smallbusiness.yahoo.com/resources/>

For more detailed Information on Billy Meier Case please visit
Official FIGU Website: <http://www.figu.org> (Switzerland)

Figu Study Group Website in U.S.A <http://www.billymeier.com>

Hans Georg Lanzendorfer's website in German Language: Billy Meier - neither a Guru nor a Great Master: Billy Meier - weder Guru noch grosser Meister: <http://www.lanzendorfer.ch/>

For official and well detailed documentation of technical and true scientific analyses of real metallic samples and sounds visit Michael Horn's Website "And Still They Fly"
<http://www.theyfly.com/>

"Talmud of Jmmanuel"

How this document, discovered in Jerusalem in 1963 ushers in the New Age while exposing the New Testament gospels as being more

corrupt than even the Jesus Seminar suspects. The most complete and detailed study on Talmud of Jmmanuel: Dr. Jim Deardorff's TJ website: <http://www.tjresearch.info/>

Learn more about CREATIONAL LAWS Laws here on this Webpage:
<http://www.avilabooks.com/Jmmanuel1.htm>

THE KEY SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF JMMANUEL

By Dr. Dietmar Rothe, Ph.D.

a transcript of a presentation Dr. Rothe gave at the International UFO Congress Summer Seminars on 17th of September 2001 at Laughlin, NV.

The material is copyrighted. © All rights reserved by the author. Dr. Dr. Dietmar Rothe. The web page is intended for your personal education and enjoyment only. Copying and distributing any part of that material requires written permission from the author.

Billy Meier: An English-Language Bibliography
<http://www25.brinkster.com/chancede/Meier.html>
by David E. Chance: chancede@slu.edu

Another Figu Friends JPLagasse and J. TruthSeeker:
<http://www.eduardmeier.org>

Links edited by J. Barreto & Jay Olivieri on September,10,
2004

Thank you for your membership and enjoy your stay.

Yahoo! Groups Sponsor

ADVERTISEMENT

Would you give Hope to a Child in need?

<[332170_011805_newchildforemail.jpg](#)>

.

[Click Here to meet a Girl](#)

And Give Her Hope

.

[Click Here to meet a Boy](#)

And Change His Life

Learn More

<l.gif>

Yahoo! Groups Links

- To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Plejarens_are_real_2005/
- To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
Plejarens_are_real_2005-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com
- Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the Yahoo! Terms of Service.