

Response to Tibbs's main web-page against the *Talmud of Immanuel* (TJ)¹

J. W. Deardorff

Portland, OR

Oct., 2012

In the web page of Clint Tibbs,² he made many poorly supported or unjustified claims against the *Talmud of Immanuel* (TJ), asked misleading questions, and omitted relevant considerations and facts. Since his article does not possess page numbers, to locate a spot within it to which one of the responses here applies, it would be simplest just to select a quoted phrase within the response and use one's search engine for it within Tibbs's article. The issues below are in order of occurrence rather than order of importance, and are serially numbered.

1. After a nice introduction, Tibbs stated and claimed:

... Deardorff, in his study of the *Talmud Immanuel* (*Celestial Teachings: The Emergence of the True Testament of Immanuel* (Jesus) [Tigard, OR: Wildflower Press, 1990) has argued that the *Talmud* was so heretical that its contents did not survive long enough to make it into the writings of the church fathers. But often times, it is possible to reconstruct "heretical" ideas from the apologetic writings of the church fathers; nothing there resembles the *Talmud Immanuel*. The argument from "heresy" then has no basis for the *Talmud's* absence in the writings of the church fathers.

It's true that often times one can reconstruct a heretical idea from writings that speak a little bit about it. But what about the other times? At other times, if a document is too heretical to even speak about or mention in writing, exceptions occur. The TJ is such an exception, as the realization of the truth of its very extensive and detailed contents would destroy the basis of Judeo-Christianity. Silence is then the prime weapon utilized against the document – silence and, in the first few centuries CE, destruction or redaction of any contemporary or past writings that mention the banished document. The fact of Jesus' actual name having once been "Immanuel" is part of the same silence or taboo. However, excellent clues do exist, especially from gnostic writings, to indicate that this name change actually took place (in the last half of the 1st century), and that the name "Immanuel" was not to be uttered.³ So when a philosopher

¹ Within this document, "Immanuel is spelled with "J" as its first letter because, according to the Plejarens, "this name is traced back to their forefathers who spelled the name Immanuel with a 'J'" symbol (TJ 3rd edition, p. viii).

² Tibbs is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Delta State University, Cleveland, MS. His web page here is entitled, "[UFOs and Spirit Communication: A Challenge for Discernment](#)," and appears to date to about 2009.

³ See "[Was his name originally Jesus, or Immanuel?](#)" for a full explanation. The rare exception to this taboo in the first two centuries CE was the mention of "Immanuel" within Isaiah's prophecy of Immanuel (Isa 7:14) once by the writer of Matthew, twice by Justin Martyr and several times by Irenaeus.

(Tibbs) concludes that something that does not often occur can have no basis for having occurred at all, what are we to think of his logic?

2. A couple sentences later, Tibbs mentioned Robert M. Price's criticisms of the TJ. These have been comprehensively countered or refuted,⁴ and this deserves mention lest the reader gain the false impression that Price's analysis negates the TJ's reality and apparent truths.

3. Tibbs mentioned the allure of Meier's beamship (UFO) photos, and showed a picture that the undiscerning reader might assume is a photograph of three of them. However it is a composite computer generated image with pictures of beamships from some of Meier's photos superimposed upon an apparent painting. Tibbs's failure to attach a label to so inform the reader is misleading. Several sentences below it is a second composite cgi showing another image of a Plejaren beamship inserted into another painting -- again unlabeled and misleading.

4. At this point Tibbs asserted that the followers of the Meier material exhibit a total lack of spiritual discernment. He explained:

This state of affairs might be due to the "all-too-Christian" nature of spiritual discernment, for this discernment is centered on the identity of Jesus as "Lord" and "Christ" (see 1 Corinthians 12:10 and 1 John 4:1)... One will search in vain to find the phrases "holy spirit" and "spirit of God" in the Meier *Contact Notes* or other Meier literature, even though both phrases have a pre-Christian antiquity and occur *frequently* in the Old Testament and Early Jewish literature.

This is specious reasoning: To possess discernment about the reality of Meier's experiences and the TJ's spiritual teachings, must one first believe in the Christian God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost?

5. Just after this point Tibbs asked,

Again, organized mega-religion and God and Christ are seen as equals by Semjase [a key Plejaren contactor of Meier]. But is this true? Do the photos of Semjase's craft and the fulfilled predictions of the Plejaren's provide sufficient evidence for the veracity of their statements about Christ and God? Or might it be the case that what they say about *modern* Christianity *is* true (e.g., a corrupt Vatican, the Inquisition, etc.), but that their identification of it with the terms "God" and "Jesus Christ" *is not* true?

Here Tibbs was distinguishing between what he considered to represent truth – an uncorrupted Christianity following Johannes Greber's interpretations, it turns out⁵ – versus various forms of corrupted Christianity, which include today's organized mega-religions. He of course disliked the Plejaren's views that all of this, even "true Christianity," is based mostly upon an

⁴ See ["Refutation of Robert Price's Claims Against the Talmud of Immanuel."](#)

⁵ See Tibbs' article, ["UFOs and Spirit Communication."](#)

anthropomorphic god (an ET, actually) and a “Christ” whose teachings were so distorted from Immanuel’s as to be unrecognizable.

