

A CRITIQUE OF C. TIBBS'S TREATMENT OF BILLY MEIER'S SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS

J. W. Deardorff¹
October, 2012

In an unpublished but online paper of 2007, Clint Tibbs wrote a comprehensive comparison of the spiritual teachings stemming from UFO contactee Billy Meier, on the one hand, and from Christian theologian-spiritualist Johannes Greber on the other.² In this critique, we will be pointing out some problems in his presentation of the teachings that stem from Meier, or through him stem from his Plejaren contactors and from the *Talmud of Immanuel* document, which Meier discovered in Jerusalem in 1963 through subtle Plejaren guidance.

Although Tibbs's analysis is quite accurate in its first 20 pages, a misleading statement occurs at this point, where Tibbs states, "The Plejarens claim that there is no God, no God of the Universe." For some time thereafter the reader is consequently left with the wrong impression that, unlike the God of Judeo-Christianity, there is no higher spiritual power or Supreme Being within the belief system of Meier and the Plejarens. This assertion is made by Tibbs in emphasizing the great differences between the belief systems of Greber and of Meier and the Plejarens; he makes the same assertion once again on p. 54. Only from p. 23 on does one gradually learn that Meier is no atheist.

The misinterpretation is partly semantic, with the Plejarens and Meier designating the Supreme Being (or Universal Consciousness or Great Spirit) by a different name, i.e., "Creation" or "the Creation," rather than "God."³ The semantic confusion arises from an underlying, substantive difference between two distinct concepts of "Ultimate Reality," which philosophers of religion and theologians sometimes characterize as a distinction between the "God of philosophy" and the "God of religion".⁴ The fundamental observation behind this distinction is that most religions

¹ With very helpful and substantive additions by RJ of the University of California.

² See "UFOs and Spirit Communication: The Challenge of Discernment as Seen in a Comparison of Billy Meier and Johannes Greber" by Clint Tibbs, in the following web page:
<http://www.tiptopwebsite.com/custommusic/xellers12.pdf>. Page numbers in parentheses in the present paper will refer to page numbers of Tibbs's web page. Tibbs is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Delta State University. We assume here that the reader is already familiar with the Billy Meier UFO contactee case, and so also with the names "Plejaren" and "Immanuel," and with the *Talmud of Immanuel* (TJ) document.

³ The TJ uses the title "God" for certain humanoid extraterrestrial (ET) leaders among the Plejaren forefathers who were present on or around Earth in Old Testament days several millennia ago. But to avoid confusion, its English version refers to such an ET as a god (lower-case "g"). Certain ones of these ET leaders succored to the Jews, and by performing occasional wondrous acts, such as traveling around in a "sky chariot," "chariot of fire" or "pillar of cloud or fire," and conveying messages to selected contactees or prophets, these ETs allowed themselves to be worshiped as the Creator of the world. From the TJ and Meier's Contact Notes, one infers that the god(s) entitled "EL" (as in "Immanuel" or "Immanuel") were ethical, as opposed to the succession of gods who became known by the title "Yahweh."

⁴ For two examples where this sort of distinction is made, see Charles Hartshorne, "The God of Religion and the God of Philosophy," in G.N.A. Vesey, (ed.), *Talk of God: Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures, Vol. Two, 1967-*

incorporate two different concepts of Ultimate Reality, and these two concepts may be in conflict or even contradictory. On the one hand, most religions bestow anthropomorphic features on their gods – consider Jehovah, Shiva, Krishna, the Greek gods, Ishwara in Advaita Vedanta, or the individual Buddhas of Mahayana Buddhism – all of whom have human-like *forms*, and exhibit very human *behaviors*, such as *loving* or *caring* for us, *listening* to our prayers, *speaking*, *taking sides* and *participating* in wars and other human affairs either directly or indirectly. In contrast to these “Gods of religion,” one also still finds within religions a concept of Ultimate Reality that is very different, and emerges primarily from natural theology and philosophy – from the classical cosmological, teleological, and ontological arguments for the existence of a deity. This entity is understood to exist *necessarily* and *eternally*, to be *infinite*, *omnipotent*, *omniscient*, and *all good*. It is also believed to be capable of generating the entire cosmos either out of itself or *ex nihilo*, and to be responsible for the generation and preservation of all life within the cosmos. This God, the “God of philosophy,” is often unwittingly fused with the anthropomorphic gods of most of the world’s religions, yet it clearly could not be a *person* in any sense, but must be a far more abstract sort of entity.

