

**From:** Michael <michael@theyfly.com>  
**Date:** March 15, 2004 12:26:53 PM PST  
**To:** "James Randi" <randi@randi.org>, derek@iigwest.com, James Underdown <jim@cfiwest.org>, Vaughn@cfiwest.org, SKEPTICMAG@aol.com  
**Subject: Re: [Plejarans\_are\_real] Dear Micheal Horn this is a Slandering if TRUTH here in Brazil by Pseudo Ufologists and Fools**

Well, Jimmie boy, looks like you're more comfortable with the sophistry, evasiveness and, basically, selective non-responsiveness that has become the hallmark of the "professional skeptics", as so ably and publicly demonstrated by Vaughn.

So, at the risk of dignifying what appears to be a drunken fit rather than a well-reasoned, scientifically and ethically based response, a couple of words for you before we send you back to doing parlor tricks for the kids.

Bottom line, obviously, *you're not a scientist* as your absolutely nonsensical comments clearly illustrate. You, typically, prefer to slander a man who was (he must have fooled IBM, how many patents have you "bought", idiot), your team of *incompetent nitwits* took *three years* to post some silly half-dozen (not 1,200) photos, which they won't even allow to be examined! **BOZO!** If your apparently pickled brain is too besotted to even ponder *how* Meier's production of evidence was possible, considering all the known data, then go back to the parlor tricks. Why didn't you read the comments by the specialists from **JPL, USGS, McDonnell Douglas**, etc. who didn't merely state that the no hoaxing was detected but that *real, unknown objects* were?

Why didn't you obtain the 23-page photographic analysis? Why didn't you respond to the sound analysis report, let alone try to duplicate those sounds instead of the flatulence that ushers forth from your numerous orifices? Scientific method, clown, scientific method. Oh, I forgot you're the only "expert" that anyone should pay attention to.

Who said polygraphs, they were PSE tests, you fool, and I doubt that you could pass one if all they asked you was your real name. And you, windbag and poseur, are *YOU* a metallurgist, photographic expert, film expert, video expert, sound engineer? In your world the tree doesn't make a sound when it's in the forest unless you're there to hear it. But then, with your credibility, who would believe you?

***The metal WAS shown to be other worldly***, you devious, lying, self-inflated fraud! Perhaps not as other world as the bottom of the barrel, transparently dishonest, deceptive, and previously unknown to this planet variety of con artist that you nakedly expose yourself to be.

**No, fool, the game will be played this way. In addition to the already EXPERTLY studied, examined, and validated physical evidence, we are in possession of copyrighted documents and books that were published *before* the specific events predicted in them occurred. We have *legal* proof of the "paranormal" so, since you mistook the velvet glove for weakness, as most inwardly terrified, pathetic little bully boys like you do, you will be held to your word to pay up.**

Your value, your *only* relevance to the debate amounts to providing the full-blown, best poster-boy example of an unscientific, cultic, true believer posing as a "scientist" to contrast with those who've taken the time to research, test and discover the truth. And, rather than slink away because your 15 minutes in the spotlight have long since passed, I encourage you and your happy little band of clueless, inept bumlbers to keep up the charade, even at the risk of people thinking *we* hired you to look stupid, unprofessional, unethical and disreputable, when in truth it's your charitable donation to the cause.

You, little fella, are one pathetic, feeble and completely out-of-your-league charlatan, which is why no reputable scientist, let alone any rational, thinking individual, would champion your silly nonsense for a second.

Dry out before you do your parlor tricks for the kids...and have a nice day,

Sincerely,

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

The "1,200 clear daytime photos" is not impressive, at all. If you can take one, you can take 1,200. Numbers prove nothing. If I lie once, the other 1,999 are just as easy for me.

Again, "no hoaxing detected" doesn't apply. No hoaxing was detected when I sent in a "paranormal" object to the JSPR years ago, but that was a fake....

The "lie detector" mention is farcical. Polygraphs simply don't work.