Regarding his second or middle question above, the trivial answer is “No”; truth about one thing need not carry over to something different. Ufology has ample cases in which the UFO witness or contactee has been given a couple of minor prophecies or pieces of information that turn out to be true, but then after being given a third, more important prophecy, it turns out to be false.⁶ In coping with such, the best advice seems to be that of TJ 7:26-27, (see also Mt 7:18-20),

[A good tree can never bear bad fruit, and a rotten tree can never bear good fruit. Thus, by their fruits you will recognize them.](#)

In the case of the ETs (Plejarens) who chose Meier as their contactee, we have some 40 years of information from Meier’s experiences and over 500 documented word-for-word Contact Reports,⁷ from which to learn about the fruit of their actions: their concern for Earth’s long-range survival, for mankind’s spiritual development, and much about Meier’s activities and mission. There is much information available from which to draw tentative conclusions. So regarding Tibbs’s third question above, the answer is a trivial: “Yes, it is possible,” and exercise of one’s own best judgment is necessary.

But we should not let Tibbs’s questions here lead us away from the fact that the Plejaren’s views and statements about Christianity agree with, or are consistent with, teachings within the TJ, whose original appears to have been a historic document.

6. Here Tibbs professed:

The Plejarens berate Christianity as a false religion that spreads false ideas such as "Christ," "God," "Satan," "the Fall," and "Resurrection." The Plejarens deny the existence of the very source that corrupted [sic] earliest Christianity, Lucifer (Satan), and they deny the existence of the very source from which the Truth comes, God, Christ, and the holy spirits.

This lets the reader know the basis for Tibbs’s abhorrence of the TJ and the spiritual teachings of the Plejarens and Meier. To his credit, however, Tibbs seemed to accept the reality of reincarnation for humans, yet illogically accepted resurrection as real, too.

7. Tibbs stated:

⁶ E.g., see [this](#) article on Marian apparitions or [this](#) article on ET deception.

⁷ See [this web page](#) of James Moore with translations by Benjamin Stevens and others.

A few of the "basics" [of spirituality] are in the *Talmud Immanuel*, such as reincarnation and the continued existence of the human spirit after physical [sic] death, but beyond that, true spiritual sustenance for the soul is lacking.

Here Tibbs overlooked an important theme of the TJ: spiritual evolution is furthered through seeking, finding and learning, all being parts of spiritual sustenance.⁸

8. In the next sentence, Tibbs wrote:

One of the maxims of the Plejarens is that only the strongest and fittest survive and the weak are defeated. This is observed in nature and they tie this into their spiritual teachings. But, this is Lucifer's game plan: the strongest defeat the weak.

Here he implied that the Plejarens follow "Lucifer's" game plan, or a "might makes right" maxim. However, we find nothing like this in the *Contact Reports* or Meier's teachings. Although the TJ teaches us to learn the Laws of Creation in part through observing nature, it also teaches that mankind, with our level of intelligence and spiritual evolution, should be much more responsible to each other and to the environment than the lower animals or plants (TJ 6:39-46), and that we should not harm one another, whether weak or strong, without urgent, necessary and justifiable cause such as dire self-defense (TJ 28:27-29).

9. Regarding "true Christianity," Tibbs summarized,

Creeds, believed to embody the basic truths of Christianity, were formulated, and, thereby, virtually denied the Christian his right and responsibility to discern the truth for himself. The Church soon became the major instrument for force-feeding a mixture of truth and error to God's Truth-starved children. And so it is to the present day. ***This*** is the Christianity that the Plejarens parade in front of the eyes of an undiscerning humanity as ***THE*** Christianity. ***This Christianity is present-day Christianity, but it is not Christ's Christianity***" (emphasis Tibbs's).

One might sympathize with Tibbs's opinion here, as an important step in the right direction. However, the Plejarens and Meier do not accept spiritual untruth of any stripe although they tolerate it in others; they do not accept Tibbs's view that truth is represented in "***THE*** Christianity," if it involves a "Holy Spirit" that is part of a personal "God," plus "holy spirits" and "Satan." Yet, the Plejarens have agreed with Meier that the churches do carry out some worthy functions.

10. Regarding the absence of hard evidence to indicate the TJ's genuineness, Tibbs wrote,

Any disciplined student or scholar of Christian origins...will quickly see that the *Talmud Immanuel* is a complete and novel ***substitution*** for Christian origins whose 'genuineness' hangs on early sayings of

⁸ Semantics may be a problem here. Within the TJ and the teachings of Meier and the Plejarens, "spirit" and "spiritual" refer to the human spirit and/or consciousness, whereas Tibbs may at times have equated "spiritual" with "Christian" or with an external spirit or "spirit of God," in addition to his stated belief in reincarnation.

a Hebrew (Aramaic) gospel of Matthew by Papias, Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1), Origen quoted by Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 6.25.4), and Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 3.24.6), and alleged Aramaisms (first-century Semitic syntax) in the German translation.

First, a disciplined student of Christianity need not be a Christian. And will his evidence for the TJ being a “substitution” be at all substantive or irrefutable?

Important signs of the TJ being genuine and not a “substitution,” which Tibbs does not mention, are, first, Meier’s own eyewitness testimony of having co-discovered and viewed the ancient Aramaic rolls, along with reliable eyewitness testimony from many first-hand witnesses that Meier is honest, non-deceptive and a genuine (Plejaren) contactee,⁹ as found also by investigators who have spent time with Meier in Switzerland.¹⁰ And second, we have the internal evidence resulting from comparing parallel verses of the Gospel of Matthew and the TJ, as well as examining differences due to 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 the TJ came into print in 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.¹¹ The result is overwhelmingly in favor of the TJ having been the ancient source document for the Gospel of Matthew.

This evidence, plus the Aramaisms and other signs of the TJ having been an ancient document, is as strong as can be expected in the absence of the original Aramaic text. The three early church-father sources Tibbs referenced are by themselves only suggestive evidence.

