

From: Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com>

Date: July 15, 2008 9:15:44 AM PDT

To: jeff@randi.org

Cc: "Derek Bartholomaus" <derek@iigwest.com>, "James Underdown
randi@randi.org" <jim@cfiwest.org>, jref@randi.org

Subject: Re: Correction and final request

What's that saying about one step forward two steps back? Oh well, my last email still expresses my preferred approach to all of this. Nonetheless, let me respond here.

With all due respect, I think that you should get very current on what actually *has* been claimed by your affiliated organizations. These weren't guesses about hubcaps, they were hte *best* arguments developed by CFI-West/IIG since February, 2001.

And you're apparently quite unaware of the totality of the evidence in the Meier case and the failure to debunk it, as well. Likewise, you're not aware of the huge body of written material that I have shown to be a major contributing factor to Meier's claims.

Rather than restate it all here, I really do suggest that you get informed about it. It's important because you do seem to be responding as a representative of JREF and appear to be very less well informed than Derek and his associates.

So, in keeping with my idealized version of how things could go here, I will refrain from any piling on, ridicule, etc., quite capable of it as I may be. Instead, I invite you to really get educated on the stte of this debate, from both sides, if you wish to.

I should state, in all fairness to you and your associates, that if you don't wish to explore the exchanges, evidence, arguments, etc. as they now exist, and still wish to offer opinions that reflect that you are uninformed, I reserve the right to make use of that in my own inimitable style.

I prefer the new direction though so, it's up to you.

MH

www.theyfly.com

Whoah! I didn't make the model claims, and I can't withdraw them. If I had to guess what the object was, I'd say it was a couple of hubcaps glued together. That's a guess, made on an impression. It's not a claim. Your lesson on how science isn't based on how things look is wasted on me.

I do NOT agree that the film wasn't a hoax. My GUESS is that they probably were, as there are so many faked UFO films from the 70's. I believe the most accurate position to take on these films is that they are "most likely faked."

Even if there was an object in the sky, and someone took a video of it.. that wouldn't lend any credence to the claim that they're extraterrestrial. Maybe they came from the sea? A cave? The future? Maybe they're a secret military project or some kid's backyard experiment.. why aren't you making those claims?

There is NO reason to say that these archives support claims of extraterrestrial contact. So why make that claim?

Jeff Wagg
JREF

On Tue, Jul 15, 2008 at 8:38 AM, Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com> wrote:
Jeff,

I shall take your comments as an admission that the model claim is withdrawn then, thank you.

Let's remember that we were dealing with Derek's (and CFI-West/IIG's) claims that they *are* models, that they *are* hoaxed, that they *are* faked, etc.

As for your last question, may I suggest that it's unscientific to base claims of hoax, or authenticity, on how we think something *looks* to us? And let's also remember that we're talking specifically here about an 8mm film, made in the mid 1970s, and that CFI-West/IIG and their representatives claimed was hoaxed.

Once we have all agreed, as it appears now to be the case, that they weren't hoaxed by any known, proven means, we can begin to discuss the other possibilities, evidence for them and ramifications thereof.

Best,

MH
www.theyfly.com

Michael, how does this help your cause? If there's not enough evidence to support the model claim, the model claim is suspect. It does nothing to lend

credence to your much more extraordinary claim that these objects are extraterrestrial.

Can you explain why real objects would look so damn fake in photographs?

Jeff Wagg
JREF

On Tue, Jul 15, 2008 at 8:11 AM, Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com> wrote:
To all concerned,

I misaddressed my response to Jeff, writing James instead, my apologies. The corrected version is below.

I have several upcoming radio shows (two this week) and, unless you present proof to the contrary, I will be stating that you have absolutely failed to be able to prove your claims regarding the model, it's means of suspension and movement, etc. I will also then publish an article to that effect.

However, I am again offering you the opportunity to speak up now and make your case, so that your position and response, evidence, etc. is absolutely clear. I think that it's quite reasonable to expect this after almost eight years.

MH
www.theyfly.com

.....
.....

Jeff,

Thanks for your response. The reason you may have received these emails, though I don't think I addressed them to you personally, is probably because of your connection to James Randi and CFI-West/IIG, all of whom have been outspoken critics of the Meier case. So they may have been forwarded to you from them if I didn't send them to you.

Now, since you do say that you know very little about the film, etc. I'll fill you in as to just what this is about.

