

From: Michael <michael@theyfly.com>

Date: April 3, 2004 2:34:33 PM PST

To: SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, derek@iigwest.com, randi@randi.org,
Vaughn@cfiwest.org, Plejarans_are_real@yahoogroups.com, James Underdown
<jim@cfiwest.org>

Subject: Regarding the Desperate Disclaimer

Regarding the Desperate Disclaimer on: <http://www.iigwest.com/horn.letters.html>

Due to the failure of CFI-West to duplicate the Meier photos (and their actual public refusal to have them tested in conformance to specific scientific standards), and having never, even after more than three years, submitted their version of Meier's "easily duplicated" film footage, and due to Randi's erroneous (and since retracted) claim that the Meier case is a hoax, these parties have now found it necessary to put "disclaimers" up to attempt to protect themselves from the obvious loss of their credibility and the inevitable transferring of financial awards to Mr. Meier. The following will address the six points they attempt to make:

1. CFI-West pronounced the evidence from Meier an "easily duplicated hoax". As with Randi's similar initial pronouncement (since retracted), such claims are legitimately taken to represent the professional opinion of the parties that have assumed a position of expertise regarding such matters, as both CFI-West and Randi have. Since both parties have protocols established for examining claims of the paranormal it is absolutely reasonable to assume that, having seen and passed judgment on the items in question, they have followed *their own protocols* in coming to such conclusions. And such claims as made by CFI-West and Randi must be seriously considered as having been made with due regard for the financial consequences, especially should such claims be inaccurate and false, as has already been shown in the case of CFI-West and admitted to in Randi's case. Further, regarding Randi, had he not initially claimed that the case was a hoax, or expressed no opinion, or even qualified his statement as being only an uninformed guess, there would be no discussion here and Randi would not have felt compelled to then retract his claim.
2. Since CFI-West has been well aware of the challenge that they accepted, it was incumbent upon them to exclude it from their offer since, at the time that they made their \$5,000 offer, they were still in the process of trying to meet the challenge, one which conforms exactly to the \$5,000 award, i.e. proof of the paranormal.
3. Again, CFI-West accepted the challenge based on their own expressed claim that the Meier case evidence was an "easily duplicated hoax". Also again, Randi concluded that it was a hoax one that "a child can see through". Both the actions and statements by CFI-West and Randi speak for themselves, i.e. the parties have indeed made claims and, in CFI-West's case, further affirmed such claims by accepting the challenge from Horn and attempting to duplicate the evidence, an attempt, as amply pointed out, that has failed and been further disgraced by Mr. Rees' unprecedented public refusal to submit his work for scientific evaluation according to the same standards as Meier's was.
4. The red herring here is the subtle attempt to switch the focus from "paranormal" to "extraterrestrial". Since the challenge regarding a hoax was accepted by CFI-West it can be safely assumed that they were clear as to what they were doing. Further, it is in fact the entire premise of such skeptics' organizations and the individuals involved that they can, indeed, absolutely (guaranteed by awards of one-million and five-thousand dollars), determine frauds and fakes and prove their claims, which they prejudicially base on their assumption that there

is no such evidence for the paranormal. It is also to be emphasized that said organizations and individuals are not comprised primarily of scientists but rather prominently feature magicians and illusionists who, by their very job description, are adept at creating and perceiving such illusions, tricks and hoaxes. Therefore, for such parties to plead that they could be tricked, especially by a resource-less, one-armed man with none of today's contemporary technology available to him at the time the evidence was made, is not only preposterous but completely humiliating to any such persons claiming to be qualified professionals specializing in just such areas of expertise. It is also completely unscientific, let alone unethical and slanderous, to make claims against a person's credibility without substantiating such claims. Therefore, since both parties made such claims, i.e. fraud, hoax, farce, etc. it is indeed demanded that they prove them, not the party submitting the evidence, which the skeptical parties have clearly, themselves, claimed to be hoaxed.

5. Another red herring from the fishery. Again, that professed professionals in the art of detecting fraud and hoax, who confidently claim that their de facto determinations against the existence of paranormal evidence are certain and secure enough to warrant their establishment of significant monetary prizes and awards, would attempt to dismiss their own failures and claims to the contrary is so unethical (as well as pathetic and humiliating) as to be beyond belief. Further, as regards the sound recordings, they were not only observed by independent parties, including an undercover policeman, they are still freely available for professional evaluation, and duplication, should the skeptical parties have the integrity and courage to test them. It must be remembered that a thing either is or isn't paranormal by definition and that is the matter under discussion. Should a thing be shown to be paranormal, by all reasonable and expert standards of examination and determination, then it is incumbent upon the skeptical parties to pay the claim. And, regarding the prophetic material, to attempt to argue with copyrighted documents and books bearing ISBN numbers, the content of the information of which is not only specifically accurate and devoid of random erroneous material but predates the actual "official" discoveries or occurrences by years or decades, is beyond disingenuous; it must be called for what it actually is, i.e. moronic, pathetic and completely devoid of ethical integrity.

6. New demands by unqualified, un-credentialed persons (who have already shown their unwillingness to abide by the terms of the challenges they already accepted and failed) who actually have the temerity and gall to attempt to belittle scientific experts who stand immeasurably far above them (as the pathetically foolish Randi did in attempting to demean Marcel Vogel, who at twelve years of age was already conducting sophisticated scientific experiments while little Randi was learning card tricks) are seen for what they really are, the frightened sleight-of-hand attempts to distract that are the specialty of the illusionist and magician but not that of the serious scientist and researcher.

7. I myself have already issued specific predictions observed by not only the skeptical "experts" but countless numbers of other people on the internet. I remain confident that my predictions will be shown to be completely accurate since they bear upon the credibility (or monumental lack thereof) of Randi, his organization and CFI-West and its personnel. If you are a betting person you can clean up on this one.

Michael Horn
Authorized American Media Representative (by contract)
The Billy Meier Contacts
www.theyfly.com