



ESSAY

The Interdimensional Universe— Part 1: Interdimensionality, the Origin of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP), and Mechanics of Travel between Planes

Paul Cunningham

Department of Psychology,
Rivier University, Nashua, NH,
USA
pfcunning@comcast.net

HIGHLIGHTS

Part 1 of a two-part study reviews evidence for unidentified aerial phenomena and proposes an interdimensionality hypothesis, that is, multidimensional planes intersect the physical universe at contact points which UAP use to travel, describing four proposed features of those planes and the presumed mechanics of transit.

ABSTRACT

This is the first part of a two-part essay that examines the theoretical and empirical case for the interdimensionality hypothesis—namely, planes of multidimensional reality meet at points in the physical universe through which unidentified aerial phenomena (UAP) travel. Part 1 examines the evidence for the existence of UAP and discusses interdimensionality as both a mathematical/scientific concept and a metaphysical hypothesis. Drawing upon the insights of the philosophical psychology of Jane Roberts, four hypothesized features of interdimensional planes (i.e., non-hierarchical organization, open-ended structure and transactional processes, relative physics, and specialized camouflage pattern) and the presumed mechanics of UAP travel between planes are described. Part 2 examines the physics and metaphysics of interdimensionality and its implications for future space travel and outlines a research protocol for the scientific exploration of likely locations where dimensional planes may make contact with the spacetime structure of our physical universe.

SUBMITTED September 24, 2024
ACCEPTED February 21, 2025
PUBLISHED December 18, 2025

<https://doi.org/10.31275/20253549>

GOLD OPEN ACCESS



Creative Commons License 4.0.
CC-BY-NC. Attribution required.
No commercial use.

KEYWORDS

Interdimensional Universe, UAP, Space Travel, Cosmology, Physics, Metaphysics, Jane Roberts.



Interdimensionality refers to a class of explanations for an ancient yet modern-day mystery of “ongoing encounter with celestial phenomena that remain genuinely unknown but deeply significant”—unidentified aerial phenomena (UAP), popularly known as unidentified flying objects (Lomas & Case, 2023, p. 614; Vallee & Aubeck, 2010). For purposes of discussion, a UAP is defined as

The visual stimulus that provokes a sighting report of an object or light seen in the sky, the appearance and/or flight dynamics of which do not suggest a logical, conventional flying object and which remains unidentified after close scrutiny of all available evidence by persons who are technically capable of making both a full technical identification as well as a common-sense identification, if one is possible. (Roe, n.d.)

The actual existence of UAP remains a controversial issue with the same facts being interpreted in different ways (Rutkowski, 2024). There is much to say on various sides of the controversy, although the accumulated evidence for the *physical* occurrence of UAP is persuasive and includes (a) eyewitness testimony (e.g., corroborated accounts of experienced aviators, such as military air crews and commercial pilots; Weinstein, 2001, 2012), (b) observational data (e.g., high quality photographs and video, satellite imagery, visual-radar data, infrared detection and tracking records; Coumbe, 2023), (c) databases of recurrent UAP sightings (Teodorani, 2009), (d) casebooks of scientific investigations (e.g., Hynek, 1972; Sturrock, 1999; Vallee, 2008), (e) government reports (e.g., Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 2021, 2023a, 2023b), and (f) public Congressional hearings (see, for example, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?529499-1/hearing-unidentified-anomalous-phenomena-uap>).

Weinstein’s (2012) analysis of 600 visual-radar UAP sightings by military and civilian pilots is instructive and reveals more or less similar patterns of phenomenology and anomalous flight characteristics across encounters with UAP. Visual-radar sightings are based on testimony from pilots and crew members who are trained to recognize unusual meteorological events and estimate distances, shapes, and speed of aircraft and thus are less likely to misinterpret known aircraft and natural phenomena for UAP. Weinstein argues that visual-radar cases are important in building the case for the physical actuality of UAP because radar detection (a) independently confirms the

testimony of visual sightings of the pilot and/or crew and (b) can provide a technical record of UAP speed, altitude, or trajectory. In some cases, the face-to-face visual sighting of a UAP is confirmed by ground radar, while in other cases a visual sighting is made but no target echo is detected on the radar screen, or an echo is detected but there is no corresponding visual sighting. How to account for such physical-sensory discrepancies and what to make of UAP that people *think* they see are two topics addressed in this essay.

Context of the Problem

The accumulated data collectively paints the picture of a distinctly real physical aerial phenomenon that characteristically behaves in a manner inconsistent with classical laws of Newtonian physics and principles of flight dynamics. These directly observable behavioral anomalies include: (a) making sharp 45° or 90° turns or suddenly reversing direction 180° without deceleration or banking turns to offset resistance of inertia; (b) abruptly decelerating and coming to a sudden and complete stop and hovering in midair for long durations in the absence of any visible source of propulsive thrust for generating lift to offset the force of gravity; and (c) instantaneously accelerating in any direction at speeds faster than the eye can track offsetting the resistance of drag (Weinstein, 2001). UAP have also been observed to behave in a manner that suggests some form of “intelligence” controlling them (e.g., approaches, circles, follows, chases, or maneuvers close to aircraft; interacts with or flees from the aircraft) and act in ways that compel pilots to respond for the safety of aircraft, crew, and passengers (e.g., take evasive action to avoid collision).

Much interdisciplinary research has been devoted to the study of this aerial anomaly since the end of World War II (Lomas, 2024). The number of research studies published in peer-reviewed journals, such as *Limina - The Journal of UAP Studies*, as well as the size of authoritative databases documenting UAP sightings—for example, the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies, the Mutual UFO Network, the UFO Case Book, the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena, the National UFO Reporting Center, and the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena—continues to grow every year. The accumulated physical evidence—including photographs, luminosity estimates, radar detection, electromagnetic interference with automobile and aircraft equipment, anti-gravitational and/or inertial effects, ground traces, injuries to vegetation, physiological effects on witnesses, and material debris—that is

documented in the various databases, in the words of astrophysicist Massimo Teodorani (2009), “though not explaining the intrinsic nature of the reported phenomena, are able to demonstrate its existence whatever its nature may be” (p. 1).

It could be argued that there is far more direct *experiential* evidence for the existence of UAP than there is for the existence of black holes. Few people have seen a black hole, while many people of all cultures and in all ages have had some direct experience of UAP in one way or another—episodes of encounters that have measurable and tangible effects. The physical presence of UAP near ordinary aircraft during cruise flight, for instance, has been reported to cause not only measurable electrical-magnetic effects on one or more systems within the aircraft (e.g., radio, radar, compasses, aircraft control, engines, weapon systems, general electrical) but also have tangible physiological effects on the bodies of pilot, crew members, and on-ground witnesses (e.g., heat, blinding light, absence of all sound, including the sound of the aircraft’s engines) (Weinstein, 2001). Such effects involving both physics and biology would seem to count as evidence that something real is happening here. As William James put it, “Anything is real which we find ourselves obliged to take account in any way” (James, 1911, p. 101) and “that which produces effects within another reality must be termed a reality itself” (James, 1902/1936, p. 507). We know that UAP are real by their physical effects, in those terms.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that we seem to be no further along in understanding the cause or causes of UFO reports (i.e., the “UFO problem,” Sturrock, 1999, p. 4) in a way that can be proven without doubt and accepted without reservation than when Carl Jung (1959) wrote his little book on the topic of flying saucers over 65 years ago and concluded that “something is seen, but one doesn’t know what” [emphasis in original] (p. 6). Orthodox Western psychology tends to treat claims of UAP sightings and memories of alien abductions as strictly mental phenomena and statements about the mind of the observer that derive ultimately from quite normal and ordinary conscious and subconscious dispositions (Clancy, 2005). Houran et al. (2025) calls attention to the hazards of this tendency of “normalizing while debunking” anomalous experiences that not only reflects a reluctance to engage UAP as a potentially authentic phenomenon that stifles further academic inquiry, but also diminishes the validity of witnesses’ experience and reinforces the scientific bias against subjective experience

as a legitimate source of evidence for justifying objective knowledge claims. If UAP sightings are merely an odd mixture of ordinary fantasy proneness, memory distortion, reality testing deficit, suggestibility, culturally available scripts, confabulation, and scientific illiteracy, then how does one account for the empirical physicality of the phenomenon and the fact that UAP throw back a radar echo which can be seen on a radar screen and possess visual properties that can be picked up on photographic film?