11. Tibbs warned,

...one must not link the fact that the Greek gospels contain Semiticisms, i.e., Semitic expressions and syntax in Greek dress, with the idea that these Semiticisms are indications of an Aramaic document from which the Greek texts were translated. The Greek gospels were composed by Jews whose mother tongue was Aramaic, the language of the household, and whose second tongue was Greek, the language of commerce in the first-century Palestinian-Mediterranean world. The Semitisms are evidence of Semitic interference whereby the mother tongue (Aramaic) influenced the clause/sentence structure of the secondary language (Greek) in which the scribe was composing his gospel.

This warning seems intended to discourage the reader from even wondering if the Aramaisms found in the Gospels and in the earliest (German) translation of the TJ are not a consequence of the Aramaic TJ. That is, we deduce that the TJ was the source of a Hebraic form of Matthew as

⁹ See [this link](#) on Meier-case witnesses and events up to 2012.

¹⁰ These include: Wendelle Stevens, Guido Moosbrugger, Lee and Brit Elders, Tom Welch, Gary Kinder, Michael Hesemann, Jaime Maussan, and Michael Horn.

¹¹ See [this web page](#) (“Introduction to Matthew-TJ Verse Comparisons”) and its links.

the first Gospel, with the latter having been a source for Mark, Luke and John,¹² and thus a source of Aramaisms and Hebraisms. One should not overlook the most obvious solution to a problem. There are a considerable number of studies, both new and in the 20th century, and involving both the internal and external evidence, which demonstrate that a Hebraic form of Matthew was the earliest Gospel.¹³

The evidence is against all four Gospels having been written by Jews. External evidence indicates Mark was written in Rome, and internal evidence indicates that its writer was a gentile and an anti-Semitic one at that.¹⁴ And it's not at all clear that the writer of Luke-Acts was a Jew; Acts 28:28-29 strongly suggests he was a gentile though well informed on Judaism. The writer of Hebraic Matthew was certainly of strong Jewish background, but the later translator of it into Greek was probably a gentile.¹⁵

12. At this point Tibbs focused on the most serious problem for any scholar interested in the TJ who does not give up right away upon learning that the original document no longer exists. As Tibbs states,

The editor of the *Talmud*, Billy Meier, himself admits that, “The German version of the Talmud Immanuel does not correspond to the original translation from ancient Aramaic because Isa Rashid neither mastered the German language sufficiently nor was he familiar with the code of the Mission to the point that he could have drawn up the German version. The German version does represent a copy of the translation from ancient Aramaic, but in a form that has been corrected by Eduard A. 'Billy' Meier and supplied with the code required by the Mission. The German version represents a product 80% of whose style and sentence structure was achieved by Eduard A. Meier, while the remaining 20% must be considered Isa Rashid's translation effort” ('Billy' Eduard Albert Meier, ed., *Talmud Immanuel* [4th ed.; Tulsa, OK: Steelmark, 2007]).

This statement from Meier is not present in the 1978 TJ, but occurs in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th editions. The 1978 TJ apparently did not contain “the code,” and one is free to study this version. Notice that it was the style and sentence structure that Meier worked most strongly on in the later editions,¹⁶ not the content except for some additions as noted below.

¹² In addition, a few detailed deductions to mention are (a) Luke depending upon Mark also (which scholars have long been well aware of), (b) John depending upon Luke also and only slightly upon Mark, (c) of the Aramaic TJ having been utilized to a small extent by the writers of Luke and John, but not Mark, and (d) Hebraic Matthew having been translated into Greek only after Mark and Luke were written.

¹³ See James Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), and [this link](#) to “Implications of Hebraic Matthew's translation into Greek.”

¹⁴ See the evidence for this in [this web page](#) on “The Modified Augustinian Hypothesis (MAH) regarding Gospel origins”.(search for anti-Semitic and anti-Jewish).

¹⁵ See the [same web page](#) (look under “MAH-G.The role of Semitic Matthew's translator”).

¹⁶ See the section on “[Differences](#) between the TJ's 1978, 1992 and later editions” within the web page on “The TJ's Genuineness.”

Each successive TJ edition contains corrections and improvements to the first edition (especially in the English translation), most stemming from one of his Plejaren contactors. They informed Meier that the errors were caused largely by the translator, Isa Rashid, having followed the text of the German Bible's Gospel of Matthew too closely when translating parallel content, and by his alleged omission of some original TJ material, apparently because it was not even mentioned in Matthew. Further errors were said to have been introduced by the woman who typed Meier's manuscript in preparation for the TJ's first printing (it was never returned to him despite his requests for it; as for the raw translation from Rashid originally edited by Meier, he never saved it during the shuffle of his changing residence from Hinwil to Hinterschmidrüti in 1976). The consequent errors from all this in the translated TJ were intermittently disclosed to Meier over a period of some 30 years by his Plejaren contactors Ptaah and Quetzal. So Meier dutifully implemented the corrections in succeeding editions of the TJ, including whatever alterations in grammar or sentence structure were called for in applying the "code," which Meier has never explicitly described, despite a discussion of it in Contact Report No. 241.¹⁷

Therefore, in searching for signs of antiquity of the TJ, only the first, 1978 edition could be used, or sections of subsequent editions in which the German text had not been altered. The indications of antiquity included frequent use of successive "and" in place of commas, similarly with "or," and use of the redundant clause "he answered and said." And of course it was important to find Aramaisms within the German text.¹⁸

Concerning the signs of redaction in Matthew relative to the TJ, or vice versa, the changes in the TJ that occurred between 1978 and the subsequent editions were not changes in meaning; but rather minor clarifications, or changes in punctuation, spelling, or grammar. Hence, whether or not the TJ suffered from a scholar's valid criticism of Matthew does not depend on which edition of the TJ was used, at least up through the 4th edition (a 5th edition is in progress, as of 2012). It does appear that the later editions of the TJ do have a few errors of translation corrected (such as replacing Elijah with Elisha in TJ 11:19). However, when an occasional change was an addition to a later TJ edition for which there is no Matthean parallel, one must try to decide case by case if the alteration in the TJ was probably a true, needed correction, or whether it was perhaps for the purpose of keeping open the option for negative skeptics to believe that Meier was a hoaxer,¹⁹ thus requiring each reader to decide for himself/herself if the

¹⁷ [Here](#) is an English translation of a portion of it.

