



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Apr](#) -> [Review](#) - 'Spaceships of the Pleiades...'

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Review - 'Spaceships of the Pleiades...'

From: **Jim Deardorff** <deardorj@ucs.orst.edu>
Date: Thu, 24 Apr 1997 12:50:11 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Apr 1997 10:15:05 -0400
Subject: Review - 'Spaceships of the Pleiades...'

> Date: Wed, 23 Apr 1997 21:32:42 -0400
> To: updates@globalserve.net
> From: Don Allen <dona@totcon.com>
> Subject: Review - Spaceships of the Pleiades...

> Apologies if this has been posted here before, but I came across
> it while doing lookups in search engines and thought it might
> be of interest to others.
> Don

Hello Don, and the List (to which I'm a newcomer):

I saw this account by Dennis Stacy which you posted, and it seems to call for some reply from myself. It's pretty long, though, so I'll only quote pieces:

Dennis speaking:

> At a conference several years ago I was having breakfast with a scientist
> from a major university. It wasn't a UFO conference per se, but over granola
> in his case and ham and eggs in mine, the talk soon turned to that subject.
> To my surprise, he reached into his briefcase and pulled out a small
> portfolio of UFO photographs -- the clearest I had ever seen. The
> photographs were taken by one Eduard "Billy" Meier; the scientist had
> purchased them on a personal visit to Meier's headquarters (now known as the
> Semjase Silver Star Center) near the small village of Wetzikon, Switzerland.

I believe I am that person Dennis is referring to, and it occurred at a SSE meeting in Austin, Texas, in 1987. I don't know why the content of breakfast was important enough for him to mention, unless it was to set up the impression that readers should identify with him as part of a majority and associate me with a minority. This is a not-infrequent editorial tactic. But I still do enjoy granola for breakfast.

It is surprising that as late as 1987 Dennis still had not seen any decent copies of Meier's photos, which for many years Meier and his support group at Schmidruti made available at cost to interested persons. But the major U.S. UFO groups did not bother to look into the case personally when it became known in the late 1970s, because they automatically assumed, and still do, that all contactees are either hoaxers or disillusioned individuals. It was not the mid 1980s, in fact, that they were forced to start considering the reality of abductees' experiences, after so many of them came to light. So it was left to independent ufologists to research the Meier case in detail over many years, which Wendelle Stevens, the Elders, and Gary Kinder did, 1977-1985. After they could find no way the case could have been any hoax, this left bad blood between the independent researchers and the UFO groups who had not investigated the case, since the former knew better than to loan their 2nd-generation Meier film material to the latter. For such reasons, the debunkings of

Meier were underway already by 1980, discouraging the non-independent types from wishing to look at high quality reproductions of Meier beamship photos and film for themselves. Why look into a matter seriously in the first place when, if you were later to honestly report on it, you yourself would receive only ridicule? The ridicule factor against the Meier case was even present at this 1987 SSE (Society for Scientific Exploration) meeting.

> My gut reaction -- in which I was hardly alone at the time -- was that the
> pictures were simply too good to be true. In general, UFO photographs are a
> haphazard business at best, one reason why they remain so controversial.
> But part of the early Meier mystique was not only the quality of pictures
> involved, but their sheer quantity.

So here is where Dennis Stacy, and even many scientific types, made a fatal assumption: that one particular UFO case could not stand out from all others in quality & quantity of supportive evidence and yet be genuine. Why make any such assumption when dealing with a phenomenon under the control of alien beings obviously greatly advanced over us in technology, psychic abilities, and *intelligence*?

> ... Many of the
> pictures were so good that they appeared posed, which, indeed, is just what
> Meier and his followers would eventually claim, particularly for an
> impressive series of photographs taken at nearby Fuchsbuel on July 9, 1975.

Notice the "would eventually claim." Meier never denied from the beginning, in 1975, that they had posed their craft for him to photograph, and even described how he had been told in advance or through telepathic direction on where to go for the photographic opportunities and contacts. This kind of innuendo on Dennis' part does not serve him well. This knowledge dates back to Meier's own Contact Reports, typed individually by him only hours or days after the events, and made available first to his support group, and later, through Stevens' efforts, to a wider audience in his four volumes, Message from the Pleiades.

> Reportedly, at Meier's request for the definitive UFO photograph, Semjase
> flew her Pleiadian "beamship" around a large tree overlooking Lake
> Pfaffikon. When researchers later noted that the tree had mysteriously
> disappeared from view, it was patiently explained that it had been sent back
> in time because of radioactive contamination!
> My scientist friend wasn't the only one who swallowed this story without so
> much as a single antacid -- or attempt at corroboration.

