

UFOs AND THE FOURTH DIMENSION

Part 4

By Luis Schönherr

A welcome return by our contributor whose first article in this series appeared in FLYING SAUCER REVIEW for March/April 1963.

IN a recent article,¹ it has been suggested that imperfect vision on part of the "pilots" of the UFOs may be responsible for the often reported erratic movements when they try to pursue automobiles.

The author argues that the visual system of the UFO pilots may not be adapted to the density of our atmosphere; that their vision may also be affected by the daylight, this being the reason for their preference for operations at dawn, dusk or night.

One could say, however, that the peculiar behaviour of the UFOs in some cases has an even greater similarity to a disease, known in neurology as *intentional tremor*.²

Such symptoms could be caused by insufficient attenuation, or feed-back, within the control system, i.e. it responds with a disproportionate counteraction to a small deviation from the true pursuit course.

Both suggestions however are open to objections. It is true that low-level UFO-activity increases during the night hours³ but more probably the reason for this could be the same as the reason for their preference for thinly populated areas. And, what is more important, there are numerous cases of well-controlled movement, and precise and sudden evasive action both in the air and on ground level, in broad daylight as well as at night, which indicate that the sensory and controlling systems of the UFOs must be of very good definition, velocity of reaction, and coordination—be they living brains with eyesight, or highly sophisticated computers with other sensory means!

Would the UFOs shoot around at such speeds if they could not rely, under all circumstances, upon their sensory systems? Is it likely that an advanced technology could have found no means to compensate for such minor inadequacies? After all, our submarine photographers and hunters have overcome similar difficulties rather well.

But let us first enquire what could be the meaning behind such occurrences.

Those who emphasise what might be called the "Defence-aspect" of the UFO problem, imply that the UFOs are studying our transportation system. But why then are the UFOs not to the same extent interested in trains and ships, which do the bulk of our transport work? There is no reason to assume that airliner pilots and car and lorry drivers are more talkative than railway employees and sailors.

There is however another very significant relation. Of all moving objects UFOs seem to be interested mainly in those with electrical ignition systems.

How are we to interpret this fact?

Some researchers, especially those who have shown growing concern about possible hostile actions, have suspected that the UFOs want to stop traffic on some future occasion. But why have they been stopping cars

throughout the years, thus demonstrating their capabilities and giving us an opportunity to develop counter-measures?

If, finally, we search for a meaning for such occurrences not so much in possible future intentions, but rather in the individual cases themselves we are likewise at a loss for an explanation.

Admittedly many drivers and pilots have been pretty unnerved, but there are too few cases—if any at all—which would allow us to conclude that the purpose of all these pursuits was some immediate action, hostile or indifferent, with regard to the pursued object, or that such actions were intended but had failed in every case.

On the contrary, although they have stopped cars, the fact that they apparently have not so often interfered to the same extent with the ignition systems of aircraft could indicate some sort of consideration.

Could it be that some action *is* actually taking place but that we are not able to recognise it as such?

It has been suggested—even by scientists—that UFOs may be able to monitor our thoughts.⁴

But why should the UFOs repeat this operation over and over again throughout the years when the thoughts of pilots, drivers and passengers are probably always the same in such a situation?

However, if we are already speculating along such a line, why not ask whether UFOs could not be interested in the monitoring of memories? From memories they could get information they could not otherwise obtain (as well as the code in which it is expressed).⁵

Could not this aspect of the problem be of some importance in view of the alleged telepathic communications by UFO occupants?

However, although such speculations seem to offer an enticing possibility for a new interpretation of certain contact cases, they cannot be applied to the pursuit cases.

Thinking is accompanied by dynamical electrical processes in our brain. Such processes could in turn create what are popularly termed "thought waves". Although there is more than one indication that this concept is rather naïve and inadequate, it would allow us at least to understand approximately how monitoring of thoughts could work, namely by tuning an appropriate receiver to the length of the thought waves.

Monitoring the human memory would be quite another matter. Computer technology knows of two basic types of memories. The one stores information by means of a dynamical process, e.g. mechanical waves travelling through mercury between two piezo electric units. The other type works statically, e.g. storing the information by the status of switches within an electrical circuit.

According to most neuro-cyberneticists the human

memory belongs to the second type. It is a network of millions of microscopically small interconnections (synapses); the status of them representing the information. The capacity of this memory has been estimated at 10^9 to 10^{13} bits.⁶

As there is no dynamical process in such a memory, there are no "waves" that could be picked up.

Anyone wishing to monitor such a memory from outside, without using other parts of the brain as do the known techniques of psychoanalysis and brain-washing, would have to scan the status of each of these synapses and activate the retarded information.

