

**From:** "Kramer" <kramer@randi.org>  
**Date:** August 20, 2004 8:48:33 AM 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>, "Dave Thomas" <nmsrdave@swcp.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Roswell UFO case  
**Reply-To:** "Kramer" <kramer@randi.org>

Hello People,

I've been looking at these emails for some time now and thought I'd offer the TRUTH, if anyone's interested.

My name is M. Kramer...I work at JREF in the Paranormal Claims Dept. Anyone who has listened to Randi speak on these issues knows that what I am about to state here is the TRUTH. The others will always believe what they want to believe, and so be it. I won't waste my time trying to convert the believers, because I know from experience that I'd be wasting my breath. Believers don't seek the truth. They only seek to discredit those who DO.

I have consulted Randi on this matter, but I didn't even need to because I know his lifelong protocol as regards these issues, and he is very adamant about being understood about this. Here we go, people:

RANDI NEVER SAID IT WAS A HOAX. HE ALSO NEVER "RETRACTED" ANY STATEMENT ABOUT IT BEING A HOAX, BECAUSE HE NEVER SAID IT WAS A HOAX IN THE FIRST PLACE. WHAT HE SAID WAS THAT THE EFFECTS IN THE PHOTOGRAPHS IN QUESTION (MUCH LIKE THE SPOON-BENDING OF URI GELLER) COULD EASILY BE DUPLICATED BY SOMEONE WHO WISHED TO DO SO, VIA DECEPTIVE MEANS.

THIS DOES NOT PROVE THAT THE MEIER PHOTOS WERE A HOAX, BUT RATHER SHOWS THAT THE PHOTOS COULD EASILY BE DUPLICATED BY DECEPTIVE MEANS.

So, just as a demonstration of spoon-bending by a magician doesn't prove that Uri Geller himself USES said deception in HIS spoon-bending, the duplication of the Meier photos does NOT prove that Meier's photos are not authentic.

Hence, no retraction was given, as he never made a statement that needed to

be retracted.

This baloney will continue ad infinitum. Accusing the accuser is always the FIRST resort of a fraud (and usually the first resort of the self-deluded, I might add), and most tellingly, it is also quite often the LAST resort, as well.

Yours,  
M. Kramer, JREF PAranormal Claims Dept.

=====

----- Original Message -----

From: "Dave Thomas" <nmsrdave@swcp.com>  
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>  
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 6:16 PM  
Subject: Re: Roswell UFO case

OK, I see that Randi mentioned a "farce." But there's very little coherence in that jumbled buch of statements and responses. Perhaps the "farce" Randi was referring to was not the Meier case, but rather your pages and pages of mind-numbing correspondence.

At any rate, I am absolutely, totally, and completely underwhelmed. You have pebbled my world!

May the Farce be with you!

Regards, Dave Thomas

At 03:02 PM 8/19/2004 -0700, Michael wrote:

Gosh, Dave, to the untrained observer that I am, it would appear that you went and did some research (contrary to your stated intentions) but perhaps didn't want to find the one I mentioned.

So, since you seem to want to find the beef without looking for it yourself (is this epidemic among "skeptics"?) let me hand to you on a silver platter the words of the greatly inflated one himself. All you

have to do is look up the following (so you don't have to take my word for it that Randi stuck both his feet in his mouth):

April 15, 2003, third large paragraph down.

Please pay ample attention to the emphatic and certain pronouncement by Randi and his assurance that even children can DUPLICATE the photos, which certainly contradicts what he says in this message.

Of course, maybe Randi would now like to, once again, claim that the case is a hoax and...finally prove it.

MH

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>

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