



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Re: 'The Gulf Breeze Paper'

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: 'The Gulf Breeze Paper'

From: **bruce maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 4 Nov 1997 11:26:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 06 Nov 1997 03:54:03 -0500
Subject: Re: 'The Gulf Breeze Paper'

>From: c549597@showme.missouri.edu [Barbara Becker]
>Date: Wed, 29 Oct 1997 12:57:54 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: 'The Gulf Breeze Paper'

(10/30/97) To the several people still following this discussion:
Here are my comments on her 10/29 message..

> <snip>

>> > > HERE IS MY COMMENT ON HER PAPER: I am aware that the GB
>>>> skeptics have tried, unsuccessfully, to discredit all the other
witnesses.

(SNIP)

>> > **** BB: There were NONE that came forward before Ed and only
>> > ONE, a man named Thompson, who described and drew a picture
>> > similar to Ed's.

>> The fact is that over a dozen people came forward within the 8
>> months following Ed's initial report. Presumably no one twisted their
>> arms or otherwise forced them to make their statements to the effect
>> that they saw the same object. I realize this is a bitter pill for the
>> skeptics to swallow, but if you took Ed completely out of the picture
>> you would still have an amazing series of sightings. Quite likely

(SNIP)

>> Presumably there would have been some publicity and then
>> investigators would have learned about the sightings that took
>> place in November, December 1987 and January and February, 1988.
>> And many of the witnesses reported the basic key features: a
>> round object with a bright ring on the bottom and a light on the
>> top. Some reported other key features as well.

>(BB10/29)The problem with their reports is that there was too much time
>between Ed's photos hitting the newspaper and these people coming
>forward. In ANY OTHER case, these reports would be viewed
> skeptically.

What does this mean? What should have been done differently?
Each sighting should be judged on its own merits. Or, would you
have them rejected simply because there are many similarities to
what Ed photographed?

>> (I don't care WHAT Don Ware's reason was

>>.for showing Ed Walters the Billy Meier video and other UFO books the
>>first week in December, it was not correct procedure.)

At least we agree on one thing. Contamination of witnesses is a dumb thing to do. On the other hand, it apparently didn't affect Ed. However, if his pictures had begun to resemble Meier's after December, 1987 the investigation probably would have been closed in January of 1988.

>>>>BSM, 10/17/97: The following people stated they saw a UFO
>>> > like or the same as what appeared in Ed's photos (list taken

>> >*****BB I have many of these reports. Unfortunately, with the
>> >exception of Thompson, the other sketches of witnesses in 1987, are
>> >NOT identical to Walters UFO. AND once again, most of the reports
>> >were taken much later.

Yes, some of the reports were taken much later because sightings were much later. (e.g., McCann, Holcomb, Pollock, McConnell, see below)

>> Your requirement of "identity" reminds me of similar
>> fallacious reasoning by the writers of Project Blue Book Special Report #14.

<snip>

>> Your reasoning could be used to achieve the same result with the
>> Gulf Breeze sightings. You could state that because the
>> witnesses did not all report exactly the same thing they probably
>> saw nothing at all... or at least no flying saucers.

>This has NOTHING to do with MY reasoning. I've been in this long
>enough to know that no two reports of THE SAME OBJECT will be
>reported IDENTICALLY. When I hear people saying that they have
>seen the SAME object, I am suspicious.

WHOA THERE!! If I understand correctly up to this point you have been demanding that support for Ed's sightings means that the descriptions must be the "same" or "identical." Now you admit different people won't report things identically and, moreover, if they did you'd be suspicious. You can't have it both ways.

Consider the report by Fenner McConnell (county coronor and pathologist) and his wife Shirley. Their sighting did not happen until July, 1988. They said they saw the same object that Ed photographed hovering over the water near their house on the western shore of Gulf Breeze. This was early in the morning. So much light was coming out of the bottom that they could see the reflection from the water. They also reported seeing "windows." As they watched, the light got brighter and then it moved away across the Pensacola Bay. The sketch by Shirley McConnell is in GULF BREEZE WITHOUT ED (MUFON Symp 1991). Do you accept their sighting as real? Or do you reject it?

>BTW: You apparently
>forget that even in your correspondence to me it is YOU who state
>that these other GB witnesses saw the SAME UFO as Ed. That seemed
>to be a way for you and they to validate what Walters claimed he
>saw. As far as I know, from the documentation I have, no one
>drew anything IDENTICAL to Walters, the pictures look more like a
>bastardized version of Walters.

