

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

**Date:** April 6, 2004 6:46:15 PM PDT

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

**Subject:** Re: [Plejarans\_are\_real] Re: Meier and Jupiter info

Well, well, more questions but, in my opinion, some problems with common sense. Glad to do my best to answer them but I am reminded of that team of engineers that concluded that bumblebees are ill-designed to fly.

Before I tackle this, let me point you to the \*articles and excerpts at the end of our discussion which thoroughly flushes your nonsense regarding Meier getting his info from "newspapers". A simple glance at the date of discovery of this important fact, *2001*, some *23 years after* Meier's information regarding the particles from Io's volcanic activity being attracted to the rings (which is explained by the magnetosphere) was published. But let's proceed as if we don't know this yet.

I think I'll insert my comments after your questions.

[Disseminated to whom? How can the dates be proven?](#)

MH: The Contact Reports were published by Meier, in German, and disseminated to those people who were involved with studying the material at the time. If that's not enough info, go research it and find out the details.

1. As far as proof regarding the Jupiter information, Lt. Col. Wendelle Stevens has stated and published that he had received the 115th Contact in Meier's house on March 9, 1979.

So the Jupiter information left Billy Meier's hands two to four days \*after\* the official discovery of most everything Billy Meier "predicted" about Jupiter and its moons. That doesn't count as a documented prediction. Plus, it is very suspicious that just barely after an event which surely was reported by news media around the world, Billy Meier comes out with the information discovered.

MH: No, Ike, you're not paying attention again for some reason. The material, as stated above, was disseminated in Europe and later, when Stevens and team came over, given to him. "Very suspicious" indeed...that he published it BEFORE it came out in the media, as he did with dozens of other items. You seem to wish to ignore the fact that every contact was dated, and the exact time of the contact

noted as well, and every sentence numbered. Some rather careful, detailed record keeping was going on so that the armchair geniuses could exhaust their rational challenges and focus on presumptions that, of course, they offer absolutely no proof for. Further holes in your theory await at \*.

This is also the contact that contains the information on the 10 predictions of events that were yet to occur, i.e. the Jonestown Massacre, the invasion of N. Viet Nam by China, etc. And all of these events did occur well subsequent to Stevens having the information in his documented possession

There are too many ways such a set up could be cheated.

You don't quote the exact text of Meier's predictions... even if there wasn't actual cheating, the information could have been "safe", general prophecies like "An admired world leader will be assassinated" and "A volcano will erupt", which, after the fact, would be reported as: "Billy Meier predicted the death of Indira Ghandi and the Mount St. Helen's eruption!".

MH: Gee, just when I thought the lights were on, well, you had me fooled. Why do you insert a patently dishonest distraction, i.e. concocting things that weren't said, let alone in evidence? If we are to continue to have a discussion, please do not resort to transparently obvious distortions to defend your religion, i.e. Skepticism. THis is the kind of crap that gives you guys a bad name and a reputation as a bunch of jokers who will do ANYTHING (and slander anybody) to keep your rather fragile world view intact.

Now, the exact texts are still available in copyrighted documents and books, too late for cheating and altering. There are actual pages from both documents and texts scanned onto the DVD, which I designed as a research tool for those wanting to learn about the case. So, to be absolutely clear (though it apparently hasn't helped much up until now) the predictions are quite specific, names are named, events described, etc.

So, assuming for a moment that it is as I've just said, what kind of convoluted nonsense will you propose next in order to preserve your belief systems from taking a serious hit?

If predictions like the above included the names of all the people and places (and, ideally, the date) and was published in a book or magazine before the events, then you would have something good. Do you have that?

MH: Well, Ike, can you imagine that we do? Not only for the above but for many other specifics. Maybe it really is time for you to get the DVD.

Michael Horn asserts "there is no reason to doubt that the actual date of Meier's information is as given, i.e. October 19, 1978". I disagree: there is reason to doubt.

Since Stevens attests to the date that he received the information, i.e. March 9, 1979, I maintain that the statement is accurate and there indeed is no reason to doubt it.

