

From: Dave Thomas <nmsrdave@swcp.com>
Date: August 19, 2004 2:38:19 PM PDT
To: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, JREF
<challenge@randi.org>, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn Rees
<Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>
Subject: Re: Roswell UFO case

Here's the situation as I see it, Michael:

On 17 Aug 2004 at 19:09:57, you claimed "Further, James Randi retracted his claim that the case is a hoax (showing some rare good sense)."

On 18 Aug 2004 at 12:06:05, you claimed "I should add that James Randi retracted his claim that the Meier case is a hoax. Now I wonder why he did that?"

When I asked you for evidence for this claim, you told me to go find it myself.

I went and found the supposed "retraction," but have not found the supposed initial instance of Randi labelling the Meier case a "hoax."

To say the least, I'm skeptical of your claim. Randi, whom I met a few weeks ago, is the first to say that reproducing, say, the Meier photos, or Uri Geller's spoon-bending demonstrations, does NOT prove that the claimants are "hoaxers." Rather, he says the following:

<http://www.randi.org/jr/032604why.html#2>

"Concerning these photographs of purported UFOs produced by "contactee" Billy Meier in the mid-'70s, any mere replication of those photos would mean little toward examining the claim, except to show that they can be replicated. If they are not properly replicated, it merely means they have not yet been replicated, but does not speak at all to the question of whether or not they're faked photos. Replication would show that faking them by this means is possible, but would not show that Meier did it that way. I'm reminded of the circumstances surrounding my exact replication of the Geller "phenomena" at King's College, UK, in July of 1975 ...But, importantly — this evidence — by itself — in no way proved anything about Geller's performance except that it could be replicated by simple trickery!..."

Now, Michael, you are making the somewhat surprising claim that Randi has indeed proclaimed the Meier case an official "hoax."

It's not my job to go around doing the research to back up YOUR claims. I'm quite busy doing research to support MY investigations. YOU are the one making vague, unsupported claims about what Randi has said.

If you want me to take your assertions seriously, then the monkey's on your back to provide support for these accusations.

In other words, "WHERE'S THE BEEF?"

Sincerely, Dave Thomas
<http://www.nmsr.org>

At 02:00 PM 8/19/2004 -0700, Michael wrote:

Dave, You have a finite amount of material to look through (which would be educational in itself to see what a bunch of bozos you may be aligned with) and you have an approximate date, further refining and narrowing your search.

If your plate is too full for that perhaps an information diet is in order, which at the same time could include an exercise program, one that emphasizes a search for truth over one that is focused on stretching it a la the glib, unscientific comments by a bunch of wannabe's. By the way, has it ever occurred to you that Randi (and at least one of the other guys involved) is a magician? While it's a noble profession (I'm friends with a couple of world class mentalists) it's fair to say that magicians, by profession, hone their skills to perfect misdirection, illusion and making things appear (or disappear) to be other than they are, kind of like what Randi does with the truth.

I told you that Randi and company lied in that "press release" (and elsewhere) and so far it turns out that I'm the one that's telling the truth (really it's Meier who's been telling the truth all along).

So, as far as why you should care is concerned, my answer is...you shouldn't, unless the truth is important to you. If it is, go dig it up yourself.

Best,

MH

So let's see, you're the one claiming that Randi has reversed himself, but I have to pore through a year's worth of letters looking for something that might be "pretty close" ?

I've got a lot on my plate, and simply don't have time to waste on such frivolities.

If you can point me to a specific statement made by Randi, I'll check it out. If not, why should I even care?

Sincerely, Dave Thomas

"Life is too short to occupy oneself with the slaying of the slain more than once." - Thomas Huxley