It appears that Tibbs has simply misconstrued the Plejaren denial of the existence of an *anthropomorphic* God as a denial of belief in any higher reality. But a more accurate description of the Plejaren view would be that they merely deny the existence of human-like gods such as one finds in so many of earth’s religions, while they certainly believe in the existence of a spiritual Ultimate Reality, or the “God of philosophy,” which, as already noted, they call “Creation.” In fact, the properties attributed to the Creation that one finds in the Plejaren teachings and in Meier’s writings describe an Ultimate Reality which is essentially identical to the philosophical concept of God that one finds in Western natural theology: Creation is the mystery of all mysteries, infinite, timeless, without form, responsible for all existence, for life and death, light and darkness, being and non-being, for the laws of nature, for logic and illogic, for true love and all other values.⁵ By denying the existence of the Judeo-Christian God, then, the Plejaren are merely claiming that the belief in a creator that is *also* a Father figure and Savior is an error; instead, they revere Creation alone. They do not wish to encourage the outmoded practice of worshiping a human-like ET leader (misinterpreted as “God”) as Creator of the universe.

Interestingly, some of the distinctions between the Christian God and the Plejaren beliefs are not straightforward. As noted in the TJ, one may consider one’s own spirit or consciousness to be a personal “savior” if one wishes:

1968 (London: Macmillan, 1969), 152-67), and John Hick, “The Real and its Personae and Impersonae,” in Linda J. Tessier (ed.), *Concepts of the Ultimate* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1989), 143-58.

⁵ See the *Talmud of Immanuel*, 3rd or 4th edition, 1:91; 3:4-5; 4:41; 5:7; 9:42; 10:7; 11:27,30; 13:16-17; 14:24-26; 16:51-52, 54-58; 18:42-44; 21:25-28; 23:39-40, 43; 25:56-57; 26:14; 28:60-61; 29: 31; 32:39-40; 34: 1-4, 23, 35, 45-46. See also Stevens, Wendelle C., *Message from the Pleiades: The Contact Notes of Eduard Billy Meier* (Tucson, AZ: UFO Photo Archives), vol. 1 (1998), 141-44; and vol. 2 (1990), 305.

TJ 26:28 "There is no higher happiness than wisdom, no better friend than knowledge, and no other savior than the power of the consciousness."⁶

By "spirit" in the TJ is meant the individual human spirit. Hence both belief systems can be considered to contain a "savior" aspect, which however is external in the Christian case. On p. 72 Tibbs notices the same thing on the basis of a different TJ verse, namely:

TJ 7:12 For whosoever asks of their spirit (consciousness), will receive; and whosoever seeks through the power of consciousness, will find; and whosoever knocks at the door of their consciousness, to that person it will it be opened.⁷

Another difference in belief is that the Judeo-Christian/Greber God is both spiritual and at other times physical, not just spiritual as Tibbs would indicate. As he notes (p. 23), this God has "comings and goings" that occur rather frequently in the Old Testament.⁸ A spirit, and one which created our universe, doesn't need to travel around in a chariot on planet Earth. In addition we must not forget that the Judeo-Christian God looks like us (we are formed in His physical image), and is treated as a Father figure (Tibbs, p. 20) rather than a spirit. Furthermore, He has been seen by various men.⁹ All this indicates that the Judeo-Christian God was at times physical. This confusion within the Judeo-Christian framework, of God being spiritual at times and physical most other times – must lie at the bottom of Tibbs's misleading comparison above. However, Tibbs does essentially clarify the misimpression on pp. 55-56.

From pp. 23-54 Tibbs otherwise does a commendable job of representing the views of Meier and the Plejarens. From there on, however, we find several errors in his presentation of the TJ.