Your original statement was that there is no reason to doubt that Billy Meier wrote the information on 19 October 1978. Now you're acting as if you said there is no reason to doubt that Stevens received the information on 9 March 1979. I agree that there is no reason to doubt the latter statement; it leaves a big window during which Billy Meier could have copied the information out of the newspaper.

MH: Somebody's not thinking here, Mr. Ike. As previously mentioned, Meier published the info months earlier (October 1978) and it was in the possession of numerous people in Europe (they do count as people, just like Americans, right?). Further, since you want to make such assumptions, please find out when the info was published, in what newspapers, magazines and periodicals, and how, if Meier manufactured it (for reasons completely unknown, and which would only make him vulnerable to charges of plagiarism coming as close to the events as you presume) he would have access to scientific info of great detail in magazines which, in all likelihood would take a certain amount of time to gather the info, publish it (in pre-internet, electronic media days) ship it, and make it available to Meier. Just for starters, find these publications, their availability and any record of Meier being a recipient of such. (Ike, that's why people investigate and research, as the team did on the Meier case...for six years. But boy, he really fooled 'em, didn't he?) Did I mention an \* at the end of this, Ike?

That being the case, how do you explain Meier handing over to Stevens information that was, clearly, not known or widely disseminated yet?

Why do you say that these facts were "clearly" not widely disseminated within a few days of their discovery? I would be surprised if there were no newspaper articles about Jupiter's ring and Io's volcanoes before 9 March 1979.

MH: Being surprised, Ike, is not exactly conclusive, substantial proof of anything objective. And this isn't about you're being surprised, unless of course we're talking about the kind of surprise that occurs when you exhaust all your options and attempts to put your own assumptions in place of the actual facts. A surprise like admitting that, gosh, Meier's telling the truth, something that, as I noted above, you've already demonstrated your willingness to not do.

How is it that a one-armed, resource-less farmer living in a rural area outside of Zurich, in the pre-computer/information age, indeed knew and published this wide variety of information...

My theory is that he subscribed to some science magazines and newspapers, read about new discoveries, wrote about them, and back-dated the reports.

MH: Yeah, right, great theory Ike. And your proof for that is? If you can't prove your "theory" does that mean you accept what has already been shown to be true regarding the case...or do we get another "the butler must have done it" here from you? This is also the moment when I point out that your entire approach here reeks of non-scientific thinking, way too many implausible, speculative, wild assumptions.

I find this more likely than the theory that he was told this information by ETs who communicate with him (and only him) telepathically, who can time travel, and who refuse to allow him to disseminate conclusive evidence of their existence.

Is there proof beyond a reasonable doubt or are there plausible, provable explanations for not only

each of the individual components of the case but for the overall preponderance of evidence?

There are plausible explanations for each piece of claimed evidence (which leaves nothing to contribute to the preponderance). The following are not proven; they are merely speculated plausible explanations.

The metal alloy: One scientist (and his friend) said the metal was remarkable, but now it reportedly has been taken back by the Plejarans and nobody else is allowed to look at it. This leaves open the possibility that this scientist either lied about the sample or made an error. The same scientist has also reported non-replicated claims about the effect of human emotions on plants and healing properties of crystals.

<[http://www.vogelcrystals.com/legacy\\_of\\_marcel\\_vogel.htm](http://www.vogelcrystals.com/legacy_of_marcel_vogel.htm)>

Keep in mind that no earthshattering scientific finding has ever been accepted on the word of just one or two scientists.

MH: Ah ha, the old attack the credibility of scientist ploy where an apparently non-scientist (who doesn't like his religious beliefs tampered with) casts aspersions on a veritable genius (IBM certainly thought so but apparently you belong to the Randi school of accreditation) and his "friend" (not a metallurgist, as Vogel reported). Well, you've got a lot more serious scientists to slander than just Mr. Vogel, so get crackin'!

