

UFO SIGHTER

EDITORIAL STAFF

BY ALLEN H. GREENFIELD

Volume Six
Number One

EDITOR & PUBLISHER:
ALLEN H. GREENFIELD

Spring - Summer
1967



Above is Commodore Hotel in New York City, site of 1967 congress of scientific UFOlogists, photo by Curtis Harris.



EDITOR'S SAY

by Allen H. Greenfield

Well, here we go again. The following are administrative changes. (1) All current staff appointments are hereby terminated, and all regular columns by same are discontinued. (2) The *Sighter* will now be published on a roughly semi-annual basis. This will not effect present subscriptions as to number of issues owed, nor will it effect costs. Anyone dissatisfied with these changes may receive a refund for issues due him upon request. Likewise, exchange cooperators should make appropriate changes, and should let us know of any dissatisfaction. While talking about administration, we wish to mention that we do not, at present (nor have we ever) issue renewal notices. Please keep up with your own date for renewal. If you have questions about this, please contact us.

The *Alternate Horizons Newsletter*, official publication of the Foundation for Philosophic Advancement, is now off the ground and in print. Anyone interested seriously in discussion of the "alternate reality" theory, or in the solving of the UFO enigma (the two are, hopefully, one and the same) should write the editor for a free application.

While in New York City in the period around New Year's, it hit home with your editor that UFOlogy seems to be "big business," and that thinking in terms of the earlier years of this field has become perhaps more than a bit prosaic. Our natural pessimism inclines us to feel that things will sooner or later revert to "normal," but this may well not be so. 1966 was a year of tremendous change in this field of ours. Whether this change will be permanent or not remains to be seen. But as long as UFOlogy remains a 'big time' operation, we will try to think in terms of this new framework.

We wrote an editorial entitled "The Year We All Packed Our Bags and Went Home" in anticipation of our Winter, 1967 issue. Due to the changes made as noted above, it is unlikely that this editorial will ever be printed in toto, but the following will, we hope, be of some relevance.

"...It may do us well to project, on the basis of presently known factors, what we can reasonably expect in the future. Here are several possibilities: (1) UFOlogy, with the boost of continued sightings, will continue to exist in the heady state it is in now, through no fault of our own. (2) Sightings will again flag off, or interest by the public will, or both, again recur within a relatively short period, UFOlogy may sink into the oblivion it was headed towards prior to 1964. (Or seemed to be-Ed.) (3) UFOlogy will, with the help of the events of the recent past, finally rally and become the coherent force it needs to be if it is to be independent of external aid or detriment."

"The course of the dedicated UFOlogist today should be, in our opinion, to encourage the latter. If this does not work out, he should be satisfied with the situation projected in point one. But point two is a distinct possibility. The sightings just *may* diminish. The press may grow wary of the 'flying saucer craze' once again. It has happened before. If it does again, we should be prepared for another fight for survival. With proper dedication, we should be able to stave off 'the twilight of the saucer era'; and beat the hangman once more."

There is also the possibility that things have come so far, they just won't go back. That having been said, we'll conclude our comments here on the UFOlogy status quo.

Our thanks go to Perrinjaquet for the gift of a UFO detector. Another note: Lucius Farish's column originally earmarked for the *Sighter*, will be published in our *Alternate Horizons Newsletter*. Finally, we extend our regrets for the long delay in publication. Address comments to: 2875 Sequoyah Drive NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30327.

UFOLOGY TERMS: A 1960's View

by Allen H. Greenfield

Terminology can be a trying problem, particularly if a field develops an "inside" set of terms so removed from general reference that one becomes lost in trying to understand what the "insider" is talking about. This notwithstanding, it is the opinion of this writer that a set of terms is necessary to a field involved in a specialized area. Two reasons for this stand out in my mind. First, because specialized study leads to specialized thought. To relate specialized thought in a coherent manner may necessitate specialized terminology. Second, there is a psychological advantage to such inside terms. The nature of this in relation to a fraternal spirit that, quite possibly, is a necessity to any well-functioning movement or field of endeavor is obvious enough that I do not think it necessary to elaborate at length.

UFOlogy does, indeed have a set of terms, some borrowed, some quite original. The face of UFOlogy terminology is, however, seemingly a changing one. The following is an informal discussion of some of them.