First, a minor overstatement within a quote from Tibbs on p. 55: "In one instance humanity has at its disposal *only* the [Plejaren] spirit teachings that come from the Meier contacts, laid down in books. In another instance, humanity has at its disposal the good spirit world of God itself, to which the Greber book merely serves as a manual..." (emphasis ours). Tibbs's main point here is that it is to our advantage for each of us to access truths about the spirit realm through spiritual mediumship, rather than simply through books, and that the Plejaren reject the use of mediumship for this purpose. But this does not fairly represent what the Plejaren claim. The Plejaren by no means deny the possibility of mediumship; they merely point out that most of those who claim to be able to contact the spirit realm reliably in fact cannot do so, and that the

⁶ This stems from the TJ's 4th edition. From its teachings, and from the Plejarens and Meier, we learn that one's individual spirit retains all memories and serves as one's conscience; it survives death, has lived in humans many lifetimes before and will do so many lifetimes into the future. Though remaining part of the "spiritual world" and attached to Creation, it is internal to the human being, not external as is God's "Holy Spirit."

⁷ From the TJ's 4th edition. The similar Matthean parallel to this verse is Mt 7:7.

⁸ God rides on a chariot: 2 Ki 2:11, Ps 104:3; in a pillar of cloud or fire: Ex 13:21-22, 14:19,24; Num 14:14. Hence there, at least, God needs to be considered physical, not spiritual. Tibbs (p. 18) is well aware of this. The Old Testament is further replete with telepathic-like messages from God to his prophets, just as is documented within ufology by certain (physical) ETs communicating telepathically to their contactees or abductees.

⁹ God was seen in person at Gen 17:1, 18:1; Ex 6:2-3, 24:9-11; and Num 12:6-8. He was wrestled by Jacob and at first thought to be a man: Gen 32:24; Hos 12:4.

number of individuals on our planet who are capable of doing this reliably are very few in number.¹⁰ They also do not deny that individuals can access spiritual truths independently of books – in fact, they insist on the importance of meditation for this very purpose. However, when it comes to what we might call “special” access to the spirit realm through mediumship or channeling, they merely claim that doing this effectively requires a high level of spiritual evolution that few people on our planet have achieved. For this reason, they emphasize the importance of our studying the spirit teachings as they are conveyed through their contact (Meier), since that information will be more accurate than what we might obtain were we to attempt to channel it ourselves.

Tibbs’s claim about our having access to “only” the spirit teachings as they are laid down in Meier’s books may also be taken to presuppose that somehow these teachings are isolated or esoteric, and that they appear nowhere else. He later amends this comment on p. 60, where he notes, “many of the spiritual teachings in the Meier case can be found in Eastern religious thought and philosophy.” While Tibbs is correct that some of the teachings in the Meier case can be found in Eastern thought, he overlooks the long history of similar ideas in the West, and in so doing he gives a misleading impression that the Meier teachings are, outside of the East, entirely unique to Meier and the Plejaren. But even prior to the time of Jmmanuel, one finds particular ideas similar to those found in the Plejaren teachings in the writings of Pythagorus (~570-494 BCE), Empedocles (~490-430 BCE), and Plato, (~424-347 BCE), and after Jmmanuel’s time one finds some of their central ideas in Plotinus (204-270 CE), Porphyry (232-305 CE), and Proclus (412-485 CE) as well. Similar ideas were also revived during the renaissance through the writings of Marcilio Ficino (1433-1499 CE). Of course, the details vary from one philosopher to the next, and none of these philosophers could be said to have espoused a theological worldview *identical* to that of the Plejaren. However, some of the core teachings of the Plejaren are also central to the views of many of these philosophers. For example, the belief in reincarnation, a core Plejaren teaching, was common to most of these philosophers (with the possible exception of Porphyry). In addition, the fundamental relation of humans to the universe looks very similar in the Plejaren teachings and in the writings of all of the above philosophers. Whether it is called “Creation” by the Plejaren, or the “One” or “Unity” by earthly philosophers, one finds a common belief that the universe is in some sense a living entity. This living entity evolves *i*) by generating living beings out of itself, such that those beings contain literal “pieces” of their source of life (the individual human spirit forms, in the Plejaren terminology), and *ii*) by the beings evolving mentally and spiritually over many physical lifetimes, so that eventually they achieve union with the source of their being, and thereby contribute to the evolution of the Creation/One itself.¹¹

¹⁰ TJ 24:38-40; Wendelle Stevens *Message from the Pleiades*, vol. 1 (Tucson, AZ: UFO Photo Archives, 1988), 87-88 (Contact Note #7 of 25 Feb. 1975, Semjase sentences #186-200).

