

# UFO Sighter

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY IN ATLANTA

"The public has sound reason for being confused about this. The public should be given all information which would not adversely affect our national security."


SEN. STUART SYMINGTON,  
Dem., Mo.

SUMMER, 1965  
VOLUME 4  
NUMBER 3


Staff:  
Allen Greenfield  
Tadd Jach  
Steve Erdmann  
Michael Dillon  
Rick Hilberg  
Dale Rettig



Cameraman on International Geophysical Year vessel took this photo at Trindade Isle, Brazil, in 1958.



These strange, circular objects are in photograph taken by U.S. Coast Guard at Salem, Mass. (1952).



Otis T. Carr's flying saucer, the X-1, constructed at Oklahoma City in 1959, never got off the ground.



DR. F. E. STRANGES  
Ancients saw saucers . . .

## Minister Ties UFOs To Bible


A Hollywood, Calif., minister and evangelist whose avocation is investigating unidentified flying objects said in Portland Friday that he finds "more confirmation than conflict" in reports of "flying saucers" and what the Bible says.

Dr. Frank E. Stranges, pastor of New Age Cathedral and a graduate of Assemblies of God Bible colleges, said he has been investigating UFOs since 1945 and he is convinced they do more to glorify God than to detract from Him.

IN HIS lecture tours around the country, Dr. Stranges asserted he tries to give his audiences "a greater appreciation of the Almighty. We, with our little pea brains here on earth, must not think we are the only intelligent life under Him."

Many of the scriptures prove existence of such extraterrestrial life, the Portland visitor claimed. He quoted parts of Job, Ezekiel and Jeremiah to back up his statements.

# 1965 U F O Congress



The Editor, UFO Sighter:

Have received the new Sighter and thought it very well done. Thought Beasley & Erdmann's article was very good refutation of Kor's "Thinking?" Also, many thanks for the notice regarding my booklet.

LUCIUS FARISH

The Editor, UFO Sighter:

I would like to comment on Mr. Steinberg's remarks about my previous letter. Webster defines "Disciple" as: "One who receives the teaching of another; a scholar; a follower." This term was used largely because of the information revealed by Steinberg to me in his personal correspondence, pertaining to Moseley. In most major respects, Steinberg's attitude could easily fit into any one of the three just list points. I wish to point out that this remark was made in the midst of correspondence with Steinberg, and since then we have come, as I said to him to "Some kind of understanding." This is important to mention, too.

Mr. Steinberg lists NICAP as an "Abysmal failure" at public education (again, using a value judgment alien to scientific terminology). If NICAP has been an "Abysmal failure at such, it is only natural if we ask: What has Steinberg been? The answer can be stated just as "Strongly"; he has been nothing! It would appear that Steinberg is not close enough to NICAP to be aware of their efforts or understand their purpose, or he does not care to see. While the egotism of Richard Hall, and other shortcomings of NICAP are a matter of concern, I suggest that none of this implies the complete (abysmal) undermining of NICAP as those known as the X group have been doing. These problems are no more than "Paper tigers" by which these people feel excused to throw their steel brick-bats.

STEVE ERDMANN

The Editor, UFO Sighter:

I have not called NICAP "Do nothing." What I attempted to say in my letter in the last UFO Sighter, and which, by necessity, had to be a curt reply, was that their efforts thus far have not been successful. NICAP certainly has accomplished something in their 8½ years of operation; however, I think they might have accomplished more. When Major Keyhoe took over NICAP in 1957, they had more potential than any saucer organization that had ever existed. I do not think they have realized their potential to its fullest extent.

And how should NICAP be improved? Well, that would require a more careful examination of the situation than I can offer offhand. In the coming months, we will attempt to give an objective appraisal of the situation, and we will be in a far better position to offer suggestions for the possible improvement of NICAP. It would certainly be unfair to simply pull something out of the hat, and consider it a constructive recommendation.

As to my own record in saucer research: I do credit myself with having at least as much of an ego, and probably more, than the average person; but I do not think it would be proper to list what my accomplishments in the field may or may not be, for you would probably find fault in all of them. I will leave it to others to evaluate my record and to decide whether I have been of any value to the saucer field.

EUGENE STEINBERG

Send all letters to: The UFO Sighter, 2875 Sequoyah Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30327.

Your editor will probably make several enemies from that title alone. Most UFOlogists agree that one of the essential tenets of the UFO field is that it is against orthodoxy; "Orthodoxy dies by inches," boasted the late dean of British UFOlogy, Waveney Girvan. Hundreds in the field would probably cheer this premise.

