



## 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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Mar](#) -> [\\_The\\_ Open Letter From Jerry Black To Various](#)

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### \_The\_ Open Letter From Jerry Black To Various

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@globalserve.net>  
Date: Sun, 15 Mar 1998 13:06:34 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 15 Mar 1998 13:06:34 -0500  
Subject: [\\_The\\_ Open Letter From Jerry Black To Various](#)

I just spoke, via phon, with Jerry Black. He suffers from chronic arthritis and is unable to use a keyboard, hence the mentions of "this tape" in his 'Open Letter' below. Mr Black uses a tape recorder to correspond.

During the course of our conversation, Mr. Black mentioned Bill Spaulding and was wondering whether any readers here knew of his whereabouts?

The telephone number at the end of his 'Open Letter' works and Mr. Black asks that if anyone needs to call him they do so after 3pm EST.

He also would like to thank Glenn Joyner for transcribing the following.

ebk

---

From: <http://members.xoom.com/ufobarb/jb01.html>

Looking Back: A Review Of Gulf Breeze

An Open Letter From Jerry Black To Various 'Ufologists'  
October, 1997

cc: Don Ware  
Art Hufford  
Charles Flannigan  
Walt Andrus  
Jeff Sainio  
Bruce Maccabee  
Bob Oeschler  
Budd Hopkins

In this dissertation, we will look back and review the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze UFO case. As always, I have no problem with any of these gentlemen mentioned, as far as their being good citizens, and good people in their communities. My only problem with the above gentlemen is their ability to investigate the UFO phenomena, or, in most cases, their lack of that ability.

My position on UFOs has been clear for 39 years. I am not a debunker, as many have tried to portray myself, Rex Salisberry, and others. I believe there is a true UFO phenomenon; I believe these objects are not from this planet. I know there are popular theories of their nature, including extraterrestrial, extradimensional, spiritual, etc. All of these theories need to be explored. I certainly believe that, contrary to what Budd Hopkins, Stan Friedman, and others say, we do not have proof of what UFOs really are. We are far from that proof. But I do believe that we are definitely dealing with real objects. I think one of the last theories, of course, that we would have to place on the list would be that the objects are from this planet -- from one of the major governments. I sincerely, steadfastly do not believe this last scenario.

So I am a true believer in the UFO phenomena? I believe thousands of people feel they have been abducted by alien beings. These cases should be taken seriously and investigated thoroughly.

I was asked by an AP reporter, during an interview, was I going to celebrate the "50th Anniversary of ufology " with a party of my own. He may have been taken aback at my response, when I said, "Certainly not." When he asked what I meant, I said, "Well you tell me what there is to celebrate." In 50 years, all we have been able to accomplish is to show the general public that we are dealing with an object which we cannot identify.

Because of cases like Gulf Breeze, Guardian, Linda Cortile, and others, we have basically made fools of ourselves. So again, what have we accomplished in ufology in the last 50 years? Nothing has been demonstrated, other than there are a lot of people with an abundance of ego, a lot of desire to make money, and no desire for scientific and objective investigation.

I'll open this missive with comments directed to Mr. Don Ware. I had an opportunity to talk with Don Ware on just one occasion. I believe that he also sent me a couple of letters. It was very clear to me, when I talked with Mr. Ware, that he had already committed himself to Ed Walters early on, and that they had, in fact, become good friends in a very short period of time.

In mentioning my thoughts to Don Ware about Ed Walters, I remember that his words to me were that, regardless of what I felt about Ed Walters, he and Ed would always be good friends. I found this very interesting. I could tell, right away, that Don Ware had been taken in by Ed Walters quite early on.

I have not had any personal conversations with Art Hufford, but am aware of a situation where he had talked with Zan Overall. I understand that Art Hufford was a fraternity brother of Tommy Smith's father, as an interesting side note to this entire affair. My complaint about Art Hufford is my basic complaint with all of the (what I call) rookie investigators at that time in Gulf Breeze; that being that I believe that Art was either following an agenda, or simply that he was a totally incompetent investigator. One would have to take their choice on how they feel about the two scenarios.

Before Walt Andrus and I got to the level of "non-speaking terms," I was given a copy of a note that Art was sending to Walt regarding Gary Watson's report. I find it interesting that, in the third paragraph of his cover letter, he says, "I trust this article meets your expectations." I guess my first comment to Art Hufford on this is, what "expectations" did Walt Andrus have? Were you following some format, some agenda, that MUFON (Mutual UFO Network) had? I thought this was intended to be an objective report by Gary Watson, sent to you for editing, then to be put into the MUFON Journal.

I also noticed, and this was extremely interesting, that you copied Ed Walters on this memo. I find this, really, somewhat bizarre. This guy obviously became, very, very early on in this investigation, one of you! Instead of being the subject of the investigation, he was basically part of the 'investigative' principals. Why in the world would you copy Ed Walters on a report going to MUFON? This was a MUFON investigative report, an internal report done by MUFON, to ultimately be put into the MUFON Journal. Certainly, when he got the Journal, he could have read the results of the investigation, if he was a subscriber, or if you sent him a copy; that would be fine. But to copy him on

the cover letter of your intra-organization MUFON investigations shows me very clearly that Ed Walters had become quite good friends with all of you people.

I understand that you are an engineer, Mr. Hufford. I know that a writer, a Mr. Smith, that did a very positive story on Gulf Breeze, used a drawing that you made. I've seen you at least two or three times in the past ten years, on national television. One occasion was an informal setting, as you appeared to be in a backyard somewhere, with Ed Walters in attendance. You were saying to the cameras, "Yeah, and I saw this object just like the one you photographed, just like yours, Ed." I thought to myself at the time that an engineer was supposed to use exact situations, exact remarks, figures, etc. However, in your drawing of the object which you saw, during daylight hours, for about 20 seconds, as I understand it, there are no windows on the UFO. Yet you claim, on national television, at least two or three times, that you saw the same object that Ed Walters photographed early on. How can that be true?