>Metal alloy samples provided for analysis by Meier to Marcel Vogel, former IBM research chemist, holder of 32 patents; stated that, with any technology available to him as a scientist neither he nor another metallurgist friend who examined the metals, could put it together, could come close to duplicating or reproducing<

Ah! Something we can examine! Where are these samples? Surely, if this statement is true, we have absolute, inarguable proof of other-worldly technology. (By the way, I knew Vogel, and he was not very smart. And what

does "holder of 32 patents" indicate? Anyone can get a patent, if they apply and pay the fees.)

But I wander. Where is the metal? If it can be shown to be other-worldly, the JREF million-dollar prize will be awarded.

I await that evidence.

(And I don't have the time to get into long, involved arguments over all this. Metal, or no more discussion, understood?)

## James Randi

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Michael [mailto:michael@theyfly.com]

**Sent:** Monday, March 15, 2004 1:34 PM

**To:** James Randi; Plejarans\_are\_real@yahoo.com; derek@iigwest.com; James Underdown; SKEPTICMAG@aol.com; Vaughn@cfiwest.org

**Subject:** Re: [Plejarans\_are\_real] Dear Micheal Horn this is a Slandering if TRUTH here in Brazil by Pseudo Ufologists and Fools

Well, James, I think we are now getting somewhere more productive in the tone and substance of the discourse. So let me respond to the points you've raised.

The first thing that has to be said is that the entire context, the entire body of evidence and the known circumstances in which it was produced and gathered, is of great importance in any real investigation. I'm sure that you'd agree that people's lives have been held in the balance, and ultimately decided, by the quality and quantity of evidence, the credibility and qualifications of those who've examined it, the skill with which the facts have been communicated and the ability and willingness of those who've judged all of the aforementioned to be both critical and objective in so doing.

In taking all of the factors into consideration, which in the Meier case involve no less than:

- 1,200 clear 35 mm daytime photos taken with a camera with specific damage/characteristics;  
a 23-page detailed report of scientific examination of photos, numerous qualified scientific experts who examined photos, no hoaxing detected, no photos submitted by other parties (including CFI-West) to date that meet scientific standards of examination and proof
- Eight 8mm film segments, of up to three craft at a time, with segments in which a craft appears and disappears each time within *one* frame, with no evidence of film tampering (examined by Nippon TV), segment in which three craft hover and two disappear, again no film tampering, segment in which craft is seen in one position then instantly appears approx. 1/2 mile away, goes **behind hill** (farther away from camera) then slowly, visibly traverses distance returning to original position (diminishing and

increasing in size appropriately to a real, large object and not a model, etc., segment in which craft at first appears "as if suspended by pendulum" but which, by the statements made by the skeptical accuser, Dr. Steven Novella (SN), actually disprove that theory as the following excerpts (full correspondence available) from my (MH) dialogue with Dr. Novella demonstrates:

SN: ....I superimposed multiple UFO images (careful to relate the positions to reference points in the frame) and then added lines to represent the apparent line of suspension (attached-Meier composite string). The lines merge far above the frame of the film. Also, they correlate fairly well, allowing for a movable point of suspension and some variability due to "wobbling" of the UFO.

**MH: Oh boy, thank you for confirming what I've said. The lines merge "far above" the frame of the film. The film is taken outdoors...Where is the guy holding the pole...in a friggin' blimp? Where, how high up, how'd he get there? Sorry, but you, my friend, are a rank amateur. That's right, there'd have to be an incredibly high, moving point of suspension (again, as I pointed out above), that would require not only the guy in the blimp but some pretty nifty accomplices coordinating precisely the multi-directional pulls and control of the object. A little evidence for that please!**

**I know, we can ask Rees to do it! He'll show us how easily duplicated the whole thing is and I'll sulk away, mad at being faked out by a one-armed farmer.**

SN:- The only known physical condition which can produce this movement is an object suspended from a string. Therefore, it is very reasonable to conclude that the UFO is indeed suspended from a string to a point well above the frame of the film.

