

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

**Date:** March 13, 2004 9:15:35 PM PST

**To:** derek@iigwest.com, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com, randi@randi.org, plejarans\_are\_real@yahoo.com

**Subject: Re: 03-13-04 Letter to Michael Horn**

Dear Messrs. Underdown and Bartholomaus,

Please excuse my not getting back to you on this one sooner but the responses from the Art Bell and Mysteries of the Mind radio shows are *still* coming in, and I have had to take time out to answer people who think that Vaughn was a "plant", i.e. part of a plot to make the Meier case look even better than it does. Don't worry, I have assured such people that there was no conspiracy (you know how many people these days see conspiracies everywhere) and that Vaughn was making himself and CFI West look bad on his own, with no help or encouragement from me or anyone associated with the Meier Contacts. What a silly idea, isn't it?

Now, on with the matter at hand.

At my first interaction with CFI West in February 2001, I was informed that the photographs, and hence the case, were an "easily duplicated hoax". This is reiterated, along with a gratuitous and unsubstantiated attack on my motives, in your press release of March 3, 2004:

"CFI-West and the IIG suspect that any physical material he would provide for testing would show the Billy Meier case to be a hoax, and that Mr. Horn might lose income selling DVDs and giving lectures about the Billy Meier UFO claims."

Since CFI-West, which tries unsuccessfully to represent itself as a reputable and objective research organization, has already admitted its prejudice against the case, i.e. "...the IIG *suspect*..." it's easy to discern the actual intention and credibility of the organization, as is further reflected in the bogus challenge criteria below. Essentially, what you are trying to say is that if something isn't presented to you the way you like it (read: can debunk it) it isn't valid and, in effect, it doesn't exist and/or didn't occur. Because this position is so transparently preposterousness, disingenuous and illogical, it's clear that the so-called "Paranormal Challenge" is itself the real hoax, masquerading as it does as a real challenge.

Before going further in explaining what an obvious attempt at sleight of hand you're trying to pull off, let me assure you that likening the challenge to Mr. Amazing's equally fatuous one is neither wise nor credibility enhancing.

Any fair-minded and reasonable person will agree that the Meier case has already met and exceeded the criteria for meeting the term "paranormal", i.e. "unable to be explained in terms of scientific knowledge" (see: Marcel Vogel metal alloy analysis). A

thing either is or isn't paranormal by definition and *intellectual honesty* requires that superimposing one's own arbitrary requirements for proof is, at the very least, unethical and also completely unscientific.

Now, before you start sweating about cutting that check, let's just admit what you, I and everyone else already know: You have never had any intention of honoring that claim because your belief system is such that no such proof *could* exist and, therefore, you'll never have to make good on a claim. Additionally, you'll be the ones who can redefine, reinterpret and raise the bar to make sure that you never have to *honor* (important word here) the challenge.

Fundamentally, your challenge boils down to a ridiculous premise: if you didn't see it happen when and how you want it to, it didn't happen. This puts you on par with Holocaust deniers, the church in its dealings with Galileo and more than a few other travesties committed against truth and progress in human history by various revisionists, Luddites and fools. By your, do we dare call it, reasoning, if a UFO set down on the White House lawn and was filmed and witnessed around the world, it wouldn't meet your challenge criteria either. Apparently Hiroshima and Nagasaki weren't bombed either, much to the relief of those who still suffer from the consequences of radiation, I'm sure.

The fact that you refuse to confront the prophetic evidence in the case, which meets the legal standard of proof, i.e. copyrighted documentation that was published (years, even decades) before "official" discovery or occurrence, renders you not only completely devoid of credibility but poster boys for the new definition of disreputable, fraudulent impostors and hoaxers trying to mislead the public. This is only further reinforced by your avoidance of dealing scientifically with the sound evidence, the video, the metal samples and the films.

That you don't see how pathetic you, who have presented no credentials confirming expertise in *any* of these areas, are in comparison with the real experts who have examined and confirmed the authenticity and, to date, irreproducibility, of Meier's evidence, is ludicrous to the point of absurdity. Do any of you wish to challenge the credentials and conclusions of the scientific experts who troubled themselves to examine Meier's evidence? Unfortunately, you attempt to do so by making unfounded claims of hoax, a rather bold but ultimately painfully ineffectual bluff in the real world of scientific and professional standards.