You made a comment, below the drawing in Mr. Smith's article, trying to explain your situation. You said something to the effect of, well you didn't see any windows, but there may have been some. Mr. Hufford, you can only say what you saw. Were you trying to match up your sighting with those of Ed Walter?

Please remind Mr. Gary Watson that, in his report on the famous model that was found by the Menzer family in Ed Walters' old home, there are three digits, followed by the words "Jamestown Drive." In the report by Gary Watson, he shows nothing before the words "Jamestown Drive," and says "unknown information." The third digit is very clear. It is a two. One can see that the other two digits, which one can only see the bottom half of, have straight lines as their bottom parts. We can then assume that they are not twos, threes, fives, sixes, or eights, because of how the bottom of the digits look. Yet Gary Watson says in his report that this is "unknown information." The two is clearly visible, and that should be noted in his report. The first two digits are two straight lines that we can see from the bottom, to the point where the paper has been cut. They could be sevens, and could be ones. It could very definitely be 712 Jamestown Drive, the Volker home plans. Yet Gary Watson chooses not to show that two in there, or the two digits before that show straight lines half way up. Why would Gary call this "unknown information?" Is it because if the plans are the Volker plans, it would indicate that Ed Walters made the model?

Are all of you people following an agenda set by Walt Andrus? Or is it that you simply don't make competent statements, and don't do your work very well?

I'd like to say something now that I know none of you are aware of. Perhaps you aren't even interested. Ed Walters claimed the model represented the Lynn Thomas family home plans, and indeed they did say that early on. Incidentally, we know that the home was never built for them. However, during the past four or five years, we've stayed in touch with the Thomas family, who have moved to Detroit.

Mrs. Thomas took an extensive course to become a real estate agent after she left the Gulf Breeze area. To make sure that she was looking at the same plans that I was, I sent her a copy of the plans from Sarah Menzer's home. (We could all have this, by simply requesting it from Ms. Menzer.) Mrs. Thomas said the plans were basically the same thing she had received from either Walt Andrus or Ed Walters.

Now, though, since taking her real estate course, and realizing that her house was going to be built on the corner of Shoreline Drive and Jamestown, she said to me that she definitely now does not believe that the model plans she was sent represent the plans of the home that was supposed to be built for her.

I asked her why she did not feel that way any longer. She said that, since she had become a real estate agent, and more adept at reading plans and diagrams, the plans she was looking at were for a house that would be much smaller than the home that was to be built for their family, which would have been situated on the corner of Shoreline and Jamestown. She reiterated, "I'm saying to you again, Mr. Black, these plans are not the plans that were designed for our home, to be built on that corner."

Mr. Thomas was on an extension phone during the conversation. He said to me, "Mr. Black, I never felt, all along, that these were our plans. But I bowed to my wife, because I felt she knew better than I."

So now we have a situation wherein Mrs. Thomas, for at least four or five years now, no longer believes that the plans are hers. In fact, she is very sure they are not her plans.

According to Mr. Walt Andrus, if anything of a major nature, like this, came up, he would reopen the case for investigation. So I would assume that after Mr. Andrus receives this tape, along with a couple of other things that have come up also, he is going to reopen the investigation into the Ed Walters case. This would be in keeping with his word. Alas, though, throughout this long investigation, he has never kept his word on anything. We can only hope that this time he will keep his word. I hope, Mr. Andrus, that you will verify this with the Lynn Thomas family. If you have a problem with obtaining their phone number in Michigan, I can supply it to you.

We are, therefore, letting Mr. Watson and Mr. Hufford (and anyone else who is interested) know that the model is no longer thought to be that of the Thomas home plans. This means that Ed Walters, again, has lied.

I only talked to Mr. Charles Flannigan one time, as well. Charles Flannigan made it very clear that he did not believe the Rex Salisbury report. Regarding the polygraph test, it is absurd that Ed Walters went out and took his own test, and that all of you accepted it without even seeing the results. When I questioned Mr. Flannigan on the polygraph, he said to me, and this is paraphrased, but is almost an exact quote, sometimes in extraordinary cases, you have to break the rules. I really think that Mr. Flannigan has this backwards: in extraordinary cases you have to make sure that you adhere exactly to the rules.

I believe that Mr. Flannigan is also in the real estate business. So, again, if that is true, he should have known, by looking at the above-mentioned plans, even before Lynn Thomas took her real estate course, that these were not the plans for the home. Why didn't Mr. Flannigan catch this error? Why didn't he notice that the plans were not of a structure large enough to be a corner lot building project? He should have realized that the plans did not match those of what was actually built, the Volker home.

In keeping with his statement, that in exceptional cases you have to break the rules, would Mr. Flannigan break the rules of integrity in real estate, if he had a chance to sell two or three homes together in one sale? Would he compromise his integrity to do that? I think not. If he wouldn't do it in that situation, why would he do it for Ed Walters?

Bob Oeschler has "retired" from ufology . I can only say that, in talking with Bob three or four different times -- one time for three hours -- while he seems like a very nice person, I think his motives in ufology were not those that at least I would associate with credible investigators.

I think Bob Oeschler had an agenda. In talking to another investigator that knows Mr. Oeschler, I believe I know what that agenda was, even though I would rather not discuss that subject here.

Bob Oeschler admittedly accepted \$5,000.00 from Ed Walters, very early on in this situation. I believe that this was totally wrong. There was nothing whatsoever that Bob did for Ed Walters, to earn himself \$5,000.00, that was a help in the investigation of this case. His acceptance of that money did nothing at all, except to make him obligated to Ed Walters. He ignored all of the evidence, as have the other recipients of this tape.