**MH: Well, by golly, you're right. Unless of course there's really a full-sized object performing those maneuvers right there. That would make it another possibility, wouldn't it? And, since you still offer only conjecture (and a nice little illustration that proves my points more than your own) what we have here is an object moving in this fashion with no proof from you whatsoever (you were trying to prove your points, not just offer conjecture, right?) that it isn't a real full-sized object.**

SN:- You previously argued that because no string is apparent on the film this hypothesis is ruled out. I disagree. The distance, blurriness, and resolution of the film would likely not allow for the recording of a thin string. The film is certainly not of sufficient quality to rule out the presence of a string.

**MH: Once again, my thanks to you and all the coffee that you must have consumed to keep you up until you reached that conclusion: "The distance" says it all. The distance precludes the model, precludes the string. If it was a model filmed close up YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO SEE THE STRING(S)! If it was a model filmed in the distance, as you assume, IT WOULD BE TOO SMALL...unless you really think Meier lugged a 21 foot UFO model out there, hung it on a fishing pole (or from the blimp he was in) and shot the film with no one on Earth noticing this feat of magic. David Copperfield, you got nothin' on that one-armed farmer!**

**Lest this get glossed over, the distance (the distance that you finally acknowledged) precludes the model hypothesis. PERIOD. Boy, I'd love to see your photo album if your thinking is any indication of your actual abilities.**

- A remarkable, broad daylight video segment where Meier pans approximately 300' across a field to close up on a metallic object approximately 14' in diameter hovering in front of a tree

- 40-minute sound recordings of UFO, recorded outside, on cassette machines, in front of 15 witnesses, sounds reported as near-deafening at times, at least one machine reportedly destroyed by sounds; sounds examined at several professional facilities by expert sound engineers with state-of-the-art technology unavailable to the witnesses, detailed report shows 32 simultaneously occurring sounds spanning a very broad range, 24 detected in audible range, eight in inaudible range only detectable by oscilloscope and spectrum analyzers; unique, non-accidental, irreproducible characteristics noted in report

- Metal alloy samples provided for analysis by Meier to Marcel Vogel, former IBM research chemist, holder of 32 patents; stated that, with any technology available to him as a scientist neither he nor another metallurgist friend who examined the metals, could put it together, could come close to duplicating or reproducing

- Regarding the above, as noted there has been substantial, expert scientific examination and evaluation (a good deal of which can be sent to you at your request). No hoaxing, models, special effects, digital effects, collaborators, conspirators, financial or technological resources or assistance/assistants was found during the six-year investigation of the case.

By the way, let me also respond to the following:

Meier's photographs do nothing to establish the existence of UFOs. His evidence" – the photographs – are provocative, but nothing more. Proof that they are genuine, since (a) they were unwitnessed, (b) we have no record of how many other photos he took, (c) no other record of detection of UFOs at that same time and place exists, and (d) we cannot know how skilled he may be in photography, is still to be produced.

(a) There have been over 100 witnesses to the UFOs to date, of the 15 witnesses that the investigative put through lie detection tests, all passed and were deemed honest in affirming the reality of the UFOs and Meier's truthfulness as well; there are four other photographers, two years ago 17 people witnessed two ships broad daylight over the property in Switzerland, additional photos taken during 30-minute sighting (b) as explained, 1,200 were known, as I recall investigators presented Meier with fully loaded camera, films were turned over to developing lab, neither Meier (nor anyone else) ever had possession of film, nor equipment to develop it with) once it was turned over to lab, (c) again, over 100 witnesses, mainly in same area, photos with military jet attempting intercept, letters from people in different areas who reported same UFOs, (d) nor do we know how "skilled" he is at filmmaking, videography, special effects, digital effects, sound generation, sound recording, sound engineering, metallurgy, manufacturing of crystals, mass hypnosis, clairvoyance, etc.

Nor do we know how *silly* anyone would have to be to even attempt to make that argument about a relatively obscure, poor, one-armed man living in the boonies in Switzerland. Anyone with a fraction of those abilities would have long ago been making a fortune in Hollywood, and isn't that what everyone's accused Meier of "being in it for"? He's certainly not in it for the 19 (documented, i.e. witnessed) assassination attempts.