Jung (1959) concluded, after his own lengthy study of the matter, that “the possibility of a purely psychological explanation is illusory, for a large number of observations point to a natural phenomenon, or even a physical one” (p. 132). Purely psychological explanations do not account for the large degree of intersubjective agreement among various observers who perceive the same visual stimulus and the ostensible physical characteristics of the phenomenon itself. Accounts of UAP abductions are less easily dismissed when they include further evidence that the crafts involved in the abductions were witnessed by other people (e.g., Fowler, 1993; Mantle & McCammon-Scott, 2023). If one temporarily suspends disbelief and grants face validity to the direct first-person subjective experience of encounters reported in eyewitness accounts, and the second-hand objective observational evidence, the database and tabulations of recurrent sightings, and the multitude of casebook investigations and governmental reports and acknowledges the possibility that “these UAP happen” and “people really see what they see” (Teodorani, 2009, p. 51), then further questions arise: If UAPs are ontologically real and not mere species-wide delusions, then what are they, what might they represent, and where do they come from? This two-part essay addresses those questions.

Statement of the Hypothesis

Drawing upon the heuristic framework presented in the philosophical psychology of Jane Roberts’s *Aspect Psychology* (Roberts, 1975, 1997–2002), the following two propositions are advanced and defended: First, UAP have a separate existence independent of the observer that does not depend upon the observer’s belief or perception in order that they can exist. Second, certain sightings of UAP (aka flying saucers) represent the appearance of visitors from other dimensions/life planes, other realities, rather than from elsewhere in our own physical universe.

This two-fold hypothesis regarding the nature and origin of UAP aligns with the interdimensionality hypothesis articulated by veteran astrophysicist Jacques Vallee

(2008) who proposed that “the UFO phenomenon *represents evidence for other dimensions beyond spacetime*; the UFOs may not come from ordinary space, but from a multiverse which is all around us, and of which we have stubbornly refused to consider the disturbing reality in spite of the evidence available to us for centuries” [emphasis in original] (p. 325).

Interdimensionality is a hypothesis that Ufologist Allen Hynek also came to embrace in the final years of his life.

I have come to support less and less the idea that UFOs are nuts-and-bolts spacecrafts from other worlds. There are just too many things that go against that theory. To me, it seems ridiculous that a technologically advanced race would travel great distances to do relatively stupid things like stop cars, collect soil samples, and frighten people. I think we must begin to re-examine the evidence; we must look closer to home for the answer. I think we should consider that UFOs come from other dimensions, a parallel reality, a universe that exists in the same place as ours, but at a different [physical] frequency, so to speak. (quote in Imbrogno, 2008, p. 123)

Lomas (2023) acknowledged that “such hypotheses [as interdimensionality] may rightly be regarded with skepticism by most scientists. However, they should not be ruled out and deserve serious consideration in a spirit of epistemic humility and openness” (p. 43). Given the “high strangeness” (Hynek’s phrase) of UAP and the inability of physical science to find a satisfying explanation that accounts for all the data, the intellectual virtues of humility and open-mindedness before the unknown or half-known would seem to be called for in any discussions of such anomalous phenomena that carry paranormal and religious overtones (Lomas & Case, 2023).

Opening the scientific imagination to the *idea* of an interdimensional universe entails a willingness to temporarily suspend disbelief and scientifically entertain its possibility without necessarily endorsing its existence (Schooler et al., 2018). It also entails a readiness to go beyond the one-reality field paradigm that currently binds scientific thinking, look outside the familiar worldview of classical Newtonian physics grounded in the two pillars of sensory observation and mathematical deduction and consider seriously the non-zero probability that there is not one reality—the physical and sensorily

perceived material one—but a theoretically infinite number of simultaneous, interweaving fields of actuality, one not more real than the others, that are open and not closed, and interact and make contact with one another (Swain, 2017, Chapter 1). Logically, the existence of two or more reality systems or life planes is no more improbable or surprising than the existence of only one and the very existence of our physical universe would plausibly seem to presuppose the existence of others.

Overview of the essay

The overall purpose of this essay is to introduce an alternative way of thinking about the nature of UAP and propose investigable hypotheses about their possible interdimensional origin that may advance understanding of this theoretically and empirically challenging phenomenon. My aim is to note the existence of UAP, invite collective awareness of their presence, and discuss the evidence in favor of “interdimensionality” as a hypothesis concerning their origin. The main thrust of the essay is to increase areas of thought and speculation regarding the ontological reality of UAP and the epistemic utility of the idea of interdimensionality as a heuristic device for expanding understanding of a phenomenon that has resisted conventional scientific explanations to this day.

Roberts’ system of philosophical psychology is chosen as a heuristic framework to advance understanding of the UAP enigma for three reasons. First, it presents an alternative way of thinking about UAP that most astronomers and physicists have not seriously considered. Second, Roberts’ theory of interdimensionality is arguably workable and testable and shares common elements with physicist David Bohm’s notion of implicit and explicate orders of reality (Friedman, 1994). Third, given that many of humanity’s most practical theories have been attributed as coming from subconscious sources (Harman & Rheingold, 1984), it is reasonable to anticipate that Roberts’ Aspect Psychology may contain some empirically verifiable propositions that can be put to the test of experience, reason, and experiment. The seemingly weird possession trance exterior of Aspect Psychology’s theory of a multidimensional universe that permits travel between interdimensional life planes masks an important empirical and theoretical challenge to modern astronomy and physics that deserves further study. When the notion of a multidimensional universe is understood, it in itself will likely lead to consideration of the existence of interdimensional planes that lead to other systems of reality or realms of being and the possibility

that other kinds of intelligent beings may exist outside the spacetime framework of our own physical universe.

Part 1 of this two-part essay begins with a discussion of the theory of interdimensionality as both a scientific/mathematical construct and a metaphysical hypothesis. It then proposes four characteristic features of interdimensional planes and concludes with a discussion of how UPA travel between planes might occur. Part 2 of the essay continues the discussion by examining possible methods of interdimensional “space” travel and proposing a way that hypothesized coordinate points, where dimensional planes make contact with the spacetime structure of our own material universe, may be investigated in a scientifically rigorous way. It concludes with a discussion of the physics and metaphysics of interdimensionality from the transpersonal perspective of Roberts’ Aspect Psychology.

WHAT IS THE INTERDIMENSIONALITY HYPOTHESIS?

Lomas (2023) identified three main hypotheses regarding possible origins of UAP: (a) conventional terrestrial origins, such as human-made drones, “black box” projects highly classified at the time of observation, and natural phenomena; (b) extra-terrestrial origins, such as nonhuman entities traveling from distant galaxies within our own physical universe (e.g., via stable wormholes, Pascoli, 2024), and (c) “ultraterrestrial” origins, involving “beings already present in the Earth’s environment in some sense, just not in ways we can conventionally understand” (p. 46), such as “extradimensional, crypto-terrestrial, demonic/djinn, proto/ancient human, time-travelers, etc., or some combination or mutation of any or all of these” (Puthoff, 2022, p. 20002). Interdimensionality, as the term is used here, is a subcategory of ultraterrestrial hypotheses and postulates the existence of life planes “outside” our own physical one that make contact with our specialized spacetime universe at points which create doorways through which inhabitants of other reality systems may travel to and from. The interdimensionality hypothesis is sufficiently broad to account for paranormal phenomena, such as apparitions that suddenly materialize out of thin air or through an apparent penetration of matter, associated with physical mediumship and haunting cases (Fodor, 1966, pp. 10–16).

