



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](#) -> [May](#) -> **Bruce Maccabee Again Confronted - Part 1**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Bruce Maccabee Again Confronted - Part 1

From: "Kenny Young" <task@fuse.net>
Date: Mon, 25 May 1998 11:53:57 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 25 May 1998 13:57:14 -0400
Subject: Bruce Maccabee Again Confronted - Part 1

[See: <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/mar/m15-005.shtml>
and: <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/mar/m15-002.shtml>
-- ebk]

Part 1 of 2

Jerry Black Replies to Bruce Maccabee's comments on The Open Letter to the Gulf Breeze Investigators, Entitled: "Looking Back: A Review of Gulf Breeze"

Let me begin by advising our readers that I will be condensing portions of my original letter that Mr. Maccabee has seen fit to address, and at times will be condensing his comments, to make this a sharper, more expeditious letter for presentation.

As opposed to Mr. Maccabee, I stand behind my investigations thoroughly. I am not afraid, nor do I hesitate, to answer any and all questions that anyone might have about the work I have done on any given case. That is why I put up my name, address, and phone number, for everyone to feel free to make comments to me about what I have written for posting to the Internet.

ISSUE #1:

I said in my original letter, "In this dissertation we will look back and review [strictly] the Ed Walters Gulf Breeze case."

Mr. Maccabee comments, "Immediately Mr. Black gets off on a 'wrong foot' by intentionally ignoring all of the other sightings...including seven on the day when Ed took his first photos."

Here Mr. Maccabee tries to use the sightings of other people to substantiate Ed Walters' photographs. Any good investigator knows that each individual UFO report is handled and evaluated on its own merits. So the fact that seven people saw a UFO on the same night does nothing to prove, or disprove, Ed Walters' photographs. However, it is interesting that a neighbor of Ed Walters, Mr. Morris, was interviewed by Rex Salisbury, and claims that he never saw any UFOs on the night of November 11, 1987, even though he was sitting outside that evening. But, in keeping with fairness to both sides, we still must say that possibly Mr. Morris could have stepped inside for a little while, to watch a television program, or something else. Maybe he wasn't looking in the right direction. So the fact that Mr. Morris did not see a UFO still does not prove or disprove Ed Walters' photographs.

So we make note of both things; the fact that seven people had UFO sightings on the same evening, and the fact that Mr. Morris claims that he never saw any UFOs that evening, even though he was sitting outside. In fact, as it turns out, Mr. Morris says he has never seen

a UFO at all, from his home, 16 months after that initial sighting by Ed Walters. However, what is interesting, is that, with Ed Walters taking numerous photographs, one would think that, after the first couple of UFO encounters at his home, Ed would summon someone like Mr. Morris, or the neighbor on the other side, to come and look at this with him, so he would have someone to support his claim of seeing these UFOs. Strangely, this was never done. At no time did Ed contact any neighbor, to allow them to see the same thing he was seeing, which would help substantiate his photographs. That I sincerely do find interesting.

ISSUE #2:

I am a little bit at a loss to explain Mr. Maccabee's comments here... However, in my original letter, I said that 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, which could have been viewed as a help in the investigation of this case.

Mr. Maccabee comments, "WRONG! And Mr. Black has been informed of this before. He sent me a tape in November, 1991. In that tape Mr. Black asserts that I have been paid \$5,000 by Ed Walters for photographic analysis work before the book was published. I responded to that tape on November 27, 1991 that I was not paid \$5,000 for photographic analysis work.... (at any time!)."

All I can say is that Mr. Maccabee is correct. On my tape of November, 1991, I did incorrectly state that he had received \$5,000.00 from Mr. Ed Walters. I corrected that mistake a few months later. As you, the readers, can see, I state that Bob Oeschler admittedly accepted \$5,000.00 from Ed Walters. I did not say that Mr. Maccabee did. So, I'm a bit confused about what Mr. Maccabee's point might be. I corrected my initial mistake in the open letter, Looking Back: A Review of Gulf Breeze. I am at a loss as to exactly what his complaint is here. Possibly a lapse of memory.

ISSUE #3:

Let's refer again to my comments about Mr. Bob Oeschler receiving \$5,000.00 from Ed Walters for doing some photographic work. Mr. Maccabee comments again on that by saying, "Therefore, when Mr. Black says that Bob Oeschler did nothing of value to the investigation which could be worth \$5,000.00, he, Black, is viewing this from the point of view of his own agenda, which should be obvious to any of the readers."

