



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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Jerry Black <blackhole60@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:18:23 PDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:30:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>
>Date: Mon, 3 May 1999 17:41:05 -0400
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>Date: Sun, 02 May 1999 07:38:12 -0400
>>From: Kenny Young <ufo@fuse.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

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

>>>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.

>>Please look beyond the 'tone' and scrutinize the substance of
>>what Mr. Black has to offer. It would be a mistake to assume
>>such a dismissive approach to his comments, as many have
>>repeatedly sought to do.

>Kenny -

>You are a serious investigator, and I have always appreciated
>your approach to cases.

>However, I am sure that you know that polemic such as that
>produced by Mr. Black is not the way to generate any sort of
>improvement in UFOlogy. Personally, I believe he does make, on
>occasion, valid points. However, they are not typically points
>which have not been made by someone else, much more courteously,
>elsewhere.

>Even if Walters and Strieber are the charlatans that Black
>claims, stridency is not the way to alter their impact on
>ufology. In regard to the Gulf Breeze case, if Mr. Black would
>like to demonstrate with appropriate science, and in a
>reasonable, objective tone, how to account for the following, he
>will be doing us all a service:

>1) How the obscuration of the object in Photo 1 and Photo 7 has
>been accomplished. Double exposure, even with the Hyzer method,
>has been experimentally discredited.

>2) That the light return from objects apparently at the distant
>edge of the flash is what would be expected from a model at a
>particular distance (for instance, Photo 13, Photo 16, Photo 23,
>Photo 35 all have foreground objects whose comparative light
>return would make that analysis simpler).

>3) That Photo 37L and R, which show that the object is obscured
>by a tree branch in one stereo frame, can be explained with
>models and mathematics within Walters' competence. It must be
>accounted for that the calculated size of the object is
>consistent with that in other stereo photos taken with other
>equipment at other times, and with non-stereo photos with
>reference points, such as the road shot.

>4) That Walters possessed sufficient knowledge to successfully
>and consistently spoof stereo photos so that the calculated
>diameter would remain consistent with that estimated from other
>images (including the road shot).

>5) That Photo 38L and R would be possible to create such that
>the resulting images be consistent with the Nimslo photo results
>(this requiring models to be suspended tens of feet above the
>water 100 or more feet from the shore) for two completely
>different objects of widely different sizes and yet have the
>resulting measurements be consistent with other photos taken
>under other conditions, including the other stereo photos taken
>by Walters.

>6) How the various videotapes could be hoaxed.

>8) How and where Walters was able to construct and test and
>photograph complex lighted models without anyone's knowledge.

>9) That Walters had the knowledge, the skills and the tools to
>create and photograph such models.

>10) That he had the mathematical knowledge to spoof the stereo
>photos or that such could be done by chance.

>11) That Walters' family was in on the hoax.

>12) Walters' motivation for the hoax.

>One of the problems with Black's discussion of Gulf Breeze (to
>take an example with which I am most familiar) is that he does
>not seem aware that most of these are issues. The characteristic
>of the scientific approach is best expressed by the section that
>appears in every scientific paper: related work. In that
>section, the author of a paper shows his understanding of the
>work done by the others in the field on the same problem and
>demonstrates why his approach is better. Black does not seem to
>properly counterpoint the important portions of the work done by
>Sanio or Maccabee, nor does he seem to realize or acknowledge
>the weakness of some parts of the Hyzer analysis.

>Now none of the above require discussion of Believer Bill, or
>the model found years later in the old Walters house, or any of
>the disputable testimony. These are simple qualitative or
>investigative requirements - and of those, the qualitative tests
>are of the most interest because they are reproducible on demand
>and are not subjective in nature.

>Understand - I am not a Gulf Breeze or Streiber partisan. I have
>many problems with Gulf Breeze, and I have even more problems
>with Streiber's case. I haven't devoted a lot of time to
>Streiber because, frankly, it seems to me he offers very little
>to work with that is not ambiguous, while Gulf Breeze is not
>ambiguous at all and offers all of the material needed for
>quantitative analysis. Of course, of the two, Streiber has
>certainly had a much more profound social effect.

>But, at any rate, I keep my mind open on Gulf Breeze because the
>above points have not been dealt with to my satisfaction, and,
>until they are, I have no choice but to leave the case open. And
>Mr. Black can attack everyone involved in the case as much as he
>>wants, but _until_ all of the above points have been addressed
>to my satisfaction, why should I change my mind? If Bruce's
>analysis is flawed, I believe he will be receptive to the proof
>- I know I am. If Jeff Sanio's analysis is flawed, he should
>also be receptive to the proof. And if Hyzer's analysis is
>flawed, there should be some sign that Mr. Black is receptive to

>the notion.

>Quiet, carefully reasoned, qualitatively backed analysis means a
>lot more to me than any polygraph test, paid for by someone else
>or not. And certainly Mr. Black's attitude does nothing to
>generate confidence in me that the results he will bring forward
>are any more objective than those he denounces.

Mr. Mark Cashman;

I wanted to take this time to thank you for responding to Kenny Young's remarks. Firstly, I appreciate his support, but do not need it. I am sorry if you and a few others do not like the tone of my letters.