¹⁸ See the first part of [this link](#) on the TJ's genuineness.

¹⁹ This possibility should not be downplayed. See [this link](#) on plausible deniability, especially item (k). There reasons are set forth why the Plejarens' need to maintain Meier in an easily debunkable status by non-discerning skeptics in order that they not force their presence upon persons who simply cannot accept the possibility of their existence and technical superiority. It is only reasonable to suppose that this strategy of plausible deniability may extend also to the Plejarens *not wishing to force the TJ upon anyone's belief*

TJ is genuine. In so deciding upon some particular passage added to the TJ since 1978, which does not have a parallel in Matthew, one must ask if Rashid may have omitted that passage because it's not in Matthew or another Gospel. (Rashid had earlier been a Greek-Orthodox lay priest).

In comparing parallel Matthew-TJ passages, the use of redaction criticism is not strongly dependent upon the detailed wording in the Greek Gospel text (NA28), because the underlying wording from which both the German-language TJ and Hebraic Matthew arose was Aramaic, not Greek. Hence it is the text's meaning that counts more than the detailed Greek grammar. In addition, according to the (MAH) Synoptic solution consistent with the TJ, Hebraic Matthew was translated into Greek in forming canonical Matthew, and during that latter process the translator could, and apparently frequently did, make use of the Greek texts of Mark and Luke.²⁰

13. Tibbs claimed:

Many of the German words in the *Talmud Immanuel* simply did not exist in first-century Aramaic. There is such a thing as paraphrase, but "metallic lights" and "half death" (among many other terms and phrases) don't come close to a paraphrase of first-century Aramaic.

That's not the case, at least for the examples Tibbs chose. Aramaic words were certainly available for "metal" and "light," and even for the adjective "metallic."²¹ Interestingly, within today's UFO phenomenon the descriptive phrase "metallic light" is not too infrequent.²²

Regarding "half-death" ("Halbtode" in German), the underlying Aramaic likely read simply "half dead." Whether it referred to a near-death type of experience on the cross and afterwards, or a deep trance (e.g., samadhi, which Immanuel could well have learned to master while in India during his "lost years"), or something else even less known, is uncertain, however. Tibbs did not specify any of the other instances he had in mind.

14. Tibbs wrote,

system, and allowing our free will to have highest priority. Their maintenance of Meier in a debunkable state also serves to help protect him from even more assassination attempts than he has already endured.

²⁰ In the [MAH website](#), search for "verbal agreement."

²¹ "Metallic" as an adjective, or as the noun "metal" used in an attributive position as an adjective, was clearly available in the middle Aramaic period (200 BCE – 200 CE); see Jastrow's *Dictionary of the Targumim*, p. 862, or Sokoloff's *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*.

²² Google "metallic light" along with UFO, and you will find a considerable fraction of the 20,000 entries are relevant and independent.

Meier claims to have retrieved items from Immanuel's tomb, but it is unclear whether this tomb was the crucifixion tomb in Jerusalem or his tomb of final resting in Srinagar, India (according to the Plejarens and the *Talmud*, Immanuel survived the crucifixion and settled in present-day Srinagar in Kashmir, India, and died at the age of 115).

On the contrary, there is no uncertainty there, as the figurines had been enclosed within the same specially wrapped packet that contained the Aramaic TJ, which Meier retrieved from the tomb in Jerusalem. (See the first two pages past the copyright page of the TJ's fourth edition.) The TJ (31:31) allows us to infer that Judas was the one with Peter who first visited the tomb early "Easter" morning, and that he picked up the clay figurines that had been left behind by the Hindu healers who had administered to Immanuel; at some point he returned them to Immanuel who in India later left them with his elder son. This son, who took over the task of writing the TJ after Judas's death, included the figurines when packaging the TJ scrolls/rolls after his father died, as a remembrance of the miraculous recovery in the tomb at the hands of the Hindu healers.

15. Tibbs stated,

The lack of such an Aramaic text does not weigh in favor of the genuineness of the *Talmud Immanuel* because the authentication of any document must begin with its *physical characteristic*" (emphasis Tibbs).

However, neither does it weigh *against* its genuineness, in this case. Can one imagine that either Israeli or Christian authorities could possibly allow a genuine ancient Aramaic text (or even photographs of it) to survive if it indicated the God of Israel (which became the Christian God, too) was an extraterrestrial? Or if it verified that his name had been "Immanuel"? Or if it indicated how Immanuel survived the crucifixion? Never, at any cost! The assassination of Rashid and his family is consistent with this, as is some fraction of more than the dozen documented assassination attempts against Billy Meier.²³

Regarding the last half of Tibbs's statement, however, if the original document was destroyed such that no physical characteristics remain to be studied -- just its content and meaning, plus the discoverer's memory of having discovered it -- Tibbs is correct as far as scholars of most academic fields are concerned. But his statement is overly restrictive for those who are not biblical scholars bound by the rule of "not touching it with a ten-foot pole" lest it be considered a hoax by those who have not delved into the matter. If an independent scholar finds the reasons for the original's destruction and the translation's survival to be logical and valid, then he/she is free to investigate and analyze it, and report his/her findings to others of like mind. Although such findings are not easily made known within the mainstream academic

²³ Guido Moosbrugger, *And Still They Fly* (Tulsa, OK: Steelmark LLC, 2004), 221-27.

community, and from there to the news media, they can nevertheless be made known to inquiring minds outside the mainstream academic community.

