

archived as http://www.stealthskater.com/Documents/Vallee_09.doc [pdf]

similar articles at <http://www.stealthskater.com/UFO.htm#Vallee>

note: because important websites are frequently "here today but gone tomorrow", the following was archived from <http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~ursa/philos/ufo1.htm> on April 25, 2006. This is NOT an attempt to divert readers from the aforementioned website. Indeed, the reader should only read this back-up copy if it cannot be found at the original author's site

The *metaphysics* of UFOs: what are UFOs really?

Peter B. Lloyd

The following is based on extracts from my book Paranormal phenomena and Berkeley's metaphysics. This is privately published by Ursa Software Ltd and available by mail-order. (Publication date July 1, 1999.) See the [publication site](#).

Links at this web site:

- [Synopsis](#)

Synopsis and table of contents of the book Paranormal phenomena and Berkeley's metaphysics.

- [Tokyo '99](#)

Further details of the *metaphysical* theory discussed are available in a paper that I presented at an international conference in Tokyo, May 1999 entitled "Berkeleyian ontology as a fundamental approach to consciousness". This paper argues for the basic theory of mental monism, and shows how this theory can provide a framework for understanding the *paranormal* phenomena of telepathy, telecognition, and telekinesis. The paper contains the core ideas of the above book.

- [Angels](#)

I have discussed aspects of the angelic realm on my angel page. This includes a description of the historical sources of information about angels and considers how they fit in with the Berkeleyian scheme.

- [Links](#)

Links to other websites to do with *paranormal* phenomena and UFOs.

1. Poverty of the extraterrestrial hypothesis

1.1 Hypotheses

Most of the discussion and debate about UFOs has been tethered to the "*extraterrestrial* hypothesis" (ETH). This is the claim that UFOs are material spacecraft from other planets. So, anti-ufologists have focused their debunking arguments on arguing that the Earth is not receiving hundreds of visits from other planetary civilizations. And the pro-ufologists have focused their energy on compiling observations that are consistent with the expected behavior of *extraterrestrial* spacecraft and speculating on the supposed *alien* races.

There has, however, been an intelligent undercurrent of thinking that recognizes UFO sightings as a facet of a much broader phenomenon that has been with us at least since the beginning of recorded history, that manifests itself in a range of forms far removed from the clean-cut but infantile image of the alien spaceships.

Carl Jung was the first to call the bluff of the extraterrestrial theorists in his book published in 1958, Flying Saucers, A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky. UFOs, he suggested, might be a projected manifestation of the collective subconscious. He was, however, hesitant about supposing that *psychic* projections could manifest themselves with such apparent physicality as to appear on radar screens. A few years later in Passport to Magonia (1969), Jacques Vallee brought out the similarity that the UFO phenomenon bore to the traditional accounts of *supernatural* beings (fairies, angels, demons, goblins, and such-like). John Keel in Operation Trojan Horse (1970) drove a horse and carriage through the whole *extraterrestrial* framework by revealing the extent of contactee cases and the absurdity of the behavior of the supposed *aliens*.

1.2 Data selectivity

The only way to hold on to the *ET* hypothesis is by ignoring a large swathe of the empirical data. There is, in fact, an ironic similarity between the defenses of the UFO debunkers (who ridicule all UFO reports) and the *ET* theorists (who ridicule all the weird UFO reports). Those who deny the existence of the UFO phenomenon do so mainly by disregarding the data on the grounds that the data do not fit in with established scientific knowledge. They presume the data must therefore be erroneous. Likewise, supporters of the *ET* hypothesis disregard the weird contactee data because they do not fit in with what we would expect of *alien* astronauts. Neither of those 2 approaches, however, is the way to do Science.

There is nothing in the data themselves that entitles us to reject reports of people who say they were abducted and taken on a sightseeing tour of distant solar systems, while at the same time we accept sightings of silvery discs speeding through the sky. Without a robust, positive theory that explains how these reports come into being in the first place, we are not in a position to say that certain categories of these reports may be presumed to be fallacious.

What I mean by a "positive" theory is an account that correctly predicts the empirical characteristics of the reports. As opposed to a "negative" theory, which merely shows how each individual report could in principle be explained. I do not mean by this that a positive theory must provide a proof that each past report can be explained by the theory. But only that the statistical features of the reports -- such as those established by Vallee -- can successfully be modeled.

