



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 2**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Bruce Maccabee Again Confronted - Part 2

From: "Kenny Young" <task@fuse.net>
Date: Mon, 25 May 1998 12:16:15 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 25 May 1998 14:02:06 -0400
Subject: Bruce Maccabee Again Confronted - Part 2

[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 2 of 2

Mr. Maccabee's comments are as follows:

"Gee, so many lies around here... you'd think I was qualified to be President. Anyway, I told Ms. Becker what was my recollection of what happened when Hyzer and Andrus reached some agreement as to what pictures Hyzer was willing to look at. What I told Becker was based on my recollection of what Andrus told me many years before, namely that Hyzer wanted the pictures quickly so Andrus sent what he had, namely 8 x 10 copies that Andrus had made from negatives which he, Andrus had obtained by photographing Ed's photos."

It is funny, Mr. Maccabee, that your memory always serves your purpose so conveniently. You knew, from the beginning, that your good friend Ed Walters did not want anyone but you and Jeff Sainio to have copies of his photographs for analysis. I do not buy your story, or your bad memory, at all.

ISSUE #15:

I stated, in my original open letter, "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."

Mr. Maccabee's comment to that was, "Dear Jerry, if I'm a liar, then you're a jerk. In fact, maybe you're a jerk anyway!"

Don't blame me, sir, for what your friend, Ed Walters, said. I have a postcard from him where he tries to deny that you had gotten any money for the book. On the other hand, though, he admits that he gave you a "professional fee" in December of 1989. Now in your 12-page letter to me, early on in this investigation, you state that you did receive money for your chapter in the Gulf Breeze/Ed Walters book in January of 1989. Accordingly, I can only conclude that you have received two payments for your work in the Gulf Breeze UFO sightings. If I am wrong, take it up with your friend Ed Walters. He is the one that sent me the postcard. If he has his dates confused, he himself has created the problem -- not me.

ISSUE #16:

I stated further, in my original open letter, "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."

Mr. Maccabee's reply:

"If I'm totally incompetent then you're a... oh well, I said it before. Evidently you don't remember that I pointed out in my Nov 1991 letter to you that I started off being as skeptical as or more skeptical than most. Like many people my first thought was of Meier. I started off assuming the whole thing was a hoax."

Mr. Maccabee continues:

"Then, after months of analysis, investigation, data collection by me and others I realized that there was just too much to it for Ed to pull off the whole thing and the photos were too difficult for him to hoax,...especially the stereo photos."

Mr. Maccabee, we're getting tired of constantly hearing about your skepticism as you came into the case; about how you came into this expecting it to be a Billie Meier type of scenario... You say, though, that "after months" of investigation, you realized there was too much evidence to support the case.

There is no evidence to support the case. None whatsoever. Ed's polygraph tests were self-sponsored. The PSE test that he took was self-sponsored. There were so many red flags abounding in this case, and you ignored every one of them.

The photoanalysis work you did was completely inept, as Mr. Hyzer has effectively demonstrated.

So what were you trying to accomplish in the Gulf Breeze case? That is what everyone wants to know. Even some of your friends are wondering. What was your agenda in Gulf Breeze? Why couldn't you see all of these red flags that everyone else saw? Many other competent investigators certainly saw them.

Ed Walters stumbled all over himself in this case, but not even one time during his stumblings did you stop to take another look. This appears, frankly, to be incompetency on your part. You insinuate that people are getting tired of hearing how Ed Walters is a complete idiot... He's worth \$2,500,000.00, Mr. Maccabee. One does not get to that level of assets by being a complete idiot. If we were to believe you, he's lucky if he knows how to hold on to a camera, much less use it.

I say again, you are a disgrace to the UFO community.

ISSUE #17:

Once again referring to my open letter, I said: "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.'"

Your reply: "Yeah, mistaken."

This, Mr. Maccabee, tells us again that you have never objectively looked at this case. Any UFO investigator would have gone back and interviewed Peter Newman. Any time something has come up with this case that does not fit your scenario, or does not lend credence to this case, you simply ignore it. Don't you have the fortitude to go back and call Peter Newman, to see if this was, indeed, a mistake?