The sound recording: Billy Meier (possibly with an assistant) could have put a loudspeaker in a tree and played a pre-recorded synthesized noise through it, attracting some witnesses. Then they could have taken down the speaker before people came back looking for a speaker later on (the report isn't precise, but it sounds like nobody went back until the next day). It is also possible that the witnesses didn't exist and were made up to improve the story. Some sound engineers analyzed the recording and claimed that the sound had some unique characteristics, but their report doesn't say anything about testing similar sound and music samples and showing that those did

\*not\* possess the supposedly unique characteristics, nor did it describe the characteristics with sufficient precision to allow someone else to conclusively say whether a given sample did or did not have those properties. I.e., they don't answer this question: How can I determine whether the sound being fed into the spectrum analyzer has this characteristic by only looking at the scope (not hearing the sound)?

MH: This just gets stupider and stupider, no? I already resent giving the benefit of the doubt to someone who offers such doltish nonsense. If you had read the sound analysis you wouldn't even offer such garbage. "Some sound engineers" refers to some of the top recording engineers in L.A. and the eminently qualified personnel at the Groton Naval Undersea Laboratories. You're absolutely incorrect also because they did rule out any other known sound sources. They were able to measure all of the frequencies as well as observe the distinct patterns the sounds made, etc. Obviously they "heard" the sounds.

So, if in doubt, DUPLICATE the sounds yourself, armchair expert!

The photographic evidence: The photographs and films could have been faked. It has been reported that Billy Meier possessed small replicas of Plejaran spacecraft (reportedly toys for his children, modeled after the real things). There is no way to verify the claim that the camera used to take the pictures had a broken focus. There is no way to verify the claim that Billy Meier couldn't have had any accomplices. It is unclear whether the actual original negatives of his pictures have ever been released for examination (the photo reports say that one analysis showed that the negative being analyzed had been created from a positive, a fact which was confirmed by Billy Meier). Again, no earthshattering scientific finding has ever been accepted on the word of just one or two scientists.

MH: This sounds familiar. Apparently you are still, somehow, unaware or, typically, in denial of the FACT that CFI-West ACCEPTED my challenge to duplicate Meier's "easily duplicated hoaxes" (photographic evidence) and, after more than three years, has failed to do so. Moreover, they have PUBLICLY REFUSED to have their photos tested, a gesture for which I guess I should be grateful, seeing as how millions of people worldwide now KNOW unequivocally what a disreputable bunch of bozos they are. **I REQUEST THAT YOU PERSONALLY DEMAND THAT THEY LIVE UP TO THE CHALLENGE, OH**

## NOBLE ONE.

Genius, the *investigative team* itself spent hundreds of dollars on *making models* in an attempt to duplicate Meier's photos. But you knew that, no?

In response to the other "points", not only has an extensive six-year investigation yielded results and information accurately presented by me (sorry you weren't there to make them get it "right") the obvious answer here is that you will suspend the preponderance of evidence, the likes of which is unparalleled anywhere, and attempt to replace them with your suppositions.

For the zillionth time, numerous scientists were involved in validating the case but you are a religious man and I don't want to disturb your "faith" with the facts (hey, I don't stand a chance of doing that anyway).

Remember, the above are just (pointless) plausible explanations, not attempts to disprove anything. The above possibilities must be ruled out by any valid proof of the ET claim.

Also keep in mind that I do not have to disprove every improbable claim that you dig up; you are supposed to prove your claims. Saying "how could it be otherwise?" is not a proof any more than saying "well, maybe the scientist lied" is a disproof.

How do you explain that Meier, in 1995, published a prediction regarding the US strike on Iraq and five other items

The press release from 9 December 2003 about the seven predictions (and other stuff) can be seen here (among other places):  
<<http://ufocasebook.com/meiervindicated.html>>

What is the evidence that the predictions were published in February 1995? It is provable that the predictions appeared in "And Yet... They Fly" in 2001 (which still pre-dates the events that are claimed to be predicted), but I have seen no proof that they were written in 1995.

MH: I downloaded them in 1998 and the publication date on Meier's documents

(1995, in this case) usually appears on the page on the internet but you don't want to know that, do you? You want to gloss over the FACT that even 2001 predates the events. Gosh, in my book that's PARANORMAL. And you want to see this and you want to see that. Well, get off your butt, let some air out of your ego and go do some research!