¹¹ For the Plejaren view of Creation see the references in footnote 5 above. For the extant fragments of the writings of Pythagorus and Empedocles, see G.S. Kirk & J.E. Raven (eds.), *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957). For Plato’s arguments for reincarnation see any edition of the *Phaedo* and *Phaedrus*, and for his general cosmology, where the demiurge shares many features in common with the Plejaren Creation, see the *Timaeus* and the *Parmenides*. Plotinus’ ideas on reincarnation and on the generation of humans by, and their return to, the One can be found in *The Enneads*, trans. by A.H. Armstrong (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966). A variant of the ideas of Plotinus can be found in the writings of his student Porphyry, especially in his *Auxiliaries to the Perception of Intelligible Natures*, which is included in *Selected Works of Porphyry*, 2nd Ed., trans. by Thomas Taylor (1823, repr. Chippenham: Prometheus Trust, 1994). For the ideas of Proclus, see his *Platonic Theology*, trans. by Thomas Taylor (1816, repr. Chippenham: Prometheus Trust, 1995), as

This basic idea also has obvious parallels in the mystical traditions within Christianity, Islam (Sufism), and Judaism (the Kabbalist tradition). In addition, these ideas are not only central to the original teachings of Immanuel, but are also found in many of the Gnostic writings, and even in places within the New Testament Gospels themselves.¹²

Next, as a clarification and update rather than a criticism, we comment upon Tibbs's sentence, "In 1974, the document [the TJ], however, was destroyed in a fire during an Israeli raid on a Lebanese refugee camp where the discoverer and translator of the document, Isa Rashid (a pseudonym), was temporarily staying with his family" (p. 55). The name was actually no pseudonym. In Meier's Contact Report #7 of 25 Feb., 1975, Rashid is referred to as M.R. by his contactor Semjase, and as M. Rashid by Meier, who had known him for over 10 years. However, at that time Semjase indicated that his real name was not Rashid, and so when Meier wrote his Foreword to the TJ he avoided mention of Rashid's name. But in November of 1976 Meier learned from Semjase that Rashid and family had been assassinated (in March, 1976),¹³ because of his work with, and their witness to, the original, Aramaic *Talmud of Immanuel*. So before the 1978 German TJ went to press, Meier did finally decide that it was OK by then to include in the End Pages a copy of Rashid's September, 1974 letter to him from Baghdad, which carried his true signature as "Isa Rashid." This is the letter explaining how the TJ rolls had been destroyed during an Israeli raid, apparently in June of 1974. In the TJ's 1992 and later editions, he is referred to as Isa Rashid. Hence until about 1992 "Rashid" was thought by many to be a pseudonym for the TJ's translator, due to Semjase not having been straightforward.¹⁴ Still later, in 2010, Meier was told by Quetzal, another Plejaren contactor, that Rashid's full name had been Markus Isa Rashid, but he did not go by his first name.¹⁵ If true, this would be in accord with Semjase having used M.R. as an abbreviation of his name in 1975.

Another minor clarification may be made. Although Rashid had directed Meier to the approximate location of the buried tomb, Meier was the actual discoverer of the TJ document.

well as his *Elements of Theology*, ed. and trans. by E.R. Dodds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963). Proclus was perhaps the first in the West to assert that humans have not just one body, but also layers of more etheric or "astral" bodies, and this hypothesis may explain the Plejaren claim that there are planets of highly evolved beings who have "bodies" that are not physical in the usual sense. Ficino's ideas can be found in the six volumes of his *Platonic Theology*, ed. and trans. by Michael J.B. Allen & John Warden (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001-2006). Ficino argued that the human soul was the cosmos in miniature (similar to the Plejaren notion of each of us containing a literal "piece" of Creation), and that the important concern of humans should be to achieve mystical union with the transcendent One.

Even in the twentieth century, Einstein [wrote](#), "I cannot conceive of a personal God who would directly influence the actions of individuals or would sit in judgment on creatures of his own creation. My religiosity consists of a humble admiration of the infinitely superior spirit that reveals itself in the little that we can comprehend about the knowable world..."

¹² See this [link](#) (those teachings followed by an asterisk).

¹³ See Stevens, *Message*, 3, 215, from Contact Report #66 of 10 November 1976.

¹⁴ This is an example of "the gods" not necessarily speaking the truth.

¹⁵ See this [Excerpt](#) from FIGU Special Bulletin #58.