My response to that is, in Mr. Maccabee's reply to me, telling me what all Mr. Bob Oeschler did with the photographs, he himself states this: "Bob learned from Polaroid how to clean the pictures, and made some of the best copies ever made." He, Bruce Maccabee, was supplied with a set of those copies.

My original comments stand, because, with all of this excellent work done by Mr. Oeschler for Mr. Walters, securing some of the best copies ever made from the originals, why, then, wasn't Mr. William Hyzer given a set of those copies as well? Mr. Maccabee was, and I'm sure Jeff Sainio probably was. Why wasn't Mr. Hyzer extended the courtesy of receiving one of those sets? He was given "pictures of pictures." Mr. Walt Andrus took photographs of the originals and gave them to Mr. Hyzer.

So, again, my question still stands: What did Bob Oeschler do, to be worth \$5,000.00, that helped the investigation of this case? He did nothing but supply Ed Walters' supporters with the better copies. He did not supply the same quality of copies to anyone who could have conducted an objective and independent investigation.

ISSUE #4:

Mr. Maccabee refers again to comments again made about Bob Oeschler and the \$5,000.00 he received for the photographic work he did for Ed Walters. Mr. Maccabee made a comment about this which I included in an article that I did for UFO Magazine about the Gulf Breeze case.

Mr. Scott Smith, a writer from out of town, did a story on Gulf Breeze. After reviewing the massive amount of literature available on both sides of the issue, Mr. Smith concluded that the arguments against Ed were weak, at best, and probably wrong. I was told that UFO Magazine was not happy with Mr. Smith's conclusions, having fully expected that Mr. Smith's research would "sink the Gulf Breeze ship" once and for all. Mr. Maccabee states that UFO Magazine published a rebuttal of

sorts, which was my own two-part article on the Gulf Breeze case. He states, also, that Mr. Scott Smith did an in-depth investigation of the Gulf Breeze case.

My response to Mr. Maccabee is that I do not feel that Mr. Smith did an in-depth investigation. He is not a UFO investigator. He did not talk to me, he did not talk to Barbara Becker, he did not talk to Rex Salisbury, he did not talk to Hugh Jones, the polygraph expert, he did not talk to Billy J. Rakes, the president of the polygraph association, he did not talk to any of the children that stated that Ed Walters used double exposure techniques with a Polaroid camera to play jokes on them, he did not talk to Tommy Smith, nor did he interview Mr. William G. Hyzer to obtain his expert opinion. Basically, what Scott Smith did was take the information readily available and write his story from that. He did not do a thorough investigation of the material before him. He did not check into the polygraph tests, or he would have realized that they were, in fact, self-sponsored by Ed Walters. He took Mr. Maccabee's word that the photographs were genuine.

So Mr. Maccabee, do not try to tell these readers that Scott Smith did an "in-depth" investigation of this case. I personally talked to Scott, and, basically, he was given some available information on the case, but did no real investigation. Mr. Smith, with no experience in the field of UFOlogy, just wrote a story on the case; it was not a thorough investigative review.

ISSUE #5:

I made some comments about Jeff Sainio that Mr. Maccabee took issue with. I stated that he was basically an unknown until the Gulf Breeze case came along. Suddenly, Mr. Maccabee had this photographic expert in the wings that would make a revelation to everyone on the case.

In talking with Jeff Sainio, it appeared to me that he was extremely jealous of Mr. Hyzer and his son, James. I surmised this because the statements that Jeff made were totally in left field. Any competent photographic analysis person would never have made some of those statements. Mr. Maccabee's comments in regard to that are as follows:

"I will let Jeff Sainio defend himself. However, I am amused at Black's claim that 'the statements that he (Sainio) made were totally in left field.' I am amused because based on my correspondence with Black I wonder whether his competence for photographic analysis even lies within the ball park, so how would he know whether Sainio was correct or not?"