Bob Oeschler promoted the Guardian case, which has been proven to be a hoax. He made a statement about the Guardian case which illustrates the type of dramatization he uses, and tried to use in the Gulf Breeze case. Bob said that, when Unsolved Mysteries did a piece on the Guardian case, they spent over \$250,000.00 trying to duplicate the scene on the anonymously-presented video tape, showing the alleged object in the field.

I contacted Mr. Tim Rogan, one of the producers of the Unsolved Mysteries show. When I did so the first time, Mr. Rogan was very quick and abrupt with me. I tried to explain to him that I wanted to find out how much it cost to produce this Guardian segment. Finally I said to him, "Well let me send you a copy of the article written by Mr. Bob Oeschler in a UFO magazine, and then if you would give me the courtesy of a return call, you can let me know what you think."

Well, I really never expected to hear back from Mr. Tim Rogan, but surprisingly, about three weeks later, he did call me, with a much friendlier attitude. He said, "Mr. Black, you're correct. I see here where Mr. Oeschler claims we spent \$250,000.00 trying to duplicate that scene exactly, and could not do it. Let me say to you that we have used Mr. Oeschler as a consultant on a couple of shows. But let me also say to you that Mr. Oeschler was in no position, whatsoever, to know how much money we spent on the Guardian scene. We are not in the business of trying to exactly duplicate a scene that we do. We try to come as close to it as possible, within the means of our budget. But there, again, Mr. Black, Mr. Oeschler would not be privy to any information as to how much it cost to produce the Guardian scene. So I can see what you're saying here. He is totally wrong in his statement, and I appreciate your bringing it to my attention."

All I can say to you is that, when any person is handed \$5,000.00 for whatever piece of work -- I do not even see what it could have been, to be worth that amount -- in my opinion, as I stated in my story in UFO Magazine, you are hard pressed to go against the person that is handing you the money. You feel a certain obligation, whether you realize it or not.

I am glad that Bob Oeschler chose to withdraw himself from the UFO community, and investigations. My conversations with Bob are always friendly, and again, as a person, I have no problems with him. But as an investigator, I certainly do have a problem. I think he was more interested in getting himself on television, getting himself recognized, than he was in doing objective and scientific investigations. The Guardian case has been basically proven to be a hoax by a member of the MUFON organization, at least to the satisfaction of most serious investigators.

I've had three or four conversations with Mr. Jeff Sainio, and I can only say that he was basically an unknown until the Gulf Breeze case came along. Then, all of a sudden, Mr. Maccabee has this hidden photographic expert hidden in the wings that will make a revelation to everyone. In talking with Jeff Sainio, it appeared to me that he was extremely jealous of Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son, James, because the statements that he made were totally in left field. Any competent photographic analysis person would never even begin to make some of those statements.

Jeff Sainio wrote a letter to Mr. Hyzer, insinuating that Mr. Hyzer did not have proper equipment, that he did not have this or that. In talking about Jeff Sainio versus William Hyzer, we can use the analogy of an eighth grade student versus a college professor. Mr. Sainio's remarks were totally out of line. Was Jeff Sainio following an agenda? I don't know. He certainly could have been. Mr. Sainio told me on the phone (in a conversation that I have on tape) that, by using second and third generation copies, just like Mr. Hyzer had, he could, just by looking at the photograph (the famous "road shot," #19), see luminosity going down the road. Mr. Hyzer, looking at the same second and third generation copies, could not detect the luminosity with his most sophisticated equipment. You have to ask yourself, who is right, and who is wrong? Who has an ax to grind, and who doesn't?

I could never understand, first of all, how Jeff Sainio could have become the Wisconsin State Director of MUFON, having never investigated a single UFO case. I mentioned something about investigations on the Ed Walters case to him, and he said, "Jerry, I'm not an investigator. I'm just a photographic analysis person."

So how does a person who has never, ever investigated a UFO case become, not a Regional Investigator, not an Assistant State Director, but the State Director for Wisconsin? I do not know if he holds that position now, but he did at that time.

Mr. Sainio mentions in his article, where he berates Mr. Hyzer,

that he realizes, of course, that he had originals to work with, and Mr. Hyzer did not. But on the taped conversation with me, he admitted that most of his findings, especially the luminosity, could also be found on second and third generation copies, which he also had.

Really, if he were a professional and a gentleman, he should have stated, "While I did have the originals, I also had second and third generation copies, just like Mr. Hyzer. I found the same evidence that I have reported in the latter generation copies as I did in the originals." That is what he should have said, as a professional. Why didn't he say that to Mr. Hyzer? He said it to me.

I think that Jeff Sainio has a tremendous amount of resentment that Mr. Hyzer was on this case. Or he was following an agenda. Only he can tell you which is the correct answer. I consider his remarks as bordering on totally ludicrous, even insane, when you realize that Mr. Hyzer had, at that time, around 38 years of experience, and that his son, James, had 20 years of experience, with no ax to grind. So one has to ask, why would Jeff Sainio make those ridiculous remarks? Why would he claim to be able to see luminosity with the naked eye, off the same copies that Mr. Hyzer had, when Mr. Hyzer could not detect it with his sophisticated equipment?

Mr. Budd Hopkins got involved in this case early on. He went down to Gulf Breeze and made statements that were published, I believe, in the 1988 MUFON Symposium papers, stating that he had met Ed Walters, and, as far as he was concerned, the case was very solid. There was no investigation done, just his interview; just him talking to Ed Walters. In my opinion, what Budd Hopkins did on his trip to Gulf Breeze was to mainly let Ed Walters know how to go about publishing a book.

Mr. Budd Hopkins has been an embarrassment and a disgrace to the entire UFO community for years. He does not investigate cases; he reports them. With regard to his book, Intruders, it was not until years later that I realized (and he admitted to this fact) that he had no evidence from medical doctors, whatsoever, that Kathie Davis was ever impregnated, even one time, by extraterrestrials, much less the many times, as he states. The reason given for this was that Kathie Davis said that the medical doctors did not want to be involved. Yet, Budd Hopkins wrote a book about Kathie Davis, with no evidence whatsoever. He should have demanded her medical records. Kathie Davis had a right to demand her medical records from the doctors, even if she had to retain an attorney, which I don't think would have been necessary. She has a right, legally, to those medical documents, that would show that she was pregnant, but later lost a fetus.