After digging out collapsed portions inside the tomb, it was Meier who discovered the TJ packet under a flat rock.¹⁶

Still on p. 55, Tibbs implies that the reason why Meier insists that the German version of the TJ appear alongside any translation of it is so that Aramaisms within the German text will be apparent to the knowledgeable linguist and reader. However, the actual reason is simpler: so that any mistranslations of the German can be more readily spotted. One of Meier's overriding concerns is that the teachings of the TJ not again become distorted or falsified.

Although these Aramaisms support the genuineness of the TJ, they are by no means the most important form of evidence to do so. First and foremost, we have Meier's eyewitness testimony of having viewed the ancient Aramaic rolls,¹⁷ along with reliable eyewitness testimony from first-hand witnesses that Meier is honest, non-deceptive and a genuine Plejaren, or UFO, contactee.¹⁸ Second, we have the internal evidence resulting from comparing parallel verses of the Gospel of Matthew and the TJ, as well as examining omissions, additions and substitutions, all in the light of a multitude of scholarly criticisms of Matthew, many of which appeared in the literature only after 1978. The TJ is not subject to these criticisms despite many rather close parallels to Matthew. All this allows a fair assessment of the internal evidence as to which writer copied from which writing. The result is overwhelmingly in favor of the TJ having been the ancient source document for the Gospel of Matthew.¹⁹

Still on p. 55, Tibbs states that "In the *Talmud*, Jmmanuel is not the Messiah." This is rather misleading because in the TJ we find that Jmmanuel was regarded as the fulfillment of the true prophecy of Isaiah by the Plejarens and by himself.²⁰ And, as is well known, the writer of Matthew also considered him to be the fulfillment of Isaiah's "Immanuel" prophecy, which he would scarcely have done if he hadn't known that his original name had indeed been Immanuel (written as "Jmmanuel" in the TJ he was working from in forming his Gospel).²¹ Also, the TJ

¹⁶ According to what Meier was told by Semjase, it was a few years earlier that Rashid had been directed to the approximate location of the tomb site, through unknowing Plejaren mental prompting of Rashid.

¹⁷ See the Foreword of any of the *Talmud Immanuel*'s editions.

¹⁸ See "[Meier-case list of witnesses](#) and events up to 2012." See also "[Earliest written testimony](#) from Meier-case witnesses."

¹⁹ About a third of [Deardorff's website](#) is devoted to the internal evidence bearing upon the question of which document had been the original – some form of the Gospel of Matthew or the *Talmud of Immanuel*?

²⁰ As a more complete prophecy than in Isa 7:14, TJ 1:85-87 reads, "Behold, the impregnation of Maria occurred eleven thousand years after the procreation of Adam through the celestial son Semjasa, to fulfill the word of god [EI], the ruler of those who traveled from afar, who conveyed these words through the prophet Jesaja (Isaiah): 'Behold, a virgin will be impregnated by a celestial son before she is married to a man before the people. They will name the fruit of her womb Immanuel, which translated means "the one with godly knowledge," as a symbol and honor to god...'" (The German word, "Jungfrau" can mean "maiden" as well as "virgin.") Elsewhere also the TJ indicates that the Old Testament is often incomplete. TJ 11:2-6 indicates that Jmmanuel was aware he was Isaiah's "mighty counselor" type of "messiah" who knew good from evil.

²¹ Read much more on this [here](#).

refers to Immanuel as a “king of wisdom” who would acquire god’s knowledge.²² Hence, he was a “Messiah” in a corrected or alternate sense of the word.

There is an unaccountable misunderstanding by Tibbs on p. 65, where he states, “According to the *Talmud of Immanuel* 23:12–30 the original concept of resurrection had nothing to do with the bodies of the deceased being physically raised from out of their graves in the ground on the last day, but rather had to do with “rebirth” (= *Wiedergeburt*) of the spirit into new physical bodies.” This misinterpretation apparently arose from the first and sixth verse of the passage whose Matthean parallel is Mt 22:23-30):

TJ 23:12 On the same day the Sadducees, who hold the opinion there is no reincarnation [*Wiedergeburt*], came to him.

TJ 23:17 “Now you [Immanuel] teach there is a renewed life [*Wiederleben*]. Whose wife will she be among the seven in the new life, for she was the wife to all of them.”

