

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: March 28, 2004 10:05:03 AM PST
To: "Tim", randi@randi.org, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>, derek@iigwest.com, Plejarans_are_real@yahoogroups.com, skepTICMAG@aol.com
Subject: Re: Alloys

Hi Tim,

Actually, the skeptics have been providing an otherwise unattainable, ongoing backdrop of incompetency that has exponentially accelerated awareness of the case internationally. In the process they themselves have actually converted to our position some fence sitters, and other reasonably skeptical people, because, as the "official" representatives of the "professional skeptics", the transparency of their ineptitude, unprofessionalism and lack of ethics has allowed the sharp and clear credibility of the rather substantial case to shine through.

Now I agree with you about getting back to the basic questions so follow along with me as I clarify the matter. It seems that I was remiss in not giving you a chronological status of this situation as it regards to the proof issues. The current situation, one that has somehow caught your attention at a midstream point, is as follows.

In February 2001, I challenged Mr. Vaughn Rees, an investigator for the professional skeptics' organization, CFI West (in L.A.), to duplicate one of Meier's photos and one his film segments that he stated were an "easily duplicated hoax". *He accepted the challenge.* Only recently, after some national and international public humiliation following publication in the press and on the internet of their failure to do so, did CFI post some half-dozen photos of a model, declared (quite cleverly) that they had "duplicated the *effect*" of Meier's photos and tried to move on. I patiently pointed out to the somewhat frazzled Mr. Rees that the "effect" wasn't what was in question, we could probably get that from any number of sci-fi movies, none of which would qualify as duplicating Meier's photos either.

Point being here that Meier's photos were subject to enormously detailed, and expensive, professional analysis (I'll include some info at the end, the rest can be read for free at my site). The credentials of the facilities, personnel and equipment are beyond reproach, much the same as the individual you mention appears to be. Of course, the examination and evaluation of all of Meier's physical evidence was conducted by many such credentialed, qualified experts, not just one.

Now Mr. Rees, on behalf of CFI, has publicly refused, (on the Art Bell radio show in front of millions of people worldwide), and repeatedly privately refused to

submit their photos for/to the same exact kind of testing. This would settle the argument, professionally, as to whether they duplicated the photos. Keep in mind that they accepted the challenge and that the clear implications are that if they can't duplicate them then they aren't hoaxed and then all of the slander spewed forth by them, Randi the party magician and the rest of the lot, is actionable. They have considerable financial stakes involved here, from \$5,000 (CFI) to \$1,000,000 (Randi) plus what could be considerable legal damages. This isn't hyperbole, they are on record all over the place calling Meier a hoaxer and deriding him, attacking his character, motives, etc. Basically, they have dug themselves a hole from which extrication may be impossible. Unless, of course, they can prove their allegations and the photo challenge is the first, you might call it official, step in the process...one which they accepted.

Let's remember that the Meier case (*ongoing for 62 years*) is either the most important event in human history or the biggest, most impenetrable hoax. There is NO middle ground. So what is at stake here is either of earth-shaking importance to all humanity, or the opportunity to bust the credibility of a wily, one-armed, super-genius in a dozen discreet disciplines, which seemingly exceed his, or anyone else's, capabilities. I'm confident that you'd like to know for sure, and to be instrumental in resolving the matter to either result.

So, Tim, please understand the importance of a very stepwise procedure here. Nothing can be glossed over (try as the skeptics continue to do) and the focus cannot be suddenly shifted away to another matter UNTIL the photo proof issue is resolved. I am enlisting your support in that. I am now asking you to join me in *insisting* that the first phase of the challenge be completed and the photo authenticity/duplication issue be resolved according to the steps and standards by which Meier's were analyzed and judged to be authentic and not hoaxed in any way. This supports the overall fairness of the proof procedure. Please confirm that you'll support this as an impartial but interested party.

Now, regarding the metal analysis issue. If we can clear up the photo matter first we may well be able to move on to the metals.

Okay, please ask Dr. Bhadeshia if he would like a video copy (NTSC) of the metal analysis, done by Marcel Vogel of IBM, forwarded to him. I think this is an interim step that would be useful in familiarizing him with the work done to date. From this he may then offer some questions, criticisms, points (regarding future testing) he'd incorporate, etc. It would be no problem to have one made. Please have him email me personally with the request and I will facilitate it. (Before it slips my mind will you, please, enquire of the good professor of any qualified sound experts/facilities with which he is professionally acquainted or familiar regarding the new testing of the sounds (which can be done by anyone, at any time since the sounds are freely accessible. Thanks.)