A Physical Science/Mathematical Construct

The interdimensionality hypothesis takes different forms in humanities and science literature (e.g., Combs

et al., 2006; Imbrogno, 2008; Kaku, 2005). For example, humanities scholar Marie-Laure Ryan (2006) discussed how theoretical physics (“many-worlds”) and philosophical narrative theory (“possible worlds”) merge and expand to embrace the metaphysical notion that basic reality consists of a plurality of cosmologies. In physics, the concept of interdimensionality is related to exotic entities such as the “multiverse” and parallel universes (Carr, 2007; Svozil, 2021; Tegmark, 2003). Superstring theory (or M theory), for instance, proposes the presence of up to 10 (or more) microscopic, tightly curled-up dimensions embedded within our own physical universe (Weinberg, 2011). Such “strings,” however, are not the type that contain alternate universes or allow travel from one dimension to another.

Mathematical models and physical theories that posit the existence of “hyperspatial” dimensions connected with our own spacetime universe yet transcend it can be quite technical, highly complicated, very abstract, and extremely difficult to visualize. They involve far-reaching journeys into hypothetical realities and discussions of infinity that stretch both the imagination and the intellect (e.g., Carr, 2015; Greene, 2011; Rucker, 2005). Visual aids provided by Rucker (1984), Escher (1989), and Banchoff (1996) present evocative depictions of the different ways that various geometric forms (e.g., lines, curves, points, surfaces) can be arranged to produce the perception of so-called “impossible” objects that help expand the boundaries of normal visual experience beyond the usual three-dimensional block or box-like features of ordinary space that form the basis of Euclidian geometry and the Cartesian coordinate system.

One easy-to-visualize account of how the three dimensions of space familiar to the physical senses (i.e., up-down, left-right, front-back) can be distinguished in imagination and build upon one another to construct the perceptual world as we know it is provided by Edwin Abbott’s (1884/1992) entertaining book *Flatland*. It depicts two-dimensional Flatlander A. Square’s adventures in Spaceland (three dimensions), Lineland (one dimension), Pointland (no dimensions) and a visionary realm of four dimensions. Abbott’s imagery of other dimensional planes having established cultures and intelligent entities existing on them as individuals, in our terms, is an evocative notion that is aligned with the idea of interdimensional “life planes” hypothesized by Roberts’ Aspect Psychology. The possibility that interdimensionality might be a distinctly real property of both the macroscopic material universe (e.g., black/white holes, worm holes) and microscopic physical matter (e.g., virtual particles, neutrinos) leads the

imagination and intellect through fields of cutting-edge astronomy and theoretical physics into the domain of philosophy and the realm of metaphysics.

A Metaphysical Hypothesis

Interdimensionality is not only a physical science/mathematical construct but also a metaphysical hypothesis; that is, it implies something about the nature and essential qualities of existence, the fundamental structure of being, and the background ontological conditions that need to be met in order for UAP to exist and for human beings to encounter them.

Metaphysical hypotheses, such as interdimensionality, serve at least two purposes in modern astronomy and physics. First, they provide a general picture of the physical universe at its largest and smallest scales and, second, they serve as heuristic guides in the preparation of research programs (Popper & Eccles, 1977, p. 442). Although metaphysical hypotheses will always retain an element of speculation, there are empirical and nonempirical (i.e., rational) criteria available for evaluating both their epistemological validity and practical value (Kekes, 1973; Kukla, 1989; Marshall, 2021, pp. 414–422).

One illustration of how empirical/rational criteria are applied in scientific tests of the interdimensionality hypothesis would be the various experiments conducted on the 512-acre property known as Skinwalker Ranch in the Uintah Basin (UT) that has been the site of numerous physical anomalies related to the unpredictable yet recurrent appearance and disappearance of UAP at that location (Lacatski et al., 2021; see also <https://www.history.com/shows/the-secret-of-skinwalker-ranch>). The results of scientific investigations conducted over several decades, unfortunately, have created more questions than they answered largely because neither the concepts nor the technology are currently available to provide a coherent explanation for the anomalous physical phenomena and psychological effects that have been observed or experienced and recorded on the property.

Metaphysical hypotheses, such as interdimensionality, when they are *empirically controlled*, are not free inventions of the reasoning mind independent of experience. They are formulated and evaluated in terms of the evidence of experiment, reason, and experience (both personal and intersubjective, sensory and nonsensory) and includes the data of consciousness as well as the data of sense (Cunningham, 2023a, 2023b). Empirically controlled metaphysical hypotheses are important in science because

they yield hypothetical knowledge just as theories of natural science yield hypothetical knowledge (Lee, 1947).

INSIGHTS FROM ASPECT PSYCHOLOGY

To claim that UAP are real and that the physical universe contains interdimensional openings is one thing, but to explain in practical terms how this could be so in a way that conceptually links philosophy, cosmology, and modern physical theory and simultaneously accounts for the phenomenology of UAP sightings, is quite another. To this task we now turn by drawing upon hypotheses derived from the philosophical psychology of Jane Roberts as a heuristic framework for formulating a novel representation of the UAP problem that points out new directions in which a satisfying solution may be found.

Metaphysics of Interdimensionality

By hypothesis, the first hint and clues of interdimensionality will come from physics rather than psychology. New discoveries in physics of properties inherent in the molecule will lead at least to a rudimentary knowledge of molecular consciousness, although the implications will not be immediately recognized and remain dormant and unused for some time. Once physicists recognize that no system is really closed, they will be forced to acknowledge that the energy within molecular structure has its origin elsewhere and, by implication, that the physical universe is not the origin of, but the result of, the energy that they seek. They will eventually postulate the existence of an unknown energy force that has always existed, in the face of repeated attempts to fit the novel observations into conventional force theories (i.e., electromagnetic, weak nuclear, strong nuclear, gravitational) and the equations of the Standard Model of particle physics. Aspect Psychology characterizes the unknown energy force that is behind and yet within molecular consciousness as the “aware-ized” energy of a primordial, prime vitality that is at the foundation of the physical universe and the source of its interdimensionality.

By hypothesis, the vitality of aware-ized energy (i.e., energy that is aware of itself as a part of and not apart from action) constitutes the intrinsic building block of basic or ground reality—the first, or true, actuality upon which everything else depends (i.e., metaphysical foundationalism; Oberle, 2022). Vital aware-ized energy functions as the inner fuel of the physical universe. It is self-generating, limitless, and formless in physical terms, yet takes many forms.

It resembles the general concept of energy in the physical sciences; that is, “the universal physical property; the only property common to all material things” which is no thing in itself but is always “the energy of some thing” (Bunge 2000, p. 459). Using the analogy of air, comparing it to the inner vitality of the universe, as air is dispelled from the lungs in various forms and is used and reused by different forms of life on the planet, so is prime vitality used in different manners. So does it enter as one thing and emerge as something different many times. So does it change its shape and content, showing many faces and yet never disappears.

As an empirically-controlled metaphysical construct, think of prime vitality as a multi-dimensional metaphysical source of the “quantum vacuum” on our particular plane—“a domain of pure energy [where] all fundamental quantum activity takes place [that] has no material content [and which is] the lowest tier of physical existence, and derives its power from the supposition of multiple energy fields” (Bodin, 2014, p. 10). According to modern physical theory, the quantum vacuum is a sea of fluctuations of quantum energy that spontaneously gives rise to pairs of “virtual” particles that “exist for time intervals so short that we cannot measure them directly, and then disappear back into the vacuum from which they came, [but whose] presence does affect certain physical processes that we can measure, such as the rate and energy of transitions between certain energy levels in atoms” (Krauss, 1995, p. 45). In this respect, the quantum vacuum would be a physical effect of a metaphysical prime vitality that is beyond and yet within all matter/energy that is familiar to physicists. It represents the home of the quantum wave function, nature’s creative source, and a bridge between matter and consciousness (Friedman, 1997). The material universe would have a physical version and a nonphysical version, in those terms.

The Character of Interdimensional Planes

Through its own workings upon itself, prime vitality materializes an infinite arrangement of dimensional planes, reality systems, and existence fields upon which beings existing as individuals, in our terms, can function, act, and develop. A plane is a materialization of aware-ized energy, which may or may not be physical in usual terms. This “subtle” energy changes its appearance on different planes, while it makes up the planes at the same time, forming the planes and experiencing them as well. The form of materializations achieved on a particular plane is determined by the properties inherent in the plane or field

itself and by the interaction between prime vitality and the plane that it has created and then becomes.

