

**From:** Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com>  
**Date:** January 27, 2008 9:37:41 AM PST  
**To:** derek@iigwest.com  
**Subject:** Please post

Pardon me here, Derek, I'm feeling a bit like Coumbo but...a couple more things.

While it's clear that you never actually read the information on the sound analysis, just how on earth did you come up with Marcel Vogel using an electron scanning microscope to detect Thulium, instead of by the means stated in the film, i.e. spectral analysis, etc.? He never said that, so why did you claim he did in your interview? Didn't you watch the full metal analysis video, or read the information on it in the investigation report?

And I wonder if people will laugh at your presentation of the film, as they already did on some occasions, when you say that the film isn't clear enough to detect the UFO going behind the hill. I also wonder what your convoluted explanation will be for the film of the three UFOs that hover in the distance, behind a tree branch, each one moving independently of the other...as well as the UFO that hovers over Meier's head.

And since, of course, this is all being posted at IIG for all to see, let me go on record as also saying that you're quite...wrong again re the photo of Meier with all the sparks flying. The explanation will not only delight everyone, it's quite plain to see.

For those who haven't seen the film yet, perhaps you'll go on record here to comment on the expert consultant (to the U.S. Army Special Forces, among other parties) who validated both Meier and Phobol Cheng's honesty. For those who don't know who Phobol Cheng is, she's the former representative to the UN from Cambodia who not only saw Meier in India in 1964 but also witnessed - along with an entire village - the UFOs and met Asket. BTW, how do you explain those 1964 UFO photos that she narrates? And how come you're silent on all these points?

Now it only took you guys some six years to come up with the brilliant presentation in the film, so take your time responding to all of the points raised...and keep on whining. Oh yeah, one thing you could do since you publicly made a charge that were advised, numerous times, that we would be editing your presentation...something that you should have been well aware of anyway, being associated with the film business.

A final note here. Only a sniveling coward would try to make his "case" against someone on a forum (ATS) where no response from the other party is allowed. If I was in that situation, I would demand that my opponent have the right to

respond, or I wouldn't participate. Anything less is cowardice. But that's redundant, isn't it?

MH