So if -- and only if -- we were to establish firmly and beyond any reasonable doubt that there are *alien* spacecraft entering the Earth's atmosphere, then we could plausibly disregard the weird contactee data whilst studying the phenomenon of alien visitations. And conversely, if we then wanted to study

the weird contactee reports as a phenomenon in its own right (perhaps only as a psychological phenomenon), we would filter out the observations of *alien* spacecraft.

Ufology would bifurcate into 2 distinct fields. Since that has not yet happened, however, the proper course is to consider the body of empirical data as a whole. In short, we have neither empirical nor theoretical grounds for splitting the corpus of UFO reports into the valid and the invalid.

1.3 Modeling UFO reports

Reading the ufological literature, one gets the impression of an underlying assumption that if a reported UFO sighting is an observational error, then that is all there is to say about it. This is not so. Observational errors are themselves natural phenomena that are subject to natural laws, that can be studied scientifically with conventional techniques and can be modeled so as to predict their statistical properties. Likewise, if an abduction report has a psychopathological cause, then that report itself is a symptom of a natural phenomenon, part of a recognized pattern with known properties that can be modeled.

On the face of it, the core of the UFO phenomenon is not explainable as observational error, nor as psychopathology, nor as hoax. My main reason for saying this is that there is a significant number of incidents in which several (but not all) of a group of normal, reliable people report having observed a UFO at close quarters. UFOs are often too clear and distinct and seen at such proximity that they cannot be regarded as due to observational error. And they are often seen by several independent competent witnesses and so cannot be regarded as a product of some individual's mental dysfunction. We may presume that they are real phenomena coming from some external source.

1.4 UFOs are not spacecraft

It is highly implausible that the core of the UFO phenomenon can be attributed to visits by interplanetary vehicles. A basic datum is that in some cases, the UFO is seen by some but not all of the people who are present, which shows that it is hallucinatory in nature. The term "hallucination" is somewhat loaded because of its associations with psychopathology. I should emphasize that for the reasons mentioned above, the cause of that hallucination must be presumed to be something external to the observer and not a psychological dysfunction in the observer.

The characteristics of the UFOs in these cases of selective visibility are shared by large numbers of other reported UFOs. It is not that we have one kind of phenomenon in cases of selective visibility and another kind in regular sightings. In respect of the UFOs' shapes and colors, the form of their trajectories, their peculiar tendency to vanish and re-emerge, and the observed features of the associated *aliens* are all the same in both kinds of sighting.

So, whatever it is that is observed in these cases of selective invisibility, it is a reasonable working hypothesis that the same cause is responsible for a large number of the other reports: that a large proportion of UFO reports are hallucinations produced by a real, external process. Furthermore, there are several pieces of circumstantial evidence which -- together -- strongly militate against the "*extraterrestrial* hypothesis" (ETH):

- The UFOs themselves do not behave like solid objects. They appear and disappear -- sometimes at distant locations -- and can merge together as one or split into two. They can sometimes be visible but not appear on a radar screen, and sometimes vice versa. They accelerate and decelerate at rates that would crush any living tissue inside them. Moreover, they achieve

enormous accelerations from rest without generating a sonic boom, which strongly indicates that they displace no air (which is to say that they are not solid objects).

- A large proportion of contactee incidents are "hallucinomorphic". That is, they exhibit the characteristic appearance and behavior of hallucinations. The occupants themselves (like the UFOs) can appear and disappear. They can also pass through walls and other solid obstacles. They appear in a great variety of forms (70 according to some counts) including a "bewildering array of insect types, intelligent lizards, grey neonates, and beautiful people, [and] luminous sorts"(Miley,1995) and can change shape before the observer's eyes.
- The UFO phenomenon exhibits some degree of intelligent behavior. It can track witnesses whether at home or when traveling by foot or car. And the occupants can engage in conversation with contactees, often possessing extensive access to private information about the contactees.
- The UFO occupants often exhibit a complete deficit of higher intelligence or purposefulness. Despite endless activity, they never actually seem to achieve any apparent objective, either in individual cases of contact or in the waves of activity that have occurred since the 1950s. Furthermore, although they carry on conversations with contactees, the content of what they say is generally inane.
- The UFOs and their occupants seem to seek out witnesses and to respond to human thoughts. At a broad level, the appearance of the UFOs and their occupants reflects the personal and societal expectations of the observers.
- UFO contacts are often followed by recognized *paranormal* phenomena such as *poltergeists*, including especially the disruption of electrical appliances. Significant numbers of contactees report the acquisition of apparent *psychic* abilities after the contact.
- The phenomenon shares the above characteristics -- as well as many details of appearance -- with a varied range of non-UFO phenomena throughout many cultures and many periods of time.

