

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

**Date:** March 27, 2004 8:36:19 AM PST

**To:** [full name and email address removed because the individual wrote a private email to Mr. Horn and we do not feel it is appropriate to display such private information in public] James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>, derek@iigwest.com, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, randi@randi.org, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com

**Subject:** Re: Alloys

**Dear Tim,**

**Thank you very much for writing as you may be able to contribute enormously to the debate. First, I wish to clarify a few things and apologize for what will probably a very lengthy response to your important offer.**

**I am a researcher of the the case, known as the Billy Meier Contacts, not the person who has the metals or has had the UFO experiences. Now, on to the other points. I think you're going to see that the professional skeptics will attempt to find ways to prevent the acceptance of any legitimate tests. Let me explain. Based on the logic, if you can it that, of the skeptics nothing occurred or occurs unless they witness it. Now, after eliminating the first problem that comes to mind, i.e. the invalidation of reality as we know it, the skeptics claim some form of authority in determining what is and is not real, or paranormal, without any credentials, qualifications or authorization to do so. Compounding this absurdity is the fact that when presented with detailed results of tests done by qualified professionals, in accredited facilities, under strict protocols they, laughably, attempt to dismiss them!**

**Based on their rather convoluted "logic", one which you can count on them employing on any new tests, we would first have to go about "testing" the personnel, facilities and protocols, yes, even at Cambridge, and decide whether or not they/it met their (unqualified) criteria for accreditation, competency, etc. Likewise, assuming that the evidence passed all tests, they would then raise the bar again and say that the tests needed to be performed again, or were suspect for some other reason or, well, I think you see the problem. Now you and I are reasonable enough to accept that Cambridge and its faculty are doubtless qualified in whatever areas of expertise that they publicly present themselves to be.**

**If we can agree on that then we can, logically, proceed to the next step. So, follow along with me and let's see if we can actually utilize your connections.**

**Now, to elaborate, in order for all parties concerned to agree on the consistent criteria for determining if Cambridge is qualified to conduct those tests we would be looking at some of the following, and perhaps many other, considerations:**

- 1. Are the personnel qualified to perform such tests?**
- 2. What are their qualifications?**
- 3. From where did they obtain their expertise and training? (Logically, a whole subset of questions regarding the qualifications, accreditation of the facility - and the qualifications of the accrediting body and its personnel, etc.- must likewise be answered.)**
- 4. Are they currently working in their accredited field?**
- 5. Are they required by their accreditation to be re-qualified in their field of expertise at either regular or arbitrary intervals? If so, what are these**

requirements?

6. Are they considered currently in good standing in their profession?
7. Are there any known and/or pending complaints against them regarding their competency, objectivity, integrity, etc.?
8. Is the current level of their expertise sufficient for them to participate in the current testing?
9. Will their conclusions be subject to reasonable criticism based on one party or the other not being satisfied with those conclusions?
10. Would lack of satisfaction with those conclusions, by either party, or unrelated parties, now or in the future, in and of itself invalidate the conclusions and require that demands for new tests be conducted until the disapproving party or parties were satisfied? (This, of course, leads to the "finally proving the claim" never, in fact, being finally proved.)

(NOTE: Can you imagine if each of us had to apply all of these considerations to the work we do?)

Now, for the sake of your time, I won't enumerate all of the many other logical questions regarding the various catch 22s that the skeptics could and would throw in the mix. Lest you think that I am mistaken, or that all is lost here, I have some clarification and some good news here. As incredible as it may seem to you, not only were the people and facilities involved in the testing of Mr. Meier's (he's the alleged contactee) various physical evidence, the skeptics who want everything re-tested have never taken the time to familiarize themselves with the actual results of those tests or the credentials of the various personnel or the facilities. Instead, they have arrogantly, and immaturely, presumed that their own unauthorized, uncredentialed, unprofessional, admittedly biased (they refer to themselves as skeptics, not scientists) opinions and demands supersede any and all of the diligent scientific work that has preceded them.

So, the first thing that **MUST** be done is to return to something with which you are probably not familiar, as I presume you have somehow just heard about this matter and you "came in" on the metal sample aspect of it. The initial challenge with the skeptics started some three years ago and involves the duplication of photographs and films of UFOs taken by Mr. Meier. A Mr. Vaughn Rees of CFI-West, an L.A. based professional skeptics' organization, accepted the challenge to duplicate these items, which he said were "easily duplicated hoaxes". (I should add that Mr. Rees, and all of the other parties assisting or involved with him directly in this are, to the best of my knowledge, two-armed individuals while Mr. Meier is disabled and has only one arm.)

After three years, some half-dozen photos were posted by CFI along with their claim that they duplicated the "effect" of Mr. Meier's originals, a subtle and rather disingenuous distortion of the challenge to be sure. I pointed out to Mr. Rees, and his numerous cohorts, that the "effect" wasn't relevant because, if that had been the point, we could have just watched some sci-fi movies that have plenty of such "effects"! What Mr. Rees had done, or more to the point not done, which was indicative of what now is the hallmark of the unprofessionalism of this entire outfit of armchair "scientists", was to familiarize himself with the actual standards, protocols and parameters, as well as the qualifications of the personnel and the facilities (see my points above) who conducted the original, rather extensive and costly analysis of Mr. Meier's evidence in the first place.

