

**From:** Dave Thomas <nmsrdave@swcp.com>  
**Date:** September 3, 2004 6:49:17 PM PDT  
**To:** Michael <michael@theyfly.com>, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, Kramer <kramer@randi.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>, JREF <challenge@randi.org>, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn Rees <Vaughn@cfiwest.org>, Plejarens\_are\_real@yahogroups.com  
**Subject:** Re: Class is now in session

At 01:58 PM 9/2/2004 -0700, Michael wrote:

**Class Is Now In Session**

**Please be seated, class is now in session.**

...

Well, Mike, I'm sorry if I touched a nerve by including the mention of Wendelle Stevens from the THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER article of June 24th, 1987. I didn't need to include that, but the article as a whole is quite relevant to the whole Billy Meier story, which was why I mentioned it earlier. It's online in its entirety here:

<http://www.ufo.net/ufodocs/text.documents/u/ufo-art1.txt>

If you have a problem with what that article said about Stevens, perhaps you should take it up with the author, Key Davidson, now at the San Francisco Chronicle, "Key Davidson" <kdavidson@sfchronicle.com>.

As regards Meier's mention of tachyons, it's still a pretty dubious "proof." There's never been experimental confirmation of tachyons, and their very existence would call Einstein's relativity theory into question.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tachyon>

"The property of causality, a fundamental principle of theoretical particle physics, poses a problem for the physical existence of tachyons. If a tachyon were to exist and were allowed to interact with ordinary (time-like) matter, causality could be violated ... At the very least the principle of special relativity would have to be discarded."

That's Meier's reported time happens to agree with a wild speculation from a physicist is not really very compelling, either. This is piling dubious on top of uncertainty.

As for your attacks on my credentials, perhaps you'd be interested to know that, unlike you, I've actually been involved in the formal scientific testing of a purported UFO artifact. That was the Roswell "Fragment" of 1996, in which a man who moved to Roswell from Utah gave a piece of material to the UFO museum, telling them he'd been told it was from the Roswell crashed craft. When the museum people started thinking about how to test the artifact, I suggested a specific material test which could

**indicate if the specimen was compatible with earthly/solar system material properties, and the museum went ahead and acted on my suggestion. They had some tests performed at Los Alamos National Labs for about \$750.00. The specimen was earthly, as it turned out - and later, it was found to be a piece of scrap filched from a Utah artist's studio.**

**The point is, the museum did the right thing, had some real tests done, and learned about their specimen.**

**You could do that too, Mike, if your self-proclaimed status of "authorized American media representative for the Meier material" is genuine and actually GOOD for something. If you are so authorized, then why haven't you hustled the material to a lab as fast as you can? If it's Randi's outfit that you're afraid of, I can get you in contact with LANL scientists who have the equipment for such testing. There may be a fee, of course, but it's slow at LANL with the classified shutdown, so this might be an ideal time for such a project.**

**If you really want to get the attention of the world's scientists, why don't you try helping to arrange some real testing of the alleged alien material(s)???? If not at JREF or IIG, somewhere? (Sandia /Los Alamos?)Why do you try to change the subject with megabytes asnd megabytes of arrogant and condescending rants????**

**That, Mike, is the \$1,000,000 question!**

**Sincerely, Dave Thomas**

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