



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Jerry Black <blackhole60@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:08:20 PDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:06:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

[Greg's message reproduced in its entirety - it _was_ five weeks ago --ebk]

>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman
>Date: Sat, 1 May 1999 11:04:37 -0400

>>Date: Thu, 22 Apr 1999 15:04:47 -0500
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>From: Glenn Joyner <infohead@airmail.net>
>>Subject: Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>My name is Jerry Black, and I will now state, for the record, my
>>position on the UFO topic.

><snip>

>Am I the only one who never wants to read another word from Jerry
>Black?

>Since I'm one of Budd Hopkins's many friends, I suppose Black
>might think I'm on his case because he got on Budd's, in his
>latest missive. But in fact I lost it with him when I read his
>latest Whitley Strieber attack, and I have no brief for Strieber
>at all. I decided to write this note after reading the first few
>paragraphs of his assault on Stan Friedman, long before I got to
>the part about Budd.

>My thoughts about Black are very simple. He's hardly the first
>to raise questions about the Gulf Breeze case, or about
>Strieber. He does, though, set new records for stultifying
>self-righteousness, barely concealing a resentment that borders
>on rage.

>And he doesn't seem to know the difference between a valid
>argument, an absurdity, and an ad hominem attack. It's absurd,
>for instance, for him to condemn MUFON, the entire organization,
>in part because he went to one function 20 years ago, and didn't
>like what he heard. And it's certainly an ad hominem attack when
>he talks about Stan Friedman's personality. Flamboyance, in
>Jerry Black's eyes, seems to be a kind of crime, prima facie
>evidence, all by itself, that the flamboyant person is only

>Finally, Black isn't, to put it mildly, very well informed about
>some of the subjects he discusses. For one quick example, take
>this:

>>Mr. William G. Hyzer informed me that the
>>technology today is as such that anyone who has a computer and
>>the money can make a UFO photograph that no one would ever be
>>able to detect as being a hoax.

>I might note, in passing, Black's exaggerated, almost obsequious
>respect for Hyzer, who may well be a worthy professional in his
>field, but surely isn't the fount of unerring wisdom Black makes
>him out to be. Nobody, nobody at all, is that good.

>But this statement about computer imagery is, first, not
>remarkable, because it's something you hear all the time,
>without having to consult Hyzer or anyone else. Second, it's
>wrong. Computer-faked images will show subtle signs of fakery,
>if you closely examine them (and, of course, if you have a deep
>knowledge of computer graphics). We've discussed that on this
>list many times. But Black propounds his notion (or Hyzer's) in
>the same tone of a self-righteous oracle that he uses throughout
>his broadsides. He makes no distinction between things he might
>know something about, and other areas, like this one, in which
>he hasn't a clue.

>Enough. I don't care whether I agree with Black, or disagree
>with him, about the many points he raises in his open letters.
>But I'm offended enough by his tone to feel I should say
>something.

Mr. Sandow, if you keep your word [which I doubt that you will do] then there should be no response from you concerning this message that I am writing, which is in response to your comments regarding my 'Open Letter to Stan Friedman'.

First of all, I take issue with your words that I 'attacked' Whitley Strieber. I wrote Mr. Strieber back in January after reviewing his numerous books for over four months and stating to him some of the problems I had with what his books had to say. A contactee, as you may or may not be aware, has given UFOlogists repeated opportunities to investigate their cases first-hand in terms of staying overnight or setting up motion-detection equipment or other related instruments. Mr. Strieber stayed on the 'offensive' against UFO investigators in the beginning, so this could obviously not be accomplished. I think that was purposefully done. Mr. Strieber has nothing else to offer as proof of his experience with the visitors. In fact, there was a lot of things in Mr. Strieber's books that he was trying to impress people that his stories are real when common sense and logic dictate that these things are not true. I stated those in my original letter.

My second letter was to Mr. Whitley Strieber two months later - after he obviously ignored my previous letter and refused to take the third-party, properly sponsored polygraph test [that I agreed to give him at my expense, by the way], and you feel this was an attack on Whitley Strieber. Don't you know the difference between an attack and a report?

I'm sorry that you don't seem to approve of the tone or the way I write my letters. That is your problem, not mine. I write my letters honestly and openly, and very much to the point.

I'm also very sorry that you are a friend of Budd Hopkins and cannot separate your friendship from Budd Hopkins and your objectivity in terms of his ineptness as a UFO researcher and investigator.

Mr. Budd Hopkins has demonstrated throughout the past twenty years that he is not - I repeat, NOT - a UFO investigator [or researcher]. He is basically a UFO reporter. And for those such as Jerome Clark, Mark Cashman and yourself who do not like that because you are friends with Budd Hopkins -- TOO BAD. His record speaks for itself. The ludicrous book, "Witnessed," is just that -- ludicrous. It has no basis of objectivity whatsoever. Your good friend, Mr. Budd Hopkins, does not believe in polygraph tests. How convenient.