It seems impossible that any such thing could be done from a UFO under the circumstances of the pursuit cases.

In 1959 an Austrian periodical published an article with the title *Creatures from the Stratosphere*?⁷

The author suggested that the UFOs could be animals indigenous to the upper atmosphere and that their peculiar behaviour in such cases could be explained by the animal play instinct.

If I am a bit sceptical about such things it is not because I have a special liking for technical answers to all problems, but because UFO close approach and landing reports point decidedly to entities of human appearance using artificial means of transportation.⁸

The following suggestion lies along the same line as the hypotheses I have presented in previous articles.⁹

In my second article on UFOs and the fourth dimension, I suggested (with respect to unexplained radar echoes) that electromagnetic force fields may have a four-dimensional structure not only in mathematical abstraction but also in reality. The force fields created by the ignition systems of our vehicles should therefore be detectable within another three-dimensional space of the four-dimensional continuum, i.e. the space from which the UFOs originate.

Movement of the field source may indicate that there is intelligent action. A UFO takes off and tries to lock on to the signal. But as the "occupants" are three-dimensional entities, just as we are, they cannot see beyond their three dimensions. Therefore navigation within the continuum, and homing on to the field source may be extremely difficult, perhaps even luck.

At first, during the process of approach, the luminous projection of the UFO's force field appears within our space near the car or plane. The navigational difficulties could account for the often reported erratic motion.¹⁰

Yes, they may suffer from imperfect "vision" but certainly not with respect to the three dimensions where their craft exhibit an incredibly perfect manoeuvrability. But within the continuum they have to depend on instruments which may be imperfect, because it is possible that the creators of the UFOs themselves have only an incomplete understanding of the laws of four-dimensional travel.

When finally the UFO has successfully entered (materialised within) our space, the field-emitting craft is of no more interest to it than the lighthouse is to a skipper once he has reached port.

The foregoing suggestion is not in all cases consistent with the facts. I feel however that we should possibly distinguish between cases where cars or planes have been approached or pursued by:

1. Solid, metallic-looking UFOs (already being within our space) and

2. By luminous UFOs (in the process of approaching or entering our space), preferably with an erratic motion, sometimes passing through a phase of transition from luminous non-material appearance to a solid appearance during the final part of the observation.

It seems that cases of the second type mostly occur at dusk or at night. Furthermore it is rather surprising how often cars quite "coincidentally" come across UFOs on or near a road. One could suggest that materialisation could have taken place near this car or a car ahead, but had not been observed because drivers concentrate upon the road and seldom have an unobstructed view in all directions.

NOTES

- 1 Dr. Bernard E. Finch. *Can They See Us?* FSR March/April 1968.
- 2 People suffering from intentional tremors experience a shake when they try to grasp an object. The more they try to reach it, the greater the shake. Intentional tremors can be simulated not only by means of computers, but also by comparatively simple devices (for an example see N. Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings*).
- 3 J. and J. Vallée, *Challenge to Science*, p. 151 ff.
- 4 C. Maxwell Cade. *A Long Cool Look at Alien Intelligence* (IV), FSR November/December 1967.
- 5 John A. Keel. *A New Approach to UFO Witnesses*, FSR May/June 1968. This article is full of dark hints, as the author apparently doesn't want to disclose all his cards. Why does he suggest that the investigators should prod into the memories of the witnesses?
- 6 For comparison: Storage of the information contained in an average book of 300 pages would require 4×10^6 (4 million) bits (binary digits).
- 7 Zoe Wassilko-Serecki (Vienna), *Lebewesen aus der Stratosphäre?* Neue Illustrierte Wochenschau, May 17 and 24, 1959.
- 8 As readers know, I have been concerned mainly with a possible synthesis between the fact that UFOs on the one hand show all characteristics of material things, and on the other, their mysterious mode of appearance and disappearance. I have tried to formulate such a synthesis in terms of physics and technical knowledge. This may or may not have been a matter of unconscious prejudice and I do not deny the possibility of other explanations, such as the biological, either for the whole phenomenon or only part of it. But if one demands of the technical quarter that they consider the whole body of reports and that they explain things as far as possible in known terms without introducing more hypothetical things and causes than necessary, then one must demand the same from the other side (see also: A. Michel, *A Note on William of Occam*, FSR March/April 1968). Bearing this in mind, I feel one should consider the following points which also have some bearing on the problem discussed in the present article.
- 8 (i) It seems that the variety of the UFO phenomena sometimes leads to the assumption that it must be the result of the manifestations of quite a number of very different and independent things of different origin and motives. I cannot help feeling, however, that this reasoning has some similarity with the well-known argument that a witness must have seen a balloon and a jet when he reported an object that hovered and flew fast.