Let me just state this: First, I do not pretend to be a photographic analysis expert, like Mr. Bruce Maccabee does. I do not pretend to be able to analyze physical material objects, nor do I have the ability to analyze soil samples or grass samples. I have, therefore, established good working relationships with experts in those fields. There is a photographic lab in Alexandria, Virginia that I can use whenever a decent photograph or video is given to me. Here in the Cincinnati area, there is a gentleman, Mr. Boggs, that will conduct studies on any soil or grass samples that I need to have tested, where a UFO may have allegedly landed. In Huber Heights, near Dayton, Ohio, there is a professional lab which can analyze any physical object that I may turn over to them, whether that be an alleged implant, an alleged piece of a UFO craft, or any other object.

Again, I do not claim to be a photographic analysis expert. The comments I made to and about Mr. Jeff Sainio were based, not on photo/analytical ability, but on common sense.

In a conversation that I had with Mr. Sainio, he said that he could detect luminosity coming down the road on photo #19, the famous "road shot," just from looking at the photograph lying in front of him. I stated to him that Mr. Hyzer had second and third generation copies. To this, Mr. Sainio replied:

"I also am stating that, using second and third generation copies, on photo #19, I can see, with my naked eye, the luminosity on the road. I could even show this to Mr. Hyzer if I could meet with him."

My comments to him were, "You understand that Mr. Hyzer has already stated that, using the most up to date photographic analysis equipment, he sees no luminosity on the road in photo #19."

Readers, keep in mind that Mr. William G. Hyzer, and his son, James B. Hyzer, had a total of over 60 years experience in photographic analysis work, as of the year 1992. So my comments against Mr. Sainio had

nothing to do with any photo/analytic ability, as Mr. Maccabee tries to allude to. It has to do with plain common sense. How could Jeff Sainio see luminosity on the road on photo #19, with his naked eye, when William and James Hyzer, using state of the art equipment, viewing the same generation of copy, could not detect it? I leave it up to you, the readers, to determine who is telling the truth, or who is more credible.

ISSUE #6:

Mr. Maccabee continued on my remarks about Jeff Sainio:

"Yet Black never discusses the real issue: Sainio worked with the original photo and published the results of his image enhancements which show brightness on the road. This rejects the double exposure explanation that Jerry Black needs in order to explain the photo."

I retained the services of Mr. William G. Hyzer for the Mutual UFO Network. I felt we needed an independent photographic analyst to evaluate the shots. Mr. Hyzer assured me, from the beginning, that he would have never worked with the second and third generation copies that Walt Andrus sent him, if he did not feel that he could make a proper analysis. With that in mind, it makes no difference whether Mr. Hyzer had the originals or not, or whether Mr. Sainio used the originals or the second and third generation copies. Mr. Hyzer told me that digital enhancement is a very powerful tool. In a letter concerning digital enhancement sent to the editor of the MUFON Journal, Mr. Hyzer wrote:

"There is a certain commonality that exists between statisticians and digital image processing aficionados. Tell me what you want them to hear, and I will produce a statistic to support it. Explain to me what you want them to see, and I will create an image to buttress that perception. The power to alter images is a great concern among forensic image examiners, and by those who depend upon their image to convey impartial information regarding a scene or an object. Elements within an image can be fabricated, enhanced, distorted, shifted, cloned, erased, and/or transferred to another image with a precision that virtually defies detection. Those who doubt the creative potential of digital image processing should see the film Terminator II.

"This is not to imply that Mr. Jeff Sainio is such an aficionado or possesses either the facilities or the expertise required to produce the spectacular special effects of Terminator II. But digital imaging and processing, even in the primitive form, is a highly manipulative process, capable of changing an image into something it isn't, in order to highlight certain features, and/or subdue others, at the personal discretion of the operator."

Mr. Hyzer obtained all of the information he needed from second and third generation copies to make an evaluation, or he would have never made that evaluation. So the fact that Jeff Sainio had originals to work with makes no difference in this particular issue. Mr. Hyzer's reputation in the photographic analysis community is such that he would never have jeopardized it by making an evaluation that he could not back up at a later date.

The point, simply, is that Mr. Hyzer's evaluation stands. You, the readers, have to decide... Is Mr. Hyzer correct in his evaluation? Or is Mr. Sainio correct in his evaluation? Keep in mind, please, that Jeff Sainio was the State Director for MUFON of Wisconsin, with 12 years experience, and Mr. Hyzer was an independent investigator, with 38 years experience, along with his son, James (who also worked on this project), with 20 years experience.