All of which together leads me to the conclusion that **UFOs are hallucinations that are induced by non-physical external entities that possess a rudimentary form of intelligence.**

It is not appropriate for me here to report at length the empirical data on which this conclusion rests. You should refer to the publications of the investigators who have done the hard work of collecting and collating the data, such as Jacques Vallee and John Keel. As a starting point, Colin Wilson's book Alien Dawn is an easy-to-read introduction. My limited aim is to take their empirical results and explore some explanatory hypotheses derived from Berkeley's *metaphysical* theory.

I am not suggesting that anyone should take my word for it. There is a wealth of reported data readily available in the openly published literature. Moreover, in order for the scientific study of UFOs to progress soundly, the pioneering studies of Vallee and Keel should be duplicated and extended by independent researchers. Of course, that is not easily going to happen because it takes time and money. And it is not the sort of thing that governments, universities, or private industry feels inclined to spend resources on.

1.5 Paul Hill's model: anti-gravity spacecraft

I mentioned above a list of ufological features that -- together -- strongly suggest that UFOs are not spacecraft. A few researchers have put forward ingenious theories of spacecraft design that rebuff some of the features. Published posthumously in 1995 20 years after his death, Paul Hill's book Unconventional Flying Objects offers a theory of UFOs as spacecraft that employ anti-gravitation. Of course, anti-gravitation would involve a somewhat surprising addition to the laws of physics. But that would hardly be unprecedented. Hal Puthoff's review of the book is quite positive. **[StealthSkater note: see => [doc](#) [pdf](#) [URL](#)]**

Puthoff mentions at the start of his review that Hill's work relies on "thoughtful separation of wheat from chaff". That, I fear, is also the flaw in Hill's work: he has simply excluded the wealth of UFO data that do not fit his anti-gravitation theory. His use of empirical data that do fit the theory is commendably intelligent and imaginative. He even purports to explain such odd features as the UFOs apparent ability to accelerate to massively supersonic speeds without producing a sonic boom, without overheating, and without crushing the alien occupants. And he explains the observed colors of UFOs and their flight patterns. This would be an impressive achievement if only it were not at the expense of discarding large swathes of the ufological data.

There is also the little matter of changing the laws of physics. Some writers have casually stated that Paul Hill has "proved" that, for example, UFOs can reach supersonic speeds without sonic booms. That is not true. What he has done is put forward an internally plausible hypothesis, which unfortunately conflicts both with known physics and a lot of UFO data.

2. Beyond the extra-terrestrial hypothesis

In opposition to the extraterrestrial hypothesis (ETH), there are several alternative descriptions of the underlying phenomena as follows.

2.1 Ultra-terrestrial

In his book UFOs: Operation Trojan Horse, John Keel called the entities responsible for the UFOs "ultra-terrestrials" and claimed that they were denizens of some hitherto unknown part of the electromagnetic spectrum. The term is etymologically nonsensical, as the prefix "ultra-" is an intensifier. For instance, "ultra-high" frequencies are extremely high frequencies. So the "ultra-terrestrials" ought to be creatures who are even more terrestrial than we are -- a description that surely applies more to earthworms and moles than UFOs. We must credit Keel for his ground-breaking research and for recognizing the need for a term to counteract "*extraterrestrial*". **[StealthSkater note: sounds like a bit of semantic nit-picking to me]**

2.2 Hyper-dimensional or multi-dimensional or hyperspatial

This term has been poached from other areas of science such as Michio Kaku's book Hyperspace, which has nothing to do with UFOs. This is a poor term for the anti-*extraterrestrial* view of UFOs because it presupposes a particular model of the underlying nature of UFOs -- and not a particularly coherent model.