What would you call this, other than a one-sided investigation? When something pertinent to the investigation is brought to your attention, you don't bother to check it out. Trust me, when something is brought to my attention that casts doubt on a case, I will check it out.

"Yeah, mistaken." That's all you can say.

When are you going to get the guts, Mr. Maccabee, to follow up on Peter Newman?

ISSUE #18:

I made a statement in my open letter to the affect that Mr. and Mrs. Thomas have stated that the model was not for their house plans.

Mr. Maccabee's reply: "Gary Watson, a realtor, investigated the Walters sightings and analyzed the Lynn Thomas story and the Volker house plan 'explanation' etc., and concluded that the paper strip in the model did not fit the Volker house plan but did agree in slab area and living area with the numbers on the Thomas house plane which implied that the model itself was a hoax."

Supporters of Ed Walters have always claimed that someone planted the model in the attic to discredit Ed Walters. There is no evidence whatsoever to support that.

In fact, the evidence indicates just the opposite:

A: Frances, Ed's wife, claimed that the neighbor across the street told her that there was a strange car parked in front of the house, with out-of-state license plates. The people from that car attempted to enter the attic of the house through the garage. (There was a staircase that came down from the attic in the garage.) When Rex Salisbury contacted the people across the street from the old Walters residence, who had to be the people Francis was speaking of, as they were the only neighbors who would have had a clear view into the garage, they stated in a signed letter for Rex that they had never seen anyone tamper with the Walters home.

B: Ed Walters claimed, early on, that the model was lying on top of the insulation. When confronted with Mr. Robert Menzer's statement, that the object was buried under three or four inches of insulation, Ed denied that he had said that. It is extremely hard to believe that someone would risk being arrested and going to jail, by breaking into an unoccupied house, going up to the attic, and placing a model, that might never be found, under three or four inches of insulation. In talking with Mr. Robert Menzer, he advised me that, if he had known where the shutoff valve was for the water, simply by either asking Ed or another neighbor, he would have found out that the shutoff valve for the water was buried in a black box in his front yard. If he knew that, he would have never gone up into the attic three times, in his search for the shutoff valve. Therefore, the model would not have been found for years and years, if ever. Thinking realistically, and using common sense, there would have been no reason for anyone to have "planted" a model in the attic, under three or four inches of insulation. So the evidence supports that the model was almost certainly placed there by Ed Walters, probably to hide it from visitors who were coming to his home at the time of the alleged sightings.

When Craig Meier and the Pensacola News Journal confronted Ed about the model, he went to the newspaper office and discussed the situation with the Managing Editor. The Managing Editor asked Ed Walters, at that time, to take a polygraph test or a PSE test. Again, as Ed has done on other occasions, he refused to take the polygraph or PSE tests. Once more, this leads to suspicion against Ed Walters.

When I contacted Sara Menzer, she told me that when Ed was at their home, and saw the model, which was being viewed by other investigators, he asked her if he could have it. She said that she did not want to give it up to anyone that would make it appear that she was being partial to one side or the other, and said she would keep it.

One would wonder, really, what Ed would want with the model that was causing so much trouble. Of course, maybe he just wanted to add it to his collection.

ISSUE #19:

I stated in my original letter, "To get back to you, Bruce Maccabee, you should do what your friend, Bob Oeschler, did, and retire from UFOlogy."

Mr. Maccabee commented, "Thanks for the advice... but I'll stick around, whether you like it or not!"

It makes no difference whether you stick around or not, Mr. Maccabee. Most of the reliable investigators in UFOlogy will not use you anymore for photographic analysis work. You do not realize how many calls we have had, asking for the name of a good photoanalyst -- even people

that have turned to you in the past. But because of Gulf Breeze and Guardian, a lot of people are disgusted.

Not long ago a friend said an associate of his was going to send a video to Bruce Maccabee. I wished him good luck, he asked what I meant, and I explained my reasons. The video tape ended up going to the lab on the east coast, instead of to you. I tell you this only to demonstrate the fact that a lot of people now question your credibility. So stick around if you want, and continue to collect your lecture fees and symposium fees, whatever. I'm not sure what you have to say that anyone would want to pay money to hear, but I guess there are still people out there that really don't know what's going on in UFOlogy, and are willing to listen to anything. Lots of luck to you, in that regard.

