



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

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 5 May 1999 11:22:09 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 05 May 1999 14:56:38 -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@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

<snip>

>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

<snip>

>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

<snip>

>4) That Walters possessed sufficient knowledge to successfully
>and consistently spoof stereo photos so that the calculated

<snip>

>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

<snip>

>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.

Might add: how Walters managed to fake the "Blue Beam photo"
(#11) and the "Beam with Frances photo" (#24).

Number 11 has been proven not to be a simple double exposure
photo.

And, of course, one could add in numerous questions related to
(a) other persons who claimed to have seen the same object in
the same time frame (e.g., Truman Holcomb who said he saw the
same sort of object emanating blue beams in April, 1988) and (b)
all the other sightings by Ed (and others) in the years
following 1988 (see UFOs Are Real, Here'S The Proof, Walters
and Maccabee, Avon, 1997).

>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
>Sanio or Maccabee, nor does he seem to realize or acknowledge
>the weakness of some parts of the Hyzer analysis.

For example, in a double exposure one must take two pictures
(exposures): first of the model in a darkened room (black
surface behind the model) and second outside. In each case the
camera is hand-held. By experiment it was determined that the
camera shutter would stay open as long as Ed held the shutter
button down under these low-light conditions. Hence there was
time for camera jiggle... which occurred and is evidence in the
smears of the images, in particular those of the bright lights.

Sanio proved that the smear direction and size were the same in
the UFO image and the nearby streetlight image. This argues
AGAINST double exposure unless you can prove that the camera
jiggle during the first exposure would be exactly the same as in
the second exposure (not likely!).

Black has never discussed the significance of the identical
image smears of the "knowns" (e.g., streetlight) and the
"unknown" (UFO image).

>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.

<snip>

>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.

Hyzer's analysis was discussed thoroughly soon after it was
published.

[[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](#).