

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>

Date: March 13, 2004 3:34:46 PM PST

To: Plejarans_are_real@yahoo.com, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, randi@randi.org, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

Subject: Re: [Plejarans_are_real] Dear Micheal Horn this is a Slandering if TRUTH here in Brazil by Pseudo Ufologists and Fools

Hi JP & Jim,

I really like what you guys have brought to the discussion here. I should add, regarding what CFI wasn't informed about, that it was also their responsibility, as good scientists trying to reproduce evidence, to inquire as to the parameters and details of the entire situation. Frankly, I hadn't recalled all of this info because, though I'd probably read it in Wendelle's book, I haven't had that book in my possession for a long time.

I think that if the skeptics have any personal and/or professional integrity at all they'll have to, at the very, very least, retract their claims that Meier hoaxed the photos (and other evidence) and admit, as *good scientists* would, that they simply *don't yet know* what they're dealing with. Such a genuine, honest admission would certainly elicit more respect from me and from the ever-growing ranks of intelligent people who look at the preponderance of overwhelmingly compelling evidence of authenticity and are objective and intelligent enough to see it for what it is.

Sure, I might miss having some adversaries whose main function has been to help propel the case into public awareness through controversy but, as every human knows, we *all* play the fool sometimes. Wisdom is gained by knowing when the play is over and finding a new role.

MH

Hi JP,

One basic problem with the CFI-West approach is that they have not done any homework to learn what sort of tests were made previously, in particular by Wendelle Stevens. They first need to learn of Stevens' conclusions and then postulate some thing poorly done there and proceed to do it right if they can. Stevens used the same make of camera (Olympus 35 ECR, focal length 42mm) as Meier's and took lots of photos of an 18" model suspended by a monofilament line with various settings of camera focus and shutter speed. His conclusion was that they could not successfully balance the focus between the object [model] and horizon. "When we focussed on the object 30 to 40 feet away, the horizon was badly out of focus. When we focussed on the horizon, the object went out of focus. When we increased the distance the suspension pole came into view." This is because Meier's camera was

stuck on a focus setting just barely short of infinity, and as far as we know, he used only one aperture setting of f-2.8. It's essential that the film of type available in 1975-76 be used in any test, along with the 2.8 f-stop setting, because with today's "faster" films, the aperture can be closed down more, resulting in greater depth of field. And depth of field is what it's all about -- trying to get a rather close-up model to be in the same good focus as background that's hundreds of feet away. The film Meier used was 24 x 35mm 18 DIN (or 50 ASA) of Kodak or Agfa Perutz (Stevens, UFO Contact from the Pleiades: A Preliminary Investigation Report, 1982, pp. 290, 400; Meier, Verzeichnis, p. 3).

Unfortunately, CFI-West wasn't informed of any of this, and the proper requirements weren't laid down, in case they wish to go do any testing as thorough as what Stevens did. Unless they use the right camera, camera settings and film, all bets should be off. There still is uncertainty as to whether Meier used a shutter speed of 1/125 or 1/100 sec, or ever altered it.

I do think CFI-West probably used a film camera, not digital, since Stevens also found that the monofilament line he suspended the model by didn't show up in his test photos, and with a model the maximum reflected light will at least be located in the right spot, and the dark shaded underside. However, Stevens also noticed that in the model tests, the model's edges showed up too distinctly when it was in focus, since the light hadn't traveled through very much diffracting atmosphere in reaching the camera.

Jim

Hi Jim,

Thanks for the detail...

It is always amazing (& humbling) for me personally, when i see the quantity, quality and depth of the analysis you "senior" guys have gone through on this stuff already... !!

**Just a further thought... (i might be barking up another wrong tree again!!)
But here goes...**

Only for the purposes of "debate" or a "tactic/standpoint" perhaps useful in the future:

**If one took the standpoint that these (hoaxed) pictures are in fact "real".... and that the originators need to prove these are in fact hoaxes. Otherwise, by their own photographs, they have demonstrated Beamships actually exist !!!
(Of course, this "standpoint" is purely conjectural... only useful for "debate" ...)**

Once they prove their own photographs are fraudulent, they would then need to then produce a "better series".

Let them use 2nd generation "contact negatives" ... even.

(It is THEIR claim that they can produce photographs equal to the ENTIRE MEIER series !!)

Eventually, at great expense, photographs will be produced, which would NOT be detectable as frauds and yet clearly claimed as such.

The entire point here is... is that eventually in our distant future, (as the "skepic's art" & general technology improves), whether these images were produced fraudulently, or by actual Beamship images, will NOT be provable.

The skeptics analysis of Meier photographs to prove fraudulence, will become totally worthless... based on their own efforts and analysis.

(They won't be able to prove their own photographs are frauds, any more than they'll be able to prove Meier's are frauds.)

One big chess game... public debates, tactics, counter-tactics etc. which will probably extend into the very distant future.

Makes me wonder what types of "photographic proof" debates/logic we'll be involved with, in our future lifetimes.

Regards,
JP

[Non-text portions of this message have been removed]

For more detailed Informations 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 Yet They Fly"
<http://www.theyfly.com/>

The most complete and detailed study on Talmud of Jmmanuel: Dr. Jim Deardorff's TJ website: <http://www.proaxis.com/~deardorj/>
and bookmark its newer address: <http://www.tjresearch.info>
Learn more about Creational 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. Olivieri

on January 3/10/2004

Thank you for your membership.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Plejarans_are_real/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

Plejarans_are_real-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:

<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>