

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

**Date:** February 27, 2004 4:29:34 PM PST

**To:** Derek Bartholomaus <derek@iigwest.com>, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, JREF <challenge@randi.org>, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>

**Subject:** Re: 02-27-04 Letter to Michael Horn

Dear Mr. Underdown,

First, let me deal with your last unsubstantiated statement. Please forward the "great weight of evidence against this case", presumably you have it though you've never presented it. Unless and until you do, I suggest that you retract such an accusation. I also noticed that CFI West offers a \$5,000 award for proof of the "paranormal" and I trust that, somewhere, you fellows have that money available. We'll get back to that.

Now, I'm all for clarity so let's be clear, taking pictures and posting them doesn't, in itself, confirm duplication. It's hardly moving any goal post to hold the standard by which Meier's photos were judged to be authentic, i.e. the detailed scientific examination of them. For your information, Mr. Rees pointed out the alternating display of two lights on the UFO on one of the 8mm film segments and declared that it was done simply by scratching the film negative, a claim that he hasn't backed up, of course. Why has it taken *all* you fellows three years to only come up with your nice little (model?) photos when the one-armed Meier, with no technology or accomplices, took *1,200* 35mm photos and eight 8mm film segments, in addition to the video, sound recordings and the metal samples? Again, it looks like the "great weight of evidence against this case" has a lot to compete with, doesn't it?

But I digress. Regarding duplication, trouble yourselves to get familiar with the scientific examinations already done on the physical evidence by, good golly, *real* scientists and credentialed experts. (Below I will include some commentaries by same.) Sorry if the negatives aren't still available for you but, unless you wish to impugn the credibility of all the experts who have examined the evidence, please be a little more mature and professional in meeting the challenge.

By the way, integrity demands consistency here so I expect that you have examined the negatives of virtually *all* photographic evidence even commonly accepted, including from the Mars missions, JPL, NASA, etc., etc., etc. You have, haven't you? I mean you're not taking NASA's word that the photos of Mars (let alone Venus, Jupiter, Saturn, Hubble, etc.) are genuine unless you've personally seen the *all* the negatives, right?

Please understand, your efforts, and excuses, are now being shared with an ever-growing audience, a sampling of whose comments were already forwarded to you. Because of my lecture in Laughlin for 650+ people, the article in the Sun, my original article on the Internet and the purchases of my new DVD (now worldwide), the fatuous claims of Johnny-come-lately pseudo-scientists are being scrutinized and revealed for

the empty-headed, unsubstantiated nonsense that they are, present company excluded I'm sure. Now that you wish to dodge the real duplication criteria, previously established, you also put yourself in the unenviable position of further reducing the credibility of any claims that Meier's photos were hoaxed since you state that photos, etc. can be easily faked and manipulated while still not proving that the case. Especially here, where you've not shown anything comparable to Meier's photos in detailed examination ( microscopic examination processed by laser scanning microdensitometer, film grain analysis, edge identification, edge enhancement, contrast enhancement, image enhancement, Z-scale contour and Z-scale density tests, spatial filtering, interferometer, infraredometer, etc.), nor, of course, his films or video, as already pointed out ad nauseum.

But you can still take a whack at the physical evidence, i.e. the sound recordings, because they are easily downloaded from [www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com) and, presumably, will be just as easily duplicated, by your trusty band of experts. To be clear, Meier made them outdoors, in front of 15 witnesses (including a plain clothes policeman), on a cassette recorder. Those are the details so go ahead. I've already told you enough about the sounds that it should be no problem for you to truly duplicate them, i.e. that they will match with the oscilloscopic and spectrum analyzation results on Meier's recordings.

Now, since you will experience happiness examining evidence that any UFO sighting is legitimate (what church do you guys belong to anyway?) I will reiterate that the *higher standard of proof* in the case is the abundant, specific and prophetically accurate scientific and world event-related information *published* by Meier years, and even decades, *before* "official" discovery and/or occurrence. Copyrighted, published documents constitute the legal proof here.

And, to save you a wee bit of trouble here, the documents published by Meier, as far back as 1975, are completely devoid of the to be expected volume of erroneous lucky guesses, the thought of which was probably already bubbling up in your minds as a "rational" explanation for the otherwise inexplicable accuracy of Meier's information. Fellows, it's quite simple, "they" told him the stuff and he *published* it.

You can research some of it for free at: [www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com) (see my Articles).

Now, while I expect more tap dancing from you regarding the photos, film, the video (try and duplicate that one!), the sounds and the metal samples, just what are you going to do to mark time on this? Come on, surprise me!

But getting back to your \$5,000 (and ultimately to Randi's \$1m) offer, you are going to have to put up that money because I am not slinking away quietly no matter how much shucking and jiving and whining you do about being held to *your* claims and word. You will also promptly put up the proof/substantiation regarding the evidence against Meier (and, for your own "credibility", I suggest you avoid the totally discredited, twice publicly

self-admitted liar, KKK).