Another book written by Budd Hopkins, 'Witnessed', was totally ludicrous. I'm told that even friends of Budd Hopkins are upset with him because of this book.

Budd Hopkins has never met "Richard" or "Dan", featured in 'Witnessed'. He has never met them. The political figure that he alludes to having met at the airport in Chicago states that he was not even present in the area at the time. Budd made no investigation with neighbors, no investigation of whether this political figure would have reason to be at the heliport.

The book, 'Witnessed', reads like a bad, bad soap opera. And Budd wonders why he is being chastised by even some of his friends and supporters. It's because, Budd, people are sick and tired of you not doing your job. All you are interested in is writing books. Your claim, that five million people have been abducted, is totally ridiculous, totally ludicrous. While I'm a believer in the abduction phenomena, there is no way in the world that five million people have been abducted. You are an embarrassment to the UFO community. I hate to say that, because years and years ago I thought you were the top dog. I thought you knew what you were doing. I thought you had covered your buns, that you did thorough investigations of cases. Obviously, you do not. You have become a disgrace to the UFO community. This woman has hoaxed you. There is no doubt that that's the way it has to be. This is not a situation where she could have had a dream at night, and she believes it to be true. This woman, because of the tapes, because of the letters from "Richard" and "Dan", is the hoaxer.

Of course, Budd Hopkins does not believe in the polygraph test.

I've heard that from some of his closest friends. Oh, no, Budd, doesn't believe in polygraphs. Well, an army major once very quickly said to me, when I told him that some people in ufology did not believe in polygraphs, "Jerry, sometimes polygraph tests don't sell books."

I realize that a polygraph test cannot be depended on 100 percent, anymore than, as Mr. Hopkins should realize, hypnosis is 100 percent dependable. But these are the only tools we have, and if you give a polygraph test under the proper conditions, where you are telling someone that the gentleman that gives you this test has 20 years experience in administering the tests, you make them aware that there are certain degrees of passing or failing. You tell them that, if you are border line, or if you do not feel comfortable with that person, we will give you the test again. This is not an entrapment; this is a situation where we are trying to get to the truth. If the polygraph test is presented to a person in that way, they basically should not be able to refuse it. If they do, it should be a sign to you that there is a problem with that case. If it was a national case, and they refused to take a polygraph, I would not even go on with it.

Budd Hopkins, though, for years now, has investigated cases this way, I now know. I don't care what Don Berliner thinks about Mr. Hopkins. I know there is an "Old Boys Club" out there; with Stan Friedman, Budd Hopkins, Don Berliner, Bruce Maccabee, Walt Andrus... None of those guys are going to say anything against the other guy. Well, let me tell you that most UFOlogists are getting tired of the Old Boys Club.

So, Budd, I feel bad in having to make these comments about you. I really do. As I said, I had the most respect for you, some 15 years ago. I kind of looked up to you, and thought you were the main guy in ufology. You're still the main guy in ufology, as far as the news media is concerned. But you're just not doing your job. I don't know if you just want to believe so badly, or if you are doing it for the money -- I don't know what your agenda is. Whatever it is, even your closest friends, I'm told, are saying that the book is ridiculous. There is no basis of proof or investigation for it whatsoever. A couple of witnesses have come forward. One, I think, has since passed away. That will happen with any case. You will always have someone come forward and say, "I was there, I saw," because they want the notoriety, too. Just look at Roswell; look at Ragsdale, look at Anderson. It happens all the time.

I failed to mention something earlier, but I want to mention it now, because it will have some impact later. For the past four and a half years, I have been working on the Gulf Breeze case. But for a year and a half, also, I worked with Tracy Torme on the Travis Walton case. I have also been working very closely with Kodak, regarding the autopsy video.

I mention the Travis Walton case because I'm the one, of course, that sponsored Travis Walton, Alan Dallas, and Mike Rogers for the new polygraph tests. They were administered by Cy Gilson, who polygraphed them back in 1975. I also sponsored the polygraph tests in 1993, which, I believe, were referred to at the end of the movie. I mention this for a purpose. By the way, all three men passed the polygraph tests, and I am a supporter of the Travis Walton case. I do not support, of course, either the autopsy video or Gulf Breeze, so I am supporting one out of the last three of my major investigations.

Two of the biggest culprits in this whole case are Mr. Walt Andrus and Mr. Bruce Maccabee. I'll start this section with talking about Walt Andrus. His treatment of Rex Salisbury, Robert Boyd, and Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son, James, is totally inexcusable. To basically allow Mr. Rex Salisbury to be dismissed from his position, by others than himself, shows a cowardly side of Mr. Andrus, at the least. When I asked Mr. Andrus why he allowed this to be done, he said, "Oh, it's been done before." But in a professional organization, when you hire, you fire. Obviously, though, Walt Andrus did not have the guts to fire him. Yet, after he was dismissed from his position by people in MUFON, in the Gulf Breeze/Pensacola area, he was reminded by Walt Andrus that he still owed Walt a report on the Gulf Breeze case. Personally, I would have told Mr. Walt Andrus to shove his report. Of course, though, Rex is much more of a gentleman, I guess, than I am, because he chose to go ahead and finish the work that he was asked to do. Of course, he got no

thanks for it whatsoever.

It was obvious to me, early on, that Walt Andrus had no intention of changing his mind on Gulf Breeze. Walt Andrus, as an investigator, just like Budd Hopkins, is an embarrassment to the field of ufology . I admire Mr. Andrus for his ability as an administrator, and for his ability to hold the MUFON organization together, through the lean years of the late 70s and early 80s. For that, I give him all the credit in the world. But as an objective and scientific UFO investigator, he is a complete failure. I can only say, in thinking about a picture I saw of him on the cover of the MUFON Journal some years ago, that kneeling in a crop circle over in England does not make one a UFO investigator. MUFON will never be held in the esteem it was before the Gulf Breeze case started.