To explain all of them in detail, I would need the actual wording of the predictions.

MH: Yes, of course, to explain them all in detail. And do know that we are ALL waiting for you to do that, when you have the time.

I don't want to buy a used paperback copy of the book for \$75 (that's the asking price for used copies listed on Amazon).

I am in no way an experienced debunker, but here are some explanations I came up with: The report of the fulfilled predictions adds in details that were not in the original. For example, from my reading of your press release, Billy Meier did not predict a US strike on Iraq. He predicted an attack by the U.S. and its president that will stun the world. Given the number of times the U.S. has carried out attacks that others in the world don't like, that is a pretty safe guess.

The press release tries to make something of the similarity between "stun" and "shock and awe". While the meaning of "shock" and "stun" are indeed close, they are used differently in the prediction and the event: the direct object of "stun" is "the world" while the direct object of "shock" is "the Iraqi army". So that parallel lacks punch.

MH: I see. Lacks punch, does it? Tell that to the Iraqi people. More to the point, like, you'd like everything to be spoon fed to you, in wording that you can "explain in detail".

including the rather specific warning of the danger of an (avoidable) accident at the nuclear power plant near Lyon, France...which

occurred (was avoided, i.e. caught in time) on August 12, 2003?

For that to be impressive, you would have to show that none of the other nuclear power plants had any safety incidents between 1995 and 2003. With the high paranoia surrounding nuclear safety, I suspect that many, if not all, of the nuclear power plants in the world have had some kind of problem in the last few years.

MH: You "suspect" that, do you like?

The incident on 12 August 2003 was that the hot weather caused cooling problems. The plant was never in any danger; it was only the regulations about water temperature that was at risk of being violated: "The Bugey power station near Lyon on the Rhone river has already requested a special exemption to pour hotter water back into the river."

<<http://www.planetark.com/dailynewsstory.cfm/newsid/21817/story.htm>>

That in no way fulfills a prediction of a "possible accident". So at least one of the seven predictions remain unfulfilled.

MH: I disagree. An accident was avoided by taking actions based on a condition that was serious enough to be reported. It was referred to in a document written years before it occurred. Of the 436 nuke plants in existence at the time, it was pinpointed by Meier and made the news rather sequentially in relationship to the other predictions, including the one about the spread of Mad Cow Disease to other animals and humans, which only began to be reported...after Meier predicted it. Review the temperatures the Plejaren told Meier were necessary to destroy the prions. Compare that to the temperatures being considered at the time, compare that to the recent estimates...as they approach the ones given to Meier. Go back to the original info re the ozone damage and A-bomb testing (when did YOU know about that, Ike?) note the first published confirmation I could find 13 years later. Note that Meier sent that info around the world in 1975, letter on record.

Ike, as I said, you and the entire skeptic army don't have enough fingers to put in all the holes.

It sounds like you are assuming the information is true and are doing everything possible to make the facts fit the predictions. You shouldn't do that if you wish to be taken seriously.

The rest of the predictions in that group are either a safe guess ("A new disease will appear") or something already known in 1995 ("AIDS will spread"). This is not acceptable proof that that ETs talked to Billy Meier.

Regarding the evidence of the rings being supplied from the four inner moons, there was no inclusion of the word "only" here and (since I am not an astronomer) I cannot, nor does the article, say that the massive volume of particles expelled by Io's volcanoes do not contribute to the rings,

The two reports conflict: the dust from the moons have been identified as the \*primary\* source of the matter in the rings, and Billy Meier said the primary source is Io's volcanoes.

Maybe the next space probe will find something that proves the current theory wrong, but you cannot claim this as a victory for Billy Meier's prediction based on what Earth scientists are reporting.

MH: You're forgetting way too many things, such as that scientists didn't even posit the source/composition of the rings until 1998, 20 years after Meier published his information! Your "reasoning" is simply disingenuous and irrational. If Meier is the first person on record, and he is, to announce the info about Europa and Io, the rings and their composition/source and you can't acknowledge that, it is your bias and determination for this to not be true that, of course, is apparent. Even Dr. Veverka at Cornell admitted that Meier was right months before they were. Then again, there's the \*.

it is still quite fair to say that the effect of a meteorite impacting the surface of the moon, while certainly powerful, doesn't account for much propulsive force, certainly nothing compared to the enormous force of a volcano.

