

"Official Publication of the Foundation for Philosophic Advancement"

EDITORIAL: A LOOK AT THE "AR" THEORY (by A.H.G.)

I don't know what I'm talking about.

Perhaps that is an odd way to inaugurate a new publication, but it's an odd subject. Truthfully, we really don't know exactly where to begin. We have a collection of facts and thoughts which we are trying to coordinate into an easy-to-understand concept. We know, generally, what we are shooting at...that is, the few of us that have been engaging in discussion of the "AR" problem. But, at least in my case, it is not completely clear as yet what we have hit on.

Maybe it's just another theory like so many others: hoaxes; psychological solutions; natural phenomena; spaceships; 4-D ships or whatever. But I think we just MAY HAVE hit upon something of significance...as I suspect my colleagues in this theory would agree.

What AHN and the FPA are going to try and accomplish are the development of the theory and, if it turns out to be valid, dealing with the awesome implications of it. Lets make this point perfectly clear: if true, this is REALLY TREMENDOUS. It will alter our entire concept of human history. Indeed, it may well alter more than this.

What, exactly are we saying? Well, it is really not developed enough at this point. I have discussed this matter with several interested UFOlogists, but to date there have been no formal conferences on the subject; no coordinated effort to find an agreeable mutual working basis. This FPA will, hopefully, correct. But in the meantime it might be appropriate to give some of my own thoughts on the subject. I must preface by saying that these are thoughts...musings on the subject and not necessarily fixed views.

(1) The UFO phenomenon and other "border" phenomena seem to be, at least in some cases, linked.

(2) Many of the accounts of contact or near-contact seem to be true to the extent that they are reasonably accurate subjective accounts of actual experiences of one kind or another. But there are amazing but relevent indications that these experiences, while accurate so far as the witness is concerned, and while having objective external stimuli, are viewed within the context of the observer's own background experience. Also, there is the distinct possibility that some amount of willful deception may be involved.

(3) The concept of "they walk among us" is not only NOT "Far-Fetched", but is probably quite true. This may serve to explain a number of baffling cases that have showed up over the years.

(4) We seem to be dealing with groups of entities with more than one purpose. In other words, some saucers may well be hostile, some unconcerned, some friendly in one sense of another.

(5) The work of such persons as Tom Comella (Peter Kor), Ray Palmer, Steve Erdmann, Jerome Clark, Paul Thomas and others working along these general lines are particularly important to understanding this theory.

(6) Other works, outside the direct usual UFO sphere, are also relevant.

SOME INTERESTING ITEMS IN THE UFOLOGY PRESS: The C.A.P.I.C. Newsletter, Volume One, Number Three contains an interesting story of a UFOlogical coincidence. UFOlogist Ronald Pelger was interviewing contactee Gabriel Green in Los Angeles. Pelger is from the Cleveland, Ohio area. During the course of the interview, in Pelger's own words... "a knock came to the door from a very excited young boy. He said there was a UFO in the sky. We then ran outside and witnessed before our eyes, an object suspended in mid-air motionless. We viewed it through Green's telescope. I also managed to shoot some movies of the object and am happy to report that the film came out positive..."

An interesting report, to be sure. But there is more. Editor Edward Biebel noted that... "although Mr. Pelger and Tom Nealings, CAPIC Vice-president knew each was vacationing in California, they were at no time in contact with each other. Only until they returned home and wanted to tell the other about the fantastic thing that they had seen, did they discover they had both seen the same object..."

Biebel continued... "at the same time Mr. Pelger was watching the UFO on August 27, Mr. Nealings was in an automobile several miles away. He also saw an object suspended in mid-air. An hour later when he emerged from a play the object was hovering in the same spot. It was only when he returned to Cleveland, did he discover that a fellow researcher and many Southern Californians had been watching the same UFO. Editor".

The FALL 1966 ISSUE OF SAUCER NEWS has an article which should be of interest to anyone engaged in "AR" studies. The article, "Perspective: Flying Saucers-Physical or Psychic", is by Peter Kor, otherwise known as "Tom Comella". Kor poses three possible frameworks of explanation for the saucer phenomena.