Of course, the skeptics could still raise their little objections no matter the outcome of any further tests, or even regarding Dr. Bhadeshia's comments on the already performed procedures, should they be favorable.

But, as I mentioned before, let's support getting the first challenge completed. What's at stake here is primarily the credibility, integrity, reputation and continued viability of the "professional skeptics" (and some serious sums of money but that may be left to the courts to decide). Meier's credibility, or lack thereof, will consequently, be easily determined.

Here's the information I referred to:

Regarding how the scientific process works, examination of the evidence in the Meier case was done by renowned scientific experts from:

- IBM
- JPL
- USGS
- NASA
- Nippon TV
- Village Labs
- INTERREPO
- Micor Electric
- SCHORI REPROS
- McDonnell Douglas
- Excalibur Sound Studios
- Photo Color Studio of Zurich
- Naval Undersea Sound Center
- Director of Special Effects, Canadian Film Board
- Design Technology (holds contracts with NASA, Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the U. S. Navy, also do subcontracted work for General Dynamics Engineering)

Some of the equipment used in the analysis included:

Hamamatsu Systems
De Anza Systems
COMTAL
HELL Chromograph DC 300
Zeiss Microscope
YOOL Laser System
Simmons Gamma/Alpha Emission Tube
Grinnel Computer Graphics Terminal GMR-37
Tektronix Computer System 4081=peripherals
Fairchild CCD-2 Digital Camera
Singer zx-2 Digital Camera
CMX-700 & 340; Computer Video Graphics

Hello Michael

It seems you have been having problems with the sceptic community (British understatement).

I don't want to get involved in that side of things - it's not my argument and I don't really want to get bogged down in it, to be honest.

It seems to me that we need to get back to the basic questions in order to resolve this matter. These are -

There is a metallic sample in existence that has defied attempts to analyse it. Correct?

You believe it's source to be extraterrestrial, but not meteoric. Correct?

You have access to this sample. Correct?

If the answer to these questions is "yes" then I believe we may be in a position to proceed.

I suggest the tests are carried out by Harry Bhadeshia. He is Professor of Physical Metallurgy at Cambridge University. He holds a BSc from the City of London Polytechnic (1976) and a PhD from the University of Cambridge (1979). He is the author of the following -

"Bainite in Steels", Institute of Materials, London, 2001

"Worked Examples in the Geometry of Crystals", Institute of Materials, London, 2001

"Steels: Microstructure and Properties", R. W. K. Honeycombe and H.K.D.H. Bhadeshia, Butterworth Hienmann, Oxford

Professor Bhadeshia has contributed to about another dozen books on metallurgy. He is co-editor of "Science and Technology of Welding and Joining" with S. A. David and T. Debroy.

Recent papers include the following -

Nonuniform Kinetics, Pico Bainite, Nb precipitation, Welded Bainite, Fast Bainite, Mo precipitation, Creeping Austenite, Strong Bainite, V precipitation, Energy Efficiency, Cold Bainite, Sigma phase, TRIP Model, Hard Bainite, Laser Spots, TRIP-Assisted?, Chaotic Bainite, and Sensitisation.

He is currently Group Leader of the Phase Transformations & Complex Properties Research Group at the University of Cambridge.

Would I be right in thinking there can be no question as to the Professor's qualifications?

I have approached Harry Bhadeshia to see if he would, in principle, be interested in carrying out such an analysis. Before we go any further I would like your assurance that you are in a position to provide the sample.

If it is what you believe it to be, then of course it is a very important piece of metal indeed and we need to set up a system to get it to the lab safely and ensure traceability throughout the tests

I look forward to hearing from you.

Tim.

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

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

To: "Tim"

Sent: Saturday, March 27, 2004 9:10 PM

Subject: Re: Alloys

Dear Tim,

You're welcome, I await your reply.

Best,

MH

Dear Michael

Many thanks for your reply. It's going to take me a day or two to wade through it all, so please be patient! :-)

Regards

Tim