

Debunking and shunning the TJ

Attempts to discredit the TJ

There are some who have debunked the Talmud of Immanuel (TJ) simply because UFO contactee Eduard Meier was its co-discoverer and the one who made it public, in 1978. These are mostly certain ufologists -- persons who have never read the TJ and have no interest in doing so, because they are under the false impression that Meier's contactee experiences are hoaxes. They assume that all UFO contactees are either hoaxers or self-deluded individuals, and so they assume Meier is one, too, who hoaxed the TJ. They don't realize that the TJ's content, fluidity, consistency, inspirational value, natural creativity and numerous details by which one can see that the Gospel of Matthew was derived from it, are beyond the capability of any scholar or combination of scholars to have hoaxed.

Thus, some of their reasons for debunking or shunning the TJ consist of their reasons for trying to debunk the Meier contactee case itself. Another key reason for their attitude is that Meier is unique among UFO witnesses, abductees or contactees in having been supplied with so many opportunities to take clear daytime color photos, and 8mm movie film segments, of his contactors' craft in the skies. Any case unique like this is looked upon with great suspicion, since they know that scientific minded colleagues will just say it looks too good to be true. "How did Billy Meier get singled out by the ETs as being so special? Why wasn't it me?" some have asked, not realizing that they would ask the same no matter who in particular the contactee was. Still another reason that arises, for someone of this character who should happen to read into Meier's Contact Reports, is the occultism involved. That is, Meier was treated to some of the ETs' advanced technology and teachings, and this of course can seem occult -- beyond our present understanding, and also self-serving.

In an attempt to dispel some of this illogical, non-scientific attitude, I wrote an article that's in the ufological journal of the Mutual UFO Network (*MUFON UFO Journal*, Dec. 1987) entitled "The Meier Case: Occultness and Ambiguity No Cause for Rejection." The "occultness" is connected both with the spirituality that Meier's ETs taught and which Meier professes, and with the advanced technology to which they treated him and which he faithfully reported. The "ambiguity" is connected with our inability to understand this advanced science and technology, and with ufologists' unwillingness to learn of Meier's explanations. I believe it is also associated with his ETs at times having fed Meier pieces of disinformation mixed in with the truth, which has helped ensure that scientists would not latch onto the reality of the Meier case but instead would assume that he was a hoaxer, in order that the UFO coverup not come prematurely unraveled through Meier having been granted so many photographic opportunities. This is the [plausible deniability](#) factor -- purposely supplied by ETs, I believe, which so often accompanies UFO sightings and encounters, and keeps negative skeptics from being forced to accept what their minds are unable to cope with. Such skeptics are of course unwilling to believe that ETs would

possess the necessary intelligence and degree of ethics to implement such a strategy, and so it is a "catch-22" situation.

The greater the amount of evidence the ETs supply a particular UFO witness or contactee, the greater care they must take to insure that they have also included ambiguous or deceptive evidence, which will allow negative skeptics to maintain their state of denial if they insist. This holds true for the Meier case.

Those interested in speculating on alien strategy may wish to read [three papers](#) I have authored in peer-reviewed journals dealing with the likelihood of an alien presence and awareness of us, and what their strategy may be for dealing with us. There have been a few scientists like myself, here and there, who have written articles of a similar nature so as to try to inform their colleagues as to what is going on. Evidently, neither the government, nor academia, nor organized religion has been doing anything constructive to help bring about a public awareness of the UFO phenomenon, and so it is up to individuals, at the grass roots level, to do so.

Regarding debunkings directed towards the TJ itself, these have so far been attempted mainly by a very few ufologists who have become aware of the TJ. Its heretical, sensational and spiritual aspects are some of the reasons why such ufologists have strenuously attempted to debunk it. One of these persons is debunker Kal K. Korff, who confronted the TJ in seven pages of his book: *Spaceships of the Pleiades: The Billy Meier Story*. However, in just those seven pages I have noticed 9 false or unsupported claims, 12 misleading statements, 13 plain errors, and 3 innuendos with false implications: [click here](#) to read these refutations.

A similar debunking attempt of the TJ has been made by Italian ufologist Maurizio Verga. It is refuted [here](#).

Regarding false ufological debunkings of Meier's experiences, a web site of [Jeroen Jansen](#) points out the multitudinous errors in Korff's book, and sorts these into categories: 46 untruths, 17 examples of omission of relevant data, 17 unsubstantiated claims against which I present counterarguments, and other failings. A complete refutation of Korff's claims against the famous photo series in which his contactor's craft posed on all sides of a mature fir tree is given [here](#).

Scholars' problems with the TJ

New Testament scholars cannot be made interested in the TJ because:

- It is very seriously heretical in several ways;
- Its originals are no longer extant;
- It indicates that certain gospel events were UFO related, and the UFO topic is taboo for scholars to discuss openly in print or on the Web;

- It is connected with an alleged UFO contactee, and as noted many ufologists shun contactees;
- It is sensational, and scholars tend to shy away from the sensational, or from what they perceive as radical;
- Certain verses, if taken out of context, may seem pro-Aryan; others are anti-Judaistic and may be misconstrued as anti-Semitic;
- It indicates that Immanuel had been a long-range prophet, not just short-range; and
- It indicates that the Gospel of Matthew had come first, not Mark.

Any two or three of these aspects will deter scholarly inquiry. All of them together rule it out except for the most independent of open-minded scholars.

