

Alternate Horizons Newsletter

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE FOUNDATION FOR PHILOSOPHIC ADVANCEMENT

VOLUME TWO

WHOLE NUMBER EIGHT

NUMBER TWO

SPECIAL NOTICE ON MEMBERSHIP

As of the release date of this issue, it is the policy of the Foundation for Philosophic Advancement to accept no further general memberships. Those persons who have joined the FPA already will receive with this mailing a refund of their membership fee, as well as a return of their application. We feel this is just compensation, but in addition those who have been members may be placed on our private mailing list upon their request. This means that they will receive free of charge future issues of the AHN, future issues of the UFO Sighter, and perhaps other releases by us as well. In the event this is not satisfactory, we urge these members to let us know in order that we may work something out.

Lest there be misunderstanding, the Executive Director wishes it to be clear that this should not be construed as an indication of our impending demise. This move is designed to improve the organization administratively. The new policy will be to send AHN to our private mailing list, as we have in the past. Listing on the private mailing list, is done at our discretion. The length of such listing is indefinite. Back issues will continue to be available at 50¢ each as our supply permits. Free samples (one to a person) are also available on the same basis.

AHG

THE NATURE OF BACKGROUND EVIDENCE: AN EXAMPLE

The following does not provide proof as such, but it does contribute to our contention that there may be a great deal of material relevant to alternate reality research in existent literature outside the UFO field.

We had been loaned a copy of Faries At Work and At Play, and unusual book by Geoffrey Hodson, a person supposedly able to see an invisible world beside our own. One of Hodson's "visions" dated June, 1922 showed a remarkable similarity to a UFO-related incident which took place over 30 years later. The latter incident was part of the John Black/ John Van Allen case, covered in Gray Barker's They Knew Too Much About Flying Saucers and H. T. Wilkins' Flying Saucers on the Attack. The particular event in question is the observation allegedly made by Black on June 20, 1953.

The description of the entity involved in the two cases was similar, at least insofar as the words go in our reading of them. The action described, at least partially, was the same (i.e., the drawing of a bucket of water). It could be that Hodson's account, which had first been published years before, gave rise to the Black account. But keep in mind that Hodson's book was rather obscurely published in England while Black was a miner in California.

If the parallel is not "fixed" it can be considered at least one point in favor of a link between UFOlogy and mythology. Come to think of it, this is true even if it is fixed! And this is what AR is all about. AHG

EXAMPLES OF CASES TENTATIVELY CLASSED AND
A TENTATIVE PROPOSAL FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF UFO REPORTS
ACCORDING TO ACCEPTABILITY AS EVIDENCE OF NON-NATURAL ORIGIN

Do UFO reports have any significance as manifestation of non-natural phenomena? A list of sightings established in classes according to strength of evidence of non-naturalness could shed some light on the matter. The following is a tentative proposal for such listing; examples included:

CLASS A: Sightings in Class A should conform to the highest possible standards for believability as being of non-natural origin.

EXAMPLES: Socorro, New Mexico; Fatima, Portugal; the Reverend Gill case.

NOTES: Class A will probably include, at least initially, only a few cases. These cases should be characterized to a high degree by those attributes associated with the strongest possible evidence.

CLASS B: Sightings in Class B should include those cases which are of a high degree of reliability as in Class A, but with one or more loopholes which shade the cases in question with a somewhat greater degree of doubt that exists in Class A cases.

EXAMPLES: The A.V.B. Case; Valensole, France; the Lead Mask case.

NOTES: The distinction between cases in this class and those of Class A may amount to as little as a subjective judgement on the part of the investigator.

CLASS C: Cases in this class should include those reports not characterized by any great flaws, but at the same time not contributing anything major to UFO research.

EXAMPLES: See notes.

NOTES: Cases in this class should ordinarily, by their nature, not be the sort which can be readily recognized by name by a general audience. A case as follows might fit into this class:

A bright, star-shaped object is seen by several people going N-S at 7:00 PM in the skies over a small farming community. The possibility of an astronomical or other natural explanation exists, but is not by any means certain. (This example is fictional.)

CLASS D: Cases in Class D include those, as in Class C, which do not seem to contribute anything to UFO research of an outstanding nature in and of themselves. Unlike the previous Class, cases in Class D do seem to have a natural explanation. To use the fictional Class C case above, if a lighted balloon was known to be passing over the town N-S at the time of the sighting, the report would appear in Class D.

CLASS E: Those reports which are doubtful to the point of being as nearly as reasonably possible proven natural belong to this Class.

CLASS X: Class X cases include those reports which do not readily conform to other classes for one reason or another.

EXAMPLES: The Scoutmaster Incident; the Flatwoods Monster; Mantell.

NOTES: Those cases not easily judged by the investigator may be placed at least temporarily in this category, as well as cases which seem permanently outside this system of classification.

This system of classification does not make provision for cases of absolute proof as no such cases to our knowledge are presently known. This system and the examples are subject to revision. We do not claim at this point to have the classifications as sharply in focus as is desired. Critical comments are invited.

One thing not dealt with above is the problem of collective evidence. Five reports in the same area over a short period of time of the Class C variety might assume Class B importance. There is perhaps a need for a Class B-1 to allow for those reports that would be better than Class C but not of the required quality of Class B cases. Perhaps a weighing scale should be added to all classes with the possible exception of Class X. A question might be raised as to whether this system deals adequately with hard-core contact cases.