Mr. Maccabee, some of the errors that were made, that propagated erroneous information in this case, can be directly attributed to you. For instance, as I brought up in my original open letter, there was the Nimslo sealed camera... Your original analysis of ten photographs revealed, you said yourself, that the object was only 40 inches long, and 40 feet from the camera.

In my letter, I stated, "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?'"

Mr. Maccabee's comments were:

"Ed's testimony was obtained before the stereo photos were developed. He said he had the impression that the object was far away. It went on the other side of some trees in the area. Hence he thought it was big. However, Frances, looking at it from another point of view felt that it was relatively close and therefore not so big. When the photos were analyzed the distance came out in the range 40-70 feet. When the distance from Ed's location where he took the photos to the tree the object went behind was measured it was found to be about 40 ft. The most convincing thing about the stereo photos was when this very unusual object was again photographed along with the more common type Ed had photographed in a stereo pair of photos on May 1, 1988."

Mr. Maccabee, you must think all of the readers, not to mention myself, are idiots. Let me stage this story for the readers... Ed Walters was given a sealed camera and told to use that camera to take photographs the next time he saw a UFO. He took ten pictures of an object some days later. He then returned the camera to MUFON. In front of the news media, he told everyone, "It must have been a mother ship. Everyone should have seen it." His wife, Frances, said, "No, Ed, it was much smaller than that."

When the film was developed, it turned out that the object was 40 to 70 feet from the camera, as Mr. Maccabee has stated. It also turned out that the object was only 36 to 40 inches long, which Mr. Maccabee has neglected to say in his comments at that particular time.

So, readers, here is what we are asked by Mr. Maccabee to believe. Ed Walters had already stated that the object must have been a "mother ship," an object alleged to be at least 300 feet long, before the photographs were developed. Ed said this, even though the object was in front of him, no more than 70 feet away, and even though it went behind a tree. Yet the evidence indicates that the object is only about 40 inches long. We are asked to believe that Ed Walters made a miscalculation of over 298 feet in his assessment, even as close as the object actually was, only 70 feet.

This is one of the red flags that Mr. Maccabee has totally ignored. You insult our intelligence.

Let me explain to the readers, instead, what actually did occur here, and the way you should have looked at this. Ed Walters was confronted, for the first time, with taking photographs of a UFO that he would not be able to see, or to manipulate, before he had to hand the camera over to MUFON. The camera had been sealed, and a test photograph had been taken at the beginning of the film.

Ed realized at that point that he did not know how this small 36 inch to 40 inch model that he had was going to show up on the Nimslo camera. Would it appear large? Would it appear small? He wasn't sure, because he would not be able to see the photograph before the camera was turned over to MUFON. So Ed and Frances talked it over. He decided to say that it was an extremely large object, like a mother ship, and Frances would

say that it was much smaller. That way, in effect, they were covered, either way the object actually appeared on the film.

Do you, Bruce, realize how ludicrous it is for you to ask intelligent people to believe that Ed Walters could not tell the difference between a 300 foot object, at 70 feet away, as opposed to a 40 inch object, at 70 feet away? No one is going to buy that argument. You have again made a ridiculous statement, about it going behind a tree, and Frances being at a different angle. This one thing, this glaring evidence, should have stopped you dead in your tracks. But it did not. Instead, you said something to the effect of "Well, we've just got a probe here. It looks like Ed Walters has photographed, for the first time, a very small probe." END OF INVESTIGATION.

I note here that you are also surprised at the fact that this same object, that he took a photograph of with the sealed camera, showed up again in a photograph he took later, on May 1, 1988. What is so surprising here, Bruce? He used a 36 to 40 inch model for the sealed camera. He just used the same model again on May 1, 1988. What is so surprising about that?

ISSUE #20:

I stated in my original letter, "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 further stated that Mr. Hyzer has shown us that Mr. Maccabee is not a qualified photographic analyst.