Further, when you are graciously assisted and introduced to the full nature and extent of Meier's photographic evidence, and the detailed criteria applied in evaluating it, by James Deardorff, you remain sullen and, typically, non-responsive, trying to remain invisible like kids covering their heads with blankets hoping that the boogey man won't see them and will simply go away. In truth, you're naked poseurs to whom the olive branch of truth has long been held out, beckoning you to act with integrity and dignity

instead of like a boat load of clowns flailing about in a storm of their own making. Your boat has capsized long ago but, since you've been all wet for some time, you haven't noticed it. Now, with Vaughn's making a fool of himself and you to an international audience (numbering in the *millions*) you've all but gone down with the boat and who can save you?

We've tried but you keep reminding us that without your clumsy charade, your misrepresentation of objectivity, your phony challenges, etc. the Meier case wouldn't have had the necessary, though unfortunately incompetent, opposition that would be the catalyst for oh so many people waking up to its reality.

Sure, we all know that your and Randi's offers are as farcical as you are, that your representation of yourselves as capable professionals *qualified in any way* to evaluate, let alone pass judgment on, the authenticity of *any* aspect of the Meier case is equally preposterous. But your still insisting on continuing to offer your services as these inept bumblers has finally raised my suspicions, which brings me back to my opening paragraph in which I stated that some people thought Vaughn was a "plant" to make the Meier case look good.

I may have overlooked the real brilliance of your plan, i.e. giving support to the hardcore opponents of the case since they can now point out that, being the ineffectual and dishonest amateurs you are, CFI-West and company *never intended* to offer a real challenge to the case anyway! They may say that we invented or funded you, crediting us with both more ingenuity and resources at our disposal than we have, your earlier characterizations regarding the money machine that my DVDs and lectures must be notwithstanding. What a brilliant, cunning subterfuge, CFI-West diminishes its own credibility so badly that your value as real, qualified opponents of the case isn't taken seriously and is actually seen as a companion conspiracy to the case itself! Brilliant! What took me so long to get it?

So, undoubtedly you will continue to offer us your Fellini-esque silliness, wearing your masks and costumes and trying to sully us by association. But, lest you ultimately actually submit a bill (\$5,000 for your unsolicited services?) let me just go on record as saying that we have had no part in hiring or creating you, you are self-made fools.

And now, in light of the public reaction to Vaughn's/CFI-West's lack of credibility, I must formally withdraw my offer of March 8, 2004, suggesting that we take this show on the road. However, if you do wish to redeem yourselves, please refer me to *qualified, scientifically-based* skeptics with sufficient integrity to back up any offers or challenges...and to pay up when they've been met and/or exceeded.

Sincerely,

Michael Horn

Authorized American Media Representative  
The Billy Meier Contacts  
[www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com)

March 13, 2004

Mr. Michael Horn  
[michael@theyfly.com](mailto:michael@theyfly.com)

Dear Mr. Horn,

In your various correspondences with us, it appears that you are particularly interested in the \$5000 Paranormal Challenge that is offered by the IIG. Our challenge is much like that of the James Randi Educational Foundation (JREF), in that formal application is required before a claim is eligible for the prize. Any other demonstration or activity in which the IIG may engage is informal and the prize does not apply. As you have never applied to have the Billy Meier claims tested, your assertions of claim to the prize are invalid.

The basic rules and process for our challenge are similar to other Paranormal Challenges offered by similar groups around the world. The process can be summarized as follows:

The IIG offers a \$5000 prize to anyone who can show, under proper observing conditions, evidence of any paranormal, supernatural, or occult power or event. The IIG is involved in designing the test protocol, approving the conditions under which a test will take place, and in administering the actual test. All tests are designed with the participation and approval of the applicant. In most cases, the applicant will be asked to perform a relatively simple preliminary test of the claim, which if successful will be followed by the formal test for the awarding of the prize.

The Billy Meier photographs, sound recordings, and prophecies are not applicable for the test because they were produced neither within pre-arranged testing parameters nor under proper observing conditions as required by the rules of the challenge. Such forms of evidence would only be accepted if they were produced within testing protocols agreed upon by both the IIG and the prize applicant.

If you are interested in formally applying for our challenge and feel that you can provide us with a testable claim, feel free to contact us for an application. Without physical evidence for testing we are left with discussing opinions. You are of the opinion that the Billy Meier contacts are real, while we are of the opinion that they are not. In the absence of a testable claim, we will be forced to agree to disagree.

Sincerely,

James Underdown  
Executive Director of CFI-West  
Chair of IIG

Derek Bartholomaus  
IIG - Treasurer  
Lead Investigator – Michael Horn/Billy Meier Response

<03-13-04 Michael Horn.pdf>