What Mr. Budd Hopkins has done, not only in the "Intruders" book [with Kathy Davis] and the book "Witnessed" with [Linda Cortile], has only reported on what they have told him. He has done no research or investigation whatsoever.

If Mr. Budd Hopkins lived next door to me, we could be very good friends. I have no problems with Budd Hopkins as a good person in the community. My problem with Budd Hopkins and others in the UFO community are how they handle themselves in the UFO field.

Mr. Sandow, you also refer to William G. Hyzer, and I might add, his son James B. Hyzer [who also worked on the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze pictures], and stated that I have put my total trust in them, and that nobody could be as good as them. But the real issue is that nobody could be as BAD as Bruce Maccabee.

In Mr. Hyzer's preliminary report of the ten pictures that he was given, which included photograph #18 [the famous "road-shot"], he stated that "ALL" of the pictures showed indications of double-exposure. He could not prove at that particular time that any one of those photographs were absolutely hoaxed, but all showed signs of double-exposure. To the contrary, Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Jeff Sainio, not only in all their vocal support given at symposiums during this time frame, and through all their reports they wrote, never ONCE had a negative comment to make regarding the pictures. So we are to assume, sir, if we adhere to your theory, that Mr. Hyzer made TEN mistakes on all of these pictures, and Mr. Bruce Maccabee is correct.

Mr. Hyzer had no ax to grind, whatsoever. Mr. Jeff Sainio and Mr. Bruce Maccabee obviously did, or we could assume that Mr. Maccabee is not the great and professional photo-analyst that we have been led to believe in the past.

This is the first time that I am aware of that Mr. Bruce Maccabee has been confronted with an independent photo-analyst of the quality of Mr. Hyzer, working on the same project. And it appears to me that we, in the past, have been misled by believing Mr. Bruce Maccabee's professional experience in photographic analysis was much greater than it obviously is. So yes, I have a great deal of trust in Mr. William G. Hyzer, and if you take the time to look on my web-site, you will see a whole page providing you with Mr. Hyzer's background.

If you wish to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee over Mr. William Hyzer, possibly because of your friendship, that is your problem.

The photographic evidence speaks very clearly for itself. Any of the pictures that Mr. Bruce Maccabee claims would be so hard for Ed Walters to produce, Mr. Hyzer has already shown how HALF of them could be re-produced very easily with a minimal amount of experience. He expressed one of these theories in "Photo Methods" magazine.

If we are to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, he claims that Ed Walters was a complete idiot in terms of photographic knowledge. Here is a man, sir, when divorced, was worth 2.5 million dollars. Idiots do not make 2.5 million dollars.

Mr. Rex Salisbury, in his interview with numerous young people who were familiar with Ed's son and his family, said that every time they had seen Ed, he had a camera around his neck. Mr. Ed Walters was very well-versed in the camera that he used. He had quite a bit of experience with it, he was a camera BUFF. But if you wish to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, who said he was an 'idiot with a camera,' that, again, is your problem. The evidence doesn't show this.

Also, you make mention of my condemnation of MUFON, the entire organization. Sir, you didn't read that correctly. I stated that when I was at the MUFON symposium in 1978, I heard the word "I" expressed so many times I could've bought my wife a mansion if I could have \$100.00 for each one that said "I." There were many people there from MUFON, but there were also people there from other organizations, such as APRO and other groups in attendance. This is not reflecting upon the entire MUFON organization. Certainly I think Walt Andrus is a disgrace to the MUFON organization -- PERIOD. Mr. Walt Andrus has never been a UFO investigator and never will be. He is strictly an administrator, and should assume that position and let someone else take over the reigns of the MUFON organization -- without question. I have many friends in the MUFON organization, Mr. Tom Duley is one, Mr. William Jones, who was State Director for Ohio, is another, I have alot of respect for Mr. Dan Wright... so I was not condemning the entire Mutual UFO Network. You, sir, stand corrected on that.

And finally, you stated that I am not the first one to raise questions about the Gulf Breeze case or Whitley Strieber. It's

not just a matter of raising questions. Sure, Mr. Jerome Clarke and yourself may raise questions, but what has been done about it? Have his books been reviewed? Has anyone offered Mr. Strieber a polygraph test? As far as I know, this is the first third-party polygraph test that Mr. Strieber has ever been asked to take. The same with Gulf Breeze: I didn't just stand aside and say "I think there's a problem here..." I spent over four years, sir, researching and investigating [along with Rex Salisbury and Barbara Becker] the entire Gulf Breeze episode, almost at the expense of losing my wife because I was so involved with it.

Don't tell me that I just bring up questions. I don't just 'bring up questions.' I take action.

JERRY BLACK
6276 Taylor Pike
Blanchester, Ohio 45105
513-625-2613

E-mail: blackhole60@hotmail.com
Website: <http://members.xoom.com/blackshole/>

[[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](#).