

From: "Michael Horn" <michael@andytheyfly.com>
Date: April 15, 2003 12:55:15 PM PDT
To: "Vaughn Rees" <vaughn@cfiwest.org>, <SKEPTICMAG@aol.com>, <randi@randi.org>
Subject: YOU'VE GOT TO BE KIDDING, RIGHT?

Vaughn,

Well, well, well. You were not shy about busting the guys on the UFO panel for their deception. But it looks like you can't take the heat...so why are you in the kitchen?

A few points for you:

1. You misunderstood (big surprise.) I said that I didn't NEED the photos or even the other hard evidence to conclude that the case was authentic. Though they DO establish it, it's the higher standard of proof that is irrefutable, irreproducible and unimpeachable. And please, don't speak about "no amount of evidence" to the contrary since you haven't provided anything except, fatuous, unsubstantiated OPINIONS and BELIEFS, just like the Mr. Amazing. And we all know that Mr. Shermer can only claim that children and elves with hubcaps, etc., etc.

2. No you didn't. You told me, in February of 2001, that you had a 35mm camera, would get an 8mm movie camera and show me how easily it was done. Remember you said the lights on the flanges of the UFO were scratched onto the film with a pin? By the way, how come you need a lab (after more than two years) to do what Meier did hundreds of times over without one? You might also remember that I invited you to use ANY technology available to you including computers, digital effects, Photo Shop, special effects, etc. I only asked that you be a sport about it and use one arm. That was in April of 2001. Now, for the record, I once again challenge you and the whole crew to show that his evidence is false. One way is to duplicate it with the same means he used to create it. That includes the still remaining physical evidence in the form of the sound recordings.

3. Whoa, boy! YOU CLAIMED that they were "easily duplicated hoaxes". So, unless your job description is defamer or slanderer you darn well better be able to prove YOUR claim. You boys don't seem to get that Meier has proved his over and over again. If he hasn't, please use a little more than hot air to demonstrate that it isn't so. A review of recent correspondence demonstrates that Mr. Amazing is running like hell from this encounter. Let's hope that you can make a better showing for your religious group than the high priest has. Of course now you're saying "probably" and "not necessarily be exact".

DO ANY OF YOU PEOPLE HAVE A NODDING ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE SCIENTIFIC

**METHOD OR DO YOU JUST FOCUS
ON BOGUS OFFERS, DEBUNKING SCHIZOPHRENICS AND DAZZLING LITTLE
CHILDREN
WITH PARLOR TRICKS?**

I have copied you on all material regarding our interaction and my critiquing of it. It is only now when the curtain's been pulled back to reveal the Wizards of Flaws for, ah let's say, far less than your group has portrayed yourselves to be that we're suddenly getting a little touchy.

Last but not least, I now request that you produce the proof for YOUR claims and charges or issue a PUBLIC retraction. We have abundant scientific proof that the case is authentic. If you provide a credible analysis and proof to the contrary it will be welcomed. You need to ask yourselves what you would LOSE by the case being authentic and what you would gain if it is. Instead of coming at things from a religious perspective where things have to fit your preconceived beliefs or they MUST be false, adopt a scientific perspective and observe, analyze and base your conclusions on what IS, not what you THINK it should be.

The ball is in your court.

Warm regards,

Michael Horn
www.andyettheyfly.com

Michael,

I would like to point out a couple of things.

1. At the Consciences Expo you made it quite clear that even if the photo's were duplicated it would not change your belief that Billy Meier had contact with beings not of this world. In other words no amount of evidence would be sufficient to change your beliefs on this matter. I suspect that even if Billy told you that he had hoaxed the whole thing, that you still would not be convinced.

2. I told you that I could not start on this project until we moved into our new facilities and that we had the photo lab in place. It is not in place yet because construction is not complete. You are more than welcome to come over and verify for yourself.

3. I am not obligated to disprove your claim, it is the responsibility of the claimant to prove the claim. I said that I could probably duplicate some of these but that it will not necessarily be exact. A statement to which you agreed.

I would strongly suggest that before you make statements to people on this matter that you contact me first to insure that the information reflect what I actually said.

Sincerely

Vaughn Rees