I have more radio shows, lectures, etc. coming up and you can absolutely count on me increasing my emphasis on your pathetic showing and excuses. You are, unintentionally I'm sure, doing more to help promote the authenticity of the Meier case than I alone could hope to do. So I guess some thanks are in order.

Sincerely,

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

P.S. Please pay attention to what these experts had to say so you'll better understand what "duplicate" means.

Scientific Experts' Comments on Meier's Evidence

From Author Gary Kinder's "Open Letter to the UFO Community"

**David Froning:** At the time, Dr. Froning had already spent 25 years as an aeronautical engineer at McDonnell Douglas in highly classified military defense and, in 1979, became interested in Meier's accounts of Plejaren starship travel, which mentioned tachyon propulsion. Dr. Froning found Meier's account of tachyon propulsion (which was only beginning to be discussed by a very small and select group of theoretical physicists), and his calculations for above light speed travel to be amazing. In 1983, he was pursuing his Quantum Interstellar Ramjet idea (JBIS vol. 33, no. 7, July 1980; AIAA 81-1533, July 1981; IAF-85-492, October, 1985) and plugged in his Quantum Ramjet performance equations, assuming: a given starship density, vacuum energy conversion efficiency (in transforming positrons and electrons within the quantum vacuum into photons), and vacuum energy conversion scales of distance of the order of the Compton wavelength. The resulting vehicle acceleration enabled achievement of almost light speed in about 4.3 hours and deceleration from light speed in about 4.3 hours. Meier said that the elapsed time during the "hyperspace jump" took only several seconds. Thus, trip time between the Pleiades star cluster and Earth with Froning's slower-than-light Quantum Ramjet Drive plus a hypothetical tachyon drive would be 8.6 hours, which was within 20% of the Plejaren trip time reported by Meier. But, while Froning's calculations were based on many arbitrary assumptions, and in no way proved the truthfulness of Meier's account (since it was a theoretical system he was working on, only time will tell as to which are correct) Froning was somewhat startled that his arbitrary flight time computations were within 20% of the flight time mentioned by Meier. Regarding the Meier material, Dr. Froning also publicly stated that, "My colleagues and I may have made breakthroughs in our understanding of possibilities and ways for traveling faster than light from Billy Meier's accounts of his encounters with the Plejarens."

**Eric Eliason:** U.S. Geological Survey in Flagstaff, Arizona, created image-processing software so astrogeologists can analyze photographs of planets beamed back from space, spent two years producing the intricate radar map of cloud-covered Venus acquired by Pioneer 10: "In the photographs there were no sharp breaks where you could see it had been somehow artificially dubbed. And if that dubbing was registered in the film, the computer would have seen it. We didn't see anything."

**Robert Post:** JPL photo laboratory for 22 years, was the head of that lab in 1979, and oversaw the developing and printing of every photograph that came out of JPL at the time: "From a photography standpoint, you couldn't see anything that was fake about the Meier photos. That's what struck me. They looked like legitimate photographs. I thought, 'God, if this is real, this is going to be really something.'"

**Dr. Michael Malin:** Principal investigator for the Mars Orbiter Camera on NASA's Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft at Malin Space Science Systems (MSSS), San Diego, CA. Analyzed Meier's photographs in 1981: "I find the photographs themselves credible, they're good photographs. They appear to represent a real phenomenon. The story that some farmer in Switzerland is on a first name basis with dozens of aliens who come to visit him ... I find that incredible. But I find the photographs more credible. They're reasonable evidence of something. What that something is I don't know." Malin also said, "If the photographs are hoaxes then I am intrigued by the quality of the hoax. How did he do it? I'm always interested in seeing a master at work."

**Steve Ambrose:** Sound engineer for Stevie Wonder, inventor of the Micro Monitor radio set and speaker that fits inside Wonder's ear, analyzed the Meier sound recordings of one of the UFO's as it hovered above him. Not only was he unable to duplicate the sounds with synthesizers, he found they created totally unique patterns on a spectrum analyzer and on the oscilloscope. Another sound engineer named Nils Rognerud corroborated Ambrose's findings. Think about this for just a moment, these experts, using state-of-the-art equipment, were unable to duplicate the sounds and the unique patterns they generated.

**Wally Gentleman:** Director of Special Effects on the Canadian Film Board for ten years, director of special photographic effects for Stanley Kubrick's film 2001, had viewed Meier's 8mm film segments of the UFO's. Showed that the manpower and costs to fake the films were clearly beyond Meier's reach: "My greatest problem is that for anybody faking this" (referring to one of the photographs) "the shadow that is thrown onto that tree is correct. Therefore, if somebody is faking it they have an expert there. And being an expert myself, I know that that expert knowledge is very hard to come by. So I say, 'Well, is that expert knowledge there or isn't it there? Because if the expert knowledge isn't there, this has got to be real.'"

**Nippon TV:** Did their own examination and also came to the conclusion that there were no models, special effects or hoaxing involved in Meier's films.