Question: Just what is the AR theory?

Answer: The term "AR" itself comes from "alternate reality", and in a way this in itself sums up the theory. It is not an easy thing to define, at last partly because the concept is not so dogmatic (as yet) that it has one, simple definition. While it has no fixed axioms, the theory—at least as I conceive of it—includes the thought that it constitutes an all-encompassing view of unusual phenomena of various sorts, from ghosts to flying saucers. It offers the idea that perhaps our own world is paralleled by one or more different worlds (or realities) which exist in something of a coequal state side by side, in a manner of speaking. It associates many of the phenomena previously relegated to the supernatural with this concept of alternate co-realities, and maintains that these phenomena may be manifestations of some kind of interpenetration of realities, either by natural cause or by design.

AR also goes on and says that there may have been interpenetration for as long as our own world has existed, and that there may have been a conscious intervention in human affairs from the outside for as long as man has existed.

Q: This is pretty sweeping, isn't it? What proof do you have?

A: As I have stated, these are my own conceptions. They are quite broad, indeed, and are subject to change and modification. As to proof, we have none in any final sense. But we do have a great amount of contributing evidence. For one thing, it all fits. AR can explain werewolves in the same breath it offers explanation for moth man.

Q: But don't all thoughtful theories do this?

A: Perhaps so. But AR does offer believable answers for the general framework of parapsychological and fortean phenomena. The theory as such does not necessarily offer conflicting explanations, that is, conflicting with other theories, on any particular given point. But as a total concept AR does not require a great deal of twisting and turning to explain various particular points. Some, but not all, alternate theories also do this to some extent.

Q: What theories other than AR strike you as plausible?

A: I do not care for the popular version of the interplanetary theory. The simple idea of spacecraft from some other planet visiting us for exploration or the like which seems to constitute the NICAPIan concept has a lot of holes. It is possible to conceive of a higher interplanetary theory involving aspects of the Shaver mystery and perhaps teleportation which has merit, though you do run into some of those "twists and turns" here which can be a strain on belief. Perhaps we should point out, though, that this "Higher Interplanetary Theory" is not necessarily in conflict with AR. AR does leave room open for possible interplanetary associations, though in our case this is not compulsive. Another explanation which might have merit might be a form of sophisticated psychological theory. Another thing which has come to mind with me is a rather complicated concept of "split evolution" in which the saucer pilots, men in black, or whatever are a kind of symbiotic race which lives side by side with man, at least partially inhabiting the same cities, etc., but which for some reason exists in a kind of "twilight world underground" which we do not fully notice. These theories are certainly interesting, as is AR.

Q: What about the 4-D theory? Shaver?

A: 4-D has given me some cause to wonder if it was, indeed, just the same thing as AR under another name. It may be, but I think AR denotes a more objective searching in the same area. For example, at the present state of the art I cannot see categorizing the alternate world or worlds under any strict mechanical concept. The term "4-D" already throws a mechanical concept at you; a dimensional one. Why dimensional? What proof is there that these hypothetical alternate realities are dimensional in nature? The idea of "vibrations" has also been introduced. But what proof is there of this? As to Shaver, I think that many Shaverian ideas may have something to them. But the literal concept of caves strains the credulity, as does Palmer's alternative of a "place in the sky". Maybe so, but what good reason is there to believe this specifically, again, given the present state of the art.

Q: What proof have you for your own ideas?

A: As I have tried to explain, none. But AR is, I think, somewhat less dogmatic than these others just mentioned in answer to the last question.

Q: How does the AR theory relate to Peter Kor?

A: Kor's work is quite interesting. I am not quite sure I understand exactly what he is trying to get at, though it seems to be at least close to AR. Frankly I'm not at all sure that Kor himself really knows what he is trying to get at though I would recommend that students of UFOlogy take what he has to say into account. An article he did some time ago in Palmer's FS called "Realm of the Saucers" is well worth reading.

Q: What other writers in the UFO field would you recommend?

A: Well, as general background I would commend to the researcher Barker's They Knew Too Much, Vallee's Anatomy, Ruppelt's Report and Fuller's Interrupted Journey (see footnote, below). I would suggest one also read some Kor/Comella articles, some ibn Aharon material, Fort, Keel, Jerome Clark and perhaps one or two of the "strange" type books from Edwards, Steiger or whoever. There is a great deal more which could enrich the reader, but these would serve as a good general background.

Q: Is there any one book which you would classify as essential?

A: Unfortunately, no. I say unfortunately because there is a book which, as far as I know, has not yet been written; A book which tries to cover this gamut of material for the modern intelligent reader.

Q: Just what, specifically, needs to be done in AR investigations?

A: Well, as I stated above that "unwritten book" needs to be written by someone. There is also the very extensive matter of indexing ARish type events throughout history. This is quite a tall order. The subject needs to be discussed, and I wish there were more dialogue going on on the subject.

(Footnote: The books noted above were as follows:

- 1) They Knew Too Much About Flying Saucers, by Gray Barker
- 2) Anatomy of a Phenomenon, by Jacques Vallee
- 3) The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects, by E.J. Ruppelt
- 4) The Interrupted Journey, by John G. Fuller)