Dennis was wrong here. Already by then I had checked with two professors in a forestry department at Oregon State University, shown them some of the pictures from this series of photos, and asked if they could identify what kind of tree it was that the strange object had posed around and had even nestled into its branches. (I asked them to try to ignore the object and to concentrate on the tree.) They had no problem of identifying it immediately as a *mature* abies alba (European Silver Fir). One of them had lived half his life in Western Germany and well knew just how the tree typically looked and how common it was over there. It was no baby tree, and no model tree; they didn't make model trees to look like irregular trees of a particular species, especially in 1975. Yet, "ufologists" like Korff are forced to assume it had to be a model tree with a model UFO somehow attached to it, because there is no way that superposition of images or negatives could have worked in that series of photos. (A claim that it was the same model tree as a tree seen in a Meier movie film taken four months earlier is also false, as seen upon close comparison of the two tree images.)

As to the "radioactive contamination," as far as I know the witnesses reported to Stevens only that when the tree was first witnessed after the event, its upper part was noticed to glow in the dark. I know of no Geiger-counter readings having been taken.

Anyone who wishes may still bring some good photos from this series, including the one showing the tree's trunk, to experts in forestry and ask them what kind of tree it was. (But it would be best to avoid taking it to any expert whose belief system would be shattered to know that UFOs are real, because his conclusions would have to come out such as to support his previous beliefs -- the usual catch-22.)

Don Allen mentioned the supportive witnesses to some of Meier's experiences, and in this instance two of Meier's friends had gone to the site later to see just where Meier had taken the photos from, and they noticed the tree was turning brown and dying. So they are witnesses to the tree having existed. They are mentioned in Stevens' 1982 book (M. Rufer and J. Bertschinger); unfortunately, his two 500-page-plus books on the case have long been out of print. When they went back to the site

still later to show others, the tree had vanished. Should we believe non-witnesses to an event, like Korff or Stacy, rather than the witnesses?

Should we still express surprise these days when witnesses report that parts of a tree were damaged by a UFO having been too close? I guess Dennis found it improbable that aliens who can cause their own spacecraft to vanish or reappear, and who are noted for occasionally altering evidence after the fact and sending out "men in black" to curtail certain witnesses' from reporting further, would or could cause a tree of such strong evidential importance to vanish without trace.

When Meier asked Semjase what had happened, he was told that the Pleiadeans had "changed the tree's time." What a contactee or abductee is told by his aliens should be considered more suspect of being disinformation than what the human witness himself reports, since so many contactees/abductees have been told so many things that conflict with each other, along with being told truths also. Yet, science has lately begun to allow for the possibility that time travel is not theoretically impossible, and some ufologists therefore think that aliens are future earthmen traveling back in time. So we cannot rule out the possibility that what Semjase told Meier here was truth associated with alien technology thousands of years ahead of ours. However, she also told him that they had had to wipe out a few selected memories of that tree from the property owner's mind (this is in a Meier Contact Report of 1975 or 1976).

> ... They [items Meier reported on] culminated, if that's the word, in
> Meier's publication of the Talmud Immanuel,
> which, according to Kal Korff, "professes to be the last true
> testament of Jesus Christ written after his crucifixion." In it, Meier
> claims that Jesus was not the Son of God, but a Pleiadian, of all people.
> Over the years, I corresponded with the scientist and again bumped into him
> on occasion. Each time I expected him to recant, or at least pull back
> slightly from his public support of the Meier "mystery" in the interest of
> science, but his belief only grew stronger. The last time I saw him he was
> working on an English translation of the Talmud Immanuel.

I've studied the Talmud of Jmmanuel for over 10 years now, and find several hundred cumulative reasons why it can be no fake, and that the *first* Gospel written was based upon it; it moreover allows a scholarly type to deduce just where New Testament scholars have gone wrong in their reassessments of which Gospel came first, etc.

Regarding who Jesus' father was, I think that the immaculate conception & virgin birth stories, combined with present knowledge of abducting aliens' preoccupation with hybridization with humans, causes even some Christians who have looked into ufology to ponder if an alien father might not have been involved. Moreover, if one reads the birth story in Luke, one finds that it comes within a hair of naming Gabriel as the father. Evidently Gabriel was a human-appearing "angel," just as the Pleiadeans are described as looking human or Nordic, so that hybridization in this case is not as much of a stretch as it is between humans and the greys. So it's well to keep an open mind on these matters. Yet, it's understandable that many Christians and ufologists with Christian backgrounds, as well as atheists, would be turned off by the Meier case after learning about the Talmud of Jmmanuel, and Meier's role in having been in on its discovery in 1963 and in seeing that it got published.

It's true, however, that I helped Wild Flower Press in their English translation of the Talmud of Jmmanuel (TJ); that was in an early stage in which I was a consultant, and a German-speaking collegian hired by the publisher was the main translator. This was after most of my own research on the TJ indicated its genuineness and its solutions to many uncertainties that have plagued NT scholars over the decades and centuries, as reported in my book, *Celestial Teachings*, also published by Wild Flower Press.

Jim Deardorff

Search for other documents to/from: [deardorj](#) | [dona](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.

To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net

Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...

Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).