

Dear Mr. Victor,

Friday 16, 2005

Thank you for your E-mail of 12/13/2005. The disputed page "victor\_prince.html" was immediately removed from my web site upon receipt and reading of your e-mail to me. I have also posted a retraction of the statements using the preliminary information in your two attachments to me. [http://www.amquix.info/victor\\_retraction.html](http://www.amquix.info/victor_retraction.html)

I did happen to notice the IBOA's posting of you message and the comment

*"IBOs everywhere, and Quixtar, have had their businesses harmed by the false and misleading information posted on the Internet by Scott Larsen"*

Let me say for the record that neither Quixtar, Amway, nor the IBOA have ever written me claiming anything on my site is false. It seems if the information were so false that they would have already taken immediate action to correct it, like you have done here. I had tried numerous times to enter into a dialog with the corporation but in the end they stopped replying to my e-mails.

When some site visitors do write claiming I have published something that is supposedly false, and that has happened fewer times than I can count on one hand, I address the issue right away, as I did in your case. I guess what I am trying to say is that if there is so much false information on my site, how come I don't hear about it?

I'm glad you wrote me as soon as you did, but the attached Quixtar letter is really not complete and technically there are a few assumed or implied answers.

The information about the disputed retouched crown photo of your parents was had been on my site since at least 4/11/2003. For as often as board level IBOs surf my site, I'm surprised I did not hear from you earlier. Surely you had seen the page back then. [http://web.archive.org/web/20030411083148/http://www.amquix.50megs.com/amway\\_divorces.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20030411083148/http://www.amquix.50megs.com/amway_divorces.html)

The first allegation about the retouched crown portrait was sent to me by an IBO in your downline. See attached file "Mark Ludwig" from 2/27/2003. After receiving your letter this week I contacted the person who sent me the mail. It seems Mark Ludwig did not author the E-mail, someone named "David" did, using Mark Ludwig's computer.

In a mail to me on Friday December 16th, Mark Ludwig had said he had heard the allegations of the family crown photo as well. He stated he had even seen your parent's crown family portrait in Ada, without Linda. Mr. Ludwig's parents who were also in the business from the early '80 also had heard the allegations as well.

Another site visitor had also verbally told me had had been guided through the "Hall of fame" in Ada and a corporate person, had even shown him the portrait made the same allegation to the Joe Victor's family portrait. The corporate officer told him that many Diamonds modify their pictures when a divorce has taken place. I believe he said the corporate officer was Ken McDonald.

Certainly we can clear these allegations up once and for all. On my page, "victor\_prince.html", I was not careful to say which crown portrait was modified. I have

carefully read the Quixtar statement about the crown portrait and it seems to me that Quixtar did not make a statement about the crown portrait of **Joe and Helyne** in Ada, but possibly only about your crown portrait with you and **Kathy**.

I came upon the crown portrait allegation when I was asking the site visitor, using Mark Ludwig's computer, for the name of your ex-wife, whom I believe is named "Linda".

*"Not sure of Jody's wife before Kathy. It's like her name and likeness was banned from any conversation, the company even had her touched off the Crown portrait of Joe & Helyne's family in the company's 'Hall of Fame" up in Ada."*

**So to get straight to the point, are you saying that Linda was never in a family crown portrait of Joe and Helyne and that any portraits were never retouched?**

If you give me your word that any family crown portrait of Joe and Helyne were never modified to remove Linda, I will retract my statement and make a public apology.

Apparently you may be the unfortunate victim of a longstanding and widespread practical joke within the business and at the corporation. I guess I just happened to be the first one to put it into print on the Internet and maybe I can help you set it straight.

You know I would have never brought the family portrait issue up had I not noticed that your 2005 IBOA picture of you presented you in a way that made you look at least 20 years younger than your photos on the Quixtar response site.

[http://www.quixtarresponse.com/images/lg\\_photo\\_victor.jpg](http://www.quixtarresponse.com/images/lg_photo_victor.jpg)



<http://www.iboai.com/IBOAI-Board.asp>

The 2004 photo on the Quixtar response site does not do you justice if the 2005 IBO actually contains unretouched image of you.

