

From: Michael Horn <michael@theyfly.com>
Date: July 4, 2008 11:27:59 AM PDT
Subject: Re: **ABout UFO behind hill**

Hi Tommy,

Thanks for writing. I didn't feel a big need to rush a response, as I don't know when you'll get this anyway.

This might sound funny but I *almost* wish you hadn't brought up the size of the "model" to JL. It's kind of like the situation with the other dim bulb, our friend Mr. Maus. I really had to restrain myself from busting him on his obvious "similar trees equals the *same model tree*" nonsense when filming and editing the segment with him. I realized that if I did that in my rebuttal to his claims he wouldn't sign off on the piece for the film because he'd see how idiotic they were. Of course, why didn't he see that before I had to point it out?

But it proved to be precisely that way, meaning that once the film was out I, er, gently brought to his attention what a numb nut argument that was and he had to basically retract it (see: http://theyfly.com/newsflash91/Top_Skeptic_Fixed.htm)

Then, naturally, he goes and gets himself really further stuck and sunk by contacting the guys from U-C and having them...reinforce the "impossibility" of Meier having hoaxed the film clip they refer to.

Now, when you do resume your communication with JL here, please be gentle on him as he's obviously in a similar condition as Mr. Maus but in some ways of perhaps more fragile in terms of mental stability. I mean how does this guy want to assert his fantasies over the opinion of Academy Award winners like U-C...and still think that he should be considered even remotely sane?

Okay, so returning to my point above, the film clip that has the ship dipping partially behind the hill, which of course it does, is another one of those bomb blasts of reality for anyone who can actually reason at a third grade level.

Since you somehow, and quite delightfully, got JL to indeed commit to the size of "Meier's models" (that's Meier, not Meir, I should point out, Tommy) as between 1' - 3', a few things become even more obvious to those who haven't lost their minds in fear, jealousy and gosh knows what, like the Maus and JL have (I do hold out a little hope for the Maus, as he thinks that he's logical and thereby shows that he at least values logic, though it has still escaped him, at least for now).

Okay, here's a little more to consider about the ship behind the hill clip. Going on JL's own foot-in-mouth blunder, obviously executed in some strange sort of

homage to the Maus, all one has to do figure out this not very difficult "problem" is to make a rough calculation as to how many UFOs would fit to either side of, as well as above, it, as you already mentioned. You will find that it's actually many more than you even estimated. You can simply pause the clip and use an on-screen measurement, based on whatever is displayed on your screen, and multiply that unit to get the numbers.

You can then use the three implied "model" sizes according to JL (1', 2' and 3') and - no matter which one you use, you'll come up with some serious distances on the three sides of the craft as pictured. Now if the object is as small as 1' or as large as 3', you have an on-screen size to work with. Next, get/make objects in the same size range (they don't even have to be exact models of Meier' UFOs, since that will be impossible for the likes of the Mausmeister or our, obviously hard-drinking, French friend).

Videotape the models outside in a similar environment as is evident in the Meier film. Now I already know that JL will *definitely* not do any such thing as he is simply a cowardly armchair "expert" (and I'm being purely descriptive, not intentionally mean by saying that). Mr. Mausmeister, having some experience in the world of film, video, etc. will probably realize what's up here and, if he actually does have integrity (okay, he did fess up to blowing it with the model tree thing so there's still some hope for him) he might actually come clean - publicly - regarding the impossibility of a model having been used.

NOTE: Both the Maus and others have focused pretty much on the behind the hill element when this other stuff is glaring and staring them right in their faces.

To not keep anyone in suspense, what obviously will be discovered, among other things, is that to achieve the relative appearance of the film clip will only require that one suspends the model a relatively short distance away, varying with each size, of course. Then one will notice that the details of the model, whatever they may be, are significantly clearer than the object in the film...gee, I wonder why?

Of course, when you try to move the model closer to achieve the same effect of the craft in the film clip...well, I'm getting ahead of myself. Really, the next thing that you're going to do is to try to create the same "problem" we have with the real film clip, i.e. create enough of a debatable appearance of your model dipping behind the hill that you're using in your set up. Naturally, you're going to have some major problems here because, if you're even 100' away, and you've suspended your nice little model on fishing line as these geniuses accuse Meier of doing, you're going to have to position it so as to create the visual ambiguity (let's call it that for now) and you're going to have to completely control the movement of the object so it's as smooth and non-wobbly as Meier's real UFO is.

THEN you're going to start the forward and upward motion to bring it closer to the camera...wait, if you're 100' away from the camera and you've got a model suspended on a fishing line and you're trying to bring it closer to the camera (as opposed to zooming in it on) just how the hell do you do that without having the thing wobbling and wiggling all over the place?

Oh, I see, you need two (or more) other people to control the object from the sides with...with more fishing line of course.