(continued on p.15)

UFOs AND COMMERCIAL AIR TRAFFIC

Part 2 How Project Blue Book could be involved

By David Brobeck Jr.

RETURNING to the imaginary litigation which I proposed at the outset in Part I of this article, Mary Doe, the plaintiff, is bringing a survival action against three named defendants. The most deeply involved is the U.S. Government, since the acts of both the FAA controllers and the Air Force Project Blue Book officials are under attack. The plaintiff's evidence against the Air Force handling of the situation would undoubtedly include a résumé of the Air Force's UFO investigatory activities; the historical perspective is crucial in proving the alleged negligence.

As a result of a flurry of sightings throughout the United States in 1947, Lt.-Gen. Nathan Twining, Commander of the Air Materiel Command, requested an investigation be instigated, and stated that there was "sufficient substance to the reports to warrant detailed study."²⁰ Thus, "Project Sign" came into being on February 11, 1948. Approximately one year later, in February of 1949, Project Sign was published, stating that on the basis of 243 of the "best documented" reports studied, "no definite evidence was available to confirm or disprove the actual existence of unidentified flying objects as new and unknown types of aircraft."²¹ The following year the project name was changed to "Grudge," and the conclusions of this report were two-fold. First, it was stated that the phenomena presented *no threat* to the security of the United States, and secondly, that the vast majority of the sightings could be attributed to misrepresentations of known objects.²² Finally, in March of 1952, the Air Force was awarded the job of evaluating any possible threat that such objects might pose; the designated name, "Project Blue Book", has not changed since that time.

Blue Book objectives

Project Blue Book has two stated objectives: First, "to determine whether UFOs pose a threat to the security of the United States"; and second, "to determine whether UFOs exhibit any unique scientific information or advanced technology which could contribute to scientific or technical research."²³

The Air Force position of "no threat" has been reiterated in recent years as well. Early in 1966, an *ad hoc* committee of the USAF Scientific Advisory Board reviewed the resources, methods, and conclusions of Project Blue Book. Although a strengthening of the project staff and initiation of an in-depth study on selected cases were among the recommendations, the Board concluded that "in the 19 years since the first UFO was sighted there has been no evidence that unidentified flying objects are a threat to our national security."²⁴ The same policy was repeated, almost verbatim, on April 5, 1966, when Dr. J. Allen Hynek, accompanied by Dr. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force, and Major Hector Quintanilla, Jr., UFO Project Officer, appeared before the House Committee on

Armed Services. In one part of his testimony, Dr. Brown assured the Committee that "The Air Force will continue to investigate such phenomena with an open mind and with the finest technical equipment available."²⁵

Blue Book staff

However, certain facts about the Project itself seem to indicate that "the finest technical equipment available" is not an apt description of its priority. Although the Air Force does have at its disposal numerous scientific consultants in the form of selected scientific advisers and some governmental agencies, the Project Blue Book staff itself consists (at time of writing) of an Air Force Major, Hector Quintanilla, and his staff of four—a first lieutenant, a staff sergeant, a secretary, and a part-time typist. Although Quintanilla is well qualified, the importance of the project as rated by the Air Force is shown by the fact that no officer above the rank of Major has ever been assigned to it on a permanent basis. Until recently, Blue Book occupied one 18-30ft. room in the Air Technical Intelligence Command building of the Wright-Patterson base. Thus, it appears that many of the quick and often widely disputed "explanations" for sightings provided by Blue Book may be due to a lack of resources for thorough investigatory activity, rather than to a desire to suppress information. Public opposition to their official pronouncements is reflected by a statement from the staff of *Life* magazine: "During the ensuing year there will be authenticated sightings of roughly 200 Unidentified Flying Objects, of which the Pentagon will be able to disprove 210."²⁶

Clear evidence of undue secrecy or "cover-ups" coupled with a failure to investigate important sightings would most certainly strengthen the plaintiff's allegations of "wilful and . . . wanton disregard for the safety and welfare of the passengers. . . ." I have already referred to Air Force Regulation 200-2 and the provision for withholding information unless a sighting has been positively identified as a familiar or known object. What motive the Air Force would have for a deliberate cover-up is unclear, but many are known to have occurred. One such incident, which appropriately enough involved a commercial airline pilot's report, is mentioned by the former head of Project Blue Book, Captain Edward J. Ruppelt, in his excellent book referred to earlier.

Typical Blue Book "explanation"

When the report came in from airline pilots Lawrence Vinther and James Bachmeier of their experience of being buzzed by a cigar-shaped object as they were taking off from Sioux City, Iowa (see p. 5), Captain Ruppelt witnessed the reaction by Air Force investigators. The sighting was treated as a joke; the