It is commonly understood that Sadducees did not believe in an afterlife, and so they did not believe in reincarnation or resurrection. However, the Sadducees of this incident had heard Immanuel teach of rebirth, and hence posed their hypothetical question to him in terms of a rebirth scenario which might trip him up. Their question was not about resurrection. Nothing in this passage deals with “the original concept of resurrection.” Hence Immanuel’s reply to the Sadducees did not involve concepts of resurrection.

A related error on p. 65 involves this statement: “Deardorff’s definition of ‘resurrection’ is derivative of later Christian doctrine and not necessarily derived from the New Testament. The New Testament phrase ‘resurrection of the dead’ was later understood to mean ‘resurrection of the flesh,’ or ‘of the body.’” Instead, the opposite is and was the case. My understanding is that in the first century the prevailing Pharisaic belief was in an eventual bodily resurrection. But by the time the Gospels were written, belief in bodily resurrection had begun to be infiltrated with belief in a spiritual resurrection (having a spiritual form somehow made visible).²³ Thus Paul’s writing in 1 Cor 15:5-8 around mid-first century seems to most plausibly indicate that after the crucifixion “Jesus” had appeared to the disciples and others in a physically recognizable form, and appeared to Saul himself in some sense also, as he had accepted that the voice addressing him on the Road to Damascus was that of Immanuel.²⁴ Although Tibbs seems to assume (p. 68) that belief in a physical resurrection reflects Church doctrine not occurring until at least late first century (with the earlier belief being in a “spiritual resurrection”), the reverse seems more

²² See TJ 2:2,4-5,11; 4:45; 11:3; 20:22; 22:6; 28:67; 29:16; 29:40,47; 30:4,6,8,32,36

²³ Hence the Gospel accounts of the post-crucifixion appearances, stemming from the TJ, were altered through omissions and additions to make it seem that Jesus could suddenly appear and disappear, and walk through a closed door – as a resurrected entity or ghost could supposedly do.

²⁴ The first description of Saul’s conversion event (Acts 9:1-9) is believed the most reliable, in which the men with Saul also heard the voice that Saul quickly accepted as that of Jesus or Immanuel. Since a human voice requires vocal cords for its generation, and since vocal cords are physical, this indicates a physical Jesus or Immanuel had been there. For him to have been physically present but undetected suggests it was a nighttime event. This is **inconsistent** with the two follow-up accounts (in Acts 22 and 26), in which it is unnecessarily stressed that the event took place in midday, when a physical Jesus or Immanuel should have been visible, if nearby.

logically argued, as above. To deduce the most likely belief that Saul/Paul held regarding resurrection, one naturally studies the resurrection belief of the Pharisees, as mentioned in the Old Testament (Dan 12:2) and in 2 Mac 7:11. This belief was in a physical, bodily resurrection, which belief Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, also held in the early second century if not before. However, one does not spend much time speculating about a resurrected body if one finds the TJ to be genuine, with Immanuel having survived the crucifixion.²⁵

On p. 72 a statement by Tibbs falls short by about 20 years: “Predictions made by the Pleiadians were recorded by Meier during the 1950s through the 1980s.” The predictions and prophecies to be found in Meier’s Contact Reports commenced in 1975, and they have continued through at least 2009.²⁶

Tibbs credits Greber with having testified of extraterrestrial contact on p. 75: “But an objective comparison of the Meier case with the Greber case gives us a disturbing contrast between two powerful testimonies of extraterrestrial contact.” However, Tibbs does not present any evidence that Greber had any extraterrestrial contact – channeling alone does not constitute powerful testimony. In contrast, the Meier-case evidence is strong, reliable and plentiful.²⁷

²⁵ See [this link](#) for discussion of evidence that after the crucifixion Immanuel (Jesus) had traveled to Damascus, through Anatolia, and finally eastward along the Silk Road to the Kashmir area and Srinagar.

²⁶ See [this link](#) from Michael Horn’s website. Meier also made some valid predictions in the 1950s, which apparently stemmed from his having had contacts with Sfath, a Plejaren ET leader; however, written evidence to confirm this has not survived.

²⁷ Again, see [this link](#) for the multiple evidence by eye-witnesses other than Meier himself of having seen or even photographed a Plejaren beamship (or UFOs), the sounds such craft have made, confirmation of Meier having received telepathic messages from those ETs, an even brief glimpses on several occasions of an ET on the occasion of a contact visit. The good photos Meier himself was allowed to take of the Plejaren beamships also attest to his being a genuine ET contactee, as noted by Tibbs on p. 18.