Even if there were other spatial dimensions through which physical objects could travel, almost all of the mysteries of the UFO phenomenon would remain. At most, the theory could explain only the UFOs ' appearing and disappearing. But even that is purely notional as it supposes that the other dimensions can be used in the same way as the ones we are familiar with.

2.3 Multiverse

Jacques Vallee used this term in his book Dimensions: A Casebook of Alien Contact to describe the informatic domain in which the process underlying the UFO phenomenon occurs. This term has some merit, but is somewhat ambiguous as it is equally suggestive of multiple physical universes as well as of Vallee's non-physical world beside or underlying this Universe. **[StealthSkater note: for a more scientific definition of "Multiverse", see => [doc](#) [pdf](#) [URL](#)]**

2.4 Paranormal

This seems the best term as it signifies only that the UFO phenomenon is produced by something operating outside the framework of normal physical processes.

3. Modeling the UFO phenomenon

The orthodox position in ufology has been that the UFOs are material spacecraft of *extraterrestrial* origin. But there is a minority view that they originate from what might be termed a "parallel world". As with *paranormal* phenomena in general, this minority view is usually expressed in the 'energetic' paradigm: the UFOs are supposed to consist of a novel kind of energy, or of energy at a novel frequency, or energy that resides in other dimensions. John Keel in his Cosmic Question offers a typical account of the energetic hypothesis:

[The superspectrum] is a hypothetical spectrum of energies that are known to exist but that cannot be accurately measured with present-day instruments. It is a shadowy world of energies that produce well-observed effects, particularly on biological organisms (namely humans). This superspectrum is the source of all *paranormal* manifestations from extrasensory perception (ESP) to flying saucers; little green men; and tall, hairy monsters. It is hard to pin down scientifically because it is extradimensional -- meaning that it exists outside our own space-time continuum yet influences everything within our reality.

However much one respects Keel as an empirical investigator of the UFO phenomenon, his theorizing is hopelessly incoherent.

None of the energy formulations stand up to even a cursory attempt at rigorous formulation and -- at best -- can serve only as suggestive metaphors. Opposed to the energetic paradigm is the "informatic" paradigm. As far as I am aware, Jacques Vallee is the only proponent of this paradigm. His theories lead in the direction of an account of UFOs that fits in with Berkeley's *metaphysics*. Whereas the energetic paradigm tries to explain UFOs as just another phenomenon in the physical world, the informatic paradigm requires a fundamental revision of the notion of reality. Vallee's thesis is that underlying the manifest physical world -- as we experience it -- is another domain, which may be likened to an associative database. Seen from our everyday world, UFOs are incursions by processes that are going on in that informatic realm.

I propose to define "consciousness" as the process by which informational associations are retrieved and traversed. The illusion of time and space would be merely a side-effect of consciousness as it traverses associations (Vallee, Dimensions, p 290).

Vallee does not, however, offer an account of the nature of that informatic realm or how it relates to the manifest physical realm. That gap is, I believe, filled by the Berkeleian model. Vallee only indicates a key property that this informatic realm should possess -- namely that it should have a content-addressable interconnectiveness:

The synchronicity and coincidences that abound in our lives suggest that the World may be organized like a randomized database (Multiverse) rather than a sequential library (the 4-dimensional universe of conventional physics). ... If there is no time dimension as we usually assume there is, the human brain may be traversing events by association. (Vallee, Dimensions, p 299)

To be sure, certain criticisms can immediately be made of Vallee's theory. As a comprehensive philosophy of mind, Vallee's notion is a non-starter since it would imply that all our waking experiences would be as chaotic our dreams. Also, there is an inconsistency in his proposing that it is the brain -- rather than the mind -- that traverses the Multiverse for the brain would be a construct just like everything else that we observe. Nevertheless, as an articulation of the kind of theory that is required to accommodate the UFO phenomenon, Vallee's suggestion is important.

As an aside, I would take issue with Vallee's emphasis that UFOa are physical. Even by Vallee's own theories, that description is stretching the term "physical" beyond its useful and customary scope. That the UFOs have an objective reality external to the observer is not in doubt. And it also seems evident that UFOs can wreak physical effects. But the UFOs themselves are in Vallee's theory things that lie outside the physical realm. And in the Berkeleian model, they are metamental daemons.