My letters were simply investigative letters to Mr. Whitley Strieber in response to his 'lack of response' regarding my invitation to have him take a third-party polygraph test financed at my own expense. I am trying to show people that when his books are read, there is much to be desired in terms of believability once you get past the fantastic ability that Mr. Strieber has in putting words on paper. There has been no evidence whatsoever to support Whitley Strieber's case -and there should be, because he is/was an alleged contactee. We don't expect that from people like the three women from Casey County, Kentucky who, in 1976, had one experience only. But when you deal with contactee's such as Billy Meier, George Adamski and Daniel Frye - we expect more. Certainly I do. Mr. Whitley Strieber made sure that all the investigators were kept at bay and unable to perform an analysis by staying overnight or throughout a weekend to view what he was seeing when he had these supposed encounters with 'The Visitors.' Motion picture cameras, motion detection equipment, audio tapes... all could have been set up in Mr. Strieber's home to try to get this information on audio or videotape. It was never done because Mr. Strieber did not allow it. His books certainly do not prove anything whatsoever. That he allowed his son to come out is a major strike against the believability of his claim, having the child put in that dangerous peril that he claims was present there.

Also, your remarks about Gulf Breeze are well taken. I will be making a final report on Gulf Breeze in which I will show you and any objective person that all the pictures that were taken by Mr. Ed Walters could have -and were- taken by him in a hoaxed manner. Mr. Bruce Maccabee, again, has sought to make it appear as if Ed Walters was a complete idiot with a camera. However, I have learned -along with investigator Rex Salisbury- from talking with kids in the neighborhood who frequented the Walters house quite often, that whenever you saw Ed, you saw a camera around his neck. We have four youngsters who will testify [and who DID testify] to Rex Salisbury and his wife Carol, that Ed Walters would double-expose Polaroid film and play tricks on them. For instance, he would take a picture of a reflection in the mirror and leave the picture in the camera and take another picture of one of the girls and say: "I wonder which one of you will have the spirits behind you tonight?" It would obviously be the first photograph that he would take, and when he pulled the picture out, there would be a strange reflection situated behind the girl.

So we know for a fact that Ed Walter's was a camera buff, unlike what Mr. Bruce Maccabee tries to portray. And when you try to use the expertise of Mr. Bruce Maccabee against Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son, you are talking about apples and oranges. There is NO comparison -NONE- between the abilities of Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son James in contrast to Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Jeff Sainio. PERIOD.

I will show in my report how the rest of the case, including photograph #19, just does not hold up. There is not one piece of evidence [although Bruce Maccabee strangely states there are many] that will substantiate this Ed Walters case. There is nothing.

A lot of times when you have people perpetrate hoaxes, such as [in my opinion] Ed Walters, Whitley Strieber, etc., they always try to rely on other people's stories or sightings to confirm their own. That is exactly what both men have done. You cannot, as an objective investigator, accept testimony from another

person because they say they saw an object which looks similar to Ed's, and say "that makes Ed's real." When you have a nationally publicized case, you are bound to have people come out of the woodwork, as we've had on every nationally exposed case, and say that they also saw something very similar. To give you a quick example, Mr. Art Hufford, one of the MUFON investigators on the Gulf Breeze case, saw an object during the daylight for twenty seconds. He drew that object and went around on national TV [I heard him at least twice] and said to Ed Walters: "I saw something exactly like what you saw." But if you look at Art Hufford's drawings, there are no portholes or windows in Mr. Hufford's UFO. Does it have a similar shape? Somewhat, but there are no windows or portholes. So obviously, contrary to what Art Hufford told the national media, he did not see the same object that Ed Walter's allegedly photographed [which shows portholes and windows]. Since he was caught and this was brought to his attention by myself and other investigators, he later stated that "there may have been windows, but I didn't see any." So contrary to popular belief, Art Hufford did not EVER see the same object that Ed Walters photographed.

I will be issuing a final Gulf Breeze report, and challenging Bruce Maccabee and Jeff Sainio on photograph #19 to back up their claims. The crux of photograph 19 is that Mr. Hyzer claims there is no luminosity projecting downward from the object, which there should be due to light bouncing off the hard surface. Mr. Jeff Sainio claims, just by looking at his first generation copy, that he can see the luminosity on the road -not with instruments, but with the naked eye. Don't you find it unusual that Sainio can assert this while Hyzer cannot detect this using the most sophisticated equipment that is the best in the business? You sir, have to determine who is telling the truth and who is not. Who has an ax to grind, and who doesn't, Mr. Cashman.

I will be offering Mr. Bruce Maccabee and challenge that he should not be able to refuse. If he does, then he shows me very clearly that he has been blowing smoke all these years. That challenge will be issued in my final report on Gulf Breeze.

If you would like to call me sir, I can go over some of these issues privately with you and have no problem with that, and would more than happy to do that for you Mr. Cashman, to show you where exactly that Mr. Bruce Maccabee keeps leading people astray, and what the true facts are on Gulf Breeze. Some of the things you will be seeing in my report have obviously not been made public by the MUFON organization, because they do not want this case to be exposed as the hoax it is [because they ran with it prematurely].

Thank you for your time, I hope to hear from you.

Jerry Black
6276 Taylor Pike
Blanchester, OH 45107

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](#).