From: Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com> Date: March 22, 2008 10:57:23 AM PDT

To: Derek Bartholomaus <derek@iigwest.com>, "James Underdown

randi@randi.org" <jim@cfiwest.org>, jref@randi.org

Subject: Coming Attractions!

Mr. Maus,

It appears that you're really stumped by my response to your demand to have your image removed from my article at www.theyfly.com. I don't know why this is so difficult when all I requested was for you to show me where in the Agreement we are prohibited form using your image.

Apparently you are very much in a fog about what the Agreement states and what it means.

Allow, then, a little generosity on my part via a clear explanation. Let's start here, since we've already covered the "possible inclusion" clause:

"DB grants Producers the right to use DB's Interview in the Program. DB agrees that Producers may film, tape and photograph DB and record his voice and conversation solely as conducted during the Interview, provided however that DB shall have prior written approval over the final edit of the Interview to be embodied in the Program. Producers agree not to depict DB in any negative, harmful, derogatory or defamatory manner in the Program or otherwise."

MH: Surely you understand that this means that we can't use any content from you - in the Interview included in the Program - that we didn't obtain through the Interview process but use only use that content, from the Interview, to which you agree, as you did indeed agree when you signed off on it.

"Subject to DB's written approval of the Interview, Producers may use said Interview solely as embodied in the Program, which includes its dissemination, distribution, transmission and/or exploitation, by any existing and or future technology/format, on earth and the entire universe. This shall include but is not limited to DVD, VHS, TV, pay TV, rentals, downloads, theatrical, internet, etc."

MH: Contrary to your fuzzy misinterpretation of this clause, it means that we CAN indeed use your Interview, the one that you authorized us to include in the Program, and disseminate it through any and all means available. Obviously, there is no need, nor any provision requiring us, to obtain your permission each time we use your Interview for promotional purposes.

Though it may have been nice to do so, for heightened dramatic effect, I didn't use your Interview in my article or in my recent presentation. As already, patiently, explained, I used your post-film comments, which are fair game. And

none of my public presentations include any defamatory or derogatory content, though yours do about me on the internet.

Further, you are a public person and, as you've reminded us abundantly, in the entertainment industry no less, with a large presence on the internet, along with numerous photographs, of course. Coupled with the fact that "Interview" does not mean "photograph", you should have a clearer understanding of your lack of standing, as far as being perturbed about the use of your image, response to your publicly posted comments, etc. You certainly have zero legal grounds on which to object.

Also note that your threat against the good folks at the IUFOC to interfere with their absolute right to do business may indeed accelerate your frequently and fervently expressed desire to speak to "legal representatives" and give you the opportunity to bear considerable costs for the pleasure.

Now that I have given you the benefit of my time, and perhaps saved you a bit of money for not having to learn the preceding from your attorney, allow me to inform you of what you can now look forward to, i.e. the above touted Coming Attractions! in the subject line.

As you have also set the precedent of posting my personal emails to you, do know that I will be disseminating all of our correspondence, including your legal threats, etc. and to a much broader audience. Perhaps people will then discover, and encourage you to pursue, your real areas of expertise, i.e. correlating the relationships between the social consequences of conservative vs. liberal political

PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION
DEATHS DURING CONSERVATIVE
PRESIDENCIES and CONSERVATIVE
STATES HAVE MORE HOUSING UNITS
WHICH ARE VACANT FOR RENT THAN
LIBERAL STATES.

(Readers, please see: http://homepage.mac.com/derekcb art/iblog/C993237955/index.html)

No wonder CFI-West/IIG chose a rational, objective scientist such as yourself to be the Lead Case Investigator in its campaign to discredit the Meier case, as opposed, of course, to actually utilizing competent, credible and objective personnel and procedures to discover what the truth of the matter is, if indeed such was important to them.

Be informed that I will indeed utilizing your interview, with all your own wonderfully illogical, silly, unsubstantiated and actually defamatory claims. (You certainly should have known the difference between stating things as facts and stating them as opinions. While it's too late now, such phrases as , "In my opinion...", "I can't say for certain but...", "It appears that..." and the one you should have been practicing in front of the mirror over and over, "I don't know." definitely come to mind.)

I will definitely tie it all in with promoting the film and drawing abundant attention to you, CFI-West, IIG and the entire skeptical contingent of "skeptical experts" who have had more than seven years to prepare a competent, substantiated, credible case against the evidence and Meier, if indeed one can be made. I will point out that you mention, some 17 times or so, "Meier and his followers", yet fail to provide one sentence, one word of proof for the repeated, innuendo laden, often prejudicial and pejorative tone of this statement.

And that's just the beginning.

You have become, and will be broadly available to be appreciated as, the Winner of the Best Backfire Job, Interminably Long Suffering Subject Award.

You have carried on this Mausquerade long enough for you and your associates to become deservedly faMaus...and so it shall be.