

18 September 1992  
15418 Lydian Ave.  
Cleveland OH 44111

Philip J. Klass  
404 "N" St. SW  
Wash. DC 20024

Dear Mr. Klass:

As has been pointed out many times already, you want to have it both ways. You threaten to sue, or hint at the "possibility" of suing, to try to intimidate critics, but then you vehemently deny threatening to sue. You did suggest more than once that the CSICOP Legal Defense Fund might be used to sue Clark; you did hint that you might sue me for comparing your ethics to Seckel's; you did suggest that Seckel could sue me regarding the financial allegations; you did make it "crystal clear" (according to Moseley) that you (or CSICOP?) would sue Saucer Smear if it pursued the Seckel affair.

Let's check the record of your correspondence with me:

- \* You denied that CSICOP promoted Seckel. It did.
- \* You stated that CSICOP never helped start a local group. Kurtz provided under-the-table start-up money to Seckel.
- \* You said I did not ask to discuss the Seckel affair with you at the CSICOP conference. You were the one who said you did not want to discuss it: you told me at the conference you wanted to read Linse's documentation first, after which you would write.
- \* You claimed I was wrong in stating that Seckel was an official member of CSICOP by virtue of his being named a CSICOP Scientific and Technical Consultant. He was a member. I was right.
- \* You claimed I tried to "convince the SCS Board and membership to join with [me] in withdrawing from SCS to create a new organization." When I told you this was false, you did not admit you were wrong but simply demanded that I explain my "inaction" in not trying to form a new group.
- \* You suggested that "although Tom McIver suspected wrongdoing by Al Seckel, McIver never contacted any member of the SCS Board to report his suspicions," although I told you precisely the contrary--that I had alerted several.
- \* You said you would check out my "scenario" of Beckjord's criticism of Seckel with Alexander. Apparently you didn't; or, perhaps you did but kept the results secret.
- \* You denied suggesting that I conspired with Beckjord.
- \* You implied you never received official documentation proving



SCS lost its non-profit status. Linse sent you documentation; also, Saucer Smear published a plea for interested persons to obtain this information, explaining exactly how to get it.

\* You claimed my attempts to warn CSICOP and yourself about Seckel's misrepresentation and fraud was "Obsessive Seckel Bashing." It wasn't; my claims were true.

\* You insisted that the editor of CSICOP's journal has no obligation to publish any disclosure of the Seckel Scandal and will not print what you want him to, but elsewhere insisted that IUR editor Clark should print what you tell him to.

\* You suggest I am lying about sending criticisms of Seckel to several CSICOP leaders in Jan. 1987, but refuse to ask your CSICOP colleagues whether I sent them. You accuse me of "cover-up" or "obfuscation" for not sending you a copy of this early criticism after I specifically told you I would send you a copy if your CSICOP colleagues would not or could not. Apparently you refused to ask them, preferring an excuse to blame me.

\* When I told you that I had heard both UFO believers and skeptics say you were dogmatic and impossible to reason with, you challenged me to name a UFO skeptic who said this. When I quoted Cohen who said this publicly (others I know of who have said this privately), your response was to claim I was unable to name a UFO believer who said this. Besides the fact that you switched demands, I saw no need to name believers who said this as I know you already knew of several who you responded to in Saucer Smear.

\* You demand I name all witnesses but refuse to do so yourself.

\* You claim that CSICOP "might" have taken action against Seckel but that I prevented it from doing so by my attempts to warn CSICOP about Seckel. This incredible claim needs no comment.

\* You deny that your attempts to find out about my personal background are for the purpose of trying to discredit me. You have done exactly this to many critics. Since denying this, you demanded to know whether any of my "previous employers or work-associates ever told [me] that [I] have a 'difficult personality.'" Several people have sent me unsolicited documentation of your attempts to discredit critics by seeking or broadcasting information about their personal lives.

\* You claimed that FATE magazine did not print your response to Clark's article documenting some of your dirt-digging "investigations" of critics. It did.

\* You said you would send me copies of part of McCarthy's thesis to demonstrate my charges were wrong. You didn't; they weren't.