ISSUE #7:

I made some comments in my original letter about a person who gave me some information concerning Ed Walters' frequent trips to the office of The Gulf Breeze Sentinel. This person told me that, during almost every one of those trips, Ed Walters and Duane Cook, the editor, were constantly laughing very loudly, as though someone had just told a very good joke. This occurred during the time of the "Believe Jane" and "Believer Bill" pictures, and for a while thereafter.

Mr. Maccabee's comments are:

"Regardless of laughter, Duane Cook did not know that Ed was the photographer until the end of December, 1987. It is also amusing to note that Duane's own mother and stepfather were two of the early witnesses to the object Ed photographed. And besides, what does laughter prove, anyway? Ed likes jokes and I presume Duane does too."

My response is as follows... You, Mr. Maccabee, make the assumption that Duane Cook did not know that Ed was the photographer until the end of December, 1987. We do not know that to be a fact. It has always been my contention that this whole thing started out as a local joke, to help increase the circulation of The Gulf Breeze Sentinel. That would mean that Duane Cook was likely in on it from the beginning. Obviously, if he was in on it from the beginning, then possibly he could have had his parents step up and say that they were also witnesses to the objects that were appearing in the paper at that time. That does not mean that they were bad people, they were just trying to help their son, who had a newspaper that was failing.

The joke, then, in my opinion, got out of hand. The local Gulf Breeze investigators began believing the case, and ran with it.

As far as the laughter is concerned, one would not expect a man who had recently allegedly been picked up by a UFO, some ten feet off the ground, in a blue beam of light, and then dropped to the ground, to be in a consistently jovial mood. This is not human nature. That made me particularly suspicious, as it did the person who made these comments to me, about the constant laughter between Duane Cook and Ed Walters at that particular time. As I said earlier, this went on for weeks.

ISSUE #8:

In my original letter, I made some comments concerning Mr. Bruce Maccabee, as follows:

"Bruce Maccabee has tried to wear many, many different hats during this investigation. He tries to pretend that he is 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's comments are these:

"I recommend anyone who wants to discuss details of the photoanalysis of several of the sightings should read UFOS ARE REAL, HERE'S THE PROOF. I can also supply anyone with a copy of my paper presented at the MUFON Symposium in 1988 which presents a detailed discussion of the analysis of Ed's early photos plus a long discussion of hoax methods. I'll be happy to compare my capability and experience in analyzing UFO photos with Mr. Hyzer or anyone else..... dueling analysts, if you wish!"

In order to have "dueling analysts," you need two. In this particular case, we only have one: Mr. William G. Hyzer. Mr. Maccabee is fully aware, when he makes the comments that he would be happy to compare his capability and experience in analyzing photographs with Mr. Hyzer, that Mr. Hyzer will no longer work on UFO photographs, because of the way he was treated by MUFON. Mr. Hyzer has clearly shown that Mr. Maccabee has no photographic analysis ability whatsoever.

In Mr. Hyzer's preliminary report, he stated that all of the photographs he analyzed exhibited characteristics of double exposure. Why has Mr. Maccabee never made even one comment that would indicate that there was possibly some problem with the photographs? Everything Mr. Maccabee had to say was positive. Everything Mr. Sainio had to say was positive. There was no reference to even one tidbit of information which would give anyone an indication that something could be wrong with the photographs. Yet Mr. Hyzer found that all of the photographs showed signs of double exposure. One has to ask oneself, why would Mr. Hyzer and his son, independent analysts with no agenda, find evidence of photographic hoaxing, when Mr. Sainio and Mr. Maccabee, known UFO proponents, find none? It is quite clear that either Mr. Maccabee and Mr. Sainio have no photo/analytical ability whatsoever, or they were following an agenda established either by themselves, or by the MUFON organization.

