

ROBERT BRAND & CO

Solicitors

17 Bentinck Street
London W1U 2ES

Telephone:

Fax:

e-mail:

DX No:

Oxford Circus North

Robert S. Brand

Peter D. Neidle

Legal Executive

Gillian B. Skelton

Consultant

Timothy J. Drukker

James Randi Esq
The James Randi Educational Foundation
201 S.E. 12th St. (E. Davie Blvd.)
Fort Lauderdale
FL 33316-1815
U.S.A.

Our ref:

TD.

Your ref:

Direct Fax.

Wednesday, 25 July 2007

Dear Mr Randi

www.randi.org

It is with some sadness that we must write to you concerning certain content on your web site.

For many years now, you have been one of our client's greatest publicists. Indeed we know that when you were ill in hospital some time ago, our client prayed for you every night, hoping that you would pull through; and to his relief you did.

Since your recovery you have once again trail-blazed for our client ensuring that his particular powers are publicised all around the world through your web site.

Frankly all publicity is good publicity.

However, whereas our client believes that where his powers are concerned it is not up to him to persuade you of the merit of the same, and that healthy debate is always good, for you to include something on your web site which is not only defamatory but additionally is incredibly insulting, goes somewhat too far.

30 years ago you wrote of our client:

"People like Geller give all of us in magic a black eye. He is in every respect a dangerous and insidious figure. I'll make no bones about it at all: I'm out to stop him at all costs, though it certainly will not be necessary to bring the conjuring profession down with him. I would expect that those in the magic field would share the responsibility for putting the man out of business."

Perhaps your above comments were made as you then believed that our client was

Wednesday, 25 July 2007

James Randi Esq.

“intending to enter the 'psychic healing' field 'soon' and when he starts into that racket, he can kill people. He is well on his way to becoming a religious figure, and he is ruthless in his methods to do so”

Perhaps not. In any event our client has not to our knowledge killed anyone through psychic healing or attempted to set himself up as a religious figure, other than some sporadic attendances in synagogue. Our client is not seen regularly in his local synagogue and the local rabbi is somewhat miffed that your prediction of 1974 has not been realised (though as a vegetarian our client clearly keeps kosher).

Perhaps with age and with your brush with your own mortality you have mellowed. Perhaps not.

Perhaps you still feel that it is your duty to destroy our client's career. Perhaps not.

Perhaps after 30 years of miserable failure in your attempts to destroy our client's career you will give up although our client's publicist hopes not.

Whatever the position and as we have said your views on our client's reputation etc., have been noted for some time now, the question that we ask is whether you wish to carry on your web site something that falls well outside the realms of critique and is at best offensive and at worst is extremely defamatory of our client.

To give some background here. Our client served in the army of his state, fought in the 1967 6 Day War and was injured in action. Like so many others our client risked his life to defend not only the freedom of his fellow citizens but perhaps to defend his states very existence.

It is true that our client now resides in the UK, but he is immensely proud of the small state where he was born.

Since the State of Israel first claimed its independence in 1948 throughout nearly 60 years of turbulent history, the State of Israel has rarely, if ever, through its democratically elected parliament, the Knesset, determined that someone is a *“disgrace to the State of Israel”*.

In truth, so far as we are aware, such a declaration is only made in the most extreme of circumstances, for example traitors, persons who have put the security of the State at risk. We are sure that you will agree that whatever you may think of our client, and your web site makes it somewhat clear what you think, that our client has never put at risk the security of the State of Israel.

We are presently obtaining from the Knesset a list of all those persons who the Knesset has in fact branded *“a disgrace to The State of Israel”* and why they were so branded. You should be aware, and we are sure that if you give this some rational thought, that you will agree, that the likelihood of our client being so branded is so remote as to be preposterous in the extreme.

So we come down to the crux of the matter. We have established we believe that though you are one of our client's greatest publicists, you are perhaps not his biggest fan. Having said this however, we understand that it is your wish that when you die, you be cremated and that our client should have your ashes. We suggest that this perhaps shows more affection for our client than you might wish to admit to, and we know that our client is touched by this gesture.

If however your parting gesture is to be *“one in the eye for Uri Geller”* then we must warn you that this is in all probability an incitement to commit a crime, and we will hold your estate liable for any damage.

Wednesday, 25 July 2007

James Randi Esq.

We are sure however that should your Urn be delivered in tact it will find its place on the sideboard in Uri's kitchen along with the others that our client (like the writer) retains of his most beloved pets whose lives are so fleeting but who bring so much joy to us all.

We have recently placed Discover Magazine on notice that our client complains of an article appearing on page 17 of the August issue of Discover Magazine by Alex Stone under the title "*Whatever Happened to Uri Geller*".

Your web site reproduces and republishes this articles at <http://www.randi.org/jr/2007-07/072007geller.html#i6>

The article makes various statements about our client as fact. We know, as we think you do, that the so called facts are inaccurate and unjustifiable and are highly defamatory of our client. The article and your reproduction and republication of it appears calculated to expose our client to ridicule and to injure him in carrying on his chosen career and to do so worldwide. The author of the article, which you repeat, writes that "*the Knesset branded him [Uri Geller] 'a disgrace to the State of Israel'*"

As we have stated above the statement made by the author is inaccurate and unjustifiable.

We are astonished that this article finds its way on to your website. A rational response to this would be to check the facts. It appears however that this you have not done. We on the other hand have. We asked that contact be made with Mr. Giora Porades (The Knesset Spokesman). We would invite you to make the same contact.

We are informed that not only did the Knesset not brand our client as a disgrace to the State of Israel but that quite the opposite is true.

Mr Porades was very helpful indeed and told our representative that

"Everything that was said about Uri Geller can be found in the Knessets' Protocols which are open for the public".

We invite you therefore to search the Knesset Protocols and make up your own mind as to whether the Knesset branded our client as a disgrace to the State of Israel, and then to see whether you are prepared to do the "decent thing" and remove the offensive material from your site.

Indeed our client requires that you remove the offending remark from your website. Frankly the rest of the article is the usual garbage and its existence on your site probably does our client less harm than good

You may also wish to consider publishing on your web site a full and complete withdrawal and apology and providing us with your written assurance and undertaking that you will not further publish this or any similar statement concerning our client. Having said that this really would be the triumph of hope over experience. We nevertheless reserves all our client's rights in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Brand & Co.

e-mail