Regarding the last of these deterrents, it turns out, as I see it, that 19th-century scholars found too many embarrassments for the church and for their own faith within the early, historical testimony that Matthew had come first and had been written in Aramaic/Hebrew. A similar opinion I've seen is that certain Protestant scholars did not appreciate the emphasis that Matthew places upon Peter, out of which the concept of papal succession and then papal infallibility evolved, within Catholicism. And so they opted for Mark being the first Gospel. This decision had a huge impact on future New Testament scholasticism, pointing it in entirely the wrong direction. For more on this, I refer the interested viewer to my unpublished papers on [Christian theological commitment](#) within scholasticism (see especially Section 6), and on the [Gospel priority problem](#) (see especially Section 1). So a majority of 20th-century scholars have accepted Markan priority, even though the decision appears to have been based upon theological commitment rather than logical deductions from the available evidence.

A few New Testament scholars with whom I've been in contact have tried to debunk the TJ through scoffing or use of disparaging comments. These appear to have been based upon nothing more than glancing at one or more Internet sites that have offered debunking statements against Billy Meier's UFO photos and contacts, by means of false claims, distortions and omissions of relevant evidence. So far, this has been more than sufficient to deter scholars from looking into the mass of supportive evidence uncovered by the original investigators of the Meier case from 1978-85 —Wendelle Stevens, Lee and Brit Elders with Tom Welch, and Gary Kinder, and of the evidence uncovered in India from 1963-65.

A particular debunking attempt

One who has not tried to use the UFO phenomenon as reason to debunk the TJ is Åke Eldberg, a Lutheran-Episcopal minister in Sweden. However, at his [website](#) one finds large numbers of claims not backed up by substance or logic. As an example, he starts out with the following slanted summary:

"Talmud Immanuel. This book is the work of 'Billy' Eduard Albert Meier who was born in Bülach,

Switzerland in 1937. His rather obvious Biblical hoax has all the usual characteristics: no manuscript is available, the text only exists in modern translations, the "find story" is unlikely, and it contains anachronisms and obvious "prophecies after the event". I find it interesting because it's such a typical and predictable late-20th century Biblical hoax."

Thus Eldberg assumes from the start that Meier wrote the TJ, which he misspells. A scholar obviously would not make any such rash assumption without backing it up by honest evidence. He calls it an obvious hoax when a comprehensive investigation finds it is no hoax at all; thus he is mixing up "black" and "white."

He mentions that no manuscript (original manuscript he must have meant) is available, as if that proves anything; he failed to mention why the lack of extant original TJ writings should be no surprise whatsoever, and is more to be expected than not, due to the TJ's great heresies for Judeo-Christianity.

By "find story" he is referring to the TJ's discovery, and of course any discovery of something new, different and important could be termed "unlikely," since it would not have occurred previously.

His statement that "the text only exists in modern translations" is especially strange, since he knows the translation exists, the original was discovered in 1963, and hence the existing translation must perforce be modern (dated later than 1963). If he was referring to ancient references to the TJ, he should realize that the TJ was just as heretical back in the early 2nd century as at present, and one cannot expect that those few who had access to it then would have allowed it to be promulgated. However, with hindsight one can realize that the TJ lay behind the [Logia](#) that the 2nd-century bishop Papias wrote about; and there is a possibility that the TJ was the Gospel of Judas mentioned by Epiphanius and bishop Irenaeus, the title of which is all that survives (see M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (1975), pp. 70-79). It is also quite possible that it was the document that Pantaenus came across in India in the late 2nd century but reported as being a Hebrew form of Matthew (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.10:2-4). This because Pantaenus reported the tradition that one of the disciples had preached from it there in India, while scholars now know that the New Testament Gospels were not written while the disciples were still alive.

He confuses "anachronisms" with prophecies that have either come true or appear to be coming true; thus he is making the not uncommon assumption that no man, however unique, could have been a successful long-range prophet. This topic is also covered within the present website, where the successful short-range prophecies of Jmmanuel (i.e., Jesus), such as Peter's 3rd denial after the cock's crow, and the long-range prophecy that the woman's deed of pouring the expensive ointment on Jmmanuel's head would become known throughout the world, are discussed. These are present in the Gospel of Matthew, so that many scholars, as well as Christians, allow that Jesus was a prophet.

The TJ, on the other hand, indicates many instances in which the editing of the TJ by the writer of Matthew produced anachronisms within his gospel, as they do not exist in the TJ. These are mentioned in discussions in the Mt-TJ verse comparisons under: Mt 3:11, 7:21-22, 9:5-6, 11:5, 12:31-32, 14:19, 14:33, 16:24, 18:5, 21:2-3, 22:42, 23:7-10, 24:9, 26:6-13 (two), 26:25, 26:26, 26:27-28, 26:30, 26:61-62, 26:63, 27:17-18,20,22; 27:54 and 28:18-20. (In all but two of these 25 instances there is a TJ parallel to the Matthean verse.) Thus, anachronisms that one may find in the TJ, upon assuming that Jmmanuel could not have been a successful prophet, are overwhelmed by the anachronisms the TJ affirms are in Matthew.

Anyone can write whatever they wish about the TJ, but unless it is backed up by detailed and honestly represented evidence plus logical reasoning, it may amount to no more than meaningless words. My advice is: check the TJ out for yourself, don't just accept pastor Eldberg's word about it. More on his website file [here](#).

Return to: [Contents](#)