Io is large, larger than our moon. The inner four moons are very small. It takes a lot more force for particles to escape Io's gravity than it does to knock particles off the little moons.

MH: Ike, do you think that material being propelled up to 180 kms at 2,500 km/hr (as opposed to practically no propulsive force with micrometeorite strikes, more of a reactive force) qualifies? Do you think that even a heavy object, such as a rocket for instance, might make it off the moon under those conditions? And does knocking particles off little moons assure that they'll reach the necessary heights? Of course, better answers await the \*.

it may be that the Plejaren considered Amalthea the closest large, i.e. "real" by their definition, moon, as the other two are extremely small. It should be noted that the Plejaren stated that Jupiter has 17 moons, according to their definition of a moon.

I assume that nobody knows the Plejaran definition of "moon". If size is what matters, the two inner moons make it into the top 17: they are the 11th and 16th largest according to both <http://www.ifa.hawaii.edu/~sheppard/satellites/jupsatdata.html> and [http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/sat\\_props.html](http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/sat_props.html). Of course, maybe there are some large, undiscovered moons out there.

However, given that the Plejarans have a particular definition of "moon" which is unknown, none of the predictions involving the number or position of moons can be used as corroborating evidence.

5. [Hubble telescope prediction] I agree that at the end of the 1980s comes, ta da, 1990. How likely is it that Meier had access to this info,

Given that he wrote about it in the late 1970s, it is very, very likely that he had access to the info that a space telescope was planned. I'm sure that it was reported in newspapers and magazines all over the

world. Do you think it's unlikely that this was generally knowable before 1978?? (Yes, I plan to find references, but I'm not sure when I will make it to the library.)

MH: You're "sure" about a lot of things but not sure as to when you'll prove them.

7. Regarding Chimborazo, while it may be "very likely that somebody published" the info regarding it prior to Meier, you yourself didn't find it, even on the internet, which wasn't available to Meier at the time anyhow. How would he have heard of it

It is most likely that he would have read it in a newspaper or magazine. I do not expect to find a full bibliography on the internet for publications before about 1990. As I already said: I'll have to look it up in a library.

MH: "Most likely", another very scientific contribution from you, Ike, Yes, we know, you'll look it up in a library...and then you'll show, as you will with all your assumptions and guesses, how, when, where and why Meier got the info and decided to publish it. Oh, I know, it's cause he's psychic and knew that these particular things would be great topics for conversation someday in the future. Yeah.

As I posed in my two-choice, multiple choice question before, either the man is a genius of unprecedented and unparalleled stature or he is a genuine contactee.

Out of those choices, the more likely is "A". But if he's so smart, why does he find it necessary to make up all the ET stuff??

MH: I see, and being a genius yourself, do you mind if I ask you why a man who is simply a genius would attract the attention of some 19 (documented, yes, I know, Ike, you'll be going over there to confirm that, I hope) assassination attempts?

No reasonable alternative is presented let alone suggested.

There are plenty of other alternatives:

- C) He, possibly with the help of dishonest or guillible friends, faked the evidence and/or reports about the evidence for unknown reasons.
- D) The CIA did it.
- E) The KGB did it.
- F) Exiled Nazi scientists did it.
- G) God did it.
- H) The devil did it.
- I) Billy Meier doesn't exist; we are imagining all of this.

Out of all the choices, I consider the most likely to be "C". So far there has not been any irrefutable evidence for either "A" or "B" and the rest are unnecessarily complicated.

MH: Well, guess what, Ike? A six-year extensive investigation failed to reveal any such parties or conspiracy. Do you believe in conspiracies too, Ike? And, in the subsequent 29+ years, no one has ever come forward to demonstrate or prove complicity or knowledge of any provable conspiracy, hoax, etc. Seeing as how people don't usually do things on a whim for so many years and with such devastating personal consequences, a hoaxer of this quality would have to be motivated by something really important, i.e. money, a huge job in special effects, etc. No evidence for such, nor any other evidence of a hoax exists. Period.