At this time I will present to the readers the qualifications of Mr. William G. Hyzer, which, because of the dispute above, are extremely important to be known. As of roughly 1992, his credits and achievements were as follows:

Academic Degrees:

Graduate of University of Minnesota, Electrical Engineering, 1946

Graduate of University of Wisconsin, Physics, 1948

Profession:

Consultant in Engineering and Applied Science (since 1953)

Awards:

Named Fellow, Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, 1965
U.S. recipient of International DuPont Gold Medal Award, 1969
Named "Engineer of Distinction" by Engineers Joint Council, New York, 1974
Named "1976 Outstanding Chapter President," Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers, 1976
Named Fellow, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers, 1977
Named "1979 Outstanding Professional Engineer in Private Practice," Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers, 1979
U.S. recipient of Coleman Memorial Award, British Institute of Physics, 1980
Awarded "Honorary Master of Photography" Degree, PP of A, 1981
Certified Photogrammetrist (ASPRS), 1988
Named Fellow, American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 1989

Publications:

{More than 500 published patents, books, and papers, including:}
The regular column, Scientific Instrumentation, in Photomethods Magazine, 1956 --
Engineering and Scientific High Speed Photography, Macmillan, 1962
Photographic Instrumentation Science and Engineering, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965
The regular column, Notes on Photonics, in Research and Development Magazine, 1971 -1978
The regular column, Instant Photoinstrumentation, in Optical Engineering, 1976 - 1979
Two chapters, High Speed Photomacrography, and Instant Photomacrography, in Photomacrography, Focal Press, 1987
The chapter, Forensic Photogrammetry, in Forensic Engineering, Elsevier, 1989

Positions Held:

Chairman, High Speed Photography Committee, Society of Motion Pictures and Television Engineers, 1964 - 1966
Vice President of Photoinstrumentation Affairs, Society of Motion Pictures and Television Engineers, 1966 - 1969
President, Photo Data Institute, Janesville, Wisconsin, 1968 --
Board Member, Redlake Corporation, Santa Clara, California, 1968 - 1970
Board Member, Research and Development Magazine, 1970 - 1978
Member, Advisory Board, Milwaukee Area Technical College, 1970-1983
Chairman, Janesville Building Board of Appeals, 1973 - 1976
Chapter President, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers, 1975 - 1976
Chairman, Photosonics Achievement Award Committee, Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, 1975 - 1978
Board Member, Technical Council, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers, 1976 - 1981
President, Carcajou Shooting Club, Lake Koshkonong, Wisconsin, 1977 - 1978
Member, Citizens Advisory Committee for Janesville Area Transportation System, 1978 - 1979
Judge, IR-100 Awards, 1978 - 1987
Board Member, Industrial Research and Development Magazine, 1978 - 1988
Vice President, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers, 1979 - 1980
President, North American Photonics Association, 1980 - 1982
Board Member, Imaging Technology in Research & Development Magazine, 1983 -85
Member, Advisory Board, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, 1984 - 1988
U.S. National Delegate, International Congresses on High Speed Photography and Photonics, 1978 - 1984 and 1986

Additional Biographical Sources:

World Who's Who in Commerce and Industry
Personalities of the West and Midwest
Who's Who in Engineering
Engineers of Distinction
Men of Achievement
Dictionary of International Biography, Volume XVII

Mr. Hyzer has also been a guest lecturer at numerous colleges, universities, professional organizations, service groups, and corporations, from 1953 through the present. He has even been sought out to give lectures for prestigious international photographic, engineering, and optical organizations, in Germany, Japan, China, the USSR, Singapore, South Africa, and Sweden.

I invite both Mr. Maccabee and Mr. Sainio to list and expand on their qualifications in the field of photographic analysis. In this way, our readers can weigh and evaluate those qualifications, in comparison with those of Mr. Hyzer. So doing, we will let our readers be the judge.

ISSUE #9:

In my original letter, I discussed the video taken by Duane Cook of Ed Walters, during the time when his head was allegedly hurting tremendously. They went out in the pickup truck, with Ed's head still hurting, with the video tape was running, and Ed feeling that there was a UFO in the area. Mr. Maccabee's comments are as follows:

"When I first heard it I had to decide whether this could actually be happening or if it was all an act by Ed. If an act it would have been a tremendous feat of extemporaneous acting in concert with a person... Duane Cook editor of the newspaper, ... who doesn't know this is an act and herefore has no prescribed lines and therefore whatever he (Duane) says or does in response to Ed's actions cannot be predicted in advance."

Most people could put on a very good acting job, for a given, very short, period of time. In this case, I think it would certainly have been within the range of Ed's ability, or anyone's ability, for that matter, to act as though his head was hurting, using profanity, and give the appearance that they are "literally going crazy." Also, Mr. Maccabee has again made the assumption that Duane Cook did not know that this was an act. He does not know that for sure. As I said before, Duane Cook could have very well been involved in this from the beginning. None of us know for a fact that Duane was not aware of everything that was going on that night. The possibility of that looms as large as any other scenario in this matter, and in fact seems likely.