Personally, I don't. At least, not without several significant reservations.

In the first place, just what is orthodoxy? Are the scientists whose opinions we are so disgusted by in their naive bias against the UFO, indeed, against any new or revolutionary concept, the "Enemy" . . . . the fabled demon we call "The orthodox." To the direct contrary, these people are the radical opposite of orthodoxy. Traditional science accepts the premise of periodic upheaval; of change with the changing times. No traditional scientist has ever claimed that science, as such, is transcendental. They recognize the essential factor, which is that science is a method or discipline, not a set doctrine or set of statutes. With this criteria, it becomes quite obvious that the numerous scientists who refuse to even examine the UFO and related matters are hardly "Orthodox". Indeed, it becomes apparent to the discerning observer that these people have usurped the title of "Orthodox" in order to gain respectability. In this they have done admirably well. Much too well for my blood. They have established themselves so well that they are now firmly entrenched as the scientific establishment.

But established and respected though they are, they are not now, nor can they ever be, representatives of orthodoxy, though they would be the first to lay claim to the title. They are . . . . . make no mistake about it . . . . . the most radical heretics of our age.

If anyone is justly entitled to the term "Orthodox" it is us! After all, what is it that UFOlogy stands for? Just what, specifically, do we advocate? I think opinions vary, but they center around the basic premise that the matter of unidentified flying objects should be looked into without prejudice. What, may I ask, is this . . . . . if not the "Orthodox" scientific method? Does this not then make us . . . and the scientists (the minority) who support us, the real orthodox? I maintain that the answer is very much in the affirmative.

We are not so unorthodox in other areas either. Is not our opposition to military censorship an "Attack on orthodoxy"? It would seem not. To the contrary, the military establishment that would take a subject of such enormous importance out of the hands of the people, indeed, out of the hands of the civilian government so completely as has been done for no valid reason, well . . . . . this is not what I would call "Orthodoxy". NOT in a democracy it isn't. What this is in a more-or-less petty form is a dictatorship-in-the-rough.

Any of you who have read the Constitution, Washington's Farewell Address, or, for that matter, 7 Days in May will recognize the basic tenet of democracy: Supremacy of the civilian government over the military. When the AF usurps preeminence over all others in an area where they have little or no business, they are not being orthodox. Indeed, those who know what is going on . . . those in the orthodox establishment, are quite angry about this state of affairs. Senators are mad. Congressmen are mad. Indeed, members of the other military services are mad. The only reason something isn't done, I think, is simply that the Air Force has so effectively squelched this subject and discredited its advocates, that not enough people know what is really going on, and those few who do say nothing for fear of ridicule.

Again, what is UFOlogy's position? We maintain that censorship and suppression of this vital issue are wrong. We want open, objective investigations of this matter, and we want the AF UFO program investigated by Congress. This is not the opposite of orthodoxy. In a free republic such as ours, this is orthodoxy, and woe be the day when it is unorthodox to advocate freedom.

Possibly I have devoted too much time to what is essentially a problem of semantics. But I

think it important to know just who we are, and who we are opposed to: We are the orthodox, fighting them, the terrifyingly powerful radical bureaucratic establishment.

..... Speaking of "Establishments", there will be a week-long UFO seminar this August in Atlanta. Several UFO researchers will be in the Southern Gate City to discuss some of the sightings of the recent flap. Meetings of this kind are all too rare these days, and with so many new sightings to discuss, we hope this meeting will serve as an example to some industrious researchers, who will set up similar meetings in various parts of the country. The recent wave of reports needs to be discussed.

By the way, it is our understanding that the Post Office Department is going to "Crack down" soon on publications that don't use "Zip Code" in their addressing. Since this is an editorial, I might as well go on record as being opposed to the whole nonsensical zip code system, but I am nevertheless obliged to ask you to send your "Code number" to us as soon as possible. This will save us considerable expense. Just print your address on a postcard, and send it to the UFO Sighter, 2875 Sequoyah Drive N.W., Atlanta, Georgia.

What? Oh! It's "30327". I forgot to mention my zip code in the above address.

..... For the past few issues we have been running a serial by Steve Erdmann on the subject of Tom Comella/Peter Kor's "Saucer philosophy". This series of articles has not, I think, received all the attention it deserves, so I thought I would comment on this editorial.