Frankly, to set matter extremely straight, any other suggestions are dishonest, evasive and indicative of an unimaginably enormous lack of integrity and ethics, as well as a similarly enormous state of denial.

Frankly, tossing off non-factual denouements doesn't help anything. I say that \*not\* considering other alternatives is dishonest, evasive, and indicative of an imaginably enormous (and repetitive) lack of integrity. So where does any of that get us? Nowhere.

MH: Other alternatives were constantly being considered, investigated and disproved during the investigation, an investigation conducted by, and with the

assistance of, experts in their fields, not theoreticians unfamiliar with the actual, factual details involved. (We haven't even touched upon the challenges to traversing the terrain in winter faced by a one-armed man on a Moped.)

It is well past put up or shut up time for the skeptics.

I already did put up. I poked a bunch of holes in your "Proof Beyond A Reasonable Doubt", and you have failed to patch any of them. You've made some of them bigger.

MH: I think the above will reasonably counter balance that. I think that the holes in the logic and common sense of the skeptics are ever increasing and exhaust the number of thumbs necessary to stop it up. Your "could be", "should prove", "more likely" hardly qualify as poking holes in anything except your credibility, logic and objectivity.

There are problems with your claim that there is sufficient evidence to establish that Billy Meier has actually had contact with ETs. Here is your multiple choice test (choose one):

- A) Provide some irrefutable proof that Billy Meier has communicated with ETs.
- B) Stop claiming that you have proof beyond a reasonable doubt of Billy Meier's claims.
- C) Continue presenting the same old non-scientific, inconclusive evidence as "proof".

If you believe that the Plejarans don't want humans to have absolute proof of their existence, your answer should be "B".

MH: Glad to put up all that I've already stated in a presentation against all your unsubstantiated assumptions and bogus assertions. A) stands, as our little \* material at the end will clearly show.

Here is my homework, which doesn't really sound very hard:

1. Find the earliest publication of the fact that

Chimborazo's peak is farther from the center of the Earth than Everest's peak.

2. Find out when information about Jupiter's ring and

Io's volcanoes were widely disseminated.

3. Find out when the Hubble Space Telescope was first widely announced.

I probably won't have time to go to the university library until the weekend.

MH: Well, your homework is a lot more than that, as I think I've already made clear. Let's add to it. since you claim that Meier somehow got the info re Jupiter from publications that you can't prove exist, or were available to him, and since you didn't "reason" well enough to note that even if the data was all collected on March 5, 1979 (which isn't said anywhere that I've found) that the time necessary for it to be processed and released to the public (in a non-internet age) would vastly exceed a couple of days. Basically, you're in such absolutely irrational denial about it that you further diminish your credibility and objectivity.

For the record, ANY person with integrity wouldn't make such illogical statements in the face of the facts.

\*Here's an article that dates the discovery of Jupiter's magnetosphere as **2001**, some **23 years after** Meier reported the conditions regarding the contribution of Io's volcanic activity to the rings, which, as we discussed, is easily explained by the magnetosphere:

<http://www.exn.ca/Stories/2002/02/27/53.asp>

Jumpin' Jupiter!

Just over a year ago, the Cassini space probe flew past the planet Jupiter and used the massive planet to nudge itself onto its final path to Saturn.

While it was in the neighbourhood, Cassini did some work. Because the Galileo space probe was also orbiting Jupiter, scientists had their first chance in history to observe the planet with two space probes.

The results of that double view are now being released. Cassini's biggest surprise came a long way out, when it encountered the planet's magnetic field. It turns out Jupiter's magnetosphere is far larger than anyone anticipated. In fact, the magnetic bubble around Jupiter is the largest object in the solar system, 20 times wider than the sun itself.

Cassini was also able to observe how charged particles are manipulated by the magnetosphere, creating intense auroral displays and clouds of particles around several of Jupiter's moons."