In response to the question, “If extra-terrestrial life exists, then where are they?” one answer is that they exist only in galaxies far, far away within our own physical universe. Another answer is that they also exist in closer neighborhoods of interdimensional reality systems or life planes that are “outside” of our own materialization reality plane. How are these “vertical” dimensional planes that are beyond and yet connected to ordinary spacetime to be characterized? In conceptual terms, a plane can be described as a type of enclosure that is apparently divided from the rest of the physical universe for a time and for a reason, where controls are applied and laws operate in such a manner that planes are kept seemingly distinct and separate from each other and its inhabitants are more or less kept in their place. Each plane provides a supporting and sustaining environment in which individual identities can operate, and each component is given the most possible “space” in which to function and construct a climate conducive to the development of the unique capacities and value fulfillment of the inhabitants of that plane.

In physical terms, a plane is not a cosmic location and is not a place, although it may be in some cases, like one planet, such as Earth, which may have several planes directly connected to it. It is not necessarily a planet, however, and may exist where no planet is. A plane can be as large as a universe or as small as a speck of energy that seems to exist by itself. The planes themselves are in constant motion, come and go in countless cases, and may spring up where there was none previously. A plane may be a time or involve various aspects of apparent time past, present, and future. The analogy of a plane with an emotional state is more apt than an analogy between a plane and space-like concepts such as a geographical location since planes, like emotional states, take up no room.

Although inaccessible to the physical senses, there are some dimensional planes that touch upon our own physical plane that can be directly experienced without too much difficulty, such as the *dream universe*. Dreams are part of a plane and exist on that plane as we exist on the physical plane of waking life. The dream plane is invisible to the physical senses and is, to some extent, independent of the dreamer and yet connected to the physical plane and dependent upon the dreamer in very basic ways. The dream plane or dream universe has its own actuality with its own root assumptions, inner organization, continuity, and duration that are different from that of physically-oriented normal waking consciousness, which is one reason

why dreams appear so chaotic, bizarre, or irrational to the reasoning mind in waking life. Dream reality exists to a fairly vivid degree while one sleeps and dreams continue to exist and unfold on the dream plane while one is awake.

Imagination is one of the creative abilities of the conscious mind that allows one to enter into the plane of the dream universe while awake (e.g., as in mind-wandering and daydreaming) and project into other planes from the waking and dream state. In important respects, *art creations* are born of the meeting or coordination of two planes—the plane of the dream world and the physical life plane—and mold the two into a reality that combines two planes. In great literature, art, and music, there is always an extra dimension that represents the materialization of inner realities that are then experienced as an actual element of physical time and space. Such acts of creation partake of a unity that gives the artist's nonphysical inspiration a physical reality—one denied to it in a usual dream.

By hypothesis, certain other existence planes coordinate with the physical life plane at particular points that offer the opportunity for communication with deceased personalities surviving on what could be called a "mid-plane" or "semiplane." *Death* on the physical plane is, among other things, an arrival at one such point of coordination and overlap between planes. At physical death, the personality structure is able to psychically approach such coordinating points, perceive them, and change its inner focus of attention from one plane or sphere of existence to another, deserting the physical construction of the body that it once maintained and seems to disappear from the physical plane with the material of the body discarded as a physical form to be used in other combinations of matter.

Open-Ended Structure and Transactional Processes

The physical universe, as we think of it, is thus one of many planes that contains an almost infinite number of other planes, all taking up the same amount of space, in our terms. Einstein (1954) makes the idea of how different planes can occupy the same space more understandable by the following analogy that draws upon the common experience of using boxes and arranging material objects within them.

When a smaller box *s* is situated, relatively at rest, inside the hollow space of a larger box *S*, then the hollow space of *s* is a part of the hollow space of *S* and the same "space," which contains both of them, belongs to each of the boxes. When *s* is in motion with respect to *S*, however,

the concept is less simple.... It must now be remembered that there is an infinite number of spaces, which are in motion with respect to each other.... Now there remains for our thought the space without the box.... In this way space appears as something unbounded. (pp. 361-362)

There are planes within planes, fields within fields, spheres of existence within spheres of existence. Our own species thus exists within many planes simultaneously and operates at many levels of reality at the same time, unperceived by the physical senses.

Although each plane may appear to be operationally isolated from others, all planes exist in a state of relatedness and can and do intermix and interact. That which divides also serves to connect. As philosopher Alan Watts (1963) put it, "The importance of a box for thought is that the inside is different from the outside. But in nature the walls of a box are what the inside and the outside have in common" (p. 46). The seeming walls or boundaries separating the various planes are apparent borders only—boundaries of function and appearance formed for practical purposes—that also serve as interconnections in the honeycomb structure of multidimensional reality.

There is a constant interchange between all planes and a continual exchange of prime vitality, electrical and chemical energies, and actual atoms and molecules between one plane and another. All universes are affected by the exchange of energies involved in the interaction and the continual movement of one plane through another, with many planes occupying the same "space" without the awareness or conscious knowledge of the particular inhabitants of either plane. According to Aspect Psychology, it was an alignment of certain coordinate points connecting two planes that made communications from the Seth entity possible during Roberts' possession trance sessions over its 20-year history.

In terms of the physics of interdimensionality, it is the wave-function of massless subatomic particles that permit planes to overlap and allow them to share identical regions of space with ordinary matter and pass through one another unaltered. In the words of physicist Robert Klauber (2000), "we would coexist in the same space and time, yet because all quantum waves in that system would pass unperturbed through, and without perturbation of, our system, we would live our lives oblivious to this other independent cosmos" (p. 278). The neutrino that has neither mass nor electric charge is an example of such particles familiar to physicists that can pass through matter virtually undetected by the external senses.

Non-Hierarchical Organization

The various planes are not only open-ended and interactive but also are organized into certain patterns of development and certain kinds of gradation within these groupings. There are no gradations in terms of “above or below,” “better or worse,” or “advanced or retarded” as far as the planes themselves are concerned, however. The familiar concept of selfhood is one main type of grouping process that includes many planes and plane groups. The different species of consciousness of animals on our plane belong to a general grouping, with our species currently holding dominance. Whole groupings of self-structures experience in different ways the dimensions of existence with which they are familiar within the coordinates of their own respective materialization reality plane in forms of self-perspectives that are, in many ways, incomprehensible to us (e.g., “What is it like to be a bat?”). There are a number of other culturally oriented materialization realities that have established existences with their own culture, histories, theories, perceptual patterns, and beings existing as individuals with their own self-structures, in our terms. The symbols, letters, figures, or insignias that reportedly appear on UAP craft, such as the red insignia printed on the side of the object observed by Officer Lonnie Zamora in Socorro, New Mexico in 1964 would be reflective of such culturally organized planes (Coumbe, 2023, Chapter 4).

There are planes that have some basic similarity with our own plane; that is, the similarity is one of organization, a version of historical continuity, a strong and involved ego mechanism, and a complicated perceptual code system. The perceptual system may have little or no similarity to our own, however, and inhabitants are without the dual inner and outer sense of alienation with which our own species has become involved. Traveling from planes that more nearly approximate the matter composition of our own physical universe, ideas of cause and effect, and linear time perspective may account for the similar vertebrate homolog and physiological similarities in humanoid form of visiting beings (i.e., two arms and a head, pentadactyl limbs, bipedal, standing upright on two legs; Masters, 2019) reported in some UAP sightings (e.g., Gill & Gill, 1978) and alien abductions (e.g., Mack, 2007; Walton, 1978).