16. Tibbs went on to say,

...nothing less than a side-by-side, Aramaic-German-English edition of the Talmud Immanuel will suffice. ... Deardorff and other zealous proponents of the Talmud assert that this is too extreme, too petty of a reason to "dismiss" a serious investigation of the Talmud Immanuel, and that the German edition should alone suffice.

It's been evident for years that the latter won't suffice for biblical scholars who value their reputations, careers and profession above seeking the historical truth in this matter. But besides fear of loss of reputation, I have pointed out other fatal stumbling blocks.²⁴ As restated, these involve ignorance of: (a) the reality of the UFO phenomenon, its contactee and abductee sub-topics, and the related "ancient alien" evidence; (b) the genuineness of the Billy Meier UFO contactee case despite unjustified debunking to the contrary; (c) the strength of the past-life evidence indicative of reality of reincarnation; (d) the validity of arguments favoring that a Hebraic Matthew preceded Mark, as certain church fathers have stated; (e) the prophet's name having originally been Immanuel, not Jesus; and (f) the capability of a highly evolved soul of making one or more detailed prophecies into the distant future. These can be considered prerequisites for serious study of the TJ. In (e), one finds that Isaiah's prophecy was indeed a long-term one, since the child's name had indeed been Immanuel, not Jesus. This instance of a highly evolved soul/spirit (Isaiah) being able to prophesy in detail for centuries into the future, (f), is then a precedent that Immanuel could also have been capable of the same.

17. More on this from Tibbs:

Who in their right, critical, and scientific mind (Deardorff has a Ph.D. in atmospheric science) would study an alleged first-century Aramaic text about God, Jesus and his ministry via a 20th/21st-century German translation, the bulk of which is the responsibility of one who neither knows Aramaic nor possesses the Aramaic texts from which the German version was made?"

The main point here is that inquisitive scholars who are not religiously biased against the TJ, and whose professional reputations can withstand studying it, ought to do so. This may require an independent scholar like myself.

However, there are two key factors not mentioned here by Tibbs that continue to attract the attention of those seeking the truth: (a) As has already been noted, the TJ's co-discoverer, who witnessed the rolls/scrolls with Aramaic writing, is honest and highly credible, and as a UFO contactee is extremely well attested; and (b) as already noted the differences between the TJ and the Gospel of Matthew very strongly indicate that the latter was fabricated out of the former

²⁴ See these [scholars' problems](#).

rather than vice versa. Further, as Tibbs knows, the TJ text is not about “God” and “Jesus and his ministry.” Instead, it is about “Creation” rather than the anthropomorphic biblical God of Israel, and it is about Immanuel (“Jmmanuel”) whose teachings were greatly altered along with his name.

18. Tibbs quoted from a book by Stephen Carlson, a recent PhD graduate of Duke University (Dept. of Religion), who is, not surprisingly, of the same view that the TJ can’t be taken seriously in the absence of its original. The six additional stumbling blocks (in 16. above) to academic study of the TJ apply to Carlson as well as most others. Carlson has a promising career ahead of him in New Testament studies that would be jeopardized were he to spend time studying the Meier contactee case comprehensively, the TJ and its prerequisites, and then report on his findings. Tibbs quoted from a Carlson discussion on perpetrating a hoax as follows:

Misdirection is the technique of causing the audience's attention to be distracted from the anomalies that would defeat the illusion. The first requirement is that the illusion must be plausible to the audience, and in the biblical studies field this means that a supposedly ancient text must be found in an ancient language in pre-modern handwriting. This requirement is sufficient by itself to filter out the vast majority of attempted biblical hoaxes, for example, the nineteenth-century *Unknown Life of Jesus*, which was supposedly written in Tibetan but only known through Nicholas Notovitch's Russian notes. Likewise, the 1970s *Talmud Jmmanuel* known to UFOlogists can never be taken seriously by biblical scholars--its archetype is a German-language version claimed to have been translated from a destroyed Aramaic text.²⁵

Not only was Notovitch’s find unjustly put down by Christian scholars soon after his book was written, but his find was independently confirmed some 28 years later by Swami Abhedananda and his travel party.²⁶ Carlson was apparently unaware of this confirmation. However, Abhedananda did not, or could not, take any pictures of the Tibetan manuscript.

The fact that a couple of important original documents, Aramaic or not, have indeed been discovered that relate to “Jesus” does not mean that other claims of such could not be false. However, the scholar should take into account that any such real document that would be upsetting to the basis of Judaism or Christianity – much more upsetting than any of the Nag Hammadi gnostic texts -- is all too likely to have been willfully destroyed over the course of decades or centuries.

²⁵ Stephen C. Carlson, *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith's Invention of Secret Mark* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005] 88).

²⁶ See [this web page](#), which also refutes the sources of Tibbs’s claims of hoax against Notovitch. See also Swami Abhedananda, *Kashmir O Tibbate (In Kashmir and Tibet)*, 2nd Ed., ed. Swami Prajnanananda (Calcutta: Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, 1953) or its translation: Abhedananda, *Swami Abhedananda's Journey into Kashmir and Tibet*, Trans. A. Dasgupta and K. B. Kundu (Calcutta: Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, 1987 and Hollywood, CA: Vedanta Press, 1987).

18. Among Tibbs's criticisms was the complaint that Immanuel was too good a prophet. This is despite the fact that "Jesus" was known even within the Gospels to have been a prophet in his day (Mt 28:11), and to have prophesied certain events that did occur later. Tibbs wrote:

The *Talmud Immanuel* contains things that are just far too modern to be accepted as the true utterances of Jesus during his ministry in first-century Palestine. Some of it reads like yesterday's newspaper, and it is because of this that suspicions should be raised.