WHOA..here you go with identical" again. Let's see, if I understand what you are (or seem to be) saying: it is my mistake to suggest that these sightings/sketches support Walters because the descriptions/drawings are similar. They would only support Walters if the drawings/descriptions were identical.

On the other hand, arguing from your Walters-hoax point of view, the fact that these sketches/descriptions are somewhat similar (or nearly identical) indicate his photos are a hoax because

(1) the drawings/descriptions are not identical and therefore don't support Ed's photos or

(2) the drawings/descriptions are so similar that they must be "bastardized versions" of Walters' photos, i.e., the witnesses don't really recall what they saw (if anything) and so they don't support Walters photos.

CONGRATULATIONS! With reasoning like this..... you could never be wrong.

>The reports were taken much too late not to rule out mis remembering
>what (if anything) these people DID see.

WHOA THERE AGAIN! Many interesting sightings occurred long after Ed's first photos were published and the witnesses made their reports soon after the sightings. (see McConnell sightings above and others below)

>Here are a few tidbits from your 1991 Symposium Paper. See, I
>HAVE read it.

GOOD FOR YOU!

**>p.190/ "Mr. Art Hufford had stated publicly and unequivocally
**>that what he saw was exactly the same thing as shown in the
**>pictures."
> (The Huffords did not make their report until March 1988.)
**> p.189/ In a letter to the GBS, Billie Zammit claimed she saw "this
**> same object", as the photo in the newspaper.
**>p.189 / Jeff Thompson, (whose report I find compelling but would
**>like it better if he had not waited 6 months to make a formal
**>report), said that what he saw was "similar".
**>p. 189 / Doris and Charles Somerby, Duane Cooks' parents, and
**>former editor of the GBS, said "what I saw on Veterans's Day
**>night , (November 11) was exactly what was depicted in the
**>pictures published in the GBS."

>> So, what is it, Barbara? Do you accept ANY of the sightings in
>> the November 1987 - July 1988 time frame (when Ed was taking
>> these pictures), or do you reject them all?

>As I said previously, I find Thmpson's report compelling, but I
>would have liked it to have been taken when the event was fresher
>in his mind.

How about Truman Holcomb who made his report SOON AFTER his April 28 sighting? How about Ray Pollock who also made a confidential (name not released at the time) report soon after his sighting May 27 (see page 202, "anonymous"). I already mentioned the McConnells. These people made "fresh" reports. Do you reject their accuracy of description simply because what they describe resembles (closely!) what Ed saw and photographed? Or do you think that in the several days or so between their sightings and their reports their memory had been sufficiently "bastardized" by Ed's photos (which had been published MONTHS earlier; there was no book at this time, you know) that they couldn't accurately describewhat they saw?

<snip>

>> Its not enough to have an overall similar or even identical
>> shape, plus a bright ring on the bottom? Just because the "windows"
>> don't show in every photo by other people doesn't mean the objects
>> aren't the same.

>Thats the point. I WOULDNT EXPECT THEM TO. I agree.

>> Hence a verbal report which mentions the key details (overall shape,
>> bright ring on bottom, light on top) should not be rejected simply
>> because it doesn't include all the details shown in Ed's pictures
>> Also, even many of Ed's recent pictures (since 1992)show objects which
>> are not identical in shape to the ones he photographed in 1987-88.

>I dont reject them. I reject Ed Walters photos as published in
>GBS. They are just too damn perfect.

Thank you for explaining the scientific basis for your rejection of the Walters photos in the face of "whelming" (some might even say "overwhelming") evidence that other people saw the SAME THING!! Said scientific basis being "too damn perfect." I think I'll invent an acronym to simply further reference to this scientific principle of UFO photo evaluation: reject photos that are TDP!

Perhaps there are degrees of TDP. For example, if anyone should be rejected it is Billy Meier who definitely ranks at the top of TDP. In comparison with this, many of Ed's photos rank low, even below the famous McMinnville photos, because in many of Ed's

photos the images are too dark to see the whole UFO. Sometimes all that is visible is the "power ring."

>>>Persons who wrote to Ed in response to the publication of his first

(SNIP)

>>>> Bruce you can personally attest that you have seen each and
>>> >every one of these letters, and that they are written differently
>>> >different people?

>>> I have not seen all these, but have seen many letters...all from
>>> different locations. Different writing. Ed saved the
>>> envelopes..all different addresses and postmarks.

>Which photos letter and envelopes have you personally seen?
> Do you have copies for your records?