And that's the easy stuff.

•We, and *thousands* of other people, are in possession of dated, copyrighted documents and books published years (even decades) before the *specific*, prophetically accurate information contained within them occurred or was "officially" discovered. There exists no volume of erroneous prophetic material which would be expected in a case of coincidence or "lucky guessing". The books are published and information can neither be added nor subtracted to/from them. This meets a *legal standard of proof*. Even Art Bell, on my recent four-hour radio appearance, had to admit that he, too, since 2001, possessed one of the books with six, specific, sequential and only recently fulfilled predictions (originally made and published by Meier in 1995).

Randi, according to your "logic" Hiroshima and Nagasaki didn't happen, as a matter of fact...*nothing happened that you didn't witness* and then, *logically*, even if you did witness it, you'd have to dismiss it because eyewitness testimony isn't reliable!

Without *common sense, and intellectual honesty*, not only can there not be reasonable discourse, those who won't conform to those standards in the face of overwhelming evidence are simply in denial. And, in the process, you completely destroy your credibility and that of your organization and its positions.

The real problem, as I've stated before, is that you're neither applying scientific nor legal standards for proof. You're approaching the matter to *disprove it*, not to examine it objectively to discover, without prejudice, what the *truth* is. That's not only unscientific, it's dishonest and lacks integrity, which has become apparent to millions of people thanks to Vaughn Rees' delightfully unexpected buffoonery on the Art Bell show. And, for what it's worth, Art played a very convincing devil's advocate, many people who wrote me actually thought he was unduly hard...on me! I didn't. And he easily shot Vaughn down for his lack of willingness to conform to the same scientific standards to which the Meier material has already been subjected.

At the very least the abundance of congruent, consistent, still irreproducible physical evidence, coupled with the published prophetically accurate documentation, wins the case hands down on the basis of circumstantial evidence alone. I'd be glad to put that to the test if you're willing. I think it would make one hell of a "trial" and should be done as a broadcast to the nation and the world.

One further (and sincerely made) point. If you were completely let off the hook regarding the \$1,000,000 offer, and didn't have that lurking as a factor in your mind, if you were assured that no "I told you so ridicule" would be heaped on you and rather that you would be roundly applauded and embraced for your intellectual honesty and demonstration of strong character, might you not plainly admit that the most important event in human history has (despite its not conforming with anyone's preconceptions of how it was "supposed" to happen) already occurred?

I look forward to your answers and to continuing to elevate our discussion. I thank you for taking a large step in that direction.

Sincerely,

Michael Horn  
Authorized American Media Representative  
The Billy Meier Contacts

www.theyfly.com

Just for the record, I'll say:

Concerning the photographs of purported UFOs produced by Billy Meier in the mid-'70s, replication of those photos means little toward examining the claim, except that they can be replicated. If they are not properly replicated – and “Jim,” below, has a pretty good handle on what would be required to correctly do that – it merely means they have not yet been replicated, but does not speak at all to the question of whether or not they're faked photos.

At least, replication within already-outlined parameters would show that faking them by this means is possible, but would not show that Meier did it that way. I'm reminded of the circumstances surrounding my exact replication of the Geller phenomena at King's College, UK, in July of 1975. The five prominent scientists who witnessed that demonstration – one of them a Nobel Laureate for the discovery of the structure of DNA – stated that I had “demonstrated in a laboratory his ability to bend and break spoons and keys that we supplied. He caused bursts on a Geiger counter and made one of our spoons become flexible and finally break in two while one of us held it at each end. Then Mr. Randi caused a compass needle to deflect by about 15° and caused several watches to advance. We were made well aware in advance that Mr. Randi appeared before us as a conjuror, and we watched him closely, knowing that he was doing tricks. We gave him no advantage that might be given to a “sensitive.” After the performance, he revealed to us how some of these tricks had been done. We believe that in investigating phenomena of apparently paranormal nature a qualified conjuror must be closely involved.”

But – importantly – this in no way proved anything about Geller's performance except that it *could be replicated* by simple trickery!