Mr. Maccabee's comments are as follows:

"You seem to be looking to Mr. Hyzer to save your rear end from my photo analysis. However, there are probably DOZENS of qualified people "out there," even some reading these internet posts, who could comment on my analysis of the Bubba vs Flare using a diffraction grating (uh, oh, that technical term again) to produce the spectrum."

Mr. Maccabee, I do not need Mr. Hyzer to "save my rear end." He has already nailed yours to the wall.

As for the "tests" you performed involving the red light that you call Bubba, against some flares, let's make sure that the readers know who helped you with the test. I believe it was Ed Walters that took the photograph of the red light in the sky that you refer to as Bubba, and who also took the pictures of the flares, to make the comparison. Isn't that like having the fox guard the henhouse, so to speak?

My challenge to you, Mr. Maccabee, is merely to put up or shut up. We cannot use your "red light," which could have been anything. Was that the same light that the Houston television crew videotaped on the beach in Gulf Breeze? Was it the same type of light? I seriously doubt it. To regain some credibility, you need to step up and use the clip that we discussed here earlier. Will you accept that challenge? What happened between you and Ed Walters, in your "tests," is not even viable. Taking a photo of some light in the sky, then of flares, for comparison, mean nothing, especially because Ed Walters was involved.

It is quite clear that you either do not understand, or worse, disregard, what "independent investigation" means. You do not use the principal, the person you are investigating, to assist you in any tests, or in any other way.

ISSUE #21:

I stated in my open letter, " 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."

To which Mr. Maccabee responded, "How do you know what the Gulf Breeze Research Team tried to do? You weren't there! Actually the airplane method was investigated but found to be too expensive for a zero budget project considering that the airplane might have to be flying for several hours every night for a week or more to have a good chance of seeing something... and even then the airplane might be miles away from the object at the time it appeared. AS for chasing in a boat... again no one could predict where these things would be. Also, many were over land. And most were too short to mount a real 'chase' before

it disappeared."

Mr. Maccabee, I know that you did not do this, because it was never reported in any literature on Gulf Breeze. So I'm certainly aware that you never made any attempt to secure a plane or a boat whenever Bubba showed up. According to Blanton Pugh, nearly every time a national news crew was known to be in town, Bubba would show up. Based on that, after the first couple of times, you certainly could have scheduled a plane or boat to be rented, so that, when Bubba did show up, you could have gotten a closer view of the object, and find out what this material was that was falling into the water, or on land, as you would like to say. But you didn't try to do that.

You are insulting our intelligence when you give us the excuse that there was a "zero budget." With MUFON's membership larger than it ever had been, in 1991 and 1992, there was no budget for the biggest case (according to Walt Andrus) in 50 years? You could not afford \$300.00 or \$400.00 for plane rental of a few hours? No, you didn't want to get any closer to Bubba, to find out. That is what the real issue is here. It was more profitable for MUFON, and for yourself, to keep people coming to the bridge for two years, having symposiums and whatever else, to raise money, than it was to find out the truth.

Of course, I may have to back off of the statement above... Knowing that the news media was coming into town, renting a plane may not have been a good idea. We know that the Gulf Breeze "investigators" always informed Ed Walters of everything that was going on. So perhaps Bubba would not have showed up after all, if Ed realized that a plane or a boat would be ready; maybe Ed would not have sent any "Bubbas" up. This is conjecture, but definitely a thought to consider, Mr. Maccabee.

ISSUE #22:

I stated, "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 him the biggest."

Mr. Maccabee replies: "Strong words, I would say....from one of several people who have had it in for Ed and other Gulf Breeze witnesses for 6 or 7 years now..... Strong words from one who has so far failed to prove a hoax..."

Mr. Maccabee, we have proven this case to be a hoax. Mr. Hyzer has proven this case to be a hoax, conclusively. He has put his reputation on the line, and stated that photograph #19 is a double exposure. Are you still going along with Walt Andrus' contention that it is merely opinion? It is not an opinion, it is a fact. Mr. Hyzer has proven that it is a hoax. The evidence supports it, just as all of the available evidence on this case belies its true nature as a hoax. If you do not want to acknowledge that, that is your business.

I thank everyone for their time in reading this.

Regards,

Jerry Black

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 Salisberry, 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.

--

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](#).