

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

**Date:** January 29, 2008 9:55:42 AM PST

**To:** derek@iigwest.com

**Subject: Response to:** <http://theparacast.com/forums/he-who-shall-not-be-named-alert-t-1540-3.html#pid20053>

Hi there,

Well, Derek, it seems like you still prefer the path of the cry baby to the path of mature, responsible...manly behavior. But since you wish to try to make your case only on forums where I can't respond directly (since they're the kind of cowards whose company you keep), I'll insert my comments to your latest post at <http://theparacast.com/forums/he-who-shall-not-be-named-alert-t-1540-3.html#pid20053> here:

**RE: he who shall not be named ALERT!!!**

Wow. He is just going apeshit over on that forum. 59 pages???

MH: Actually, there are hundreds of forum pages devoted to futile attacks on the case and me. A lot of trouble for a...hoax, no?

DB: He really seems to be completely unable to understand the english language at times, or at the very least comprehend what has been said. How many times is he going to repeat the same old canards?

MH: Understand the language, comprehend? Hey, I'm the guy who spoke extemporaneously (look it up) throughout the film. You're the bungler who scripted your comments and humiliated yourself in the process. As for "How many times, etc.?", well, um, until you have the guts to answer them. Clear enough?

DB: I will address one of his oft-repeated statements: "Well, Derek had since at least 2001 to prepare his best shot at the case and its evidence." This statement assumes that I have spent every waking day trying to figure out how to find flaws in the wonderful world of Billy Meier. Well, I haven't and I didn't. I don't care about the case. I only got involved in it because a former employee of CFI-West made the "easily reproducible hoax" statement and engaged in email correspondence with Horn without informing CFI-West or the IIG, so I had no choice but to step in and try to do damage control because no one, other than the person perpetrating it, can call an event a hoax. Once I worked out a contract for my appearance in the documentary I finally started to collate all of the various pieces of information that I had collected over the years. What I presented was the result of less than a couple of months of work.

MH: Let's see. A bit of passing the buck here, I'd say. I visited the CFI-West offices at least twice, had numerous phone calls with Vaughn Rees and engaged him on C2C, where Art Bell effectively threw him off the air for declining to have the CFI-West/IIG UFO model photos tested to the same standards Meier's were...and which authenticated his photos. Then you guys threw poor Vaughn overboard when you realized that it was no slam dunk, as you - up until recently - still erroneously presumed that it was.

DB: I will also agree with Horn that the

photograph section of the short version of my lecture was the weakest part of my presentation. That is why he is concentrating on that aspect in his recent postings.

MH: I wonder if I got this right. A presentation that, you claim, you took "less than a couple of months" to prepare. Really? The truth is that you've been in the loop on this - and commenting about it - since February, 2004:

[http://www.iigwest.com/investigations/meier/02\\_27\\_04\\_Michael\\_Horn.pdf](http://www.iigwest.com/investigations/meier/02_27_04_Michael_Horn.pdf)

Please note that within your response you claim to have "successfully duplicated Billy Meier's photographs". All of this reveals that your statement above, "I don't care about the case.", is hardly the fact of the matter.

DB: I had five topics to discuss and I wanted to keep my presentation to less than 25 minutes. The photographs section is no longer the weakest section thanks to the evidence that I have uncovered since being interviewed.

MH: Actually, that was not the case. We never granted you a specific time for your interview, nor did we expect that, instead of being actually interviewed, you would script a presentation. But since you did script one, and only presented exactly what you wanted to, what you were absolutely sure of...there are no excuses for such ineptitude. There

are, however, explanations, an entirely different matter. And one explanation is this. You're not a scientist, you're a skeptic who, by definition, approaches this matter with foregone conclusions and then tries to make them fit those conclusions, such as you did with your brilliantly bungled "similar trees equals same trees" fiasco. You try to state flimsy opinion as facts and you do this repeatedly.

And now, after some four years of having everything in the Meier case available for scrutiny and study, you've "uncovered" presumably new evidence that you think will redeem what someone of stature has already referred to as, "Scientifically speaking, he's an embarrassment." Well, do have a go at it. And may I add that you also bungled the sound, film and metal sections, which indeed are just as weak, and which I'll gladly, publicly point out after you make your next presentation on just why you think they're strong.

DB: I will be a guest on The Paracast in the near future and I am so happy to finally be able to discuss the case publicly. This, more than anything, is what has Horn so riled up at the moment. I've let him have a free reign for over a year and I don't need to be silent any longer.

MH: Well pardon me but you've been "able to discuss the case publicly" for as long as you wish. For the record, you declined my invitation to debate me on it or make a counter presentation...even at your facility. And need I really dignify that you've

"let" me to do anything?

DB: The most important thing though is that this case is about Billy Meier and not Michael Horn. Michael is merely a salesman for the case and having seen where he lives in an earlier cut of the film I think it is safe to say that he isn't doing nearly as well as we may have thought he was.

MH: "Merely a salesman"? Well then, what does that say about you and your entire crew, since I've made monkeys out of you guys (or did you just do that yourselves)? No, Derek, I'm an investigator and researcher with observational and objective abilities the likes of which I doubt that you'll ever develop.

After all, I also saw through your own cowardly masquerade without much difficulty, which you've now put on public display on a forum that excludes me, and which will yield you far different results than the reinforcement for your bruised ego, that you seek here, than you can imagine.

And, as Ronald Reagan once said, "There you go again!" Has it not occurred to you that you've assumed and presumed quite a bit? How do you KNOW where I live? Are you sure that I live where I am shown coming out of in the film? How do you know HOW I live, how WELL I do, etc.? Actually, this is simply more evidence, not only of your own ineptitude as a genuine researcher - but also plain evidence of your being a superficial snob...and

at such a young and inexperienced age. My, my.

I do want to thank you for the blow up of the "ring of fire" photo, however. If you actually did have the brains to see what's now even more clearly in front of your eyes, you might regret ever having provided the ammunition that I - being just a good and humble "salesman" - will unload on your "argument", publicly, at the IUFOC and elsewhere.

You really should consider another hobby, this one isn't your strong suit.

MH