**Quixtar did not mention it in their letter, and you did not mention it in your rebuttal. Was the 2005 IBOA board picture retouched?**

In the "Mark Ludwig" letter as well as comments from IBOs, it was alleged that the true original MMP organization was rather small and could fit

*"Almost none of the MMP organizational leaders are actually in Jody Victor's group. They are all actually under Jody's parent's group. Jody's "crownship" from the early 80's is nowhere to be found. Can't name a single Platinum who was actually personally sponsored by Jody and still a part of MMP."  
"Rumors have it that Jody Victor is going one by one to all of Yagers Diamonds trying to create unrest with the fact that Yager's kids are handling the business. Jody uses Yagers events to get close to the Diamonds then tries to steal them to MMP. None of the Yager Diamonds have any idea how small MMP really is. Even with 5 pirated Diamonds tapping in, they still average less than 500 total people at 3 yearly functions. At 50 people needed for a solid Platinum, the numbers don't add up."*

At least two other former diamonds have commented on how small the MMP functions actually are.

As far as the comments about your current qualification, you did not specifically state what your pin qualification is and you refer me to Quixtar's letter for clarification.

I see from Quixtar's letter that you qualify for "Executive Diamond Club". I have reviewed the Quixtar compendium ([www.amquix.info/pdfs/compendium.pdf](http://www.amquix.info/pdfs/compendium.pdf)) from September 2005 and I cannot find a pin level called "Executive Diamond Club".

The qualifications for Executive Diamond are:

*Rev. September 2005*

*Executive Diamond*

*You can qualify as an Executive Diamond if you either:*

- 1. Personally, internationally, or foster-register 9 or more groups (3 must be North American), each of which qualifies at the 25% Performance Bonus level for at least 6 months of the fiscal year, or*
- 2. Achieve Diamond Bonus qualification and generate at least 10 FAA credits during the fiscal year.*

According to the 2002-2003 Sales Incentive Plan ([www.amquix.info/pdfs/2002-2003USSIP.pdf](http://www.amquix.info/pdfs/2002-2003USSIP.pdf)), it states that "Executive Diamond Club" is a trip award:

### ***3. Executive Diamond Club***

*Executive Diamond Club is a leadership forum for eligible IBOs who qualify at the Executive Diamond level or above.*

Absent from the brochure is whether IBOA board members, who are no doubt considered leaders, and who no doubt should be attending all leadership forums are by default invited or "qualified" to attend "Executive Diamond Club". So it could be those *qualifying to attend* Executive Diamond Club is not just limited to those who qualify for the Executive Diamond pin and above and who are in good standing with the business.

The fine differences between the "Executive Diamond Pin" and the "Executive Diamond Club" leadership forum are not clearly made in Quixtar's response.

The IBOA website post with the support of the Quixtar letter seems to imply that the "*periodically qualifying as emerald statement*" is untrue, as you are in fact qualifying for some sort of "*Executive Diamond*" recognition.

Can we set the record straight? **Do you qualify for the Executive Diamond Pin to the definition in the Sep. 2005 compendium?** That is do you have 9 direct legs, or 10 FAA points with a diamond bonus? **Do you qualify for the Executive Diamond Pin if you remove legs you might have purchased or inherited?**

If you give me your word that you qualify for the Executive Diamond Pin, or you qualify for some other pin higher than Emerald, I will retract my statement about "periodically qualifying for emerald" and make a public apology.

As far as if you ever qualified as a crown on your own without legs from your parent's business, or purchasing them, if you give me your word that you had personally sponsored 18 groups that simultaneously qualified for at least platinum, I will retract my statement and make a public apology.

We can also clear up the American Way Association comment. **Did your father ever have part ownership in the American Way Association? If so, did he ever relinquish it or sell it?** If he never had ownership in the American Way Association or if he never relinquished it, I will retract my statement with a public apology.

You trained as an attorney know that the truth is always a defense in any defamation case. Even if you are not deemed a public figure, people are still allowed to say truthful statements about you in a public forum. As you well know, being a public figure is only an issue if the statements were in fact untrue.

If you were deemed a public figure, due to your association with the controversial Amway/Quixtar business, then you only have legal recourse if you could prove I knew the statements were false before I made them.

Of course, if the statements were not true and you were not deemed a public figure I would be libel for damages. These damages might however be difficult to prove for the short duration the page was up and now based upon my retraction.

I certainly want to clear up what the actual truth of the situation is. I will certainly make a public apology to those statements you take issue with if you just give me your word the answers to the questions above are the truth.

With Best Regards,  
Scott Larsen