The actual fact of the matter is that Derek Bartholomaus, and Vaughn Rees before him, have specifically stated that Meier hoaxed his UFO photos, films and

video evidence and did so using *models*. As a matter of fact, in the Special Features segment of our new film, The Silent Revolution of Truth, Derek clearly makes that claim.

Regarding this specific film segment, Derek focused on whether or not the UFO actually dipped partially behind the hillside and whether the film was cut at a certain point (both points which have been well rebutted by arguments such as are also presented at <http://www.tjresearch.info/bachtel.htm>) but he completely missed the obvious problems in asserting that the object was a model. To briefly touch upon those problems, let me point out that there are only two apparent means of manipulating a model in such a setting, i.e. from overhead suspension or by use of a line and pulley rig. Of course, if you wish to point out another means of such possible manipulation, and provide the evidence for its application in the film, I would be glad to consider it.

But staying focused on the fact that Derek has committed himself, and his organization as its authorized spokesman regarding the Meier case, it is his claims that need to be substantiated at this point, not Meier's or mine. As you mention the prior incorrect analysis that I have pointed out, and Derek has acknowledged, I must point out that this is no small matter, nor about "competitiveness or oneupmanship", as you call it. Meier's reputation is at stake, at the very least, and publicly proclaiming that he is a fraud and hoaxer, and claiming to show the evidence of that fraud when one clearly hasn't, is beyond irresponsible, as you well know.

You may also not know that Derek contacted the Academy Award-winning special effects experts who own Uncharted Territory in hopes that they would effectively support his hoax premise (which included claims that Meier used model trees as well as model UFOs). Instead, they said the following regarding <http://www.theyfly.com/photos/photos.htm#movie> (emphasis added): "But, to reflect on the statement that's in the film, I also remember seeing a shot on the Super8 reel that showed a UFO circling around a fairly tall tree. According to that shot, we said that we can't conclusively say whether it's real or not, but it *seemed impossible* to stage that kind of a shot with a miniature (it would have to be hanging on a very tall crane, with wires - but even then the movements would be *hard to achieve*.) So, yes, in regards to that shot, we mentioned that we could definitely do it today with CG, but at the time these were supposedly shot - it would have been *very hard, probably even impossible*, to fake this kind of shot."

Getting back to the two means of manipulating the UFO, I am well prepared to deal with either argument for hoaxing and it's only right that the evidence for such hoaxing, as publicly claimed by Derek, must now be put on the table. To be

perfectly clear, we are now dealing with his (and his organization's) claims and *their credibility*, not Meier's or mine. And, to use a common and fitting phrase, after all, we're not dealing with rocket science here, just with substantiation of someone's claim's - those of Derek Bartholomaus.

As for my agenda, yes, of course, I have one. I represent the Meier material and my "stake in this", as you put it, is indeed to find the truth, as you yourself seem to value. To further clarify my position, as you may not be aware of it, I do all of my research, writing, film producing, correspondence (including contentious exchanges), traveling, etc. solely on my own time and at my own expense, i.e. voluntarily, without any compensation from Meier, FIGU, etc. And I've been doing all of this long before I either had, or produced, anything on the case to sell or, in fact, before I contractually represented Meier.

Now, since you're honest enough to state that the objects in the film are "something we can't identify. Anything else is speculation," it should be pointed out that this makes them Unidentified Flying Objects. And, since Derek has firmly, publicly, committed himself and his organization to identifying them as models, contrary to your own opinion, I'm sure that you'll agree that it's not only appropriate of me to push for him to substantiate his claims but of the utmost importance that he do so, for the reputations of all concerned.

As mentioned before, these professional skeptics have had more than eight years to substantiate their claims. And, if the skeptics had indeed focused on, as you say, "discovering what is really in those films, if that's possible," instead of unfounded assumptions, derision and trying to prove it's all a hoax, we all might have learned a lot more.

As I said in the last line of the film, when asked what I would do if I found out that all of Meier's evidence was a hoax, "I'd just want to know how he did it." Well, Derek claims to *know* that, so it's well past the time that he shares that with all of us...or, once again, retracts his claims.

Sincerely,

Michael Horn
Authorized American Media Representative
The Billy Meier Contacts
www.theyfly.com

Producer /Writer
The Silent Revolution of Truth

Michael,

I don't know why you include me on these e-mails, and I know very little about the film involved. What little I did see looked very fake, but I've done no analysis so I don't make that claim. Even if the film is real, it's another thing entirely to suggest that the contents depict alien technology. If you're making that claim, the impetus is on you to back it up.