Now, if you're going to use the same relative framing that Meier does in his film clip, you're going to need from 30' - 90' (on the right side) of distance between your accomplice on that side, somewhat less on the left but still quite substantial. Ooops, did I forget to mention the obvious? We're dealing with a *sloping* hillside here and, these lame-brained, know-it-all's apparently also failed to notice that the UFO is angled *against the slope of the hill*.

Did I make that clear enough? No?

Well, for my squeaky little friend and his knuckle head in arms across the sea, anyone with a fraction of a working brain can see that the obvious attachment points on an object like the Meier UFO would be (in addition to the presumed top of the ship) on opposite sides of the craft, most logically strategically attached somehow to the rim of the ship (the argument still works even if they were on the upper body of it). The main point is that the two side attachments, being opposite of each other, give us an angle that is almost exactly *opposite* the downward (to the right) slope of the hill. (People who are really swift with geometry can employ the proper terminology to describe the painfully obvious here.)

Now, to keep it simple (especially for Monsieur Denial) when you extend the (necessarily very straight) line (that is determined by the rim of the ship) to the left, it requires that the presumed accomplice on the left is (even assuming that the ship never goes behind the hill) going to be in a much lower position and the one on the right, even more problematically, will have to be in a *very* much higher one.

Hey, whether at 100' or even 50' away, that's got to be one TALL dude! Of course, whoever is presumably holding the top of the ship is also doing so off to a peculiar angle, using one heck of a very tall fishing pole and, nonetheless, this trio of masterful manipulators keep the whole thing together as they somehow bring the object up - *even higher and closer* - for their close up shot. Keeping in mind that our little genius has the "model" at 1' - 3' in diameter, one can see that there's a serious problem in elevating the object AT LEAST 20', while keeping perfect tension on only three points of attachment to control the object, avoid ANY wobble, tilt, tipping, slack lines, ...and not falling off of whatever crane

(remember, the U-C guys mentioned the use of a crane just for the relatively simple UFO circling the tree film clip), etc. they would have to be rolling around the countryside on.

Say, is this just a crazy hobby that Swiss farmers have? I mean in between milking cows and tending their fields, do they just get together to make Academy Award-winning special effects experts look like amateurs and bumbling, know-it-all skeptics look village idiots? And they do it all *completely* unnoticed by their friends, neighbors...and enemies? Seamlessly, in one smooth take? Cranes, cows and all.

Basically, this is an impossible clip to hoax and the idiot that JL refers to who said it was done with "ropes" must have been having a laugh at his own expense, incompetent that he revealed himself to be with that claim.

Now, if ANY of these bozos want to tell you something to the contrary, it is *absolutely* a requirement that they duplicate the film...period.

Of course that immediately eliminates Mr. J'ai Plus Excuses. And our Deflatedmauster most assuredly won't tackle that one; if he's smart he won't even try to float another idiot "model anything" theory.

Anyway, look for more about this to be posted on my site, with liberal disdain for any of the idiots who still try to claim a hoax here. And, at the risk of being redundant, this is going to make the Maus even more Famaus than I've already made him, on several continents, which I hope doesn't produce in him incontinence.

BTW, I suggest that you share this with the guys at your agency, etc. as I think that they will appreciate it. All one really has to do is focus on the complexity of the angle-height-control factor and it screams impossible to have been hoaxed by this man...or anyone else.

Oh yeah, about the Korean clip, the problem with these goofballs is that, when a clear video of their little gem is posted, one will see that in addition to the floppy model not exhibiting the same solidity and uniformity of controlled movement, etc. it will be *too clear* in comparison to Meier's, since the small object was closer to the camera and wouldn't have any of the haze, etc. that Meier's filmed objects have.

Now, because dealing with absolute, dwelling in denial, imbeciles is something is a bit taxing (even though I do it on a voluntary basis as a contribution to the overall social welfare), I too need my relaxation. And I figured out not just a way to relax but to...levitate at the same time. So, enjoy this clip:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UcUa_02pvUU

By the way, since what you're seeing there is basically physically impossible, denying the laws of physics as I do, I probably qualify for all that money that Randi and CFI-West/IIG are waiting to give away for (controlled) proof of the paranormal. I'm sure what I do at least qualifies as...abnormal.

MH

Hi Jean Louis,

Look I had to take a minute here cause I realized a few things such as you sunk your whole argument here again completely. Now you know I don't think you had one to begin with but if you will just think about this latest mistake you'll see you really are out of ammunition and out of the realm of possibility and reality.

Where does he get the idea from that the model would be at a distance of **100 yards** from the camera (which, if I'm correct would be equivalent to **+/- 1 km**)?

There's simply nothing that can be seen in the image that allows to determine the distance the model is at, or even the size of the model, unless you like to take the length of the leaves of the grass as a criterion...

