

**From:** Michael [mailto:michael@theyfly.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 02, 2004 11:48 PM  
**To:** Vaughn@cfiwest.org; James Underdown; SKEPTICMAG@aol.com;  
randi@randi.org  
**Subject:** Three more years?

Dear CFI West/IIG,

While it appears that I may have to wait at least another three years until your team of model makers, magicians, techno-wizards and elves comes up with your next attempt at "duplicating" Meier's evidence, I'll take this opportunity to clearly define what is actually required to substantiate your claims, and your obligations to also back up your financial offer for proof of the "paranormal". While scientists seek to find out what is, to find the truth, whatever it may be and wherever it may lead, professional skeptics demand that reality fit their preconceptions/beliefs and approach matters from that rather childish perspective and, in your case, also appear quite willing to attack and defame a person without feeling obliged to prove their accusations.

You repeatedly \*claim that there is "a huge body of evidence" disproving and invalidating Meier's photos and claims, as well as "compelling new evidence" of your own, yet you have failed to provide the substantiation and proof for your claims, slandering Meier in the process, something which apparently is permissible by your ethical standards as long as it serves your agenda.

The *fact* is that the evidence in the Meier case has been examined by a good number of respected scientific experts. The results of their research have, in part, already been made available to you. Unless you believe in grand and impenetrable conspiracies, lasting decades, you'll have to accept that the people involved were neither fools, shills nor incompetents. You have been invited, as long as three years ago, to duplicate the "easily duplicated hoax" but apparently didn't take the time to inform yourselves of a few key details, such as the fact that Meier's 35mm camera's focus was broken and permanently set on infinity, or that a substantial number of his photos, films and video involved close comparison to objects of known size. Then, of course, there are the unique details of the surfaces of Meier's UFOs, which can be seen even without magnification, as well as photos which were obviously taken from a position well above the ground of two other UFOs. Add to that the multiple UFOs and sequence shots and it's no wonder that you have submitted the most ambiguous, and easily discredited, photos, which hardly "duplicate" Meier's by any stretch of the imagination. And it is obvious that you don't wish to submit them to the same standards of

examination applied to Meier's.

There's an enormous difference between diligent, objective examination to evaluate the evidence, and proceeding from a haughty, presumptuous belief that you've caught a hoaxer and can dispense with scientific, as well as ethical, protocols and procedures in your zeal to expose him.

In addition to the already provided overview of the scientific experts who had examined Meier's evidence, there is a report on the sound analysis and a 23-page report on the photographic examinations. There is also a good deal of photographic analysis to be found at: <http://www.tjresearch.info/moretreet.htm> and at: <http://www.tjresearch.info/ufology.htm>

Then, of course, there is the higher standard of proof, the abundance of specific, prophetically accurate information provided to, and published by, Meier over a thirty-year period. Perhaps you wish to argue with *copyrighted, published* documents and books that establish that information was indeed given to him up to 25+ years before the mentioned events occurred. Go ahead, this is your chance to give it your best shot because, now that you've finally picked up the gauntlet, I have no intention of letting you put it down until you have retracted your accusations and slander, admitted your inability to disprove the genuineness of the case and paid Meier the money you claim to hold for just such proof. And that will also facilitate Mr. Amazing's having to turn over his \$1,000,000 or be revealed for, how shall I put it, a hoaxer and fraud.

If you were truly *scientists* devoted to finding the truth, instead of agenda-driven, cultic devotees invested in being right (and maintaining a rather small view of life and the universe), it wouldn't be all that hard for you to admit that you were wrong and incorporate what you've learned into your body of knowledge.

So:

- Please *promptly* produce the proof for your \*slanderous and defamatory statements.
- Subject your photos to the same standards of examination that Meier's were. (At your request, I will forward a copy of the 23-page report detailing the protocols and results.)
- Download and duplicate the sounds of the UFO. (Please only use synthesizers *after* you've attempted to duplicate them on a cassette machine, outdoors in an open field, with witnesses who will attest to the absence of any sound-generating equipment.)

- Please duplicate Meier's video where he pans across an open field (about 300') to the UFO hovering in front of the tree.

- Please duplicate Meier's 8mm films including the ones where the lights display on the UFO, the three UFOs hover and two disappear and the one where a UFO disappears from close view, reappears and one-half mile away and slowly returns to its original position. (I'm sure you're familiar with all of this since you have proof that the case is a hoax.)

- Please provide specific (names, dates, places) prophetic information in 10 different fields, i.e. sciences, world events, weather-environmental incidents, etc. that will occur in the next 12 months.

Rest assured that I will provide, *at no additional charge to you*, ongoing publicity regarding our correspondence and interactions. That includes my radio, TV and lecture appearances, as well as publication of my related articles.

Sincerely,

Michael Horn  
Authorized American Media Representative  
The Billy Meier Contacts  
[www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com)

\*"A proponent of the famous, but **repeatedly disproven Billy Meier UFO photos** has recently claimed that skeptics have proven that Meier's photos are actually legitimate. We beg to differ!"

"Second, there is a **huge body of evidence in skeptical literature that has invalidated Billy Meier's claims numerous times**. We now have **compelling new evidence** showing why Meier's photos cannot be taken seriously."

"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**." Please duplicate