For enlightenment on this topic, lack of awareness associated with 16. (a,b) above needs to be overcome to allow stumbling block 16. (f) to be overcome. The evidence that Immanuel had been a UFO contactee of the same alien group that has been contacting Meier needs detailed study,²⁷ as well as the many prophecies and predictions that they gave Meier which were later fulfilled.²⁸

19. From Tibbs:

Furthermore, the *Talmud Immanuel* is divided into chapters and versification, not unlike our present-day Bibles. The original Aramaic scrolls, if they existed, would not have had such divisions. Instead, it would have been a continuous text as we see in the Dead Sea Scrolls texts and Nag Hammadi texts and gospels. Who was responsible for the chapter divisions and versification? It could only have been either Rashid or Meier. Why would Rashid or Meier bother with these divisions in the translation? To make it look more "Bible-ish...?"

According to Meier it was Rashid who added chapter and verse numbering, though Meier altered Rashid's numbering a little in the 1992 edition. Rashid also added chapter headings and sub-headings. Rashid, as an ex-Greek-Orthodox lay priest, wasn't translating the TJ for scholars to analyze, but rather for future readers who would find the numbering and headings useful for the usual reasons.

20. Tibbs continued,

If the translator remained true to the text, a translation would look more like the translations of the non-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls texts found in Martinez, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.

The appearance of a translation depends upon both the style of the particular writer who wrote and/or dictated it, and the belief system, style and aimed audience of the particular person who translated it. In the case of the TJ, it depends also, especially in its 2nd and later editions, upon

²⁷ See *Contact Reports* Nos. 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 18, 23, 38, 41, 43, 45, 66, 70, 117, 143, 146, 150, 154, 179, 200, 207, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 223, 224, 229, 230, 233, 236, 238, 248, 260, 306, 311, 501 (search for Immanuel), for which "The [Pleiadian/Plejaren Contact Reports](#)"; Stevens, *Message from the Pleiades*, vols. 1-4; and "The [Contact Reports](#) of 'Billy' Eduard Albert Meier: A topical listing -- summary for contacts up to 117th," may be helpful. See also D Hurlburt and P. Cheng, *Eduard "Billy" Meier's Contacts with Asket of the DAL Universe* (Tucson, AZ: UFO Photo Archives, 2002), 51-65.

²⁸ See Michael Horn's [web page](#) on fulfilled prophecies by the Plejarens and Meier.

the style of the later editor, Eduard Meier, who often did not find Isa Rashid's style satisfactory. Hence the TJ's translation may well be expected to exhibit important differences from translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

21. Tibbs also wrote,

... it is difficult to find any correspondence between the "theology" of the *Talmud Immanuel* and the theology of the rest of the Ancient Near East and the early Jewish and Christian world. ... we have no extant Jesus narratives from 'western' sources that look, even remotely, like anything in the *Talmud Immanuel*.

(Here his use of the word "theology" may refer principally to Immanuel having survived the crucifixion.) First, as a contactee of the Plejarens, Immanuel would not be expected to profess a theology at all close to that of Judaism or Christianity, given that authorities of the latter religions succeeded in having the TJ destroyed due to its unacceptable "theology."²⁹

Second, any ancient sources that had referred to the man as being "Immanuel" and not "Jesus" could not have survived purging by early churches of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, since they had adopted a Pauline Christology by the end of the first century. The man was to be worshiped as "Jesus Christ," rather than respected as Immanuel the great prophet, teacher and healer. That he had originally been named "Immanuel" or "Immanuel" was not even to be mentioned after late first century. Fortunately, a few Gnostic writings and other clues survived that point toward this apparent fact.³⁰

Third, due to Immanuel's travels after the crucifixion, when he remained pretty much incognito, he became known under other names. Therefore one needs to research traditions and writings of the man as identified by other names or as "Jesus" only after later recognition of the fact. Several such pieces of evidence exist.³¹ Traditions leading to later writings, from his travel along the Silk Road to northern India and Srinagar, therefore stem mostly from non-western sources. The best known Roman (western) source is found in the book by the Roman philosopher Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, whose book managed to survive despite the contrary wishes of Eusebius.³² The identity of Apollonius with Immanuel alias Jesus is too striking to be ignored,³³ bearing in mind the precautions Philostratus needed to take in order to camouflage his hero. Tibbs may be under the false impression that Apollonius was fictional.

²⁹ See "[Translation of letter from Rashid to Meier.](#)"

³⁰ See "[Was his name really Jesus?](#)"

³¹ See "[Traditions of Jesus' Travels after the Crucifixion.](#)"

³² Eusebius, "Against Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus," in *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, the Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius*, F. C. Conybeare, ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912) vol. 2, 485-605.

³³ See "[Jesus within Roman paganism.](#)"

21. Regarding survival of the crucifixion, Tibbs wrote:

Jesus' surviving the crucifixion, the so-called 'swoon theory,' is not unique to the *Talmud* and is a late development. See Frederick T. Zugibe, *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry*.

