

**From:** Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com>

**Date:** July 10, 2008 9:40:09 AM PDT

**To:** Derek Bartholomaus <derek@iigwest.com>, "James Underdown  
randi@randi.org" <jim@cfiwest.org>, jref@randi.org

**Subject: Regarding the film clip and Meier's latest scientific confirmation**

Derek,

You are now aware, based on information that I've shared with you, of the fact that the film segment of the UFO that you discussed in the Special Features section could not have possibly been hoaxed. Of course, if you still disagree with that, now is the time to make your case on it, as I am going to be publicly discussing that quite a bit.

You also are now aware of Meier's information, published almost three years ago, that was just corroborated by scientists who carefully examined the crystal skulls. I would think that, if you and your organization operate from a place of integrity, both that corroboration and the information surrounding the 5,100 year-old man, which Meier preemptively published up to 10 years in advance of "official" discovery, qualify as meeting any "paranormal" or "psychic" challenge you could imagine, and thereby any financial prize associated with it.

However, since neither Meier nor FIGU operate as profit-making entities, I think that I can accurately state that such prize money as actually exists should go to a charity that they would designate. Of course, if you still think that such scientific corroboration doesn't meet the most stringent, honest and obvious standards, you can inform me.

Now, since I've had an inordinate amount of fun at the expense of your organization and you, largely due to your own stubbornness, denial based pre-judgments and faulty research, I sincerely extend this offer to you as follows.

Please acknowledge that your findings and conclusions were again (as in the model tree argument) incorrect, or provide your proof of any hoaxing in the film clip, should you actually have any, and please provide any legitimate reason why Meier's latest, dated, published evidence of specific foreknowledge of an only recently scientifically determined finding doesn't win your prize.

My real purpose isn't to maintain a contentious debate or continue to publicly exploit your weak arguments. I'm interested in finding the truth. One of us is wrong in this matter. I think that it's time that, for the sake of the greater purpose, for the sake of the truth, that you respond and assist the truth to come forward.

I also request that you not only post this email on your site but actually respond to it with your answer.

MH

[www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com)