I looked at my file and found that in January 1991, four years before there was any talk of a book by me and Ed, Ed sent me copies of about two dozen letters he received from Florida, other places in the USA and other countries. With each letter was a copy of the envelop with postmark. In reviewing the letters I found many with drawing and descriptions and statements of "similarity" or "identity", just as in the published letters. I found only two in the collection I received in 1991, which are published in the book: Alan Stutzamen (from Germany) and "Marsha Pagan" (not her real name). You will find these on pages 122, and 130 in the book...Ed had literally thousands of letters to choose from and apparently he chose mostly letters that were more recent than what he sent me.

Example of unpublished letters:

March 6, 1988 sighting (letter date May, 1990)
"...what it looked like most was photo 17...";

June 10, 1989 sighting (Mar 1990 postcard)
"My wife and I saw something glide through the sky that greatly resembled your photo #18..."

<snip>

>> > Your comment, "Oddly enough, they are from around Costa Rica,

(SNIP)

>>>****BB I really dont know what you are saying here but...Has
>>> this one been in the newspaper? Which of the South American
>>> reports and sightings were recorded in a newspaper at the
>>> time of the sighting?

>> See my response above to the previous comment.

>Which of the South American reports/pictures used in the book are
>fixed in time by an independent source?

You can read a UPI story dated March 18, 1989. Then in his letter James Warnerfred says it was the publicity that got him to go to the area on March 30, 1989. So far as I know none of the photos published in the book was published in a newspaper.

> <magnum snip>

> > >**** BB: Anyone with the slimmest doubt was kept away from this
> > > case. No skeptics allowed...only believers.

>> Instead they proceded on their own. Perhaps you don't recall (or
>> never knew) about Ray Stanford getting egg all over his face in
>> April, 1988,

<snip>

>>I know about Stanford...but I also know that it was Andrus who
>>made a proclamation about rain in one of the photos, so anyone,
>>with bad info can open mouth and insert foot.

Yes, indeed. However, there is a considerable difference between what Andrus did (saying that in his opinion the little white spots on photo 19 were water drops on the windshield) and what

Ray did. (He sent letters to the mayor, TV station and newspaper to claim publicly (and loudly) that he had proof that a man generally considered to be an upstanding and respected citizen of the community was actually the perpetrator of an amazing hoax and conspiracy!) If Walt Andrus inserted his foot then Ray swallowed himself whole.

(SNIP)

>>> The person Tommy "came forward" to with his story was his
>>> father.

(SNIP)

>>>At the press conference Mr. Smith was careful to avoid criticizing
>>>any of the other Gulf Breeze witnesses, including those who
>>> claimed to have seen exactly the same thing have seen exactly
>>> the same thing that Ed photographed.

>There you go with the "same thing Ed photographed"...

There you go again mixing up identicality with "the same thing..."

>>> Tommy's photos were analyzed. Tommy had claimed that
>>> Ed had faked them by double exposure methods.

> > 10/17/97 Readers: note well the following paragraph:

(SNIP)

>>> However, analysis revealed no evidence of double exposure
>>> and, in fact, the photos appeared to be just single exposures,
>>> not double exposures as Tommy had indicated. The shape
>>> and color of the depicted UFO was consistent with what Ed
>>> had photographed.

(SNIP)

>> Evidently you don't understand. I'll try again, The proof that Ed
>> faked the pictures that Tommy gave to the Sheriff was
>> ***supposed to be** the evidence that it was a double exposure,
>> according to T. Smith. But there is no evidence of a double
>> exposure.

>> Hence your claim "Ed took the photographs" is not proved by
>> the photographs.

>Who analyzed the photographs? Please don't tell me you did.

Oh, but I did. And so did Bob Oechsler. And so did Robert Nathan at JPL. None of us could find even the slightest hint of a double exposure. There was simply nothing on the negatives other than the faint reddish images of the UFO itself. If there had been a double exposure there would have been siome other images like a background scene. But there was nothing.

And, by the way these photos rank near or at the bottom of the TDP scale mentioned above.

<snip>

>>>**** BB: I cant speak for any of these people but everyone
>>>makes a bad call once in while...even you Bruce.

>>>Yeah me.....and even You, Barbara.

>> > ****BB Bruce. The above line is childish.

>> Yeah, so is the above line.

>Ya! Well, mom always liked you better!!!!