**Marcel Vogel:** Research chemist for IBM for twenty-two years, held thirty-two patents, and invented the magnetic disk coating memory system still used in IBM disk memories. A specialist in the conversion of energy inside crystals, Vogel probed crystalline structures with the most complete optical microscopic equipment available in the world - a system of scanning electron microscopes costing \$250,000. Lieut. Col. Wendelle Stevens, USAF (Ret.): One of the original investigators in the Meier case. In 1979, he sent Vogel crystals and metal samples Meier had received from the Plejarens. Vogel reported, "When I touched the oxide with a stainless steel probe, red streaks appeared and the oxide coating disappeared. I just touched the metal like that, and it started to deoxidize and become a pure metal. I have never seen a phenomenon like that before." Of another metal sample containing nearly every element in the periodic table, Vogel stated, "Each pure element was bonded to each of the others, yet somehow retained its own identity." At 500 X magnification thulium was revealed. "Thulium exists only in minute amounts. It is exceedingly expensive, far beyond platinum, and rare to come by. Someone would have to have an extensive metallurgical knowledge even to be aware of a composition of this type", said Vogel. At 1600 X Vogel said, "A whole new world appears in the specimen. There are structures within structures - very unusual." At 2500 X he found that the sample was, "metal, but at the same time ... it is crystal!"

Vogel put the full weight of his expertise in these summary comments: "With any technology that I know of, we could not achieve this on this planet! ... And I think it is important that those of us who are in the scientific world sit down and do some serious study on these things instead of putting it off as people's imagination." Again, here is another top-level scientific specialist who is unable to duplicate the material presented to him by Meier.

February 27, 2004

Mr. Michael Horn  
P.O. Box 5163  
Playa Del Rey, California 90045  
michael@theyfly.com

Dear Mr. Horn,

I think it is important to recall what your exact challenge to the Center for Inquiry-West was. In your February 19, 2003, email to Mr. Vaughn Rees you stated:

"I first contacted you at CFI West and showed you the photographs and films of UFOs taken by Billy Meier in Switzerland. You may remember telling me then that they were 'easily duplicated hoaxes' and that you accepted, on behalf of CFI West, my invitation to duplicate one of each."

Then, in an email to Mr. James Randi on April 14, 2003, you stated:

"I challenged CFI West, the professional skeptics' cult with which you are associated, to duplicate ONE of Billy Meier's UFO photos and ONE of his film segments."

And, in your press release/email bulletin of December 5, 2003, you stated:

"Mr. Rees agreed to back up his claims by duplicating one of Meier's UFO photos along with the film segment."

So, let us be very clear. Your challenge to the Center for Inquiry-West was to duplicate one photograph and one movie. At our website, [www.iigwest.com/horn.test.html](http://www.iigwest.com/horn.test.html), we have duplicated seven photographs. We have actually duplicated more, but we have only posted seven. In time we may decide to put more examples on the webpage.

After the Independent Investigations Group and the Center for Inquiry-West's letter to you on February 11, 2004, you responded with a very different claim. In your February 15, 2004, email to us you state:

"the next step is for you to show that your hoaxed photos meet the same criteria on which Meier's claims of authenticity are based."

And, in your February 19, 2004, email you write:

"Sooooooooo [sic], now you just have to do the next step in the examination of your photos and show that they do indeed duplicate Meier's by meeting the above criteria."

To use a sports analogy, this is "moving the goalpost." Having successfully duplicated Billy Meier photographs you are now asking for an entirely different challenge than you previously requested.

You are also asking us to conduct tests on our photos without having examined Billy Meier's photos for ourselves. There have been several books and magazine articles

written about the Billy Meier photographs, but CFI-West and the IIG have never actually seen the original Billy Meier negatives. In order to accurately compare our UFO photos with Billy Meier's photos in the way you are suggesting we would need you to supply us with the original 35mm camera negatives of Billy Meier's photos, and specifically an entire roll of negatives from the first negative to the last negative without any gaps. You can choose which roll of camera negatives you want to provide, as long as it is a complete roll of original negatives.

We would also like to reiterate something that was in our February 11, 2004, press release. And that is "photographic evidence is very unreliable, as photos (and their close cousins videos and movies) can be easily faked and manipulated." Little relevant information can be gotten from the mere "testing" of photos, because the content of any picture, movie, or video can be so easily faked. We, and many others, have demonstrated this ad infinitum.

We are far more interested in investigating physical evidence. An extraterrestrial metal alloy that you claim to have from an alien spacecraft intrigues us. If you were to provide us with a small sample, approximately 10 to 15 grams, of this metal alloy for testing we would be more interested in examining that than comparing photographs. Please keep in mind that any sample you send to us will not be able to be returned to you since part of it would be destroyed by the examination itself. We wish it could be done another way, but this is the way the actual science of Mass Spectrometry works.

We will be happy to consider any physical evidence that supports the idea that the Billy Meier, or any other, UFO sighting is legitimate. However, the IIG will not spend a lot of time examining photographic evidence, or any other minutia which does not refute the great weight of evidence against this case.

Sincerely,

James Underdown  
Executive Director of CFI-West  
Chair of IIG  
Derek Bartholomaus  
IIG - Treasurer  
Lead Investigator – Michael Horn/Billy Meier Challenge  
<02-27-04 Michael Horn.pdf>