A friend of mine mentioned to me, regarding Gulf Breeze, that in the Journal some years ago, Walt said that they had doubled their membership since that case, I guess from 1987 to 1992. He said, in this message from the director, "We must be doing something right." No, Mr. Andrus, you did not do anything right. What you did do, was you stooped to low tabloid-type journalism stories, to get your name out on the television networks with this absurd Gulf Breeze case, and that's how you increased your membership. You compromised your integrity to bolster your membership. Believe me, there are a lot of people out there in the UFO field that are aware of this.

One interesting thing is that Mr. Ray Fowler is supposed to be the Director of Investigations for MUFON, or at least that is what I was told. Yet, through all of the hundreds and hundreds of papers written on the Gulf Breeze case, his name is never mentioned. You would think that the Director of Investigations would be involved in a high-profile case that was investigated by MUFON for four to five years, and possibly longer. You would think he would be in charge of that investigation. I'm not sure if he was there in 1987, but I know he was there in the early 90s. You would think he would be the man leading that investigation...

Mr. Andrus, I know of at least three members of you board (at least three) who do not believe the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze case is a good case. They believe it to be a hoax. I have never seen their names mentioned in your MUFON Journals, that a friend of mine receives, and always lets me know if there is anything there that should be brought to my attention.

You, Mr. Andrus, were following an agenda. When your investigators ran with the case, you did nothing better than run with the case, yourself. You embarrassed a senior investigator, Mr. Robert Boyd, who saw problems with the case early on, by not taking his advice, but instead taking the advice of junior rookie investigators, Charles Flannigan, Don Ware, and Art Hufford. You took their advice over that of a senior investigator of 15 years, which is completely inexcusable. I talked to Robert Boyd on a couple of occasions. It was clear, from the beginning, that you were not going to change your mind about Gulf Breeze, no matter what evidence was given to you. This was contrary to the statement you made, that, given evidence that would show this case to be a hoax, you would reopen the investigation. Well, now you have the model, as one major lie of Ed Walters. I challenge you to call the Thomas family on that.

Mr. Hyzer would not have even been involved in this case, if it were up to you. Early on, in taped conversations, I suggested that you get an independent photographic analysis person. Where were you going to find one? You asked how you were going to get hold of one. Well, you have quite a few resources that I do not, correct Mr. Andrus? So how was I able to come up with a photographic expert, from my home in Blanchester, Ohio, without coming down to Gulf Breeze, without leaving my house, and you supposedly could not find one, with all of the resources and professional people you are connected to. I found one of the top ten photographic analysis people and his son without leaving my home. You did not want to find one, Mr. Andrus.

I had found Mr. Hyzer, and in our phone conversation, which was taped, I requested that you send him some copies of the photographs, which I assumed would be originals. I told you that I had found Mr. Hyzer, and that I had secured his services for you, for free -- he waived his \$200.00 per hour fee -- and you

did not return my call for three weeks. So I called you back, and asked if you were going to send some photographs to Mr. Hyzer. I had already sent you the background information on him, which, by the way, reads like that of a top corporate executive. Anyway, your reply to me was that you had a Journal to get out. You were very busy; you were going to try to get around to it, but you were very busy. So I took the liberty, at that time, to make a statement to you -- a very true statement -- but I knew how you would take it. I told you that I had sent Mr. Hyzer a Journal, in which there were some reproductions of some of Ed Walters' earlier pictures. I told you that Mr. Hyzer had said to me that he could not tell by looking at these pictures in the Journal that the photographs were a hoax. Mr. Hyzer did truly make this statement. Right away, you said, "Oh really? That's strange, because Dr. Willy Smith said he could tell just by looking at them." I said, "Well, I'm just telling you what Mr. Hyzer said, Mr. Andrus."

I received a call within 48 hours from Mr. William G. Hyzer. He said that he had received, by air mail express, ten second and third generation copies, just that quickly. So obviously my comments to you worked, because the minute you thought that Mr. Hyzer was a person who may side with you on these photographs, simply because of the statement I had made, he got the photographs that quickly. However, I noticed that he did not get originals. It was your job, Mr. Andrus, to see that he got originals, so he could be treated as fairly as, earlier, Mr. Bruce Maccabee had been, and as, later, Mr. Jeff Sainio was. But you did not see to that. You sent him second and third generation copies.

But, boy, you sent them out air mail express, the same day, because you thought, from the remark I had made to you, that Mr. Hyzer was going to be siding with Bruce Maccabee. You thought, because he could not see anything with the naked eye, that his instruments would not see anything, which was not true at all. You cannot tell anything, by simply looking, especially in a night time photograph. You have to apply the different tests to it.

Your treatment of Mr. Hyzer, a highly-ranked professional, after his first report, was totally embarrassing to me, as the person who brought him to you. Your treatment of him was disgraceful. You did not answer his letters, his requests for original photographs were ignored. Your lack of professionalism, not only in the UFO field, but as one person to another, was clearly shown. As I said, you are an embarrassment and a disgrace to the UFO community. You were given, at no charge, access to one of the top ten photo analysts, and this is the way you treated that person, because you, sir, had an agenda. You sir, let the case get out of hand, and you were not a big enough person to say, "I made a mistake, we've got to change our attitude. We've got to let this analysis go through with Mr. Hyzer, and let the chips fall where they may." You were not about to do that. You did not have the courage to admit you made a mistake.