"1. Psychic. 2. Conventionally Physical. 3. Substratic (Intangible). Each of these frameworks has unique consequences which can be tested by fundamental trends in the saucer evidence. Which one do you think best fits the history and facts of the flying saucer saga?"

While the degree of our agreement with Kor's alternatives is tenuous, we find much of what he has to say of interest. Here we apparently have a new term introduced to the field: substratic. Let's not make a mistake; "substratic" is not the same as "alternate realities". It seems to mean a UFO phenomenon that is inherently intangible. It would be interesting to hear how, within this framework, Mr. Kor accounts for cases of physical evidence.

ANOTHER RECENT ARTICLE can be gleaned from the July-August, 1966 issue of the outstanding British journal, Flying Saucer Review. The article by Jerome Clark, "The Strange Case of the 1897 Airship" poses a very basic question about the nature of UFO and contact accounts: Are they accurate to the extent that the witnesses are reporting what they have seen within the witnesses' own ecological framework? If the answer is affirmative, the implications are quite vast.

An Article In The general press should be of interest to UFOlogists, also. If it were ours to say, we would give the author of this article a Pulitzer Prize. The article appeared here in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of Sunday, October 9, 1966, an AP release. It was written by John De Groot, a staff writer for the Akron Beacon Journal. It tells the pathetic (yes, pathetic) story of one Dale Spaur, and other policemen who sighted a UFO. The case is known in the UFO circles as the Revenna case and it is quite fantastic. But that is not really the issue here. The issue is the personal tragedy of a man who saw an object in the

sky and for the "crime" of saying he did has brutally suffered ever since. It is a shocking story. Mr. De Groot is to be congratulated for his unsensationalistic account of this unfortunated affair. Let those who doubt how serious the UFO matter is, read this article and reflect. Atrocities of this sort should not be happening in enlightened twentieth century America.

THE ALTERNATE HORIZONS NEWSLETTER IS THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE FOUNDATION FOR PHILOSOPHIC ADVANCEMENT (FPA). SINGLE COPIES 50¢. SUBSCRIPTION WITH MEMBERSHIP. WRITE FOR APPLICATION. EDITOR AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: ALLEN H. GREENFIELD, 2875 SEQUOYAH DRIVE NW, ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30327 U.S.A. MATERIAL IN THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE REPRINTED. READERS ARE INVITED TO SUBMIT MATERIAL.

### QUESTIONS & ANSWERS ABOUT THE "AR" THEORY by A.H.G.

The following series of informal questions concern, generally, the "AR" theory. If the reader would like to ask some questions along these lines, please send them in. EDITOR

1. In relation to the so-called "interplanetary" theory of saucers, what does the AR theory have to offer?

ANSWER - There are inconsistencies in the interplanetary theory, that is, in relation to the evidence. The AR theory does not rule out the possibility of interplanetary visitations, but rather says that this may be only a part of the explanation of the phenomena observed. Pure physical phenomena might explain some of the evidence submitted, but there is a large body of evidence that it does not explain. Similarly, a wholly non-physical phenomenon would not explain all of the evidence. The AR theory seeks to coordinate all the evidence into a single coherent pattern.

2. How does the AR theory account for saucers, per se?

ANSWER - At this point, the theory does not offer a definite reason for the UFOs. There does seem to be the idea that they are vehicles of a sort, though their exact nature and reason for existance is unsure. There is also the matter of the sub-theory of seeing the phenomenon as a manifestation of the viewers own background experience, that is as subjective viewing of an objective stimulus, the exact nature of which is currently unknown.

3. Does the AR theory account for mysterious disappearances?

ANSWER - Yes. If one accepts the idea that reality is not fixed (at least not fixed in our present understanding of reality), it is not difficult to understand how persons or objects might be caught in some sort of reality warp and enter or leave a given state of reality. This would serve to explain many legends and fortean phenomena as well.