UFO, UFOlogy: These two terms have been around for some time. The former was, as I understand it, coined by the late Capt. E.J. Ruppelt, USAF, as an official alternative to the civilian "flying saucer". It is interesting to note that public knowledge of this term appears to have been somewhat less than common until the March, 1966 wave of reports. The latter term, coined by the late M.K. Jessup meaning the study of UFOs is still principally an insiders term. Getting back to the former term UFO, it is interesting to note that, despite its direct technical equation with "flying saucer", in popular usage it can (and usually does) have a distinct meaning of its own. Hence, it would be no contradiction in terms to say one "believes in UFOs" but not in "flying saucers."

UAP, UAO: These are terms that are essentially flops. The former is an Air Force term standing for "Undetected Aerial Phenomena (or Phenomenon)." An interesting point about this is that the Air Force has used the term thusly: UPAs....which, of course, is a contradiction of sorts. This term, while probably more desirable in one respect (i.e. the scientific) than more popular counterparts, nonetheless is "artificial," as is UAO. This latter, which stands for "Unknown Aerial Object" or sumesuch is the 'exclusive property' of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, which persists in using it despite the heavy liability of confusion it carries with it.

MENZELFORM: This term is a gem of the field. This writer does not know its origin. In any case the meaning of the term is a pat explanation for a UFO report. To anyone who knows the field, it should be obvious where the term gets its impetus; it is derived from the name of arch saucer foe Dr. Donald Menzel.

UFOloger, UFOlogist: Both terms have the same meaning, which varies from one who devotes himself ardently to UFO study to anyone with a casual interest in UFO phenomena. There are other terms in this same regard: "Saucerologist"; "UFOer"; "Saucerer". Of the two in question, the second seems to be the most widely used today. "UFOloger" seems to have been quite popular at one time, but, it is interesting to note, seems to have suffered a decline over a period of years and is now used only rarely. The reason for this more than likely is the "hobbyish" sound of "UFOloger" as contrasted to the "scientific" ring of "UFOlogist." The former will, I think be remembered (if it is remembered at all) as a 1950's term. To our ears it has a "good old days" ring.

FLAP: This is one of the "borrowed" terms. It is military as are so many terms in this field. In UFOlogy it means a wave of reports, or, less commonly, any great rush of activity. The latter is probably closer to the original.

UFOnaut: This term was coined, as I recall, by the Reverend Guy J. Cyr, S.M. It was one of a number of terms introduced in an issue of the old *INS Report*. "UFOnaut" is the only one of these terms that seems to have caught on with people in the field somewhat. It means the pilot of a UFO.

BRASS CURTAIN: This term potentially could have been a gem on the level of "Menzelform", except it never seems to have caught on in a widespread way. It means the alleged cloak of secrecy which surrounds official UFO study.

MONGER: "Monger" is such an inside term that I'm not really sure of its origin. Possibly those who do know that read this will snicker about my erroneous speculation, but I would venture to guess the term is in some way connected with Gray Barker's old column in *Flying Saucers Magazine*, which at one time contained a section allegedly by a person named "Monger" who rendered forth "wild rumors". It means, basically, to bother or something that bothers. Baker himself, gave me an alternative explanation, which concerns a system of gaging a UFOlogists emotional ups and downs. I tend to go along with this.

AR: I am intimately involved in the study of the "AR" Theory, yet I am not at all sure of its origin. It means "Alternate Reality", It started out on about equal footing with a term I invented, "exo compages", but immediately became the more popular term sending "exo" to the "exo". "AR"'s most likely originator is Eugene R. Stenberg.

DERO, TERO: These terms were either coined or brought to light (according to which story you buy) by Richard Shaver and/or Ray Palmer (again depending on which story you prefer). To fully explain them would involve a discussion of the Shaver mystery itself. Suffice it to say that the meaning varies from the literal Shaverian meaning of good and evil beings beneath the surface of the earth, to demons from the lower astral.

ANGEL HAIR: This is a borrowed term, and seems to derive from the stuff you might put as a decoration around a Christmas tree. In UFOlogy, it means matter dropped from UFOs or simply found lying around, or falling from an empty sky which looks like the more conventional "angel hair". Other terms have been used for this matter, but this is by far the most popular.

FA, AFB, PIO: Air Force, Air Force Base, Public Information Officer, et al. A considerable amount of Air Force terminology is shared by UFOlogists for obvious reasons.