It seems that the character who writes in various saucer publications under such names as "Peter Kor" or "Tom Comella" espousing a rather unusual philosophy has received a great deal of attention. I think he deserves some attention, because I think his entire philosophy is a threat to UFOlogy. So far as its contents go, I think "our man in philosophy" has adequately explained and refuted most of what Comella has had to say. If you haven't been reading Mr. Erdmann's serial in the past few issues, I suggest you drag out your old Sighters and take a look. This is the going thing right now in highbrow UFOlogy circles. I, for one, consider this unfortunate.

I may be wrong (I've never met him), but it seems to me that Comella is an egotistical person inclined towards (his own version of) pragmatic philosophy. Unable to find an outlet for his frustrated ideas elsewhere, he brings his more-or-less worthless ideas to UFOlogy, and imposes this ho-hum boredom and concepts; this ordinarily innoxious "Filler material" is turned into an obstical and menace. Boredom is a dangerous enemy in this field, and if Comella is nothing else, he is boring. I have no personal axe to grind with Tom Comella (or whatever his real name is), but why doesn't he take his musty ideas to a place more suitable than the pages of UFO publications? There is nothing basically wrong with them; they just don't belong.

By the way, any of you readers who would like to comment on the Sighter, or send us a letter for publication, or write an article for us, are invited to do so. We sent out a poll to some of our readers recently and found a pretty general satisfaction with the Sighter. If you too are satisfied, or if you are not, why not drop us a card and let us know about it? We always welcome constructive criticism, and we especially welcome new ideas and opinions for publication.

By Steve Erdmann

Part III.

In the first two sections of this serial, we have looked into the sundry aspects of Tom Comella's "Saucer philosophy". In this third and temporarily concluding section, we deal with a disclosed case, on which Comella bases much of his "Proof" --- that of individual UFO sightings that supposedly disclose evidence of his theory. The case in point is that of Jeff Lund, as reported in the April, 1964 issue of Palmer's Flying Saucers.

Comella considers this a very important case, mainly because as he points out "What this and other experiences confront us with is a phenomenon capable of transforming itself into several different forms. This kind of evidence prompts us to ask how many of the so-called 'good UFO cases' involved a similar phenomenon under conditions which did not trigger the metamorphosis Jeff encountered?"

The Jeff Lund case, as is given in detail in that particular issue, bases around a March, 1959 sighting, which had every appearance of being a physical, tangible craft, but upon very close examination by Lund, turned out to be a psychic projection, with various mixed phenomena. Comella hints that this is the case --- or, that it must be the case, under the conditions of his theory --- in the other reports of "UFO aircraft". Let us now proceed to compare some other cases of "Craft" as to that of Jeff Lund.

In June, 1951, Mr. Thomas P. Weyer had accidentally discovered a "Hub-cap" laying in the grass. He picked it up to examine it, and noted that this "Hub-cap" was convex on both sides, and was genuinely a "Small disc", approximately 15" in diameter and 6" thick at center, perfectly symmetrical with tapered edges. It had the appearance of "Polished chrome". It was warm to the touch, probably from sunlight. There were no openings or markings. And the "Disc" was very light, as if made from aluminium. He then set it down, and thinking to himself, turned away. Instantly, he heard a "Whoosh" and turned to see the object rising rapidly away. In a matter of seconds it was lost from sight in the sky. Weyer's description fits perfectly that of Lt. David C. Brigham, who--on March 27, 1952--sighted an almost identical object.

In the September, 1964 issue of APRO's Bulletin, in a C.W. Fitch Commentary, is an account of a Mr. R.B., a Philadelphia radio moderator and UFO investigator, who was shown a "Landed Disc" in June, 1963. R.B. apparently seems to be "Bob Berry", a person whom I corresponded with several years ago, and who some other investigators also know.

R.B. located the lady, on who's property the UFO was reported to have fallen, and was granted permission to see the disc in her garage. The object was round and saucer-shaped, grayish-white in color and approximately 3 feet in diameter. The lady would not release it for analysis, and upon a second visit, R.B. was told that it had been "Thrown away". Neither person could give belief to the lady's "Answer". And it probably ended up as the property of the Air Force: The "Hardware" they claim they never have.

In October, 1959, Mark George Muza, Jr., Poquoson, Virginia, had encountered a UFO which was aimed directly at him. At first he thought it was a flock of birds, but upon looking, it shocked him to see a "Disc, 4 feet in diameter, black body, encircled by a silver rim about six inches wide" gently descending for him. He immediately fired a load of No. 4 shot at it, and heard "The ring of metal striking metal". 55 more feet up, the object stopped in time to receive his second shot of "Maximum 4's". For the final shot, Muza used a "Steel bearing", and "Heard the clear hit of the slug". The UFO then disappeared.

