

archived as http://www.stealthskater.com/Documents/PHill_05.doc [pdf]

more of Paul Hill is at <http://www.stealthskater.com/UFO.htm#PHill>

note: because important websites are frequently "here today but gone tomorrow", the following was archived from <http://www.johmann.net/book/ciy8-2.html> on October 31, 2003. 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.

[Kurt Johmann's Homepage](#)
[Science, History, Politics](#)

[Other Writings](#)
[essays and commentaries](#)

[Prev](#)

[Book](#)

[Next](#)

8.2 The UFO According to Hill

Aeronautical engineer Paul Hill (1909–1990) presents a detailed technical evaluation of UFOs in his book Unconventional Flying Objects [87]. His experience with UFOs included 2 different sightings that he personally had (both sightings were made in Hampton, Virginia). The first sighting was on July 16, 1952:

"In the early 1950s, I studied the UFO pattern and noticed their propensity for visiting defense installations, flight over water, evening visits, and return appearances. ... Accordingly, expecting conformance to the pattern, at 5 minutes to 8 pm just at twilight, a companion and I arrived at the Hampton Roads waterfront, parked, and started to watch the skies for UFOs. ... They came in side by side at about 500 mph [about 800 kilometers per hour], at what was learned later by triangulation to be 15,000-to-18,000 feet altitude [about 4500 to 5500 meters]. From all angles, they looked like amber traffic lights a couple of blocks away, which would make them spheres about 13-20 feet [about 4 to 6 meters] in diameter. ... Then after passing zenith, they made an astounding maneuver. Maintaining their spacing of about 200 feet [about 60 meters], they revolved in a horizontal circle about a common center, at a rate of at least once per second [88]."

Hill computes the acceleration of the revolving UFOs at about 122 Gs [89]. Hill's second sighting -- made in 1962 -- was of a single large dirigible-shaped UFO that was seen by Hill (who was riding as a passenger in a car) to be maneuvering over Chesapeake Bay:

"... I was surprised to see a fat aluminum- or metallic-colored "fuselage" nearly the size of a small freighter but shaped more like a dirigible approaching from the rear. It was at an altitude of about 1,000 feet [about 300 meters] It was moving slowly, possibly 100 mph [160 kilometers per hour] ... It looked like a big, pointed-nose dirigible, but it had not even a tail surface as an appendage. ... Soon ... it began to accelerate very rapidly and at the same time to emit a straw-yellow, or pale flame-colored wake or plume. Short at first but growing in length as the speed increased until it was nearly as long as the object. Also, when it started to accelerate, it changed from a level path to an upward slanting path, making an angle of about 5 degrees with the horizontal. It passed us going at an astounding speed. It disappeared into the cloud layer ... in what I estimated to be 4 seconds after the

time it began to accelerate. The accelerating distance was measured by the car odometer to be 5 miles [8 kilometers] [90],[91],[92].

Hill computes the acceleration of this dirigible-shaped UFO at about 100 Gs with a velocity (when he last saw it) of about 9,000 mph [about 14,500 kilometers per hour; about 4 kilometers per second] [93]. Although an acceleration of 100 Gs would kill a man, intelligent-particle beings have no physical body to crush and would be safe.

Assuming that a UFO is composed of "p-common particles", an acceleration of 100 Gs is not necessarily destructive to that UFO's p-common content. And Hill points out that the U.S. military has self-guiding cannon shells -- subjected to more than 7,000 Gs at launch and designed to survive 9,000 Gs -- that contain electronics, sensors, and maneuverable flight surfaces [94].

Based on the observation that UFOs tilt to move (which implies a single thrust vector) and based on the various reported effects of UFOs (such as the bending down and breaking of tree branches when a UFO flies too closely over them), Hill concludes that the UFO moves by means of a **directed force field** that repels all physical matter in the same way that gravity attracts all physical matter [95],[96]. This **anti-gravity** force field is not known to 20th Century physics.

Although a physical UFO, in theory, could, in effect, be infused with bions and those bions could use the learned-program move statement to **move** that UFO about, there are 2 reasons that work against this explanation:

1. The **move** statement moves p-common particles directly. Thus, if a physical UFO were being moved about by the **move** statement, there would be none of the reported outside reactionary effects such as the reported downward bending of tree branches under a UFO.
2. As explained in **Section 7.6** (<http://www.johmann.net/book/civ7-6.html>), bions cannot be directly programmed by any civilization. Thus, how would those bions infusing the physical UFO be programmed to move that craft as desired by the craft's occupants? Alternatively, suggesting that the occupants themselves are moving the physical UFO avoids this second reason, but not the first.

Given the above considerations, it seems most likely that the normal motive force for the physical UFO is the directed force field described by Hill and not the learned-program **move** statement. However, although not normally moving the UFO themselves, the intelligent-particle beings in the craft may play an indirect role: For example, assuming they are the Caretakers, then perhaps they use the learned program that they have for materializing p-common objects (**Section 9.4** - <http://www.johmann.net/book/civ9-4.html>), to materialize whatever exotic p-common fuel is needed to run whatever engine creates the directed force field.

[StealthSkater note: Kurt Johmann's book (<http://www.johmann.net>) is also archived at [doc](#) [pdf](#) [URL-doc](#) [URL-pdf](#)]

Footnotes

[87] Hill, Paul. Unconventional Flying Objects: a scientific analysis. Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville VA, 1995. (Although completed in 1975, Hill's book was not published until 1995 by his daughter, 5 years after his death.)

[88] Ibid., pp. 44-45.

[89] Ibid., p. 48.

[90] Ibid., pp. 175-176.

[91] According to Hill's analysis (Ibid., pp. 53-82, 179-180), the plume emitted by this dirigible-shaped UFO is the result of the ionization of the air that moves into the wake of the vehicle. This ionization is caused by soft X-rays, presumably emitted as a consequence of the propulsion system. Although it looks like a flame, the plume is not a flame. There is no burning, and the plume is not hot. The plume lengthens as the vehicle moves faster through the air because there is a relaxation time for the ionization.

According to Hill, this emission of soft X-rays -- primarily in the direction of the vehicle's thrust vector -- is a common feature of UFOs. This accounts for the reported instances of radiation sickness in those persons who get too close to the outside of a UFO for too long. The ionization plume is not normally visible during daylight. But it is visible under low-light conditions. For example, a saucer-shaped UFO hovering at night can appear cone-shaped: the cone under the saucer is the ionized air beneath the saucer (Ibid., pp. 144-145). In general, the ionization around a UFO tends to interfere with the ability to clearly see the surface of that UFO.

[92] According to Hill, he heard no noise from this dirigible-shaped UFO even though it was moving -- when he last saw it -- at supersonic speed. According to Hill's analysis (Ibid., pp. 181-218), both the lack of a sonic boom and the apparent lack of any significant heating of the UFO (as the UFO moves at supersonic speeds through the atmosphere) are due to the same cause: the same type of force field used to move the craft is also used to move the air smoothly around the craft.

[93] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[94] Ibid., p. 49.

[95] Ibid., pp. 98-118.

[96] According to Hill's analysis (Ibid., pp. 219-224), this same type of force field can be directed into the craft (opposite to the thrust vector) so as to more or less cancel the acceleration force on the presumed passenger area of the craft. What this means is that the presumed passenger area and its occupants would be more-or-less free from experiencing any acceleration, even though the craft may in fact be accelerating at a high rate.

**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'**