Meier's photographs do nothing to establish the existence of UFOs. His evidence” – the photographs – are provocative, but nothing more. Proof that they are genuine, since (a) they were unwitnessed, (b) we have no record of how many other photos he took, (c) no other record of detection of UFOs at that same time and place exists, and (d) we cannot know how skilled he may be in photography, is still to be produced.

As with so many other claims of supernatural, paranormal, or extraterrestrial effects, the onus of proof is on the claimants, not on the skeptics. The skeptics make no claim except that the claimants' case is not proved.

James Randi

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Michael [mailto:michael@theyfly.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 13, 2004 6:35 PM

**To:** Plejarans\_are\_real@yahoogroups.com; derek@iigwest.com; Vaughn@cfiwest.org; SKEPTICMAG@aol.com; randi@randi.org; James Underdown

**Subject:** Re: [Plejarans\_are\_real] Dear Micheal Horn this is a Slandering if TRUTH here in Brazil by Pseudo Ufologists and Fools

Hi JP & Jim,

I really like what you guys have brought to the discussion here. I should add, regarding



what CFI wasn't informed about, that it was also their responsibility, as good scientists trying to reproduce evidence, to inquire as to the parameters and details of the entire situation. Frankly, I hadn't recalled all of this info because, though I'd probably read it in Wendelle's book, I haven't had that book in my possession for a long time.

I think that if the skeptics have any personal and/or professional integrity at all they'll have to, at the very, very least, retract their claims that Meier hoaxed the photos (and other evidence) and admit, as *good scientists* would, that they simply *don't yet know* what they're dealing with. Such a genuine, honest admission would certainly elicit more respect from me and from the ever-growing ranks of intelligent people who look at the preponderance of overwhelmingly compelling evidence of authenticity and are objective and intelligent enough to see it for what it is.

Sure, I might miss having some adversaries whose main function has been to help propel the case into public awareness through controversy but, as every human knows, we *all* play the fool sometimes. Wisdom is gained by knowing when the play is over and finding a new role.

MH

**Hi JP,**

**One basic problem with the CFI-West approach is that they have not done any homework to learn what sort of tests were made previously, in particular by Wendelle Stevens. They first need to learn of Stevens' conclusions and then postulate some thing poorly done there and proceed to do it right if they can. Stevens used the same make of camera (Olympus 35 ECR, focal length 42mm) as Meier's and took lots of photos of an 18" model suspended by a monofilament line with various settings of camera focus and shutter speed. His conclusion was that they could not successfully balance the focus between the object [model] and horizon. "When we focussed on the object 30 to 40 feet away, the horizon was badly out of focus. When we focussed on the horizon, the object went out of focus. When we increased the distance the suspension pole came into view." This is because Meier's camera was stuck on a focus setting just barely short of infinity, and as far as we know, he used only one aperture setting of f-2.8. It's essential that the film of type available in 1975-76 be used in any test, along with the 2.8 f-stop setting, because with today's "faster" films, the aperture can be closed down more, resulting in greater depth of field. And depth of field is what it's all about -- trying to get a rather close-up model to be in the same good focus as background that's hundreds of feet away. The film Meier used was 24 x 35mm 18 DIN (or 50 ASA) of Kodak or Agfa Perutz (Stevens, UFO Contact from the Pleiades: A Preliminary Investigation Report, 1982, pp. 290, 400; Meier, Verzeichnis, p. 3).**

**Unfortunately, CFI-West wasn't informed of any of this, and the proper requirements weren't laid down, in case they wish to go do any testing as thorough as what Stevens did. Unless they use the right camera, camera settings and film, all bets should be off. There still is uncertainty as to whether Meier used a shutter speed of 1/125 or 1/100 sec, or ever altered it.**

**I do think CFI-West probably used a film camera, not digital, since Stevens also found that the monofilament line he suspended the model by didn't show**



up in his test photos, and with a model the maximum reflected light will at least be located in the right spot, and the dark shaded underside. However, Stevens also noticed that in the model tests, the model's edges showed up too distinctly when it was in focus, since the light hadn't traveled through very much diffracting atmosphere in reaching the camera.

