

**From:** Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com>  
**Date:** January 26, 2008 10:27:42 PM PST  
**To:** derek@iigwest.com  
**Subject:** Whine on

Derek,

You really are a bit of a whiner. And apparently you didn't read the info on pages 428-447 of the Preliminary Investigation Report regarding the sounds, nor did you get it right with Vogel's analysis, for some strange reason. But more importantly, I wonder why you haven't addressed your very goofy "similar trees equals the same tree" theory, as well as why you haven't produced such a presumed model tree...in the past *seven years* since your esteemed organization first stuck its foot in its mouth. And all this from the kid who wants to lecture me on logical fallacies!

As for your appearance in the film, ironically I was the one who fought to keep it in. Jack thought that it was so weak that it discredited him as a filmmaker...and he's the skeptic in our partnership! My p.o.v. was that if we didn't keep it in, we'd be criticized for leaving out the skeptical viewpoint. He kept asking me why we didn't get a more qualified person to represent the skeptics and all I could answer him was that such was the "strength" of the skeptical position that no reputable scientist could be found to seriously criticize the Meier case. I also knew that if I busted you on your nonsense about "the same tree" and "model trees" that you wouldn't approve it for the film. So I bit my tongue and it actually worked out for the better, with you sitting there straight-faced trying to make a case for utter nonsense.

So, by all means whine away and make sufficient noise to propel people to look into the case and, inevitably, come to me with your brilliant "similar tree equals model tree" theory, now permanently immortalized in our film, and wherever you will so kindly display it. Do know that I will take especial delight in showcasing your carefully scripted, well rehearsed, illogical and utterly inane and incompetent premise, which implodes under the weight of its shear silliness and ill thought out amateurishness.

BTW, how do you conclude that we are, legally, in violation of our contract with you?

Take your time, write it out, practice and rehearse it and then send it to me...perhaps along with an explanation of your little tree theory, that you attempt to pass off as fact - to the unsuspecting. Oh, and in case you're a bit unclear about my responses to your presentation, since you scripted it, I was of course entitled to respond to it. After all, despite your particular delusions about having a 20-minute piece in a 94-minute film, well, it just don't work that way in real life.

MH