Relative Physics

The human species’ highly focused physical senses and specialized egoic self-structure concentrates with such great intensity upon certain frequencies of matter within the

particular coordinate system that forms the physical plane that the appearance of a cohesive enough, all-pervading material reality is maintained. The technological success and predictive effectiveness of classical Newtonian mechanics and the Standard Model of particle physics naturally gives rise to the expectation that the law-like correlations and regularities that hold for our own small solar system would apply everywhere—both to remote galaxies and any other dimensional plane connected to our own (Wigner, 1960). UAP that display apparent weightlessness and gravity-defying velocities and aerodynamics, however, would seem to offer counterevidence to that expectation. Such apparent “laws” have been broken in isolated instances of psychokinesis (Braude, 1997) and levitation (Grosso, 2015) on our plane often enough, yet orthodox physicists constantly ignore such problematic exceptions. Any one time that something or someone can behave in such a manner suggests that physics’ cherished laws of the universe are not universal laws at all, at least not in any basic manner, but only seem to be because this is how things look from the relative view of our physical plane.

Inhabitants of any particular plane tend to construe the appearance of their particular universe as the expression of a definite rule of nature, never realizing that just beyond the perceptual pattern constructed by the external senses that their familiar so-called universal “laws of nature” appear completely different on other planes. Conventional scientific wisdom supposes, and correctly, that all universes are composed of the same fundamental particles and atomic elements that can be found on our plane. The manifest appearance that these components adopt and the basic rules that govern their action, however, operate differently on different planes. All planes are basically part of each other and yet would seem to be at different ends, such that the perceptual patterns on one plane seems oftentimes to be the opposite on another. In some cases, the transformation is so complete that the so-called laws become almost unrecognizable camouflage.

Specialized Camouflage Pattern

By hypothesis, some form of “camouflage” is necessary on every plane. Every inhabitant of each field perceives the quite valid reality of their own life plane from their own self-structure and self-perspective through a set of highly specialized senses that construct perceptual patterns consistent with those perceptive mechanisms. The perceptual constructions that characterize each plane make it

necessary for those within any given materialization reality to only recognize certain features or aspects of the main coordinate system in which a focus of consciousness is maintained. There is some overlapping, but the main focus within any dimensional plane, system of reality, or sphere of existence is entirely unique.

The constructed self-worlds that individual inhabitants enact for themselves shape their active experience of the environment on their plane, just as our constructed self-worlds do on our own physical plane (e.g., *Umwelt*; von Uexküll [1934/2010]). Each perceptual construction is interpreted through highly discriminating psychological structures filtered within the framework of a particular species of consciousness and, as such, is valid. This means that physical reality does not exist in human perception in any more basic way than it exists in the form perceived by other organisms that are also native to the physical plane or by the different types of self-conscious beings in other dimensions of their own life plane.

The specialized camouflage pattern perceived on our own material plane can be traced to physical senses that constrain human observers to detect and encode an available field of matter or mass/energy in sensory terms. Cognitive psychology shows how the physical senses act as inhibitors of experience that induce a certain conscious focusing along limited lines, grouping perceptions and comprehensions in a narrow fashion to avoid feeling it all “as one great blooming, buzzing confusion” (James, 1890/1950, Vol. 1, p. 488). More important, biopsychology has shown that the physical senses act as living transducers that detect and encode otherwise unknowable stimulus energies (e.g., electromagnetic energy, air vibrations, molecules of gas and liquid) and translate them into observable, knowable sensory-perceptual terms (e.g., qualia of solidity, brightness, size, weight, duration, color, sound, sweetness, cold) that those stimulus energies themselves, at the level of the elementary particle/energy physics that compose them (e.g., atoms and molecules, fermions and bosons, quarks and leptons), do not inherently possess. Zakaria and colleagues (2017) make this point when they note that “light is merely an EM [electromagnetic] energy where the illumination we perceived is [*sic*] nothing to do with the frequency or wavelength or electric and magnetic field of that wave.... It is not ‘light’ (brightness) until it can be seen by observers” (p. 278).

Ordinary objects and bodies that one experiences and *knows* to be solid, relatively permanent and enduring, individual and separate things are *known* by physics

not to possess any of these attributes at the level of the elementary matter that composes them. Ordinary objects and bodies are instead swiftly moving mass/energy particles consisting almost totally of thin air with most of their mass concentrated in the protons and neutrons within the nucleus and the spinning electrons separated from the nucleus by a vast expanse of so-called “empty” space. We do not see the “air” of which the body is composed or the atoms and molecules that fill the empty space when we look into a mirror. We see only its outer camouflage physical form. The sensory receptors of the body simply do not allow observers to tune into that range of atomic and subatomic activity. What is physically perceived by the external senses is thus only a portion of the true dimensionality of an event. There is always more going on in physical reality than physical senses can show.

This implies that, at the level of everyday awareness, we are dealing not with a direct experience of what most physicists consider “fundamental” reality, but with qualia and properties of matter that could be called, for all practical purposes, a camouflage pattern constructed by the perceptual apparatus that happens to be operative at the time. By hypothesis, the action of perceiving creates a “distortion” of that which is perceived, creating in fact a new reality and *that* is what is perceived. The distortion or camouflage is not a falsehood but is creative and the interpretation of an available field of stimulus energies through a state of limited awareness and perceptions. A new basic reality is created whose legitimacy and basis for existence lies in the very perception of it. Perceived according to the nature of the perceiver, it always remains “that which is” and the basis for new perception.

Perceptual psychologist Bruce Goldstein (2014) described the transduction-transformation-materialization process this way: “Our perceptual experience is not only *shaped* by the nervous system, as in the example of rod and cone vision, but—in cases such as color vision, hearing, taste, and smell—the very essence of our experience is *created* by the nervous system” [emphasis in original] (p. 222). Because the external senses have evolved only to perceive sensory data (e.g., qualia such as solidity), they do not perceive nonsensory data (e.g., atoms and molecules). Organisms born on our physical plane are already conditioned to perceive sensory stimuli in a particular manner (e.g., binocular vision). This predisposes human observers to imagine that what they cannot or do not perceive with the physical senses must not exist. Packaged in outer sensory clothing, the observer takes the wrappings for the underlying actuality itself.

Just because sensory data are accessible to experience via the external senses, however, does not mean that physical reality is the only actuality. It is simply the only reality perceived using the physical senses. Physical sense data do have a “reality,” but this reality is not located at the “objective” camouflage level of ordinary Newtonian objects and bodies or the elementary particles of quantum physics that compose them. It is located rather in the *state of relatedness* of the material universe and natural world (i.e., physical reality) with a “subjective” body/brain consciousness and all its electrical, chemical, neural, and cellular systems that respond to stimulus energies by transducing them into sensory terms, translate them into camouflage patterns that are organized and interpreted by a specialized perceptual apparatus, and then further transduced into an experience of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, or touching.

None of this is meant to deny the validity of our own material universe or waking physical experience. The sensory qualia of the natural world is real and definite on our level. Physical reality is not false. The physical picture is not a deception or falsehood but is creative. It does mean, nevertheless, that the familiar sensory picture of the world—including the constructed mathematical models and physical laws that find their justification in sensory data—is simply one of an infinite number of ways of perceiving and interpreting the various guises through which prime vitality expresses itself and the different forms and appearances it takes on different planes.

The fact that the physical universe’s actuality is only limited to our dimensional plane, and does not extend to other fields does not mean that we can or should discount it. We must act *as if* there was an already-out there-now-real world for the sake of the body’s physical survival, which crucially depends upon the reliability of the camouflage sense data that the external senses detect and encode in sensation and organize and interpret in perception. While we must behave in a large manner *as if* the physical universe we perceive is objectively constituted by classical Newtonian objects and bodies and modern quantum matter particles and energy forces, we must still retain the knowledge that this apparent objectivity, reality, and definiteness of sensory knowledge has great limits, physically speaking, and cannot be presumed to be the final arbiter of all reality. Nothing about the physical nature of perception is direct, unmediated, or “objective” in those terms. Perception and creation on the physical plane are far more intimately connected than is realized.