Mr. Hyzer never gave me any copies of any letters that were sent to him by Bruce Maccabee or Charles Flannigan. Yet, you were told by me, at least twice, on tape, that Mr. Hyzer was not going to respond to Bruce Maccabee, to Jeff Sainio, to Charles Flannigan, to anybody, but you and Rex Salisberry. I guess, evidently, either you did not follow through on that, or your people are hard of hearing. Bruce Maccabee sent letters to Mr. Hyzer. He told me about them, but did not tell me the contents. Charles Flannigan had even sent a letter, and Jeff Sainio, I guess, sent him letters.

The only time any letter was specifically mentioned was one he received from Charles Flannigan -- and I'll address this question to Mr. Flannigan, because I would like to know what he meant. He said to me that, after the initial preliminary report, wherein he said all of the photographs showed signs of double exposure, but it was not conclusive, he received a letter from Charles Flannigan that he did not understand. I asked him what about it he did not understand. He did not want to make me privy to the content of the letter, but he did tell me one sentence. He asked, "What does Mr. Flannigan mean, when he says that I don't understand the whole story?" He asked me, "Jerry, what am I supposed to understand here? I'm just doing some photographic analysis work. What does Mr. Flannigan mean when he says to me that I don't understand the whole story?"

So Mr. Flannigan, I'll put that question to you: What did you mean when you said to Mr. Hyzer that he did not understand the whole story? What other whole story should he have known? You were told, I thought, not to write to him, not to bother him, as was Bruce Maccabee supposedly told, and as was Jeff Sainio, as I said. Are you people deaf?

Thanks to you, Mr. Walt Andrus, Mr. Hyzer, as he mentioned in a letter to you, I think, and to Jeff Sainio, will not involve himself with any more UFO videos or photographs. Thanks to you, sir, because of your rudeness in the way you treated him. Yes, thanks to you, ufology has lost a top-notch photographic expert, someone who could lend some credibility to our field.

I have no respect for you, Mr. Andrus. You should resign from the position you have at MUFON, turn it over to someone else, and take over administrative duties. You have even been hyping the Linda Cortile case, for years, at your conventions, basically just because you and Budd Hopkins are so "buddy-buddy." My own father could be like Budd Hopkins, in reporting the kind of trash that he does, and I would tell him, to his face, that his reporting was trash. I would ask him, "Where is the evidence? Where is the proof?"

Allow me to pass on another tid-bit of information that you may not be aware of... While I cannot state whether this is first-hand or second-hand information, because the source does not want to be acknowledged, during the time of the "Believer Jane" and "Believer Bill" photographs (and I will discuss them, and the copyrights on them, later), which was earlier on in the case, Mr. Ed Walters visited offices of The Sentinel newspaper, seeing Duane Cook, at least three or four times a week. According to my most reliable source, during those visits, sometimes behind closed doors, sometimes with the doors wide open, there was always continual laughter between Duane Cook and Ed Walters. Mr. Duane Cook was in on this thing very shortly after Ed acknowledged that he was the one that had taken the pictures. Mr. Cook either got in on it at that time, or he was in on it from the very beginning. I perceive it to be that he got in on it after Ed Walters admitted that he was the photographer. Nonetheless, he knew early on. This person, this witness, who should know, states to me that there was continual laughter, week after week, between these two, as Ed appeared at the office several times each week.

Now this man, Ed Walters, was supposedly picked up with a blue beam of light from a UFO, dropped to the ground, and terrified. Is this the way a man in that position would act? I don't think so.

So there's another tid-bit of information for you, Mr. Andrus, that you never bothered to follow up on. I took the time to check it out, during my own four and a half years of investigating the case. I took my time to check on details, to check with people who were in a position to observe.

Peter Newman told you guys early on that Ed Walters double-exposed photographs for kids, playing hoax with them. Did you bother to go back and check on that? I asked you to. I can assure that you did not -- because you didn't want to. Peter Newman stated, early in 1987, that Ed Walters had told him that he double-exposed Polaroid photographs, playing with the kids. Yet Ed Walters consistently denied to you that he knew how to double-expose Polaroid film.

You never really listened, Mr. Andrus. You didn't have the courage, or the guts, to change your mind, when you should have realized this case was a hoax. Anybody, a kid in school, would have realized this case was a hoax early on. I feel sorry for Robert Boyd, for the time he put in on this. There is much more I could say about you, Mr. Andrus, but I don't want to press the point any further.

The last person on the list is probably the biggest culprit in the whole case. For Mr. Bruce Maccabee to have the audacity to co-author a book with Ed Walters is unbelievable.

Bruce Maccabee has tried to wear many, many different hats during this investigation.

He tried to pretend he was a UFO investigator -- in which he failed. He tried to pretend he was a photographic analyst. We now know (thanks to Mr. Hyzer and his son) that Bruce Maccabee and Jeff Sainio do not even begin to qualify as professional photographic analysts. We have proven that now. Of course, they may have been following an agenda of their own.

Mr. Maccabee also tried to wear the hat of a talent professional, in the acting field. He believes that no one could "act" like Ed Walters did, in the video allegedly taken by Duane Cook, showing Ed going crazy before he saw this UFO (that nobody else saw). When I mentioned something about this in a letter to Mr. Maccabee, he said he could understand where this could have possibly been set up, except for the tremendous "acting" ability of Ed Walters -- no one could "act" that well! No one was that good of an actor, unless they were a professional. I assume that's what he meant. So, on that basis alone, he assumes that Ed Walters is telling the truth.

Mr. Maccabee, so far as I know, you are not a professional talent scout, or a director, and are not qualified to judge anything like the above. Anybody could act like that for a short period of time, sir. You, too, are an embarrassment and a disgrace to the UFO community.

I assume, Bruce, that you're still with the Fund for UFO Research (FUFOR). You shouldn't be. I don't think anyone there has the guts to kick you out of FUFOR, as they should -- any more than Walt Andrus has the courage to kick you out of MUFON.