LITTLE GREEN MEN: One of the most popular terms for UFO occupants (rivaled by "Men from Mars"), "little green men" is a paradoxical term in that not one substantiated case of a "little green man" has ever been made! Little men, yes. But where the green came from beats me.

FORTEAN: A term that predates organized UFOlogy, it means any type of strange, unexplainable physical phenomena. It is derived from the name of Charles Fort, the great American writer. Interestingly enough, it seems to be used in connection with parapsychological phenomena as well.

It should be emphasized that this discussion was off the cuff, and therefore none of this should be taken as final word. The actual origin of some terms is obscure, and this discussion has been based on what I have developed as my own understanding of them. I could quite easily be wrong.

UFOlogy is rich in terminology. What is lacking, however, is a more precise *technical terminology* for the phenomena being dealt with. Perhaps time and research will precipitate this.

What seems to be becoming more and more clear as time goes by is that the phenomena UFOlogists are dealing with is by no means a laughing matter. Indeed, in our opinion it may well be true that UFOlogy is a cause well worth one's lifetime dedication, with reference to both researching the mystery and to championing the cause.

Make no mistake about it: UFOlogy is most definitely a cause. Whatever the UFO may turn out to be, UFOlogy is possibly the leading battleground in the war to determine the very direction that science (and thus civilization itself) will go in: objective scientific research or ritualistic cultist scientism. In this fight UFOlogy is rivaled by such causes as the Krebiozin conflict or the controversy over parapsychology.

UFOlogy is in effect saying to the scientific establishment: You are off course and out of tune with reality. You continue to look up at the sky and see only meteors and swamp gas, despite the fact that people are seeing something that just logically does not seem to fit these categories.

In short, UFOlogy is in effect a defense of the traditional scientific method in the face of a dangerously bigoted establishment and its collaborators.

It might be here relevant to quote some extracts from my editorial, "In Defense of Orthodoxy" published in the Summer, 1965 issue of the *UFO Sighter*.

"...Are the scientists whose opinions we are so disgusted by...the fabled demon we call "the orthodox"? To the direct contrary, these people are the radical opposite of orthodoxy....Indeed, it becomes apparent that these people have *usurped* the title of "Orthodox" in order to gain respectability....They have established themselves so well that they are now firmly entrenched as the *scientific establishment*..."

In this editorial I made the perhaps strange-sounding assertion that the UFOlogists constitute the real defenders of scientific orthodoxy in our age. After all, science is essentially a method of evaluation. The "facts" of science are transitional, but the method stays the same: Evaluation of a problem through objective study, uncolored by pet theories and by pressure. It is this kind of thought that has brought our civilization to the great technological era we find ourselves in today. And it is this kind of thought that UFOlogy, at its best, is attempting in an era when science and knowledge are taking on the increasing contenance of a cult, to uphold.

Viewed in this context one can easily see the importance of UFOlogy, quite apart from the importance of the enigma of the UFOlogy and its fate as a movement may well be an accurate barometer as to what direction civilization will go in. Richard Hall, in *The Challenge of Unidentified Flying Objects* (co-authored by Charles A. Maney, Washington, D.C., 1961) in a chapter on the nature of UFOlogy ("UFOlogy - A Delineation", page 133) points out that UFOlogy is, in essence a protest movement. It is, by definition, just this. But unlike some protest movements it is not a radical one. Indeed, though the solution to the enigma may prove to be the cause for revolutionary change in human thought, the movement is, if anything, *counter* revolutionary.

How science has gotten itself into the mess it is in is a matter too wide in scope to cover in this discussion. One must look in the direction of increased insitutionalization, as well as increased reliance on scientific grants. Both of these have a tendency to discourage free inquiry.

In any case, it is the awesome task of UFOlogists (among others outside of the scientific establishment...and those in it who remain independent at least in

their private thinking) to change the situation. It is the opinion of the present writer that there are today many scientists who are "with us" in spirit, but who are afraid to speak out lest they lose their standings, the (at least public) respect of their colleagues, and possibly their livelihoods. With cases like those of Ivy, Leary and Velekovski, it seems that such fears are not without justification. Witchburning is still alive.