However, I must say that you come across as someone who has an agenda, and one that is not searching for the truth. You have a stake in this, and that's a bad place to be if it's the truth you're after.

I suggest you put away the competitiveness and oneupmanship, and instead concentrate on discovering what is really in those films, if that's possible. When you do this, I'm afraid the the most supportive conclusion you'll be able to reach is that they're something we can't identify. Anything else is speculation.

Even if the prior hoax analysis is wrong (not a claim I'm making), that doesn't make you right.

Jeff Wagg
JREF

On Sat, Jul 12, 2008 at 6:45 PM, Michael Horn <Michael@theyfly.com> wrote:
Derek,

Nine friends? Who are the other three?

Anyway, you and your associates have had ample time, almost eight years, to actually substantiate your, not so polite, charges that a very nice little old man, a personal friend of mine (one of the six I know of), has been doing dishonest things, hoaxing his evidence, leading a "cult", etc.

I was even nice enough to give you enough rope to hang your argument in our film, you know, you later referred to the "same tree equals model trees" fiasco that got you all gummed up as the weakest part of your presentation. And I even helped you by referring to Uncharted Territory, just so you could contact them and have them issue that coup de grace to your hoaxed film claims. Maybe it's because I'm so nice that I have so many friends, even ones I don't know about.

Well, the film clip (where you focus on whether it dipped behind the hill, whether the film was cut, etc.) is actually impossible to hoax, certainly with what is in evidence regarding Meier, his equipment, resources, etc.

Sooooo, since you fellas still think you have some ammo left, I now offer you the chance to present your best argument regarding your *model* theory - surely you have that together after eight years! Do feel free to contact UC, or any other FX experts you want, about it.

And excuuuuuuuse me if your little, petulant, "I'm only gonna do what I want to do when I want to do it and you can't make me do what I don't want to do when I don't want to do it because I can't do it anyway" tantrum is not playing well here in Hornville.

While the difference between you and me is that I don't want to be unfair to you, to in any way misrepresent your argument, etc., there comes a time when the final details, the evidence, substantiation and proof for your rather slanderous/libelous remarks need to be put on the table. You have attempted to sully a man's reputation and somehow you think that you're not to be held accountable for that, that you're not required to prove your claims.

Well you are required to present your evidence now, lest I be accused of picking on you guys unfairly and "misrepresenting" your position. BTW, there's an old saying, "no answer is also an answer".

Tick-tock, tick-tock (simulated sound effect, indicates time running out)...

MH

Michael,

Your self-imposed and arbitrary deadlines have never been a motivating factor for me. I will publish what I want to publish when I want to publish.

The world does not revolve around you. It never has and it never will. This inability of yours to understand this is but one of the many possible reasons that you apparently only have nine friends.

Good day.

-Derek

On Jul 12, 2008, at 1:03 PM, Michael Horn wrote:

Hi Derek,

Let's focus on the film segment and whether you wish to contest your de facto capitulation.

The rest is academic.

MH

Hello Michael.

Please keep in mind that neither you nor Billy Meier have ever applied for the Paranormal Challenge, so nothing that you say or do will ever entitle you to claim that you have "won" the Paranormal Challenge until you submit an application and a properly conducted test of paranormal abilities is successfully completed.

Sincerely,

Derek Bartholomaus

On Jul 12, 2008, at 8:45 AM, Michael Horn wrote:

Derek,

I am planning on posting an article regarding your and CFI-West/IIG's capitulation in the matter of the UFO on the hillside film clip taken by Meier.

I will be stating that you have failed to support your premise, with any evidence, that the object is a model and that it was somehow manipulated by Meier.

I will further be stating that it is virtually impossible, for a number of reasons, for the object to have been a model and that neither you nor anyone else in your organization have succeeded in even coming close to duplicating it.

And I will also state that, since you have clearly claimed that the object was a model and not a real, unknown flying object, not under the control of Meier or anyone else on earth, that it clearly fulfills your challenge regarding paranormal phenomena.

If there's anything incorrect in the above please notify me asap.

MH

www.theyfly.com

--

Jeff Wagg
General Manager
James Randi Educational Foundation
<http://www.randi.org>