4. Metamental daemons as strange manifestors

4.1 Metamental daemons

In the Berkeleian theory, reality is fundamentally mental. We are living in a system that is rather like a virtual reality in which a mind-like entity -- the "metamind" -- drives all the natural phenomena that we observe.

My working hypothesis is that the metamind itself is a stream of consciousness that functions as an object-oriented information processing system. Our perceptions of the physical objects that we see around us are generated by "metamental objects" within the metamind. Each such object is conscious and has a basic capacity for perception and volition, but is characterized by having no intelligence of its own. It is "dumb" in computer jargon. There is another kind of entity which I shall call a "daemon", which possesses a rudimentary form of intelligence but lacks the fully reflective conscious awareness and self-awareness that characterizes sapient beings such as people.

The term 'daemon' originates in Plato's writing where it denoted a powerful entity responsible for governing the manifest world.

In the computer industry, it has taken on the less grand but more useful meaning of an autonomous program that is continually scrutinizing its environment and -- when the circumstances are right -- reactivates itself and sets about performing some task.

One of the leading features of the UFO *entities'* behavior which Keel noticed is the severely limited level of intelligence evidenced. *They* have a certain, low level of intelligence. But *they* are guided by what appears to be stupidity or madness. *They* are clever enough to travel about by novel means, to acquire confidential information about people, and to set up ingenious hoaxes. But *they* never seem to be engaged in any constructive projects. And all *their* solemnly delivered messages seem ultimately inane. What does all this call to mind? Surely it is the notion of a robot? Not a material robot, but a robotic entity operating in the mental realm.

The suggestion that I want to explore is that there are entities in the metamind that although *they* are not fully sentient beings as we are, nonetheless possess a degree of autonomy in *their* actions. *They* can manifest themselves in our lives and make contact with us by **projecting some appearance of themselves into our streams of consciousness**. This may be a constructive way of viewing the range of manifestations that Vallee and others have identified as sharing characteristic features with UFOs (such as angels and fairies).

Ordinary objects express themselves in our conscious perception under the aegis of a central processor called the "metamental engine". This process is known as "normal manifestation": the imagery generated by a metamental object is mediated by the nomologically bound engine of the metamind. It is this that gives us the impression of a robust, stable World. On the other hand, my hypothesis is that metamental daemons can express imagery directly into our minds. This is known as "strange manifestation".

The form taken by the daemons is evidently tailored to the individuals who witness them. The most striking example of this is that when *they* engage in verbal communication, *they* normally use the observer's own natural language. A rather broader point is that -- as John Keel noticed -- *their* visual form is consistent with the expectations of the observer's culture. In the pre-industrial age, *they* presented themselves as fairies. In the late 19th Century, *they* appeared as airships. In the second half of the 20th Century, as *alien* spaceships. To Roman Catholic folk, they sometimes appear as visions of the Virgin Mary. And so on. **[StealthSkater note: could this explain why WWII "foo fighters" are not seen that much anymore?]**

If this is so, then at first it suggests that the signal that the metamental daemon conveys to the individual observer's mind must be of an abstract and general nature, which is rendered into a suitable sensory impression within the observer's own mind. According to this view, if you were visited by one of these *entities*, *it* would not inject a specific visual form into your mind but would rather signal *its* presence and your imagination will unconsciously clothe *it* with particular attributes in accordance with your personal and cultural expectations. The weakness in this hypothesis -- as I have pointed out earlier -- is that it does not readily explain how multiple witness see the same thing. Therefore, I prefer to suppose that the underlying process takes the elements of the imagery from the observers' unconscious reservoir of personal symbolic forms and even common archetypes. That is also consistent with the Jungian model.

Many people have reported sensing just the presence without any accompanying imagery. When that happens, people are apt to think that the *entity* is located near them in physical space (maybe a few feet away) but happens to be invisible. This is really an acute form of our general confusion about the sense in which minds can be localized at all. For if this *entity* has no spatial or directional properties such as size, shape, color, and so on, then *it* is somewhat empty to assert its literal local presence.

According to the Berkeleian framework, the experience of the entity's proximity is nothing but the experience of its making contact. For in the Berkeleian realm, there is no relation of distance between

the minds, objects, and daemons that exist within the metaverse. They are, in effect, all adjacent. But some are in contact or engaged in some communication with each other, and some are not. Of course, from the Berkeleian perspective, even when a daemon presents itself in visual form, *its* localization in 3-dimensional space is just an imaginative projection. It is not really out there in the physical world. Indeed, like all the ordinary stuff of the world, *its* real existence is only in the metamind.