\* You deny questioning my evidence of Seckel's dishonesty. In fact you have attacked it repeatedly.



\* You denied my statement that Seckel had "for years made false claims regarding SCS's tax status." He did.

\* You demanded proof for my statement that you "believed that Seckel did not make false tax claims about SCS prior to 1990, as you told me after I showed you evidence to the contrary." I asked you whether you denied this; you never answered.

\* You said you did not suspect Seckel was lying because you "assume that people are fundamentally honest until proven otherwise." Contrary to this claim, you have treated me with the utmost suspicion and have repeatedly accused me of dishonesty, although there has been no reason to suspect me of dishonesty and much reason to suspect Seckel.

\* After I requested for the second time the names of CSICOP Council members and Board of Directors (and after Hansen told me that Kurtz had refused to divulge Board members), you said you told Frazier that Council members should be listed regularly in SI. They still aren't. Your list of Council members was incomplete.

\* You denied you threatened Moseley with a lawsuit "if he continued to pursue the Seckel affair." He quoted you saying just that; your only response then was to insinuate he was drunk.

\* You claimed I stated in Saucer Smear that Seckel had obtained tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars from SCS funds, but later had to admit I was wrong. I admitted no such thing. You distorted my statements. I said there were allegations he took money from SCS, and later said that in addition to money taken directly from SCS he reportedly also defrauded people of money by other means. You then suggested Seckel could sue me for this.

\* By selective quotation and omission you distorted a statement of mine to make it appear as if I claimed I first wrote to Saucer Smear only after my correspondence with you began. I never claimed this, as my full, undistorted statement shows.

\* You repeatedly claimed my criticisms of Seckel sent to CSICOP leaders were improper "back-door" approaches. They were as direct as could be: signed letters to several CSICOP leaders over a period of several years, plus direct person-to-person confrontations initiated by me at the CSICOP Conference which I attended primarily for that specific purpose. It is Plummer who insisted on secrecy, and other CSICOP leaders such as yourself who want this affair covered up.

\* You publicly claimed, as reported in Saucer Smear, that there was an audit which cleared Seckel of some of the financial charges, but provided no evidence for this, telling me instead to ask Shneour about it. When I did, he refused to provide any evidence of the alleged audit and said he would sue me if I continued asking.



\* In your gloating claim of victory in the Geller lawsuits you misrepresented what I said in Saucer Smear, declared that Geller "KNEW his charges were spurious," and promised to send a copy of the official court decision. (Since you sent your unaddressed announcement to me, I assume you meant you would send a copy of the decision to me. You haven't.)

\* You said you would buy me a subscription to FATE and send me copies of Clark's editorials. I'm still waiting.

\* You complain that I stated I wanted to end our correspondence but later accused you of not answering my questions. It was you who restarted our correspondence, writing to me three times subsequently without answering my questions, then claiming you didn't answer them because you weren't writing to me. Also, you had repeatedly ignored many questions prior to this.

\* You recently stated you did not intend to write to me again. You have since written several unsolicited letters to me.

\* You claim I made a "number of spurious allegations" which you refuted. They were not spurious, and you did not refute them.

\* You imply I claimed to have sent a letter (or ought to have sent a letter) to Seckel requesting to see SCS bank records. It was you who quoted Seckel as declaring SCS bank records were open to public inspection, and I clearly told you that a request was made to the bank itself rather than to Seckel (who lies and falsifies records). The bank replied that the records were not open.

\* You claimed my early statements about Seckel were like Randi's statements about Byrd. Randi's were false; mine were true.

Again, I admit I mistakenly stated that you told me about your suggestion to Clark that CSICOP funds might be used to sue him. I should have realized that although you sent copies of your letters to Clark to "interested parties," this "speculation" was a private suggestion to Clark that you probably did not want to become known publicly.

By the way, after all your quoting and backpedaling on this, do you still "speculate" that the CSICOP Legal Defense Fund might be used to sue Clark? And why do you emphasize my use of the word "might" in describing your "speculation" to Clark? Do you feel you have to emphasize that--as I correctly reported--you were careful not to make a direct threat?

Sincerely,

\* You denied suggesting that I conspired with Beckford.