A "swoon" is not a satisfactory description of what the *Talmud Jmmanuel* calls "half-death." A swoon implies a temporary fainting or blackout, which a person will soon snap out of and no longer appear as if unconscious or dead. The TJ's description of "half-death" better fits a near-death experience or clinical death – showing scarcely any signs of life for an appreciable length of time. As noted previously, the deepest trance within Hinduism, "samadhi," has also been suggested as a possibility. Tibbs mentions the book by Zugibe to show how impressive the evidence may seem to be against "Jesus" or Jmmanuel having survived his crucifixion.³⁴ However, like other books and articles on this subject, Zugibe's book fails to mention relevant factors that cause one to consider a very finite probability of survival. These include: (a) the 1-in-3 odds of survival implied by a well known account of Josephus, if the victim is taken down from the cross within a day and then attended to, and (b) the medical care given Jmmanuel, according to the TJ, while entombed for three days, by a couple of Hindu friends of Joseph of Arimathea, who were evidently skilled in applying salves and balms to his (scourging, nailing and spear-thrust) wounds (TJ 30:65,72). Although Jmmanuel's relatively prompt recovery might be considered a miracle, that is much less improbable than the unprecedented restoration of a corpse to look just like the original body except for partially healed wounds, and which needs to eat, but exhibits ghostly traits of being able suddenly to appear and disappear, and walk through a closed door – a "resurrected" body.

22. Tibbs then remarked:

Occasionally, the *Talmud Jmmanuel* reveals extremely trite and unreal statements. For example, during the last supper, Jmmanuel (Jesus) was supposed to have said, 'Drink from this cup, all of you; the throat becomes thirsty even on a rainy and cold day.' (TJ 27:41). What?

In response, almost any imagined real statement from the Last Supper may seem rather trite in comparison with the claim that the wine they were to drink was actually the blood of Jesus; moreover, anything that differs from the standard communion formula the Christian hears over and over throughout the church year could seem wrong and thus unreal. Rather, the verse should be taken in full context of the ones preceding and following:

TJ 27: ⁴⁰As they were eating, Jmmanuel took the bread, broke it and gave it to the disciples, saying, "Take it and eat, the body requires nourishment even in times of distress and grief. ⁴¹And he took the

³⁴ Frederick T. Zugibe, *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry* (New York: M. Evans & Co., 2005). He gives quite a complete review of "swoon" theories on pp. 145-163, based largely, however, on his interpretation of the Shroud of Turin. Although he mentions "deep coma" in his review, he doesn't mention "clinical death," "near-death experience," or samadhi. Also omitted is any mention of the preferred survival theory in Deardorff, *Jesus in India*, pp. 151-71.

cup, gave it to them and said, “Drink from this cup, all of you; the throat becomes thirsty even on a rainy and cold day. ⁴²Truly, I say to you, a wise person does not hunger and thirst because of things that must happen. ⁴³But a fool hungers and thirsts on account of stupidity and dissent against things that must happen.”

Thus, TJ27: 42- 43 follows directly from, and culminate,s TJ 27:40-41. So Immanuel’s teaching lesson here was simple and related to his coming ordeal. He knew he must undergo a crucifixion, which he would survive, and that they should not refuse to assuage their hunger and thirst (with bread and wine) on account of grief over what would happen. And one needs liquid even on a cold, rainy day. ³⁵ As to how one should know what must happen versus what can be avoided or altered, that is where wisdom enters in. And wisdom is positively correlated with evolution of the spirit.

After TJ 27:42-43, Tibbs’s only comment was “Come again?” I.e., again, what was written is not the standard formula Tibbs was used to hearing.

23. Tibbs wrote:

The word “trinity” is used in TJ 21:31-32 where Immanuel predicts fourth-century Trinitarian theology as an erroneous teaching. *There is no word in Aramaic for ‘trinity,’* the TJ German text of which is *Dreifachheit*, ‘three-wayness ,’ and *Dreieinheit*, ‘three united.’

Here Tibbs is not contesting the ability of Immanuel to foretell a Trinity belief, but the translation from Aramaic into German. However, we see that the German text does not give the word for “trinity,” which is *Dreifaltigkeit*, or “three-foldness.” So why did Tibbs imply that it does? It seems that in translating, Rashid used a direct translation of the Aramaic, which of course had words to express being like one or like three.

24. From Tibbs:

The *Talmud Immanuel* also claims that Immanuel was the first person to be nailed to a cross, for up until then the crucified were tied to the cross. The crucified were indeed tied to the cross, but there is evidence that nails were also used way before the crucifixion of ‘Immanuel.’

Although Tibbs does not supply the reference for this earlier use of nails by the Romans, I believe it occurred well outside the Jerusalem area. In Jerusalem, cords had indeed previously been utilized. ³⁶ If so, I believe we may give the writer, Judas Iscariot, or Immanuel, the benefit

³⁵ That a cold rainy spell was upon them could be significant in terms of having facilitated, or advanced, Immanuel’s lapse into a near-death state the next afternoon when on the cross. According to TJ 30:41-42 the darkness during the three-hour period (Mt 27:45) was due to a rare thunderstorm. And according to a Norse physician, Kjell Ytrehus, hypothermia would help induce a deep coma; see K. Ytrehus, “Var Jesus dod etter korfestelsen? (Was Jesus dead after the crucifixion?)” *Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen* 122 (8), 833 (Thanks to F. Zugibe, *The Crucifixion of Jesus*, 157-58, 367, for this reference).

³⁶ The one known case of crucifixion in the Jerusalem area in which at least one nail was used is that near Giv'at ha-Mivtar. [According to Joe Zias](#), this case occurred in the 1st century after the crucifixion of Jesus.

of the doubt in not being too pedantic or too knowledgeable on the details of Roman crucifixions carried out in other lands.

25. Tibbs complained about the sketch which Semjase drew of Immanuel at Meier's request:

The fourth edition of the *Talmud Immanuel* has a pencil sketch of what Immanuel (Jesus) really looked like [not shown here], drawn by Semjase from, you guessed it, *old pictures of Immanuel dating back to the time when Immanuel (Jesus) was active in Palestine*. Pictures of the original human Jesus (Immanuel) as he was during his ministry on Earth? But of course. Who took the pictures? And with what kind of apparatus were they taken? Might not have Semjase simply given a copy of one of the original pictures to Meier to include with his thousands of other photos, instead of providing just a drawing based on the photos?

