

From: michael@theyfly.com
Date: February 25, 2008 1:06:35 PM PST
To: <derek@iigwest.com>
Subject: Nice goin' at
[http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread336632/pg1!](http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread336632/pg1)

Nice going Mr. Maus!

First of all, let me thank my many fans who only get to read my responses here. to the inane ranting on the ATS board which, by the way maintains its agenda of disinformation on the Meier case because of its own vested interests. Can you imagine what will happen to their credibility (literally dozens and dozens of pages attacking Meier and me) when the inescapable truth can no longer be...escaped from? Okay, and now back to the Mausmeister.

You contacted one of the forestry professors but...he doesn't want to talk about it. You, of course, misconstrued and misinterpreted what he said. Hey, can you blame him? The guy's into trees and had the courage to comment on some rather radical photos with a big, unknown object right next to a big - known - tree. And now we have the junior Sherlock Holmes here wanting to give him some unwanted publicity. If you'd have, dare I suggest it again, thought it through, you'd have realized that not only didn't Prof. Deardorff make up the comments ascribed to the six forestry experts, he has the electronic correspondence from them. And, while they may be less than delighted to become associated with a UFO case, to the best of my knowledge none of them have reversed their opinions and said that the trees are indeed NOT full-grown, mature trees but model trees, as in the now worldwide faMaus "similar model trees are the same model tree" proclamation of our friendly, intrepid skeptical bungler here.

But the Uncharted Territory stuff is...great, thanks!

The first comments by Marc Weigart - and I am VERY surprised that the Mauster logician didn't immediately notice this - are understandable and common to many people BUT...erroneous.

I shall explain. While many people speak about the UFOs that Meier photographed, filmed and videotaped as "looking like something from the 1950s sci-fi programs, etc.", what they fail to have computed is the following.

The basic ideas for the disk-shaped UFOs came from human observations - spanning thousands of years - and made memorable by such things as Kenneth Arnold's comments, Roswell reports, fly-overs of the U.S. capitol, etc. So - and please follow along here - the so-called 1950s looking UFOs were really based on objects which, since they've been reported for so long, are based on objects that are more likely what to us is the FUTURE development of space craft,

despite the fanciful versions seen in more contemporary films, etc.

To be clear then, it is a logical error and one that is further exposed when one refers to many of the actual, seminal space sci-fi TV shows of the early 1950s, i.e. Captain Video, Buck Rogers, Flash Gordon, etc. For what they based their version of spacecraft on was nothing even remotely resembling disk-shaped craft, let alone (and contrary to Marc's memory of the Meier photos) the actually rather detailed UFOs in Meier's - still irreproducible - evidence.

Now, on to Marc's more specific comments:

"But, to reflect on the statement that's in the film, I also remember seeing a shot on the Super8 reel that showed a UFO circling around a fairly tall tree. According to that shot, we said that we can't conclusively say whether it's real or not, but it seemed impossible to stage that kind of a shot with a miniature (it would have to be hanging on a very tall crane, with wires - but even then the movements would be hard to achieve.) So, yes, in regards to that shot, we mentioned that we could definitely do it today with CG, but at the time these were supposedly shot - it would have been very hard, probably even impossible, to fake this kind of shot." This statement alone shows the difficulty one will have in simply saying that the UFOs must not be real. Heck, if they're not models or special effects, then what are they?

Now I know that in your usual quaint way you'd like this to appear to be some kind of, what, rebuttal to what we've said. But here you have the statement of a super high-level special effects person telling you that a crane would be necessary, etc. and that it would have been "probably even impossible". Are we still talking about the one-armed Swiss man who's still at the center of this controversy?

Now I've sent Marc and Volker a copy of the film (BTW, thanks for all the promotion that you're doing on our behalf, Mr. Maus, it does help) so I have a little suggestion here. Why not ask them about the UFO above Meier's head, the UFO partially dipping behind the hill and, of course, the three UFOs hovering (with at least one of them rotating)...and of course the WCUFO video?

Wouldn't it be neat to see what they have to say, especially considering their comments to you so far? Of course it would, so go for it! Oh yeah, I made notes about what was said after the original meeting but I doubt that they did. I'm sure it wasn't as important to them as it was to me, so a difference in recollection is understandable. But here we are now, with all the growing focus worldwide on the Meier case...and one little guy who may now be considering un-growing a beard to disguise himself, since the plain silliness and ineptitude of his presentation can't be disguised.

And I see that Bonsai Ritzmann is at it again with his "guitar amp" theory. Perhaps the worst part of the whole mess he's in is that it flies in the face of all the facts...as well as nearly 20 witnesses (including plain clothes policemen) to the recordings (events). A strange kind of arrogance there, I wonder if he thinks that the Swiss are a bunch of unsophisticated, knuckle-dragging, country bumpkins. People came from miles around because the sounds were so loud and they found what...Billy Meier playing air guitar, with one hand, through a guitar amp plugged into a tree?

And the sound engineers at three studios were hardly prior "believers" in the case. what kind of pain-killers is the Ritz on, anyway?

BTW, how come no one here has bothered to think about this. If special effects experts like Marc and Volker are saying what they've said, indicating that this is some kind of near impossible feat, and we're only speaking about their looking at one film so far, and if other people are accusing Meier of being in it for the money (however he did it) and if the Swiss are KNOWN to be among the most financially savvy people in the world - how come Meier's never made a career of it, which would be enormously lucrative, say as the third partner at UC?

And no, so far no one's contacted me to scold me for reporting what they are quoted as saying. Hey, I've got an idea, since you're into, er, investigation. Why not contact the witnesses in the film who spoke about their own experiences and see if they'll retract them because you're squirming in discomfort?

Ah yes, forever immortalized (I know it's redundant) as Mr. Similar-Means-The - Same.