Mr. Hyzer clearly demonstrated to us that you, Mr. Maccabee, have no talent, whatsoever, as a photographic analyst. So, to write in this new book, that it can't be a flare, because of this or that -- you can use all of the high technology terms at your disposal, but it makes no difference, because Mr. Hyzer has shown us that you don't have an ounce of true ability in your body to analyze such photographs. Even Rex Salisbury, who does not claim to be a photo analyst, compelled you to change your figures on the "road shot" (#19) by 100 percent. You had to change your figures drastically, and I'm sure that was an embarrassment to you.

Your audacity, in recently sending a six-page letter to Jim Mosely berating Rex Salisbury for his part in the case demonstrates your lack of integrity. You didn't have the fortitude, the guts, to send that letter to Rex, personally, disputing his findings. Why don't you send it to me? I'll be happy to respond to it.

Mr. Maccabee, you also recently lied to Ms. Barbara Becker, about Mr. Hyzer. When she confronted you with the issue of why Mr. Hyzer never received the original photographs, you stated that it was "because he wanted them in such a hurry." You, sir, are a liar. I told Barbara Becker that, she e-mailed you back that response, and you decided to change your mind, saying that you didn't really know what happened. This was another lie, Mr. Maccabee. You know why he never got the originals, as well as I do. Ed Walters did not want anyone like Mr. Hyzer, an objective person, that Ed didn't have in his back pocket, to receive any original copies.

I still wish you would tell us, Mr. Maccabee, what the fee was that Ed Walters gave you in December of 1989 (according to the post card that I have from Ed Walters), besides the \$20,000.00 that you got for your chapter in the book. You could have, I imagine, just about bought a home for what you got in December of 1989, plus what you got for your "work" in the book. This whole issue of the money tells us that you were not in a position to be truly objective in regard to this case.

There are so many things in this case, Mr. Maccabee, that as an intelligent person, someone with a college education, like yourself, should have given you cause to just stop and say, "wait a minute." You should have thought to yourself, "Stop, another red flag," but you did not. So I have to assume one of three things: 1) Either you were following an agenda, set by Mr. Walt Andrus; 2) you were following a financial agenda, set by Ed Walters and yourself; or, 3) you are completely, totally, incompetent. That's all I can make out of this.

You were told, just as was Walt Andrus, about Peter Newman. You

assured us that he was mistaken. That's what you said, "He's mistaken."

Well, is this other witness that I know of mistaken about the laughter and carnival atmosphere that went on in the offices of The Sentinel between Ed Walters and Duane Cook? Are Mr. and Mrs. Thomas mistaken about the fact that the model was not for their house plans?

What about the excellent work done by Barbara Becker on the copyrights? Ed Walters copyrighted the "Believer Jane" and "Believer Bill" photographs in his book. He tried to lie to Barbara Becker, telling her that permission was given to him by Duane Cook, and then that permission was given to him by somebody else.

Barbara Becker did a tremendous job, in checking with attorneys in the copyright field. You cannot legally do what Ed said he did. No one could have given him permission to use those photographs in his book, except the persons who were, in fact, "Believer Bill" and "Believer Jane."

Now do you think that any book publisher is going to publish a book, taking the chance to be sued by someone coming forward, claiming ownership of the photographs? The very real possibility, if what Ed was saying was true, was that the true "authors" of those photographs could come forward saying, "Hey these are my pictures. This gentleman didn't have the right to copyright them." You better believe that Ed Walters was asked by the publisher if all of the photographs which he copyrighted (including the "Believer" photographs) were taken by him. He would have had to respond with the word, "Yes," or they would have never published them in the book. So, before the book, The Gulf Breeze Sightings, was actually published, the publisher knew that this was a hoax, because they knew that Ed Walters had taken the "Believer Jane" and "Believer Bill" photographs. By copyrighting them, as he has done, he has basically admitted, to everyone, that he was the photographer.

To get back to you, Bruce Maccabee, you should do what your friend, Bob Oeschler, did, and retire from ufology . So many of the things in this case are your fault, like the Nimslo sealed camera. You made an analysis of ten photographs, and yourself said that you thought the object was only 40 inches long, and 40 feet from the camera. Yet that just slides by. Ed Walters said that it must have been a mother ship, that everybody in Gulf Breeze should have seen it. Did that give you pause? Did you think, "Now wait a minute, these are pictures that Ed Walters never saw before he handed them to us. How could he make a statement like that?"

Do you know what your good friend, Jeff Sainio, had to say about that situation when I approached him with it on the phone? He said, "Didn't you know, Jerry? Ed Walters doesn't know what a mother ship is." To which I said, "You've got to be kidding me, Jeff." He said that it must have been a mother ship -- that everybody in Gulf Breeze should have seen it. How the hell could everybody in Gulf Breeze have seen a 40-inch object?

In regard to the Gulf Breeze sightings of "Bubba," the light in the sky, I can only say that I am extremely tired of reading articles by Blan Pugh. I have never seen anyone write so much trash as this man has in four years. How could an intelligent person say, "Well a characteristic of this large UFO we see is that, just before it takes off, it drops off a piece of itself." Does that make any sense at all? I notice that the object doesn't just disappear and go off into the sky. It goes out -- like a flare goes out -- after 15 minutes or so. Everything it does is consistent with a flare, like pieces of burning material dropping off of it.

Bruce Morrison sits on the beach taking pictures of this thing. He gets on television saying, "Wow, look at that! I got a good picture of that!" He says, "I don't know what it is, but I know what it isn't." Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Morrison, but you do not know what it is, and you do not know "what it isn't." You do not know that it is not a flare.

In this new book, Mr. Maccabee, you state that Bubba is definitely not a flare. What are those pieces of material falling off of the object? Is this some kind of signal that it's getting

ready to take off? Is that what we are supposed to believe, Mr. Maccabee? I have video tapes of "Bubba." These falling pieces are burning material, a piece of the flare, that, in all likelihood, Ed Walters had put up there, or put up there himself. Obviously your analysis, that it cannot be a flare, because of this or that, is null and void, because you, we now know, are not a real photographic expert. Mr. Hyzer has proven that. Mr. Hyzer could probably destroy your analysis, if he would take the time to do it. We cannot even pay him to take an unbiased look at anything to do with the subject anymore, though, because of his treatment by people at MUFON.