Here's info from: <http://voyager.jpl.nasa.gov/science/jupiter.html> that contradicts your brilliant theory regarding Io and the particles, as well as a few other points:

"Although astronomers had studied Jupiter from Earth for several centuries, scientists were surprised by many of Voyager 1 and 2's findings. They now understand that important physical, geological, and atmospheric processes go on - in the planet, its satellites, and magnetosphere - that were new to observers.

Discovery of active volcanism on the satellite Io was probably the greatest surprise. It was the first time active volcanoes had been seen on another body in the solar system. It appears that activity on Io affects the entire Jovian system. Io appears to be the primary source of matter that pervades the Jovian magnetosphere -- the region of space that surrounds the planet, primarily influenced by the planet's strong magnetic field. Sulfur, oxygen, and sodium, apparently erupted by Io's volcanoes and sputtered off the surface by impact of high-energy particles, were detected at the outer edge of the magnetosphere.

This time-lapse video records Voyager 1's approach to Jupiter during a period of over 60 Jupiter days.

Particles of the same material are present inside Io's orbit, where they accelerate to more than 10 percent of the speed of light. It is clear to scientists from a comparison of data from Pioneers 10 and 11 (which flew past Jupiter in late 1973 and 1974) and the Voyagers that something changed in the four and one-half years between the Pioneer and Voyager encounters.

It is not entirely clear just how far-reaching those changes are, or what brought them about. They may be related to Ionian activity. It is difficult to imagine, however, that at least some of Io's volcanoes were not erupting when the Pioneers flew past; it is also, the Voyager scientists say, difficult to believe the Pioneers' instruments failed to see magnetospheric concentrations of sulfur detected by both Voyager spacecraft (Voyager 1 saw greater concentrations than Voyager 2).

This page was last updated January 14, 2003"

Again, dating the findings:

"The Cassini-Huygens and Galileo spacecraft orbited Jupiter for two days in January 2001, making observations of the planet's magnetosphere. The experiments conducted during this unique event have shed light on many of the processes that take place in Jupiter's magnetosphere, and reports on ultraviolet emissions, interaction with solar radiation and the presence of ultra-relativistic electrons appear in the current issue of *Nature* (2002 415 issue 6875).

In the six years it has orbited Jupiter, Galileo has studied the planet's atmosphere, satellites and surrounding magnetosphere."

Need we say more about how right Meier was ? From:  
[http://www.planetaryexploration.net/jupiter/io/io\\_plasma\\_torus.html](http://www.planetaryexploration.net/jupiter/io/io_plasma_torus.html)

"Within Jupiter's magnetosphere, there is a significant amount of hot, ionized gas, or plasma. This plasma moves along with Jupiter's rotating magnetic field, sweeping charged particles off the surfaces of its moons as it passes them. Io has a particularly significant impact on Jupiter's magnetosphere. Io's volcanoes continually expel an enormous amount of particles into space, and these are swept up by Jupiter's magnetic field at a rate of 1,000 kg/sec. This material becomes ionized in the magnetic field and forms a doughnut-shaped track around Io's orbit called the Io Plasma Torus... As Io circles around Jupiter and through the plasma torus, an enormous electrical current flows between them. Approximately 2 trillion watts of power is generated. The current follows the magnetic field lines to Jupiter's surface where it creates lightning in the upper atmosphere. The first black and white Hubble Space Telescope image (top) shows the flux tube, where Io and Jupiter are linked by an electrical current of charged particles. Volcanic emissions from Io flow along Jupiter's magnetic field lines, through Io, to Jupiter's north and south magnetic poles. In the second black and white image, auroral emissions are visible at Jupiter's north and south poles. The ultraviolet image below shows how the structure and appearance of Jupiter's aurora changes as it rotates."

But I do thank you for getting me to look for further proof that now shows that, in fact, Meier was not only 20 years ahead of Cornell scientists, but 23 years ahead in terms of the scientific discovery that corroborates his information.

Now, Ike, remember that you're a skeptic and there MUST be an "alternative explanation" for Meier sticking it to you, and the bozos at CFI-West and Randi, Inc., once again.

Best to you,

MH