

From: Michael Horn <Michael@theyfly.com>
Date: January 23, 2008 10:39:49 PM PST
To: derek@iigwest.com
Cc: JOHN LEAR
Subject: **Bending the truth**

Hi Derek,

A little clarification since you're now, how shall I say it, bending the truth.
Regarding this:

As the skeptic interviewed for the DVD let me fill you in on a few things.

First, I was interviewed for 50 minutes and they used about 10 minutes. My original agreement with them was that the section you see in the special features was originally supposed to be included in the main film and then my full 25 minute presentation was to be used in the special features. Well, they cut me out of the main film and used that as the special feature. I had agreed on the editing of the piece as it exists because I was told that the complete interview would be included which would provide much more explanation on the topics discussed.

First, you are the ONLY person who insisted on making a scripted presentation rather than simply being interviewed. The painful truth of why your section wasn't

included in the main body of the film is that at the test screenings it was consistently judged as inept, illogical and neither complementary to the overall quality of the film...nor to you. So it's not just that Jack, the director, found it to be a potential embarrassment, a bad reflection on him as a filmmaker.

You might want to watch it very carefully again and notice how you make the brilliant jump from some "similarities" in some trees to stating that they are "the same tree". Several people also wondered why you didn't seem to notice the *dissimilarities* of the trees you were referring to. Exactly what brand of logic and/or scientific integrity were you demonstrating for us? Since when is similarity, partial similarity at that, the same as...the "same"? Another huge red flag was that you never actually showed the model tree, a model tree with a model UFO next to it, *any* model tree, etc. Is it really asking too much of you and your organization to put your money where your mouth is...after seven years? Why didn't you just ask Jeff Ritzmann to send you *one* photo of a model UFO next to a miniature tree that duplicates Meier's?

And of course you didn't mention that, contrary to your assertion that "only the hoaxer can say it's a hoax" CFI-West *did* in fact claim that it was an "easily duplicated hoax" and that they could duplicate Meier's photos *and* his films. Well, we know how that turned out...Randi sheepishly retracted his claim too, remember?

You'll also notice that, in the spirit of fairness, we used the therapist's potentially unflattering comments about people with delusional disorders, etc. We even

surrounded *me* with her statements so that people could reflect on and then and see how they applied, to me, to Meier, etc. And we would have been more than happy to use your "interview", had it had the authenticity (let alone the plain logic and intelligence) to represent the skeptical view very well, and you in particular.

I see that you are no stranger to distorting the truth to attempt to make yourself look good, though it didn't turn out that way:

Here are a couple of things to keep in mind about the DVD. They do present a lot of information that was new to me. Such as that when Billy was younger than 15 years old he was incarcerated in a youth prison for **attacking a woman.**

He didn't "attack" the woman, as you must surely know. What part of self-defense here don't you understand? And the fact that the man is fully open about his life, the highs and lows, shows that he is an honest person...as the NLP consultant also indicated.

If there had been *one* person, in all of the test screenings, who felt that you made any kind of a respectable case against Meier, we would have been *glad* to include it in the main body of the film. We put it in the special features (meaning we put it somewhere in the film) so as to present the best skeptical case against Meier. But the real problem is that your performance is what discredits you and

you may be the last to realize it but the skeptical challenge to the Meier case is over and you (and Ritzmann) have helped to put it to rest.

BTW, you are also quite in the minority, as the screenings also revealed, being unable to see that the UFO does indeed go partially behind the hill. Oh well.

And, returning to the first paragraph above, we said that the full interview might be included on a subsequent disk.

And I do hope that you have more to throw at the case...we have a bit more too that we'll be revealing next month.

MH

P.S. Here are some reviews of the film:

http://www.outtheretv.com/kates_column.cfm

<http://www.alienseekernews.com/writers/mystories/silent-revolution-truth-review.html>

<http://www.ufodigest.com/news/0108/silentrevolution.html>