The Mechanics of Interdimensional Travel

If the preceding account of a multidimensional universe containing an infinite number of embedded interdimensional planes that possess certain characteristic features is conceptually coherent, still it does not describe how travel between planes by intelligent beings may occur. The conventional extraterrestrial interpretation of UAP is to consider them as vehicles originating within our own physical universe and traveling through our camouflage spacetime to reach us (Svozil, 2023). On the present hypothesis, UAP vehicles travel through their own specialized version of camouflage space, and in some instances are doing so even now in the so-called “space” taken up by our planet. They fly through, in our terms, the very core of what we presume to call solid Earth, which is not solid to them at all. In certain instances as we attempt space travel, we will travel through what inhabitants on another plane will think of as their own particular “solid” and neither we nor they would ever know the difference.

By hypothesis, when a plane comes into the sphere of influence of a different plane and contacts it, it takes on the particular camouflage form of materialization inherent in the contacted plane to one degree or another. Camouflaging its true appearance in a chameleon-like fashion by taking on the outward manifestation of that particular plane, the interdimensional point at which planes coordinate and meet temporarily appears as the same type of camouflage as other materializations native to that plane. Taking on the camouflage of the particular plane that is contacted results in distortive spatial-temporal boundary effects and the creation of apparent borders that ostensibly separate the different planes into various spheres of relation in which cause and effect operate, to some extent, as we understand it. The distortive boundary effect in some cases resembles a flow as if a plane were surrounded by water or, in other cases, as a charge of electricity. The distortive effect could be likened to the reflection of a solid tree in water where observers on our plane seeing the reflection mistakenly try to judge the depth of the water by the height of the tree, supposing it to be as deep as the tree is high. On each plane the resulting distortive effects will take on the camouflage of the particular plane. Using the perceptual apparatus developed on a particular plane, it is almost impossible to see beyond these boundary effects or to perceive another plane’s own characteristic camouflage pattern which follows different root assumptions.

Bringing Their Own Camouflage Pattern Along with Them

As a rule, inhabitants of a plane see only the camouflage they have constructed of their own system and are aware only of camouflage materialization patterns that are similar to their own. From the perspective of Aspect Psychology, the strange thing about UAP is not that they appear, but that we can see them. The first-hand reports in 1959 of missionary priest Father William Gill and others at the Mount Pudi mission in Papua, New Guinea who experienced repeated close encounters with a very large saucer-shaped object stopping and hovering above the mission building with intelligent beings of some kind waving from a deck surrounding the craft conveys the sense of astonishment that is experienced when viewing such a craft (Gill & Gill, 1978). The complex series of UAP sightings made by police and civilians in Exeter, New Hampshire in 1965 likewise expresses the sense of shock and awe of seeing an object that, according to multiple authoritative witnesses, moved without sound at great speed, suddenly stopped and hovered, then slowly moved away and disappeared from sight, behaving as if under intelligent control (Fuller, 1966). The feeling of surprise, bewilderment, and even fear is illustrated in reports of military and civilian pilots who experience UAP approaching the aircraft as if on a collision course causing them to take evasive action as occurred in the helicopter-UFO encounter over Mansfield, OH in 1973 (Zeidman, 1999). Correlating what they see with what they know or imagine possible of the physical universe, on-ground witnesses and airborne pilots and crew members immediately recognize the UAP as being not our own.

Because the inhabitants of each plane are bound by the materialization patterns of their own plane, visitors to our plane must bring the particular camouflage patterns of their “home station” with them. The camouflage paraphernalia of an UAP entering our particular spacetime materialization field appears more or less visible to human observers’ own astonishment, as the UAP attempts to reproduce an approximate camouflage pattern of physical laws and forces governing the environment in which it is observed but that is not native to its own camouflage plane. The apparent craft generates its own set of defining forces and camouflage that are native to its own environment that are transduced in our environment into a variety of anomalous physical phenomena.

The bewildering array of behaviors of UAP reported in 1,300 sightings by military airplanes and private pilots over an 80 year period (1916 to 2000), for instance, reflect

the operation of a set of alien plane characteristics that are, in effect, “inconsistent with known principles of flight and local physical laws” that govern our particular plane (Roe, 2019, Conclusion section, para. 3). The 1986 case of Japan Airlines Cargo Flight 1628 is an example of a visual-radar sighting of a “flying” physical object traveling at 50 to 300 times the speed of sound with not a single sonic boom being reported and performing in ways far beyond the capability of a human pilot or the structural capability of any known aircraft (Coumbe, 2023, Chapter 2). In violation of Newton’s first and second laws of physical motion, UAP display flight characteristics that an ordinary airplane is physically incapable of performing and in a manner that appears decoupled from spacetime itself (Roe, 2019).

Aspect Psychology explains these unusual flight capacities as the outcome of UAP bringing their own camouflage pattern along with them to our physical plane. What UAP have actually managed to do under such circumstances is retain functions ordinary to it in its own particular habitat and camouflage system. The UAP observed near Aguadilla, Puerto Rico in 2013 brought elements of its own camouflage pattern with it that were reflected in the physics-defying behavior disclosed by thermal imaging data recorded by multiple airplanes. In this instance, the UAP seemingly overcomes terrestrial physical laws that govern the immense drag force of entering a body of water at high speeds and then traveling at speeds beyond the world’s fastest submarine (Coumbe, 2023, Chapter 5). Bringing their own camouflage pattern with them, the craft may be visually seen by observers while leaving no identifiable echo trace on radar and vice versa, travel at speeds that no human pilot could endure and that no human sensory system can track, perform flight behaviors that would ordinarily be impossible according to the laws of physics on our particular plane, and then disappear from sight without a trace.

Caught between Two Worlds in a Dilemma of Form

On the present theory, when a UAP starts out toward its destination from its own dimensional plane, the atoms and molecules that structurally compose the craft are more or less aligned according to the camouflage pattern imposed upon it in its own “home” territory or materialization field. As the UAP enters our particular plane, a distortion occurs. The actual atomic structure of the UAP undergoes a dilemma of form between transforming itself completely into earth’s particular camouflage pattern while also retaining its original pattern. There are many

cases where multiple UAPs—ranging from two up to 20—have been observed at the same time and while most are perceived as having a three-dimensional, physically solid, material appearance, these “objects” nevertheless can take a variety of different shapes (e.g., disc, spherical, oval, cigar, triangle, missile, cylindrical, half-sphere) and even change shape during observation (Weinstein, 2012, Table 9). Materializing as something between one shape, size, and color or another, it resembles neither—variations in the appearances of the observed craft being well documented (Powell et al., 2023)—with the different craft shapes being reflective of their different origins.

Upon entering our field, the UAP ends up in a form having little relation to appearance, properties, and structure as it is on its own plane. What we have in the materializations of UAP is something that is actually, as we view it, not of our plane nor of the plane of its origin. The UAP is literally caught between worlds or universes—a state of affairs reflected in the craft’s strange aerobatics and weird aerodynamic forms (Eastwood & Nurowski, 2020a, 2020b)—as it attempts to transform itself completely into earth’s particular camouflage pattern while struggling to retain what it can of its own original structure and camouflage pattern. In such incidents, we do not have a vehicle such as the vehicle that witnesses perceive or *think* they perceive. UAP are always reassemblies that are never the actual reappearance of the exact camouflage as it exists upon its own plane.

Any materialization would thus “represent” the craft instead of depicting what the craft actually is. According to Aspect Psychology, what is happening is

an attempt to exchange camouflage realities. The original beings entering [our] plane cannot appear within it as themselves, their atomic structure is not the same as [ours]. Distortions must therefore occur in order to make any contact possible and indeed, distortions must occur in order to make these contacts possible. So [we] are greeted with a certain set of sense data. [We] then try to figure out what is happening from the sense data that is presented to [us], but the sense data means that the event is already to some extent distorted. The physical vehicles that are often perceived are [our] interpretation of the event that is actually occurring. (Roberts, 2010, p. 15)

Because of the tremendous pressures that push against the vehicle itself as it struggles to be one thing or

the other, the UAP simply cannot afford to stay betwixt and between for any indefinite period or exist upon a particular reality field for any long periods and thus can take only quick glimpses of our plane. For this reason, it is unlikely that physical UAP landings, in the usual sense of the word, will occur soon.