Mr. Maccabee's comments continue on, to state:

"One does not have to be an acting 'talent scout' to recognize the high quality of the 'performance' if that's what it was. I subsequently concluded, after many hours of conversation with Ed, that it was very unlikely that he could have carried this off as an act."

Mr. Maccabee is now trying to represent himself as a psychologist. What next?

ISSUE #10:

I stated in my letter, "Mr. Maccabee, so far as I know, you are not a professional talent scout or 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."

Mr. Maccabee's comment was:

"I guess we'll see who's the embarrassment."

My comment to that is it is obvious that you are the embarrassment in the Gulf Breeze/Ed Walters case. And, I add further, a continual embarrassment in the Guardian case, which you supported on national television, and which now has been proven to be a hoax by MUFON in Canada. So it is you, Mr. Maccabee, who continues to be an embarrassment to the UFO community.

ISSUE #11:

I said in my original letter, "I assume, Bruce, that you're still with the Fund For UFO Research. You should not be. I do not think that anyone there has the guts to kick out of FUFOR, as they should, any more than Walt Andrus has the courage to kick you out of MUFON."

Mr. Maccabee's comments:

"You'll have to take this up with the new Chairman, Don Berliner."

Bruce, like I told you before about the "Old Boys Club," you and Don Berliner are both members of that club, so I guess my wishes won't come true, and you'll still remain a member of FUFOR.

ISSUE #12:

I stated the following in my open letter: "Mr. Hyzer clearly demonstrated to us, Mr. Maccabee, that you have no talent whatsoever as a photographic analyst."

Mr. Maccabee's comment: "He did? How did he do that? Or is this just your wishful thinking?"

Mr. Maccabee, in a letter that you wrote to me a few years ago, you stated that Mr. William B. Hyzer had more talent as a photographic analysis person than yourself. Mr. Hyzer has said that Photo #19 is definitely a hoax; and you have concluded that none of the photographs have any indication of being a hoax, then certainly Photo #19 is not a hoax...

I guess you've answered your own question. You have already stated that he has more ability than you. He differs in his answer from you. The readers can see the qualifications of Mr. Hyzer above. I think I've answered your question, too.

ISSUE #13:

Comments from my original letter are as follows:

"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."

Mr. Maccabee comments that I have basically embarrassed myself, because of my lack of photographic knowledge. He discusses his work on "Bubba," and determining that "Bubba" was definitely not a flare. Those of you interested in reading more about that can refer to his book UFOs Are Real, Here's the Proof, on page 193, as Mr. Maccabee states in his reply.

While he is correct that I have no knowledge whatsoever about photographic analysis work, what I have done -- and Mr. Maccabee does not advise you of this here -- is to make a challenge to Mr. Maccabee, back in January of this year, in a taped message to him. The object that he used in his experiment in Gulf Breeze was a red object, which I don't believe was actually shown on national television. He took some photographs of some flares and determined from that, by using a special camera, that the red object seen over Gulf Breeze definitely was not a flare.

My challenge, then, was for us to use the famous video shot of Bubba over the bay, taken by a Houston television station crew, somewhere around 1991, which clearly shows a large white object with a piece of material falling from it, into the water. This is a well-known shot, and was shown on many television programs around the country back in the time frame we are discussing. I told Mr. Maccabee that we could use this particular video clip, which I have a copy of. I proposed that we send this to the lab that I mentioned earlier, and have them analyze it. The fee would be quite substantial, and would range anywhere from \$2,000.00 to \$3,000.00. I told Mr. Maccabee that, when this independent lab made an analysis of the Bubba shot, if it turned out that the object was definitely not a flare, I would pay for the entire analysis. If the analysis, on the other hand, indicated that the object was, or could be, a flare, Mr. Maccabee would then be responsible for all of the charges incurred in the analysis. I gave Mr. Maccabee 30 days to respond to my taped challenge. As of the dictation of this letter, he has apparently chosen not to accept that challenge.

ISSUE #14:

I said in my original letter: "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."

continued in Part 2

--

UFO Research

<http://home.fuse.net/task/>

[[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](#).