4. Is the AR theory science or mysticism?

ANSWER - Science. While on the surface the AR theory may seem to imply a mystical attitude, to the contrary it is an attempt to explain in objective scientific terms various phenomena previously relegated to mysticism and cultism. The AR theory firmly recognizes the basic concepts of logic and fixed reality (that is, that "a" is indeed "a"), but maintains that if we are to fully understand the objective nature of reality, we must have an expanded frame of reference, a broader view.

5. In relation to question #3 above, how do you account for sightings by more than one person, each of different background, yet with their descriptions coinciding?

ANSWER - Firstly, persons coming from the same general ecological framework would probably see a given UFO in generally the same way. Secondly, there are cases where persons of totally different backgrounds sight unidentified aerial phenomena (example: the Reverent Gill incident). Further study of these special cases would be needed before a full evaluation of this consideration may be given.

6. What are the mechanics of inter-reality travel?

ANSWER - At this point we can see several trends in the evidence. First, if UFOs are indeed in some way manifestations of vehicular activity, then it would follow that some form of vehicular inter-reality transmission is possible. Secondly we have the above mentioned matter of "reality warps". Thirdly, there are the indications of fixed transfer points, such as at the North Pole (Holes In The Poles).

QUESTIONS CONTINUED

7. If UFOs are physical, why aren't they governed by normal physical laws?

ANSWER - The answer is that they (assuming their vehicular nature) may not be fully within our framework of reality at the time such phenomena are observed.

8. Why do some UFOs appear hostile, others not?

ANSWER - In our opinion, some UFOs appear to be hostile, some do not, and others appear to be indifferent. Using "reasoned speculation", one may assume from this that we are dealing with at least three different groups of entities. This seems consistent with the Shaverian concept of dero, tero and "elder races". It is also consistent with our own experience in that there do seem to be three possible basic points of view on a given question: pro; anti; neutral.

The editor wishes to thank Mr. Donald R. Cook, Jr. for his assistance with the above article.

CONTACT CASES IN LIGHT OF THE AR THEORY by AHG

The alternate reality theory can shed a whole new light on cases of alleged contact with "alien" entities. The idea that contactees have been honestly reporting things as they see them is not new. Dr. Davidson some years ago posed this idea in relation to Adamski's case, but attributed the deception to the government. The flaw in this is the widespread nature of these cases, and the lack of real motivation.

However, the AR theory can provide a much more plausible rationale. For example, if we accept the "ecological" premise, we can easily see how a contactee, having a legitimate experience, will hear from the "spacepeople" what he wants to hear. We can also see why persons from more unsophisticated backgrounds might have less sophisticated experiences.

The problem of deliberate deception can be dealt with in either of the following ways: An individual chances upon a landed UFO. The entities aboard are not welcoming company, so they tell the unfortunate passerby some cock-and-bull story and send the poor devil on his way.

The other instance would be the planting of deliberately contradictory stories with various contactees in order to keep a state of confusion about their nature in effect. Either of these instances are plausible.

The "men in black" type cases might have connections in the same vein. Here there might also be an authentic element of "knowing too much about flying saucers", although at least in the famed Bender case, it hardly seems possible that Bender knew all that much. In fact, from his magazine of the period, one would be inclined to say the Bender seemed to know very little about UFOs.

The Maury Island incident is less easy to handle. Likewise the recent "man in black" case in Brazoria County, Texas. Here we may have incidents where there was, indeed, too much information floating around.

But getting back to hard-core contactee cases, what evidence is there that these individuals have had any sort of experience? While there is no proof, one may ask in the instance of someone like Carol Honey or John Reeve, where is the motive for fake? Money? Publicity? If not, we are stuck with honest and presumably sane men making what many would regard (and I include myself in this category) as foolish and unfounded statements. Why? The only answer other than hoax or insanity is that someone has pulled the wool over these men's eyes.

Who? The government? In light of some of the things that have supposedly happened, this would seem to be completely incredible. Some private group bent on some unknown motive? Also fantastic. This leaves one alternative: the entities themselves.

The question of humanoid cases can fit into the same category. Here we lack the "message to earthlings" aspect, but the similarity should be fairly obvious. In light of this a new evaluation of contact accounts with this in mind might prove fruitful. Here is a project which AR investigators might well take up.

AHG