Right, but you got the dog and all I got was that stupid chicken!
BARK,. CHICKEN!!!! Never could get that chicken to bark.
(unquote, Smothers Brothers, ca. late 1960's or early 1970's)

> > > 4) Here is my comment on her paper:
> > > This discussion about the copyright does not prove Ed
> > > created the Bill and Jane photos. Hence Barbara's claim

>> <big snip>

>> > > "this demonstrates his ability...." is also not proven. In

>>> >BSM: 10/17/97 When it comes to deciding who's right, you
>>>> grasp for legalities is you wish; I'll stick to the physical
>>>> analysis.

>> >****BB Your physical analysis can be wrong. Law, at least this
>> >copyright law, is very specific. And it VERY specifically says

(SNIP)

>> Physical analysis can be wrong.....and the law can't be wrong?

>>Can lawyers repeal the "laws" of optics and photography? But we
>>are talking about diverse things here. I claim that the photos
>>which Ed claims to have taken were not hoaxed by Ed...and
>> severalof them contain images which could not have been
>> hoaxed by Ed for reasons outlined in UFOS ARE REAL.....
>> Also, I claim there were many other witnesses to the same type
>> of UFO. Hence, I claim the
>> photos and sightings are real

>> You claim that Ed broke the law if he published the Bill and Jane
>> photos without owning the rights to those photos.
> >But to arrive at your conclusion you must assume Ed (and his
>> lawyers) would be smart enough not to break the law.

>Oh, pullleeeese. Dont go through this "Ed's too stupid to..."
>routine.

Who said Ed's too stupid? Perhaps he got bad advice. After all,
he doesn't claim to be an expert on copyright law.

>> Therefore he would have transfer agreements with Bill and
>> Jane to protect himself against a lawsuit... or else he took the
>> photos himself.

>"By George, you've got it!"

Got what? Your TDP principle?

>> Since he has no transfer agreements you conclude that he
>> must have taken the photos himself. (But then he would be a
>> liar because he said someone else took them, and this lie
>> then carries over into the other sightings... etc.)'

>You're smarter than I thought.

>>BUT...WHAT IF ED DID BREAK THE LAW IN PUBLISHING BILL
>>AND JANE'S PHOTOS? Ed doesn't think he broke the law. Ed's
>>lawyer doesn't think he broke the law.Morrow's lawyer doesn't
>>think he broke the law. But, according to you, if he is telling the
truth

>>HE BROKE THE LAW. SHAME ON ED!!!! Well, as I have
>>suggested (challenged you) in the past, if you really think he
>>broke the law in publishing the photos, the sue him on behalf of
>>Bill and Jane!

>But I dont think he broke the law. I think he owns the copyright
>(ie didnt break law) because he took the pictures. He is
>perfectly legal. There is nothing to sue.

And your justification for thinking Ed didn't break the law is
what? The TDP principle?

> <snip>

>> >****BB I'll repeat the question. Maybe you overlooked it the
>> >last time I asked. Hey Bruce....Is Ed dead????? If not how
>> >about calling him on the phone (surely you have his number)
>>>and ask him why he doesnt have a transfer agreement and
>>>why he owns the copyright to the B&J photos? Thats simple.
>>> And please no BSabout Duane giving him the photos.

>> The answer has already been given.

>NO IT HASNT. Why wont you just get on the phone,or send him
>a letter and ask him point blank about the Bill and Jane photos?
>AND if you refuse to do that, how about telling me and the rest

>of the people on this list exactly why you wont do it.

I did talk to him some time ago when you brought this up in private letters. His answer was that he has no transfer agreement and his lawyer thinks he is not infringing on any copyrights.

>>> If you are correct, Ed is a CRIMINAL, A FELON,
>>> GUILTY OF INFRINGING ON THE COPYRIGHTS
>>> OF BILL AND JANE...
>>> So, why don't you sue Ed on behalf of Bill and Jane?>

>Because there is nothing to sue. Walters owns the copyright
>because HE took the pictures. That is what his LOC Copyright
>.registration says. If its good enough for them, (and Morrow and
>Ed's lawyer) then its good enough for me.

As I said before, looks as if we're back where we started....except for one thing. Every reader of this message is now aware of the TDP principle, which appears to have been your underlying justification for this "attack." As far as the legal aspects are concerned you haven't proven a thing. Ed could be guilty of copyright infringement, but we'll never know for certain if he isn't taken to court. You think he owns the copyright and therefore can't be sued. His lawyer thinks he owns the right to publish the photos in his book because Bill and Jane have abandoned the rights to the photos. This sounds to me like a statement. If this were a court of law I would ask the judge for a summary dismissal of this argument.

Too bad it's not a court of law.

Search for other documents to/from: [brumac](#) | [c549597](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).