All of you people, including you, Mr. Maccabee, sat down there for two or three years, around 1992 and 1993, watching "Bubba." By Blanton Pugh's account in your book, on page 227, he says that almost every time a major television station came into town to do a story, Bubba appeared. If it appeared every time, by the second time, you should have had a helicopter in reserve, ready to be put into the air to investigate the object. If that wasn't feasible, then the least you could have done was have a motorboat ready, so that the minute Bubba appeared, instead of standing on the beach or the bridge -- so you could get yourself on television -- you could have gotten yourself out there on the ocean. You could have gotten underneath that object, to get a closer view and photographs. Did any of you guys, Mr. Maccabee, Mr. Andrus, Mr. Flannigan, and others, ever do that? No. None of you really investigated it.

In Middletown, Ohio, on Independence Day, there was a red light object seen. It turned out to be a flare attached to a balloon. A pilot was asked to vector in and check on it. Why couldn't you guys, with your resources, if you couldn't have gotten a plane or a helicopter that quickly, at least had a boat ready to get out underneath this object? I can tell from the videos of the object that it was fairly close. Why couldn't you guys have gotten into a boat, gotten underneath this object, taken some good photographs, and probably even recovered some of the material that was being dropped every time that it was seen? None of you guys tried to do that, because you didn't really want to find out what it was.

Ed Walters has been a liar about the Gulf Breeze case from the beginning. We will expose Mr. Ed Walters for exactly what he is, one of the biggest -- not the best, by far, because he has made so many mistakes -- hoaxers in this century. Again, I say, not the best, but the biggest. And that's only because you guys made it the biggest.

I mentioned to you earlier that I had been involved in the Travis Walton case. My challenge -- and please pass this along to Mr. Ed Walters -- is that I challenge Ed to take a polygraph test, sponsored by me, given by Mr. Cy Gilson, the polygraph operator who passed Dallas and Rogers in 1993.

If Ed Walters goes to Arizona and takes the test, I will reimburse him for his flight there, for his lodging, and for his meals, once he takes the test. The questions will be provided, just as they were for Travis, by me, reworded by Mr. Gilson, and we will await Mr. Gilson's report. Cy Gilson uses the Utah Computer-Aided Polygraph System, one of the most sophisticated systems now available to polygraph experts.

If I don't hear from Ed Walters, or any of you in his behalf, within 30 days of your receipt of this tape, I will assume that this challenge has been refused.

I also make the same challenge to Mr. Budd Hopkins, for Linda Cortile. I will have Mr. Gilson make himself available to Linda. She can fly herself there and back, then give me all of the receipts for her fare, expenses, lodging, and meals. I will personally reimburse her for those expenses, once she completes the test. Again, I will be in charge of the tests. I will supply the questions, and they will be re-worded, as necessary, by Mr. Gilson. As in my challenge to Ed, I will give Mr. Hopkins 30 days to respond. If he does not, I will assume that request also has been denied.

So again, I am totally embarrassed, as a ufologist, by all of you gentlemen that this is directed to. It would be great if only one of you that is receiving this tape would write to me and say, "Hey, I realize I've made mistakes." I don't expect it from Budd

Hopkins, I don't expect it from Bruce Maccabee, or from Walt Andrus.

It would be nice, though, if one of the junior investigators would come forward and admit that they had really screwed up -- even if it was sent to me anonymously. It would be nice to know that at least one person involved in this affair had some common sense, after ten years, to admit that a tragic mistake was made on coverage of the Gulf Breeze case.

Recently, on national radio, Mr. Walt Andrus has been heard asserting the fact that aliens are interbreeding with humans, even though a medical doctor, who belonged to MUFON, but passed away some two and a half years ago, spent 20 years researching that scenario, and could not come up with one provable case.

Why, then, was Mr. Andrus doing this? Because of his good friend, Budd Hopkins. Again, a miscalculation in judgment, certainly, on Mr. Walt Andrus' part.

I would also like to mention that Mr. Bruce Maccabee has supported, on national television, the Guardian case. There again, because his good friend, Mr. Bob Oeschler, was the investigator on that case.

In closing, one of the saddest side effects of this whole story of Ed Walters and the hoax he has perpetrated upon ufology for the last ten years, is that hundreds and hundreds of people, particularly in the late 1980s and early 1990s, have sent letters to him, talking about UFO experiences. They have described to him experiences that they perhaps never even discussed with their own families. They poured open their hearts to Mr. Walters, in lengthy letters, describing UFO abductions, or UFO close encounters that they had experienced in past years, feeling that Ed Walters was someone who could relate to those experiences. They did not realize that Ed Walters has probably never in his lifetime seen a true UFO, and never in his lifetime ever been abducted. That is one of the most tragic events in this whole sordid affair.

Gentlemen, the blame is laid at your feet. The reason that ufology has not moved forward is laid at your feet.

Have a good evening.

Jerry Black Independent UFO Researcher/Investigator

JB/gmj

P.S. Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Budd Hopkins did not respond to my challenge.

\*\*\*A Note About Jerry Black\*\*\*

Mr. Jerry Black has been researching and investigating UFOs in a scientific and objective manner for the past 39 years. He spent four and a half years re-investigating the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze case, with experienced investigators Rex Salisbury, Barbara Becker, and Zan Overall.

Mr. Black invites your comments on the above. He can be reached at the following address and phone number:

Jerry Black 6276 Taylor Pike  
Blanchester, Ohio 45107  
(513) 625-2613

NOTE: Permission is granted by the author to reproduce this article in its entirety, in electronic form. Please contact the author for permission to reproduce segments only.

The UFO Research Center

---

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

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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