As I have said, the visual form in which a daemon presents itself is predominantly determined by the observer's own mind, drawing on her reservoir of memories and expectations. Some features, however, are so widespread that we might suppose that they relate to a genuinely universal reference (rather like Jung's archetypes). Examples would be the use of light as a sign of benevolent daemons, darkness as a sign of malevolent daemons, and the circle or sphere as a sign of the soul.

4.2 Choice of imagery

Where does the imagery of UFO encounters come from? Mark Pilkington has written an excellent study "Screen Memories", subtitled "An exploration of the relationship between science-fiction film and the UFO mythology" (c 1996). He traces in some detail the symbiotic relationship between the imagery that turns up in UFO reports and what is used in cinema and television films. He is not advocating the simplistic skeptics' argument that all the bizarre imagery in UFO reports stems from science-fiction. Instead, he recognizes that there is a 2-way flow. Undoubtedly, some reported UFO experiences so closely resemble filmic performances that it is highly implausible to suppose that the reported experiences are not mirroring the films. Conversely, it is well known that film scriptwriters and directors take the ufological literature as a source of ideas.

Martin Kottmeyer has also written a good analysis in "Entirely Unprejudiced", subtitled "The cultural background of UFO abduction reports", published in *Magonia* in January 1990.

5. Physical effects of strange manifestors

Sometimes (but not often), UFOs are reported to have physical effects. It is very interesting that these physical effects are almost always physiological. They are various forms of minor medical damage.

Given our hypothesis of UFOs and other strange manifestors as being metamental daemons, we would not expect them to have effects on their physical surroundings. The daemon is supposed to deliver its signals directly to the observer's mind, generating sensory impressions there for the duration of the visitation. In order for the daemon to produce lasting physical effects, *it* would also have to deliver signals of the right kind to the metamental objects that correspond to the physical surroundings of the UFO.

For example, if *it* is to leave marks in the sand (as was alleged in several cases), then *it* would have to communicate with the metamental object controlling the sand. In principle, it should be possible to do this. But then the daemon would need to be a lot more complex than we had been supposing. Normally, the state of physical objects is maintained under the tight, law-governed control of the metamental engine. If individual daemons were able to execute their own modifications of the physical World -- if *they* could make arbitrary changes -- then that would raise the risk of violating physical laws.

On these grounds, the theory we are developing here does not predict that UFOs would produce overt physical changes other than physiological ones. There are thus 2 categories of physical effects that

are exceptions and which we might expect from the theory: (a) covert effects such as synchronicity; and (b) physiological changes.

It may well be that marks on the ground can be explained within the "local energy" hypothesis: that the UFO is able to channel some of loose energy that is circulating around in the atmosphere (such as small eddies and air currents) and harness it to blow the sand away to form what look like the footprints of a spacecraft.

6. Conclusions

"Conclusion" may be too strong a word for anything that we can say about UFOs yet. At best, we have hypotheses. Most hypotheses can never hope to explain more than a few aspects of the UFO phenomenon. The Berkeleian model at least promises a comprehensive account of the phenomenon, enabling us to tie together Jung's model of UFOs as exteriorizations of the collective unconscious and Vallee's suggestion of the UFOs 'existing in another world.

Obviously a lot of research needs to be done in order to derive a fully formed theory. But I do think that Berkeley points us in the right direction.

References

Carl Jung

(1958) Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

John Keel

(1970) UFOs: Operation Trojan Horse, Abacus.

(1975) The Cosmic Question, Abacus.

Jacques Vallee

(1969) Passport to Magonia: On UFOs, Folklore, and Parallel Worlds, Souvenir Press.

(1988) Dimensions: A Casebook of Alien Contact, Souvenir Press.

Michael Miley

(1995) "Aliens in the New World: A New Paradigm for Ufology", *UFO Magazine*, vol. 10, no. 6

Colin Wilson

(1970) Alien Dawn, Virgin.

if on the Internet, Press <BACK> on your browser to return to the previous page (or go to www.stealthskater.com)

else if accessing these files from the CD in a MS-Word session, simply <CLOSE> this file's window-session; the previous window-session should still remain 'active'