But how are we to do anything about this? Just what should we do? Before answering, it should be made clear that UFO research itself remains a prime interest. It is our feeling that these two sometimes perhaps seemingly contradictory motivations may well be directly linked; that we need to deal with UFOlogy as both a mystery and a movement. But leaving this aside for the moment, it seems to us that the first thing UFOlogy must do as a movement is to come to grips with itself; to realize the situation I have outlined above, and UFOlogy's relationship to it. Once this is done, we may be able to act with a greater amount of comprehension of just what it is we are trying to do.

It is no small task, NOR IS IT ANY SMALL MATTER. It is not something to idly talk about on a quiet Sunday afternoon out on the back porch. It is not something to read a couple of quaterly amatuer magazines on. It is not something to attend a few public lectures on. It is a high stakes, very important *gut issue*. Make no mistake about it. We are talking bread-and-butter. We are talking life and health.

What we are getting around to is this: Hobby and UFOlogy don't belong in the same vocabulary any more than hobby and mental health or hobby and religion. We are dealing with something that is in desperate, crying need for serious, full-time professional-level interest. Around the world there are probably not more than a handful of full-time UFOlogists. It is probably quite true that part of the reason is that, bluntly, people need to eat. People need to work if they are going to live.

But no, this is not all of it. There is something basically wrong with the attitude of even some of the most active people in this field. It hasn't *really* hit home, that what we are dealing with is a bread and butter issue in itself. If it had, there would be a lot more activity, and maybe a lot more professional UFOlogists.

Let us take a brief, frank look at just how "gusty" this issue is. First, from the movement side. There is considerable reason to believe that today if we had a more open brand of science at lease some forms of cancer would probably be by this time long-since eradicated. HOW MANY PEOPLE DIED OF CANCER THIS YEAR? If science were more open, we might well have, now, at this minute, an adequate system of defense against nuclear attack. ARE YOU FRIGHTENED BY THE PROSPECT OF NUCLEAR OBLITERATION? Now look at the mystery side. Do you happen to live in an area of the U.S. or Canada abruptly shapen by one of the recent blackouts? THERE IS CONSIDERABLE REASON TO SUSPECT UFO INVOLVEMENT. An article in the October, 1966 issue of *Flying Saucers* ("Navy Claps Saucer Sighters In Psychiatric Ward!" by Ray Palmer, Page 7) shows evidence of dreadful ill-treatment by military authorities of military personnel who sighted UFOs. Another article in the same issue ("Did UFO Bring Death" page 11) shows evidence of a possible UFO-initiated death; not in some remote foreign land but in the United States during 1966. DOES THIS SOUND LIKE A THING FOR A HOBBY?

I should hope this article will give the reader pause. That you will think about this business of UFOs and UFOlogy with a new and better perspective. Flying saucers *do*, admittedly and happily, hold a sort of fannish fascination for people so inclined. But it is much more than this. Cancer? Nuclear war? Incarceration? Death? These are not laughing matters to this writer. I doubt if they are to you either. WHY DON'T YOU STAND UP AND BE COUNTED?

Jeep: Yes?

Li'l Dickie: I wanna go home.

Marie: Wait! Look at the board!! An entity is coming through!!!

Board: I .. am .. entity .. 69 .. from .. the .. planet .. Ahmherste .. in .. the .. galaxy .. of .. Kinaranalle..

Jeep (slowly): O Ouija, are you the entity responsible for the sightings here in Wannaclue? Please tell us.

Board: No .. two .. other .. were .. responsible ..

Jeep: Can you tell us....who they are.

Board: Gray's .. car .. battery .. is .. dead ..

Jeep: But, o Ouija....what has that to do with my question?

Board: Nothing, really. But it seemed like a nice thing to say so I thought I'd throw it in for the hell of it, you know?

Jeep: Er, then would you answer my question?

Board: Yes .. the .. two .. you .. want .. are .. known .. on .. this .. side .. as .. entity .. 163 .. and .. entity .. 1536 ..

Jeep: They sound vaguely familiar. But could you tell us more about these strange beings.

Board: Warn him! Warn Al Bender!!

Jeep: Oh Christ. Don't start that again.

Board: O.K., the entities you want are better known to you as none other than Colonel Kemmmmmmbqq4567q828 ' ' '\$\$ ¼ %2'\$((\$

Marie: EEEP! The board has broken down.

Li'l Dickie: Must be interference caused by unharmonic influences. Now we shall never know who the entities were.

Jeep: Or could it be that somebody kicked the board?

Li'l Dickie: Kicked the board? Tsk, tsk Jim. You're Sooo suspicious.