Now, in light of such a monumental (and arrogant) oversight, the poor Mr. Rees and

company had no idea how silly they looked and how much credibility they had permanently flushed down the drain. I'm sure, with your association with Cambridge in mind, that you can appreciate the necessity of being familiar enough with established protocols for duplication and testing to be able to follow them and, should you be qualified to find flaws in the original procedures, personnel or facilities, to bring these to the attention of all concerned prior to proceeding.

In light of the actual, very specific and professionally done, photographic analysis having been available for the asking at any time during or after the three year period, it's beyond incredible that, not only was it never requested, it was never accepted when offered! How was Mr. Rees supposedly going to duplicate something when he didn't know, because of his self-inflicted ignorance, the true, in-depth details what he was trying to duplicate? I do hope you can appreciate the cavernous, subterranean depth of the incompetency, unprofessionalism and downright arrogance of these bumblers.

Now, even with all of this outrageous, childish and farcical nonsense, I have left the door open for the little band of "skeptics" to still get the photo analysis and subject their photos to the same standards of evaluation. Maybe they'll be just as good as Mr. Meier's. Who knows? We certainly can't know if Mr. Rees refuses to familiarize himself with and follow the protocols, as he did actually refuse, in front of millions of people, on international radio! I think I've been overly generous with these clowns but the offer is still on the table. As a matter of fact, the report on the photo analysis is posted on my site ([www.theyfly.com](http://www.theyfly.com)) for FREE so they can't scream that I'm trying to get rich off them or some equally stupid comment that they've already proved themselves to be quite capable of.

Talk about setting a trap and then being the one to walk into it, these poor guys really bit the big one.

Now, having already apologized for the length of this, I beg your further indulgence since finally having heard from someone who apparently is connected to personnel and facilities that conduct themselves according to professional standards is very heartening. So let me recap this aspect of the situation. There is a photo challenge accepted by CFI-West, a group who has been party to a rather vocal and completely unsubstantiated character attack on Mr. Meier for many, many years. They've never offered, nor felt compelled to present, one shred of proof to back up their defamatory claims against him. Now that they themselves accepted the challenge they will not be left off of the first hook so that they can try to wiggle off the second, third, etc. And by they I mean the entire pack of them, Mr. Rees, Mr. Underdown, Mr. Bartholomaus, Mr. Randi, Mr. Shermer, Sketpic magazine, etc.

In addition to their slander, and the consequences of it that may lie down the road, they also have financial offers (of suspect credibility) on the table for proof of the "paranormal". Despite a lot of attempts at sleight-of-hand conditions for proving if something is paranormal, it's obvious that there are objective standards which, assuming that they are making a credible offer, which I've already called into question, must be adhered to. In other words, if something is paranormal by definition then Randi and Rees, the team that's brought you this folly so far, must belly up to the bar and pay Mr. Meier, a prospect that is so unappealing to them that they will doubtless perform a disappearing act to avoid it.

So, while I unwaveringly hold their feet to the fire to live up to the challenge that THEY accepted, I will open the door for you to proceed with another test of physical

evidence in the case, an offer I've already made to these poor guys but they're so stuck with the photo challenge they can't see straight. I'll actually attempt to be brief here. There are sound recordings of the UFO, which constitute physical (and, we still claim, irreproducible) evidence. You can download them, and a report on their analysis, for FREE from my site. I will assume that Cambridge has sufficiently good sound studios or, at the very least, access to them where the sounds can be tested. The beauty of this is that, not only are they far less expensive to analyze, any number of professionals can simultaneously have free and open access to test and try to identify their source and also duplicate them.

Since the top sound studios have extremely extensive sound banks, identification of the sounds, should they be of terrestrial origins is virtually assured and, while it doesn't pertain to the authenticity of the photographic evidence, then Mr. Meier's hoaxing in the sound department could be clearly determined and he exposed for, however brilliantly, having fooled people with them for the past 24 years.

If you would like to contact the aforementioned professional skeptics/amateur scientists, I am including their email addresses above and am, therefore, also forwarding this to them. Perhaps you could encourage a little professionalism on the part of all of them regarding completing the photo challenge we agreed upon. They know by now that failing to either meet the challenge, or promptly pay up, is diminishing whatever already diluted credibility they once had.

I suggest that they may wish to now come out and loudly endorse homeopathy in order to claim that there is still a molecule of credibility floating somewhere in the ocean of their incompetence.

But I digress. Please, Tim, let me know your thoughts on all of this, and on your getting Cambridge involve in testing the sounds. Of course, the complete information regarding the photographic analysis and the current challenge may be presented to them as well. And, lastly, though I know you started there, we'll certainly discuss more about the metal samples after we wrap these items up.

Thanking you most graciously for your time,

Sincerely,

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

**Dear Mr Horn**

**I understand you have in your possession a sample of alloy you believe to be from another world.**

**Let us assume it is not a meteorite.**

**If it would be of assistance to you I can arrange to get the sample tested at Cambridge University Labs in England to ascertain the chemical makeup and origin.**

**Please email me with your suggestion of shipping it to this country.**

**Yours sincerely,**

**Tim [last name removed]**