When duration exceeds the capability of the craft, difficulties can occur, some of which may be extreme and even result in the explosion of the craft, leaving physical traces of one kind or another that do not necessarily have to reflect their exotic origin (Vallee, 1999). The metallic fragments of a UAP that reportedly exploded into flames and fell into the sea near a remote beach near the town of Ubatuba in San Paulo, Brazil, for instance, were later found by spectrographic analysis to have undergone oxidation at high temperatures (i.e. an explosion) and have a chemical composition (i.e., 99.94 percent pure magnesium with a trace of strontium) unusual for manufacturing processes at the given time and place of the sighting in 1957 (Coumbe, 2023, Chapter 3).

This does not mean that a stationary body of any kind cannot materialize itself upon another plane. If it does materialize, it must in some way surround itself with the constructed camouflage of the plane which it attempts to enter. Where visitations are of beings from different planes, it is a practical necessity to conform to the laws of a particular plane. This technical achievement takes a high level of inner development on the part of those inhabitants of the other plane who are doing the traveling.

By hypothesis, the inhabitants of UAP that appear on our planet do not originate from elsewhere in the physical universe on our own “horizontal” physical plane. They come from another plane that is much more advanced in technological sciences than Earth at this time. There are many kinds of science and the sciences dealing with locomotion on another plane may not be the mechanical and electronic sciences that we are familiar with. As science advances on various planes, the inhabitants of the various planes learn to occasionally travel into the apparent division between planes and their visitations become less accidental and more planned. It is possible that accounts of alien abductions may represent examples of the disturbing reality of such planned interdimensional encounters (Hopkins, 1981; Pritchard et al., 1994; Rapuano, 2023).

This is still not what could be called a “mental science” plane. When the inhabitants of a plane have learned mental science patterns, then they are to a great degree freed from their more regular transportation patterns.

Physical scientists know that all matter is composed of the same elements but do not know consciously how to control the weather or change desert sand into a flowing river using this knowledge. Some inhabitants of other planes utilize that knowledge to undertake manipulation of their own matter through a realignment of its molecular components in a manner that is currently unknown to science on this plane. Had the human species gone into certain mental disciplines as thoroughly as it has explored technological ones, its science and practical transportation system would be vastly different.

NEXT STEPS

It remains to be determined whether Roberts's theory of interdimensionality will yield practical results or is to be ruled out on physical grounds. Einstein's equations of special and general relativity and the physics of quantum mechanics would not seem to explicitly forbid the possibility of either a multidimensional universe or interdimensional travel and perhaps even encourage such possibilities. In the words of consciousness researchers Combs and Krippner (2003): "In a scientific community that takes seriously such theoretical wonders as black holes, multiple universes, galaxies that travel backward in time, and nonlocal quantum effects, it is hardly defensible to dismiss any serious proposal simply because it does not fit with traditional opinions" (p. 56). The claim here is that certain sightings of UAP represent the travel of beings from other dimensional planes or reality systems rather than from elsewhere in our own physical universe. Further questions arise: Is interdimensional travel a two-way street and, if so, how might it be accomplished from our physical plane in a manner that makes encounters with UAP or their inhabitants less accidental and more planned and predictable? Where do interdimensional planes coordinate and make contact with our own physical universe and how might these "coordinate points" be scientifically explored in an empirically controlled way? Part 2 of this essay addresses those questions.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, E. (1992). *Flatland: A romance of many dimensions*. Dover. (Original work published 1884).
- Banchoff, T. (1996). *Beyond the third dimension: Geometry, computer graphics, and higher dimensions*. Scientific American Library.
- Bodin, M. (2014). *Fermi's paradox: Cosmology and life*. Trafford.
- Braude, S. (1997). *The limits of influence: Psychokinesis and the philosophy of science* (Rev. Ed.). University Press of America.
- Bunge, M. (2000). Energy: Between physics and metaphysics. *Science & Education*, 9(5), 459–463. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008784424048>
- Carr, B. (Ed.). (2007). *Universe or multiverse?* Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107050990>
- Carr, B. (2015). Hyperspatial models of mind and matter. In E. F. Kelly, A. Crabtree, & P. Marshall (Eds.), *Beyond physicalism: Toward a reconciliation of science and spirituality* (pp. 227–273). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Clancy, S. (2005). *Abducted: How people come to believe they were kidnapped by aliens*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674029576>
- Combs, A., & Krippner, S. (2003). Process, structure, and form: An evolutionary transpersonal psychology of consciousness. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 22(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2003.22.1.47>
- Combs, A., Arcari, T., & Krippner, S. (2006). All of the myriad worlds: Life in the Akashic plenum. *World Futures*, 62(1–2), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02604020500412709>
- Coumbe, D. (2023). *Anomaly: A scientific exploration of the UFO phenomena*. Rowman & Littlefield. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9781538172155>
- Cunningham, P. (2023a). An empirically controlled metaphysics in a science of spirituality—Is something real happening? *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 43(2), 90–107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000210>
- Cunningham, P. (2023b). Metaphysics and its place in psychology as a human science. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 55(1), 9–42.
- Eastwood, M., & Nurowski, P. (2020a). Aerobatics of flying saucers. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 375(3), 2335–2365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-019-03621-2>
- Eastwood, M., & Nurowski, P. (2020b). Aerodynamics of flying saucers. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 375(3), 2367–2387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-019-03622-1>
- Einstein, A. (1954). *Ideas and opinions* (C. Seelig, Ed., S. Bargmann, Trans.). Wing Books.
- Escher, M. C. (1989). *Escher on Escher: Exploring the infinite*. Harry N. Abrams.
- Fodor, N. (1966). *An encyclopedia of psychic science*. Citadel Press.
- Fowler, R. (1993). *The Allagash abductions: Undeniable evidence of alien intervention* (2nd ed.). Wild Flower Press.