\* You implied you never received official documents proving

Tom McIver



Philip Klass  
404 N St. SW  
Wash. DC 20024

24 January 1993  
15418 Lydian Ave.  
Cleveland OH 44111

Dear Phil:

Regarding your "Forked Tongue Memo #8" (Dec. 14, 1992) about the financial statement Seckel published for 1987: According to SCS co-workers, only Seckel knew how much money SCS took in; only Seckel had any control over finances. According to former CSICOP Executive Director Mark Plummer, Seckel did not keep legitimate records; Plummer was appalled at Seckel's reckless financial unaccountability. According to Plummer and SCS workers, information in the 1987 SCS financial statement (the only statement you cite, as that was the only year ever reported on) was false; e.g. the claim of payment to Prometheus Books. Seckel is a liar who made false claims about SCS tax status and other important matters, as I have documented. California revoked SCS's non-profit status in 1987 because Seckel never filed any financial information since founding SCS in 1985--though he continued to take in money (under false pretenses, and without reporting it to anyone) for several years afterwards. I stand by my statements about Seckel's financial dishonesty and wrongdoing.

In May 1991 Linse provided you with a list of SCS workers and urged you to contact them to ask them about such matters; apparently you never did. What you had done was publicly claim that an audit cleared Seckel of financial allegations, yet you refuse to provide any evidence for this mythical audit, and your CSICOP colleague Shneour, who you said oversaw the audit, threatened to sue me if I asked him again for any evidence.

"Forked Tongue #9" (Dec. 20): You assert my claim that you called me a "hopeless kook" is a "spurious charge," because, you say, on Aug. 1, 1991 you wrote: "I would not characterize you as a 'kook.' Rather as an obstinate crank who believes his own ends justify any means." This denial is utterly unconvincing. Earlier you wrote that you would "resist [your] instincts" to put my letter in your "'Hopeless Kook' file--unanswered." You often make accusations and innuendoes, but then brazenly deny you are making these very accusations or innuendoes, and later point to your denial as "proof" you have not made the accusation or innuendo. Your letter about Clark which you wrote you were sending to "heads of journalism departments at many universities and colleges" is a flagrant example of this, as is your innuendo of anti-Semitism directed at me.

Your professed outrage at my "spurious charge" that you called me a "kook" is even less impressive given that you have repeatedly made accusations such as the following: that I am an "obstinate crank" and "Venomous Pipsqueak," that I make "spurious



charges" which you "know to be false," that I "resort to inventive distortion and/or falsehood," "obstructionism" or "outright coverup," and make "spurious" and "false accusations." You have described my criticisms as "Obsessive Seckel Bashing," and my letters to you with terms such as "paranoia," "pathological venom," "Flat-out Lie," and "slander."

"Forked Tongue #10" (Dec. 27, 1992): You try to make much of the fact that my 1987 letter(s) did not accuse Seckel of financial misdeeds or phony credentials. (I "only" provided evidence, based on my firsthand experience with Seckel, of seriously unethical conduct and misrepresentation.) Frazier responded to me in Feb. 1987, thanking me for sending my complaints about Seckel, and wrote: "We have heard this before, and are keeping a close watch on him." He told me CSICOP had received "stacks" of complaints about Seckel by then. David Alexander and Plummer made numerous complaints to SCS Board members and CSICOP leaders about Seckel's unethical behavior and crooked financial mismanagement of SCS. Randi told me in 1991 that he had warned CSICOP about Seckel "for years."

It was not until Spring of 1991--when I provided documented written proof that Seckel's credentials were phony and that he made false financial claims about SCS--that CSICOP "allowed" Seckel to resign (apparently, according to what you told me, without insisting or even asking him to resign). This says much about CSICOP, rather than (as you claim) the alleged inadequacies of my 1987 criticisms. You continue to attribute the "blame" for CSICOP's lack of action to me, the whistleblower:

Whom does McIver blame for this failure to respond... to his early 1987 anti-Seckel letters? CSICOP. This Modus Operandi demonstrates McIver's Third Law: WHEN PEOPLE DO NOT REACT THE WAY YOU WOULD LIKE THEM TO, BLAME THEM, NEVER YOURSELF. [Emphasis far greater in your original]