And in fact, if you look to a frame like 07:09:05:17 (the file called "Meier_model_below_horizon_line_01.jpg" of the folder I posted), you can indeed more or less distinguish the leaves of the grass along the hill's horizon line. I'd say that their size suggests the model is of the usual size Meier used, i.e. between **1 or 3 feet in diameter!**

NO, YOU'RE NOT CORRECT! It's nowhere near 1km! 100 yards is 300' or about 310 meters. **VERY IMPORTANT** since you've made more assumptions that are clearly incorrect.

More important: You have committed yourself to a model

"1 or 3 feet in diameter". Now, look at a full frame of the UFO and make a rough estimate - based on YOUR OWN IN WRITING CLAIM OF 1 OR 3 FEET - and you will see that there's an absolute MINIMUM of let's say 20-30 feet on either side of the UFO. And then measure how high above it to the top of the frame is.

You are proposing that there would have to be AT LEAST three people, one on each side of the UFO, on for the top, who would be controlling and coordinating the complex movement - outside with whatever wind conditions exist - with huge distances from the model for everyone - and ALL of this performed flawlessly while the fourth person Meir is operating the camera.

And you want us to believe that ALL of this is not only technically possible WHICH IT ISN'T but that no other human on earth observed this and the ones who participated still haven't come forward!!!!

Jean Louis - I think you would be a fun guy to have a drink with and to shoot the bull but please my friend you have in your own words and miscalculations sunk your boat for good in the argument.

I can tell you that just by sharing your pages and some emails with a bunch of people in the buildings you have caused some of them to buy probably everything that Horn sells on his page. And you got a few people mad at ME that I didn't tell them about the Meir case before! Just so you know I will forward some of this stuff to Horn especially this last bit with the dimensions and all the mistakes that shows. I don't expect an answer from

him as I have gotten auto-response when I wrote him before but maybe he will want to discuss it further with you who knows but no harm done for him to have a couple emails. So let's not talk about this and just stay friends when I come back. Okay have a good summer.

T

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

From: Starglider

To: Tommy T

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2008 1:31:27 PM

Subject: Re: ABout UFO behind hill

Hi Tommy,

Here we go for an extra mile...

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

From: "Tommy T"

To: "Starglider"

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 7:29 PM

Subject: ABout UFO behind hill

> Hi Jean Louis,

>

> Here's some more feedback from someone who's opinion about these things I respect (I'm not into Photo Shop and all that):

>

> "Hey Tommy,

>

> Will somebody tell this guy how ridiculous his arguments are about the UFO disappearing behind the hill! I defy him to explain his premise and to actually, physically demonstrate it. Here's why. He claims that it's a small model. Probably by that he means well less than 1' in diameter. Now that sloping hillside is a good distance from the camera.

>

> At a distance of even 100 yards from the camera the 1' model would be practically INVISIBLE, no details such as either he or batboy are arguing about would even be discernible. No reflections, no shadows, none of the elements that get analyzed to death on his pages. Even better, at a mere 100' the same sized model wouldn't present these features. Then you have it coming back to top-center screen in the film - continuous movement - clearly larger than when it's in the distance, much clearer detail, couldn't be the same small model obviously would have to be a much bigger one. But the continuous

movement destroys his arguments. If he wants to claim false perspective he better prove that too.

>

> I've read his sorry excuses for not trying to prove his case. He should stick with something he knows something about, whatever that may be, but this isn't it.

>

> Oh yeah, if the film's a fake let's hire the guy who did it. If it's not a fake why isn't this all over the news?

>> This is a really silly argument from a pretty self-contentious but totally unpertinent guy.

Where does he get the idea from that the model would be at a distance of 100 yards from the camera (which, if I'm correct would be equivalent to +/- 1 km)?

There's simply nothing that can be seen in the image that allows to determine the distance the model is at, or even the size of the model, unless you like to take the length of the leaves of the grass as a criterion...

And in fact, if you look to a frame like 07:09:05:17 (the file called "Meier_model_below_horizon_line_01.jpg" of the folder I posted), you can indeed more or less distinguish the leaves of the grass along the hill's horizon line. I'd say that their size suggests the model is of the usual size Meier used, i.e. between 1 or 3 feet in diameter!

>

> G.R."

>

> P.S. Jean Louis I noticed that you also discuss the Asket photos on your site but aren't you aware that Meier was actually warned in advance about that...in 1975 I think? It's actually in one of Wendelle Stevens copyrighted books that were published long before the Asket flap happened. I think that if you're smart you won't hang your hat on that at all.

>> That's not me hanging my hat on. It was Bat who started suggesting there was a version of the Asket picture that would be "more authentic" than others, and it's Jimmy Deardorff himself, who claims there is that version which is authentic, even if Meier claims it "could" be tampered with (notice how this time it's Meier who excels in the use of the term "could!").

What I show is that the version that Deardorff calls the "Alien" Asket, is actually the originally published picture, which was tampered AFTER the publication, i.e. by someone of Meier's team (like Deardorff himself).

Don't you just love that?

Hope this will help to see things clearer.

Take care ;)

JL

>

> T