Jim

Hi Jim,

Thanks for the detail...

It is always amazing (& humbling) for me personally, when i see the quantity, quality and depth of the analysis you "senior" guys have gone through on this stuff already... !!

Just a further thought... (i might be barking up another wrong tree again!!)  
But here goes...

Only for the purposes of "debate" or a "tactic/standpoint" perhaps useful in the future:

If one took the standpoint that these (hoaxed) pictures are in fact "real".... and that the originators need to prove these are in fact hoaxes. Otherwise, by their own photographs, they have demonstrated Beamships actually exist !!!  
(Of course, this "standpoint" is purely conjectural... only useful for "debate" ...)

Once they prove their own photographs are fraudulent, they would then need to then produce a "better series".

Let them use 2nd generation "contact negatives" ... even.

(It is THEIR claim that they can produce photographs equal to the ENTIRE MEIER series !!)

Eventually, at great expense, photographs will be produced, which would NOT be detectable as frauds and yet clearly claimed as such.

The entire point here is... is that eventually in our distant future, (as the "skepic's art" & general technology improves), whether these images were produced fraudulently, or by actual Beamship images, will NOT be provable.

The skeptics analysis of Meier photographs to prove fraudulence, will become totally worthless... based on their own efforts and analysis.

(They won't be able to prove their own photographs are frauds, any more than they'll be able to prove Meier's are frauds.)

One big chess game... public debates, tactics, counter-tactics etc. which will probably extend into the very distant future.

Makes me wonder what types of "photographic proof" debates/logic we'll be involved with, in our future lifetimes.

Regards,  
JP

[Non-text portions of this message have been removed]

---

For more detailed Informations on Billy Meier Case please visit Official FIGU Website: <http://www.figu.org> (Switzerland)

\*\*\*\*\*

Figu Study Group Website in U.S.A  
<http://www.billymeier.com>

\*\*\*\*\*

Hans Georg Lanzendorfer's website in German Language: Billy Meier - neither a Guru nor a Great Master: Billy Meier - weder Guru noch grosser Meister:  
<http://www.lanzendorfer.ch/>

\*\*\*\*\*

For official and well detailed documentation of technical and true scientific analyses of real metallic samples and sounds visit Michael Horn's Website "And Yet They Fly"  
<http://www.theyfly.com/>

\*\*\*\*\*

The most complete and detailed study on Talmud of Jmmanuel: Dr. Jim Deardorff's TJ website: <http://www.proaxis.com/~deardorj/> and bookmark its newer address: <http://www.tjresearch.info>  
Learn more about Creational Laws here on this Webpage:  
<http://www.avilabooks.com/Jmmanuel1.htm>  
THE KEY SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF JMMANUEL  
By Dr. Dietmar Rothe, Ph.D.  
a transcript of a presentation Dr. Rothe gave at the International UFO Congress Summer Seminars on 17th of September 2001 at Laughlin, NV.  
The material is copyrighted. © All rights reserved by the author. Dr. Dr. Dietmar Rothe. The web page is intended for your personal education and enjoyment only. Copying and distributing any part of that material requires written permission from the author.

Billy Meier: An English-Language Bibliography  
<http://www25.brinkster.com/chancede/Meier.html>  
by David E. Chance: [chancede@slu.edu](mailto:chancede@slu.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*

Another Figu Friends JPLagasse and J. TruthSeeker: <http://www.eduardmeier.org>

Links edited by J. Olivieri  
on January 3/10/2004  
Thank you for your membership.  
Yahoo! Groups Links

<\*> To visit your group on the web, go to:  
[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Plejarans\\_are\\_real/](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Plejarans_are_real/)

<\*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[Plejarans\\_are\\_real-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:Plejarans_are_real-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

<\*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:  
<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

---

Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.522 / Virus Database: 320 - Release Date: 9/29/2003

---

Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.522 / Virus Database: 320 - Release Date: 9/29/2003