From Contact Report No. 41, it appears that Semjase used no picture of Immanuel at that time to draw from, just her memory of what Immanuel looked like. We are not informed if she knew his appearance from "old pictures," or from having traveled back in time, or what. Perhaps the Plejarens rarely use pictures but instead use some sort of three-dimensional representation. We are only told that it took her 11 minutes to sketch it, and that Meier was glad to receive it.

Tibbs doesn't think the sketch looks realistic enough; others have thought so, too, and so a nicer looking version of it appeared back in the TJ's 1978 edition, as well as yet another rendering in the 2006 4th edition. Here Tibbs seems not to have studied the Meier contacts enough to realize that although Semjase and other Plejarens supplied Meier and other FIGU members with sufficient evidence to prove their existence and presence many times over, they also were careful not to supply so much specific evidence ("extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence") that negative skeptics would be forced against their will to realize the genuineness of his UFO-alien contacts. Not allowing Meier to take pictures of any of the Plejarens was part of their strategy of plausible deniability. And Immanuel was half Plejaren. Hence this strategy carried over to the sensitive topic of what Immanuel/Jesus looked like. By supplying Meier with only a sketch from her memory, Semjase made sure that Christians would not be forced to believe that he looked somewhat different from pictures they are familiar with.

26. Tibbs wondered if the Plejarens might not have written the *Talmud of Immanuel* themselves and planted it in the tomb site for Rashid and Meier to discover:

Let us consider a hypothetical situation for a moment. What if the *Talmud Immanuel* was found, just as Meier said it was, in Aramaic, in a tomb in Jerusalem, but it was actually a creation of the Plejarens and placed there by the Plejarens themselves? This is not impossible.

In making this suggestion, Tibbs indicated he had serious doubts that any of his previous arguments were correct to imply that Rashid or Meier had fabricated the TJ. And he must assume that the Plejarens gave Meier honest information in the Contact Reports yet was totally dishonest in having forged the TJ. This possible contradiction results because Tibbs utilized

Contact Report No. 7 to show that a Plejaren could learn and teach the old Aramaic language (in order to help Rashid learn it, through sending him the proper mental thoughts at appropriate times). Hence, Tibbs reasoned, the Plejarens, knowing the language, could have forged it, complete with four rolls of text with crumbly edges, along with certain figurine artifacts, all of it wrapped in parchment encased in resin, and somehow emplaced under the flat rock in the half-buried tomb site. Further, this TJ text would be cleverly replete with occurrences of parallels to Matthean text that make it look like the writer of Matthew utilized the TJ in forming his Gospel. All this is too reminiscent of the arguments utilized by fundamentalists to prove that the Earth is only 6800 years old, replete with fossils, etc., designed to make it look much older.

27. Tibbs went on to say,

.. according to them [the Plejarens (or the TJ itself)], the real author was Judas Iscariot whom history confused with the 'real' betrayer of Jesus (Jmmanuel), that of the similarly-named Judas Ihariot (go figure that one).

Tibbs is well aware of the full story on this, where one learns a realistic history of how a false rumor was implanted from the start. The gist of it is contained in the short-term prophecy of TJ 27:31-33, which concerns Jmmanuel's coming arrest:

As Juda Ihariot, the son of the Pharisee, will turn me over to the henchmen, my disciple Judas Iscariot will be considered the traitor, so that the message to the people will be, "Behold, these fools are divided among themselves, so that one betrays the other. How, then, can the teachings of Jmmanuel contain any truth?" But since Juda Ihariot, the son of the Pharisee, and my disciple, Judas Iscariot, have almost identical names, the lie of the chief priests will be accepted from the beginning.

And at the arrest, Immanuel speaks to Judas Ihariot's father, Simeon (TJ 28:41-42):

Jmmanuel answered, saying, "Truly, I say to you, for a long time you may succeed in accusing Judas Iscariot as my betrayer before the people, but the truth will come out and be known by all people throughout the entire world; namely, that my betrayer is not Judas Iscariot but is your son, Juda Ihariot, who bears the name of his father, the Pharisee.

The lie was thence promulgated within the synagogues and later perpetuated by the Gospel writers, who could not tolerate Judas Iscariot having been a witness to Jmmanuel alias Jesus surviving the crucifixion, etc., and being the TJ's author. There is no reason to think that a near coincidence in names couldn't have occurred, as "Juda" and "Judas" were so common.

28. In his final paragraph, Tibbs wrote:

The Plejarens dismiss the terms "Christ," "God," and "Satan" as figments of the human imagination proliferated over the Earth in order to enslave humanity under the false religion of Christianity. Fourth-century, Roman Christianity distorted the Truth, indeed, but the *Talmud Jmmanuel* is not the 'truth' that was distorted, **as the Plejarens would have us believe**. The Truth that the Church distorted is found in Johannes Greber's *Communication with the Spirit World of God*.

The first sentence is too easily misinterpreted. According to the Plejarens , “Christ” is a distorted or incorrect term for “Jmmanuel’ or “Immanuel, but since we know the New Testament figure to whom it refers, it’s not a complete fiction. Similarly, since the translator Rashid used the term “God” in the TJ to represent the Plejaren leader overseeing Earth affairs, the Plejarens don’t consider this “God” or “IHWH” to be a fiction. The latter portion of Tibbs’s second sentence could be corrected by replacing “The Truth that the Church distorted...” with “The truth as I see it, which the Church distorted...”