Here are three cases, which typify several of the same calibre, and don't ring true nor toe the line as Comella's "Philosophy" dictates. First, in the Lund case, no lie-detection, truth serum, etc., was in use, and so (as it is in most general UFO cases) Comella has to rely on the supposed integrity of the person. Lund, in his sighting, has

nothing over the other UFO witnesses in question, that would make his testimony more suitable, outside of some personal preference, which wouldn't be objective.

About the time that Jeff had "Penetrated the outer extremity of the hemispherical volume of pulsating gas" (of the UFO), Mr. Thomas P. Weyer had "Picked up" his "Disc" and then "Examined" it. Where as, R.B. located the witness, and "Found" the saucer laying in the garage after the night of the noted "Fall". Further, Muza fired at his "Disc" several times, hearing the "Ring of metal striking metal", where as, Lund "Was greatly disturbed and puzzled that there was no structure what-so-ever to the phenomenon."

This is not a blanket denial that --- as "Popular science" and the majority of average citizen's insist --- "Psychic phenomena" doesn't exist. Neither is it a denial that the UFO phenomena may not be included in some psychic encounters; as it would be included in every part of life. The exact degree that it is, doesn't fit into Comella's philosophy; and there appears to be several major inconsistencies, despite Comella's smugness.

As Curtis Fuller points out: "The day must come surely, we believe when apparitions will be fitted into the general framework of (scientific) knowledge, although one must confess there is not much evidence of progress in this direction." "Maybe all the mysteries can and will be solved, or maybe some are incomprehensible to humans and never can be fully explained. Certainly some are so difficult we don't even know how to go about trying to find the answers to them." Curtis Fuller is a noted parapsychologist and Editor of FATE magazine.

Those wishing to contribute information, may reach me at the address given in the last issue of the UFO SIGHTER.

---

If you own a CB or amatuer radio, and are interested in a UFO reporting network, please contact immediately AISAP, c/o Steve Diehl, Rt. 3, Box 129 Bedford Rd., Cumberland, Maryland. 21502. Free literature; no obligation. Your editor is participating in this worthwhile project ..... AG

By Tadd Jach

The media known as science fiction has bred within us a distinct fear of alien life. Stories of gory (yet intelligent) monsters alighting from their huge space craft (preferably saucer shaped) - parked illegally in the middle of State and Madison - and conquering the earth are as familiar to us as the resulting plot; some young scientist (preferably unmarried) discovers the space beings' weakness and forces them to retreat to their home planet, Yksehtnieip.

On the other hand, there are many people waiting for the arrival of The Other People, not with apprehension, but with the idea that the arrival of The Other People will be of great benefit to the world. Some people have even claimed to have made contact with the space beings. However, the credibility of such reports is doubtful since the purpose, intent, size, description, et al, of the beings varies from contactee to contactee. In some cases, these overly anxious individuals have even confessed to fraud, throwing even more doubt on this fringe of UFOlogy.

History has always shown us that when contact is made between two cultures, races, et cetera, it is always the more advanced which discovers the less advanced. (The other case involves an analogy in which earthmen are depicted as war painted savages paddling into New York Harbor in dugout canoes.) With this in mind, one may surmise as to why the space people have not contacted us - and this author believes that they have not. One: They recognize the fact that contact would inevitably lead to the destruction of our primitive (relatively speaking) culture, as demonstrated by the collision of the European and Amerindian cultures during the early part of American history. Or, Two: They have about as much interest in us or in contacting us, as a scientist at MIT would have in a virus culture under his electron microscope.

In the last case, the implications are frightening, for what if (as many others have already imagined) the space beings, far from making contact, would have no more feeling in eliminating us, than would the scientist at MIT have in eliminating the virus, if it proved to be a danger to his existence. Thus, they wouldn't even have to press a button to convert our planet into the cloud of galectic dust it was billions of years ago.

But my purpose, here, is not to elaborate on the possibilities and outcome of the latter reason for my belief that contact between us and "Them" has not been made, nor to suppose that the things we see in the air now and then are examining us before giving earth the "Thumbs-up" or "Thumbs-down" routine, but to bring out a point - an opinion of why the UFO problem has not entirely been solved despite the many years it's been under investigation.

Now, as we all realize, cultural collisions as the one which would result in our meeting with the Other People, have the predictable habit of effecting the technology of the lower civilization the first and worst. (If a comparison be necessary, when the white men entered into the culture of the Indian, the witchdoctor was the first to go.) Should the space people ever bring their civilization "Down to earth", the first thing to "Go" in our culture would be our science and technology, (the military would perish, which may bring to mind ideas as to why the Air Force is censoring every scrap of UFO evident they get their hands on, also, there are some religions which would "Kick-the-bucket" should contact ever be made.)