Considering what I have told you about Plummer's extremely harsh criticisms of Seckel's appalling financial mismanagement--criticisms Kurtz told me he and other CSICOP leaders were well aware of--it is deliberately misleading of you to write "Nor did the four CSICOP Council members [Frazier, Randi, Hyman, Gardner] or Executive Director [Plummer] who received copies consider McIver's anti-Seckel letters to be an appropriate subject for discussion at the next Council meeting." Plummer most certainly wanted something to be done then about Seckel; Frazier told me he was very concerned also, and Randi said he tried to warn CSICOP "for years." Why indeed was it not discussed at subsequent Council meetings, and nothing done until late 1991 (and nothing done even then, if, as you claim, CSICOP merely let Seckel resign on his own initiative)?

You continue to claim, falsely, that I have "refused my [Klass's] requests that he send me copies of these [1987]



letters." I have explained to you many, many times, for well over a year, that I would send copies of my 1987 letters provided you asked your CSICOP colleagues first and they would not or could not send you copies themselves. Initially I said I would send replacement copies to your CSICOP colleagues to forward to you; later I offered to send copies directly to you provided you asked your CSICOP colleagues first. Apparently you never asked. It is deliberately and blatantly dishonest of you to continue to claim I have "refused" to send you copies. After offering for over a year to send copies to you directly or via your CSICOP colleagues, and having you claim repeatedly that I "refused" to send you copies, I came to the conclusion that you did not really want them and/or that you intended to deliberately misrepresent them, and I withdrew my offer. If you do want them, you can still ask your CSICOP colleagues--something you refuse to do. You still imply you doubt these letters even exist--something your CSICOP colleagues (and Seckel himself) could affirm with a single word--but you refuse to ask them.

I made the very easy condition that you ask your colleagues first for these letters because your attacks against my whistleblowing and your unethical attempts to discredit me constitute CSICOP's only response to my criticisms since you began to try to discredit my evidence and my character. CSICOP leaders are apparently quite willing to let you respond to me in this way without themselves getting involved, but I wanted you to ask them about receipt of my criticisms in order to elicit some acknowledgment from them of my persistent warnings and of your accusations and tactics; also to encourage them to comment on the situation instead of ignoring it and letting you remain sole CSICOP respondent, thereby tacitly condoning your attacks on me.

"Forked Tongue #11" (Dec. 31, 1992): You triumphantly announce that CSICOP dropped Seckel after receiving (from me), in 1990, documented proof that Seckel's credentials were completely phony. Should CSICOP be congratulated for dropping Seckel only in late 1991? CSICOP received many warnings from me and others for years prior to this--years in which it continued to endorse and promote Seckel. Randi, at the 1991 conference, told me he had tried to warn CSICOP about Seckel years ago. Former CSICOP Executive Director Plummer had for years complained about Seckel; he knew Seckel was not keeping legitimate financial records and knew the SCS financial statement was falsified. And you did not admit that CSICOP willingly dropped Seckel even after receiving this documented evidence of fraud; you told me Seckel himself asked to be removed; that at the Council meeting it was noted "that at Al Seckel's request, his name has been dropped from the list of CSICOP consultants..."

And what response did the whistleblower get for providing this information which you say led to Seckel's removal? No one in CSICOP even acknowledged receipt of this information, though you proudly point out that half a year after receiving this evidence CSICOP removed Seckel from its Consultant list (the



Spring 1991 SI issue). Your response was to viciously attack my evidence as "spurious" "completely unsubstantiated charges" and to try to discredit me. I asked Kurtz (and Karr and Frazier) in person about Seckel at the May 1991 conference; their only response was to insist that he had nothing to do with CSICOP, and to make disparaging remarks about my motives for criticizing him. When I signed up for the conference, CSICOP was still endorsing Seckel and listing him as an official member and Scientific Consultant. CSICOP had not informed me it was dropping Seckel or doing anything at all about my documented proof of fraud.