- Friedman, N. (1994). *Bridging science and spirit: Common elements in David Bohm's physics, the perennial philosophy and Seth*. Living Lake Books.
- Friedman, N. (1997). *The hidden domain: Home of the quantum wave function, nature's creative source*. The Woodbridge Group.
- Fuller, J. (1966). *Incident at Exeter: Unidentified flying objects over America now*. G. P. Putnam.
- Gill, W., & Gill, A. (1978). *The Gill sightings, June 1959*. Victorian UFO Research Society. <https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/catalog/2951975>
- Goldstein, B. (2014). *Sensation and perception* (9th ed). Cengage Learning.
- Greene, B. (2011). *The hidden reality: Parallel universes and the deep laws of the cosmos*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Grosso, M. (2015). *The man who could fly: St. Joseph of Cupertino and the mystery of levitation*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Haggard, H., & Rovelli, C. (2015). Quantum-gravity effects outside the horizon spark black to white hole tunneling. *Physical Review D*, 92(10), 104020. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.104020>
- Harman, W., & Rheingold, H. (1984). *Higher creativity: Liberating the unconscious for breakthrough insights*. Tarcher.
- Hopkins, B. (1981). *Missing time: A documented study of UFO abductions*. Richard Marek.
- Houran, J., de Oliveira Maraldi, E., Massullo, B., & Molnar, D. (2025). Evaluating anomalous experiences with respect and responsibility: A critical reflection. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/scp0000398>
- Hynek, J. (1972). *The UFO experience: A scientific inquiry*. Abelard-Schuman.
- Imbrogno, P. (2008). *Interdimensional universe: The new science of UFOs, paranormal phenomena and other dimensional beings*. Llewellyn Worldwide.
- James, W. (1911). *Some problems of philosophy: A beginning of an introduction to philosophy*. Longmans, Green.
- James, W. (1936). *The varieties of religious experience: A study of human nature*. Modern Library. (Original work published 1902). <https://doi.org/10.1037/10004-000>
- James, W. (1950). *The principles of psychology* (Vol. 2). Dover. (Original work published 1890). <https://doi.org/10.1037/10538-000>
- Jung, C. (1959). *Flying saucers: A modern myth of things seen in the sky*. (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Kaku, M. (2005). *Parallel worlds: A journey through creation, higher dimensions, and the future of the cosmos*. Doubleday.
- Kekes, J. (1973). The rationality of metaphysics. *Metaphilosophy*, 4(2), 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9973.1973.tb00507.x>
- Klauber, R. (2000). Modern physics and subtle realms: Not mutually exclusive. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 14(2), 275–279.
- Krauss, L. (1995). *The physics of Star Trek*. HarperCollins.
- Kukla, A. (1989). Nonempirical issues in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 44(5), 785–794. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.5.785>
- Lacatski, J., Kelleher, C., & Knapp, G. (2021). *Skinwalkers at the Pentagon: An insiders' account of the government's secret UFO program*. Henderson, NV: RTMA.
- Lee, H. (1947). Metaphysics as hypothesis. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 44(13), 344–352. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2019784>
- Lomas, T. (2023). The ultraterrestrial hypothesis: A case for scientific openness to an 'interdimensional' explanation for unidentified anomalous phenomena. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 55(1), 43–98.
- Lomas, T. (2024). A history of scientific approaches to unidentified anomalous phenomena: Time to rethink their relegation to the paranormal and engage seriously? *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 38(1), 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.31275/20243163>
- Lomas, T., & Case, B. (2023). From angels to aliens: Humanity's ongoing encounters with, and evolving interpretations of, the genuine celestial unknown. *Zygon*, 58(3), 614-635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12891>
- Mack, J. (2007). *Abduction: Human encounters with aliens*. Simon and Schuster.
- Mantle, P., & McCammon-Scott, I. (2023). *Beyond reasonable doubt: The Pascagoula alien abduction*. Flying Disk Press.
- Marshall, P. (2021). Mind beyond brain: Surveying the metaphysical landscape. In E. F. Kelly & P. Marshall (Eds.), *Consciousness unbound: Liberating mind from the tyranny of materialism* (pp. 407–482). Rowman & Littlefield. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798881814885.ch11>
- Masters, M. (2019). *Identified flying objects: A multidisciplinary scientific approach to the UFO phenomenon*. Masters Creative.
- Oberle, T. (2022). Metaphysical foundationalism: Consensus and controversy. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 59(1), 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.5406/21521123.59.1.07>
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2021, June 25). *Preliminary assessment: Unidentified aerial phenomena*. Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2023a, January 12). *2022 Annual report on unidentified aerial phenomena*. Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2023b, October 18). *Fiscal year 2023 consolidated annual report*

- on unidentified anomalous phenomena: October 2023. Washington, DC: The Department of Defense. https://www.aaro.mil/Portals/136/PDFs/FY23_Consolidated_Annual_Report_on_UAP-Oct_2023.pdf?ver=BmBE-f_4EBtMRu9JZ6-ySuQ%3d%3d
- Pascoli, G. (2024). The Hessdalen lights seen as the aerial counterpart of an unsuspected subsoil phenomenon. Is the Earth harboring a multimouth wormhole? *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 38(2), 273–287. <https://doi.org/10.31275/20242965>
- Popper, K., & Eccles, J. (1977). *The self and its brain: An argument for interactionism*. Springer International. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-61891-8>
- Powell, R., Hancock, L., Hasan, L., Little, S., Truong, R., & Kamoru, T. (2023). *The reported shape, size, kinematics, electromagnetic effects, and presence of sound of unidentified aerial phenomena from select reports, 1947-2016*. <https://codigooculto.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Evaluation-UAP-Shapes-Characteristics-SCU.pdf>. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2024-3735>
- Pritchard, A., Pritchard, D., Mack, J., Kasey, P., & Yapp, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Alien discussions: Proceedings of the Abduction Study Conference held at MIT, Cambridge, MA*. North Cambridge Press.
- Puthoff, H. (2022). Ultraterrestrial models. *Journal of Cosmology*, 29(1), 20001–20016.
- Rapuano, B. (2023). *Dominion lost: A scientist's own alien abduction*. Amazon.
- Roberts, J. (1975). *Adventures in consciousness: Introduction to Aspect Psychology*. Prentice-Hall.
- Roberts, J. (1997–2002). *The early sessions of the Seth material* (Vol. 9). New Awareness Network.
- Roberts, J. (2010). *The early class sessions* (Vol. 3). New Awareness Network.
- Roe, T. (n. d.). *The definition of unidentified aerial phenomena or UAP*. <https://www.narcap.org/blog/definition-of-uap>
- Roe, T. (2019). A preliminary examination of the flight dynamics of four profiles of unidentified aerial phenomena, UAP, commonly associated with aviation safety incidents as reported by pilots. *National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP) Technical Report No. 18*. <https://www.narcap.org/blog/flightdynamicsofuap>
- Rucker, R. (1984). *The fourth dimension: A guided tour of the higher universes*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Rucker, R. (2005). *Infinity and the mind: The science and philosophy of the infinite* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Rutkowski, C. (2024). Whither UAP data? *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 38(3), 370–379. <https://doi.org/10.31275/20243551>
- Ryan, M.-L. (2006). From parallel universes to possible worlds: Ontological pluralism in physics, narratology, and narrative. *Poetics Today*, 27(4), 633–674. <https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-2006-006>
- Schooler, J., Baumgart, S., & Franklin, M. (2018). Entertaining without endorsing: The case for the scientific investigation of anomalous cognition. *Psychology of Consciousness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 5(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cns0000151>
- Sturrock, P. (1999). *The UFO enigma: A new review of the physical evidence*. Warner Books.
- Svozil, K. (2021). Interdimensionality. *Axioms*, 10(4), 300. <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms10040300>
- Svozil, K. (2023). *UFOs: Unidentified aerial phenomena: Observations, explanations and speculations*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34398-8>
- Swain, F. (Ed.). (2017). *The universe next door: A journey through 55 alternative realities, parallel worlds and possible futures*. New Scientist/Nicholas Brealey.
- Tegmark, M. (2003). Parallel universes. *Scientific American*, 288(5), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0503-40>
- Teodorani, M. (2009). A comparative analytical and observational study of North American databases on unidentified aerial phenomena. *National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP) Topical Review, TOP-01*, 1–80.
- Vallee, J. (1999). Physical analyzes in ten cases of unexplained aerial objects with material samples. In P. Sturrock (Ed.), *The UFO enigma: A new review of the physical evidence* (pp. 234–256). Warner Books.
- Vallee, J. (2008). *Dimensions: A casebook of alien contact*. Anomalist Books.
- Vallee, J., & Aubeck, C. (2010). *Wonders in the sky: Unexplained aerial objects from antiquity to modern times and their impact on human culture, history, and beliefs*. Penguin.
- Von Uexküll, J. (2010). *A foray into the worlds of animals and humans: With a theory of meaning*. (J. O'Neil, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1934).
- Walton, T. (1978). *The Walton experience*. Berkley/Medallion Book.
- Watts, A. (1963). *The two hands of God: The myths of polarity*. Collier Books.
- Weinberg, S. (2011). *Dreams of a final theory: The scientist's search for the ultimate laws of nature*. Vintage.
- Weinstein, D. (2001). Unidentified aerial phenomena – Eighty years of pilot sightings: Catalog of military, airliner, private pilots sightings from 1916 to 2000. *National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP) Technical Report, TR-04*, 1–60.
- Weinstein, D. (2012). Aviation safety and unidentified aerial phenomena: A preliminary study of 600 cases

- of unidentified aerial phenomena (UAP) reported by military and civilian pilots. *National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP) International Air Safety Report*, IR-4, 1–25.
- Wigner, E. (1960). The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 13(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160130102>
- Zakaria, S., Salim, S., Zainon, M., Razak, N., & Shamsudin, S. (2017). Hypothesis of human-light dependency, conceivably could ascertain Einstein's prediction. *Transactions on Science and Technology*, 4(2–3), 273–285.
- Zeidman, J. (1999). The Mansfield, Ohio, case: A helicopter-UFO encounter over Ohio. In P. Sturrock (Ed.), *The UFO enigma: A new review of the physical evidence* (pp. 298–372). Warner Books.