Those of science in our civilization realize this. No doubt, it is this realization which has influenced them to look into the UFO field in hopes of finding evidence for the confirmation or rejection of the existence of extraterrestrial life. In their own search, they are bound to help the UFO investigator by joining a "Saucer" club. The talents and knowledge of these men (physicists, astronomers, aeronautical

and aeronautical engineers etc.) would be a large asset to UFOlogy. Unfortunately, these scientists and engineers, although rational, logical and open-minded, have been repulsed by the parade of contactees, mystics, supernaturalists, psychics, and political extremists (which seem to be predominant in saucerology) engaged in the study of aerial phenomena. Seeing this, they turn to books by (shudder!) Doctor Menzel, who, after a brilliant display of logic and scientific reasoning (which can be distilled from some of the double-talk), converts the open-minded individual into a narrow-minded enemy of UFOlogy. However, if, by sheer will power, the interested scientist or engineer continues his study of UFOlogy, deleting sensationalistic and obviously publicity seeking reports, books, and theories from his research, he becomes bogged down and bored by the avalanche of this type of material he is rejecting and loses interest altogether. (This includes articles of scientific INcorrectness - i.e., in the February, 1965, issue of the magazine called Flying Saucers, on page five, there is an article called "Earth's Center of Gravity - Up or Down?" - author, UNKNOWN - and I can see why. The half truths and obvious scientific errors presented in this article enraged my physics instructor (whom I thought would be amused!) so much, that when he asked me if I had actually purchased that magazine, I became noncommittal, but did give the impression that the zine was not my own!)

Another thing, if this level-headed scientifically minded individual affiliates with almost any of the UFO clubs - only a handful of which are really worth the effort - he is challenged when presenting a logical and well-thought-out idea and assailed when disproving an unscientific idea he encounters. The end results of all this, is his resignation as a member of the UFO organization.

This author does not possess any of the high standards of the many scientifically minded people who have tried, are trying, or will try to enter into the UFO field. But, he can offer advice to the well established members of these organizations to whom the enlistment of these scientifically oriented individuals would benefit greatly.

First of all, do not try to convince him that UFOs are intelligently controlled space crafts, or that the people who control them have actually contacted us, et cetera, but refer him to a UFO organization with a reputation for level-headed scientific investigation of the UFO phenomena (NICAP, for instance). Give him a list of UFO books that are not too radical (NICAP's "The UFO Evidence", books by Major Donald E. Keyhoe, et cetera), the so-called "Contactee" books are OUT. Most of all, encourage him to write about the UFO situation, his opinions, comments, investigations, conclusions, such articles would be of great help to UFOlogy.

As for yourself, the UFO investigator, instead of burying yourself in contactee books, read some books written for the laymen on physics, logic, aerodynamics, astronomy - everything and everything of a scientific nature. Become familiar with the scientific method, logic, induction, mathematics, and other related fields. Then, besides impressing an interested engineer, you will also be more qualified to explain and cope with the increasing number of reports, articles, and theories "Cranked-out", it seems, by people who write such trash as "Earth's Center of Gravity - Up or Down?" .....Ha!

#### PRESS TIME NOTES

With the death of George Adamski, an era has ended in UFOlogy. Although the Editor did not subscribe to Mr. Adamski's views, we join with others in the field in mourning the passing of this outstanding personality. He will, we think, be missed by one and all; friends, enemies, and neutral observers.

The Second Annual Congress of Scientific UFOlogists, an event actively supported by the Editor of the UFO Sighter, the American UFO Committee, and others was held in

Cleveland, Ohio June 24th to 27th. The Open Session was attended by approximately 300 persons from throughout the U.S. and Canada. The event was highlighted by delegates' sessions which developed a "Code of Ethics" for UFOlogy which should have far-reaching implications. Delegates included many leaders in the field. The Congress was attended by James W. Moseley, Eugene Steinberg, Tom Comella, Gene Duplantier, and many other leaders in the field. Plans for the 1966 Congress were made, and a permanent Congress Committee was established with Allan Manak of Cleveland as Chairman. The highly successful convention welcomed delegates from the American UFO Committee, Saucer News, Saucers, Space, and Science, plus other leading groups and publications.

(Cover credits this issue: True Magazine, The Oklahoman, and the Oregon Journal)