The only action CSICOP took regarding Seckel was to remove his name from the Consultant list in the Spring 1991 SI issue--but this list was then stated to be only "partial," so it was not even clear that omission of his name meant he was no longer an elected CSICOP member and Scientific Consultant. CSICOP has never publicly acknowledged that they "dropped" Seckel or that there was any problem at all with him--much less that he was guilty of fraudulent claims. CSICOP has, in my opinion, tacitly condoned your vicious attacks against me and against my evidence by refusing to comment on or offer the slightest criticism of your tactics and vicious ad hominem attacks. The only response from CSICOP or CSICOP members since the conference to my documented proof of fraud has been: your attacks.

In response to Linse's request that CSICOP at least acknowledge Seckel's wrongdoing, you said CSICOP should not "denounce" anyone (though neither Linse nor I suggested you "denounce" Seckel) "without incontrovertible evidence"--thus indicating you did not consider the available evidence sufficient proof. You then made it clear that you were neither denying nor confirming the "allegations," saying nothing about any documented evidence of fraud--again indicating that you did not consider my "documented evidence" sufficient proof of fraud even after the CSICOP conference. Kurtz told me at that meeting that Seckel "almost" graduated from Cornell and emphasized that he did not consider my documented evidence proof of serious fraud (Seckel had apparently by this time produced a phony transcript and concocted a brilliant but totally fraudulent academic record for himself, which Kurtz and Shneour believed). You, from the very start, accused me of making "completely spurious charges."

You continue to quote from my letters, encouraging copying by others, though on Dec. 21 I specifically denied you permission to send your letters quoting mine to others unless you included a complete copy of my letters too. Posner has told me that you are sending copies of your "Forked Tongue memos" to him. Who else are you sending them to? In your "Forked Tongue #11," dated Dec. 31, 1992--ten days after I denied you permission to quote from my letters without enclosing a copy of my complete letter quoted from--you continue to state that these flyers "MAY BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PERMISSION" (emphasis greater in your original). This indicates you are continuing to send these memos to others, and that you are encouraging public distribution of your "memos"



quoting my letters without including copies of my complete letters--though I explicitly denied you permission to do this.

You have sent me copies of numerous letters from Clark and others. You sent me a verbatim transcript of a private telephone conversation with Robert Mortenson. Did Clark, Mortenson, and the others give you permission to send copies of these to me or anyone else? I ask because you have claimed to Lippard, after finding out he sent copies of your correspondence with him to me, that "all correspondence is presumed to be personal and confidential unless the writer indicates otherwise." But earlier, after finding out I had sent Lippard copies of our correspondence, you asked him whether I had "sent you [Lippard] complete copies of all of my letters...as well as his own?"--i.e., indicating you wanted him to see your letters to me, and would have complained if I hadn't sent them along with mine. Later you wrote: "Delighted to learn that McIver (apparently) has sent you a complete set of our correspondence ..." again indicating you wanted copies of your letters sent.

You also wrote: "Enclosed is photocopy of McIver's Nov. 15 letter--Plus the first of my new TM ("Forked Tongue") series, of which there will be more." You have sent copies of my letters, but now complain to Lippard that he does the same with your letters, and you now quote from my letters without sending copies after I specifically denied you permission to do so. The reason you now complain--contradictorily and hypocritically--about Lippard sending copies of your letters is because you realize you wrote something potentially libelous about me--that I have "slandered" you--in a recent letter to Lippard, which--in accordance with your own well-established custom--he sent a copy of to me. (If Lippard had merely reported to me that you had accused me of slander you would not have been able to make this hypocritical complaint.) The fact is that you have routinely encouraged public distribution of your correspondence.

You have informed me (by sending me copies of your mailings to Clark) that you have "contributed \$2,500 to the building fund of the Center for Inquiry (where CSICOP headquarters is housed) and pledged another \$5,000." That is revealing.

Did you submit "Crybaby" to Skeptical Inquirer or any other journal before you submitted it to Fate? You have claimed that you evaded the scientific issues Rawlins raised because you wrote it for Fate, whose readers did not want and were incapable of understanding scientific arguments.

And what, specifically, have I said that you consider "slander"?

Sincerely,

Tom McIver