

The Case of John Foster: A Preliminary Evaluation using the Principles of  
Integral UFOlogy, Part I

Submitted to:  
UNO UFO Study Group and  
Omaha UFO Study Group

By Steve Snodgrass, LCSW

December 7, 2010

## SYNOPSIS OF PREVIOUS WHITE PAPERS

In two previous white papers submitted to the UNO UFO Study Group and Omaha UFO Study Group, I laid out the foundational arguments for a third white paper entitled, “Integral UFOlogy: A Rubric for Evaluating Extraterrestrial Contact.” I explored in some depth a sample of purported evidence to support the claim that we have been visited by beings from other worlds. I examined ancient alien theory, scientific support for witness claims, abduction reports, and psychic phenomena - which are claimed to be involved in abduction scenarios and complex experiences.

In “A Report on Ancient Aliens” I emphasized the importance of UFO researchers’ ability to reduce “mental noise” -biases and predilections, preconceived notions and individual and social conditioning. I recommended that a capacity to take different perspectives either for or against (true believer or hardened skeptic) would enable the UFO researcher to approach a case with more clarity. In “Phoning Home” I explored various hypotheses related to the UFO phenomenon alongside an area of discourse known as Integral Theory. I examined the nature of human development and the development of consciousness and culture using principles of Integral Philosophy. I recommended using imagination, perspiration, awareness and careful observation as tools that will eventually build an understanding of undiscovered realities in time, space and consciousness. In the most recent white paper entitled “Integral UFOlogy” I suggested an approach that I believe would be the most likely to reduce contamination of UFO/ET evidence. Integral UFOlogy makes an assumption that in order to have any intelligent discussion on the topic, we would have to have at least two things in common with ETs: objectivity (physics) and subjectivity (consciousness). Otherwise the world “alien” will always mean “completely unknowable” and no discussion would be worthwhile. Integral UFOlogy uses the ontology of Integral Theory by examining, including and questioning evidence from at least four known sources: objective (behavioral), subjective (intentional), intersubjective (cultural) and interobjective (social.) I contend Integral UFOlogy is more comprehensive and therefore more valuable. Moreover, I contend it is the most reliable means of assigning validity to cases that meet the axiom set by Carl Sagan’s maxim “extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.”

## FOCUS OF THIS PAPER

In this two-part paper I will provide a preliminary examination of the case of UFO/ET contactee/abductee John Foster, a case I believe closely represents an example of “most extraordinary claim.” I will do so using the four “lenses” or sources of evidence from Integral Theory. I will examine the case in light of what “extraordinary evidence” is provided (or would need to be provided) to substantiate some or all of Foster’s claims. In order to do so, Part I will present a more in-depth description, with examples, of the format I recommend to accomplish this task. I will provide specifics on how to evaluate UFO reports and ET encounter reports making use of Integral UFOlogy principles.

APPENDIX A describes an Integral UFOlogy evaluation format. Part II will explore how one of John Foster’s experiences could be examined using these principles.

FORMAT FOR INTEGRAL UFOLOGY EVALUATION

As described in the white paper “Integral UFOlogy” a thorough evaluation would examine a case from eight perspectives. A UFO/ET report would need to be examined from the four perspectives in Integral Theory (subjective, objective, cultural, social) as well as from the “interior” perspective of each of these four. The result would be a discussion of four additional perspectives that take into account the perspective of the evaluator (me if I’m doing the evaluation, you if you’re doing it).

Figure 1: The Four Perspectives of Integral Theory adapted from (Wilber, 2006)

	Interior	Exterior
Singular (Individual)	Upper Left (UL) Quadrant “I”, 1 <sup>st</sup> person Subjective, intentional Interior of an individual Art – Aesthetics – Phenomenology Validity claim – Truthfulness	Upper Right (UR) Quadrant “It”, 3 <sup>rd</sup> person Objective, behavioral Exterior of an individual Science – hard sciences Validity claim - Truth
Plural (Collective)	Lower Left (LL) Quadrant “We”, 2 <sup>nd</sup> person Intersubjective, cultural Interior of a collective Morals – Ethics - Language Validity claim - Justness	Lower Right (LR) Quadrant “Its”, 3 <sup>rd</sup> person Interobjective, social Exterior of a collective Science – sociology, systems theory Validity claim – Functional fit

Figure 2: The Eight Perspectives (even #s are the evaluator’s perspective of the report) adapted from (Combs, 2009) and (Wilber, 2006)

	Interior	Exterior
Singular (Individual)	Perspective 1  (Perspective 2)	Perspective 5  (Perspective 6)
Plural (Collective)	Perspective 3  (Perspective 4)	Perspective 7  (Perspective 8)

Figure 3: Integral UFOlogy Evaluation Items (Description of all eight perspectives)

	Interior	Exterior
Singular (Individual)	(1) Intention/motivation of reporter  (2) Evaluator’s impression of the reporter’s experience	(5) Behavioral/measurable objective evidence and facts reported in the case.  (6) Evaluator’s analysis of these facts
Plural (Collective)	(3) Cultural influences present in the reporter’s circle (friends, family, etc)  (4) Evaluator’s impression and familiarity with cultural influences	(7) Social factors and evidence for them, witness corroboration.  (8) Evaluator’s analysis of evident social factors and witness corroboration

SUMMARY OF THE EIGHT REPORTING ITEMS

APPENDIX A provides a more detailed and itemized description of each of the eight perspectives that should be included in an Integral UFOlogy analysis. The reader is encouraged to review this section before proceeding. This is the reporting format I am proposing in this paper that would serve as a narrative to supplement data collected in MUFON Case Management System and National UFO Reporting Center formats.

I realize field investigators are volunteers. More often than not they lack the equipment and time to even complete a cursory review of an assigned case, let alone an in-depth and complex exploration I am proposing herein. However, as the study of UFOs/ETs continues toward what I believe it will be - an accepted field of inquiry - perhaps this offering may serve some use.

Keep in mind that in order to be sufficiently informative the length and depth of the examination in each of these areas should be provided according to the unique aspects of the case. As illustrated in Appendix A of the “Integral UFOlogy” white paper, separate rubrics for evaluating close encounters of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup>+ kind should require a progressively more thorough examination. The case of John Foster clearly would require the most in-depth and broadest evaluation possible or available to the evaluator. This is simply due to the complexity and depth of the claims he makes. Investigators who may consider adopting elements of this format should know that the depth of their evaluation will depend on the complexity of the case being reported.

Consequently, this format is simply a suggested guide to allow an evaluator of a UFO/ET claim to remember to address all aspects and perspectives in a report. Why do it this way? Because such a method intentionally addresses more variables and can help to ensure that nothing or very little is left out. It can serve as a system of checks and balances that can take evidence from one perspective and use it to “cancel out”, “devalue” or even lend support to evidence from another perspective. As an example, I will take a recent report from Lincoln, NE investigated by Star Team members Dave Pares and John Powers. The case involved the following:

	Interior	Exterior
Singular (Individual)	Former university police officer has sighting on July 4, 2010 while fully awake and after having consumed small amounts of alcohol.  UL	Triangular shaped craft with no sound is seen at intersection near the home of the witness. Next morning discovers swirls in overgrown grass on an adjacent abandoned property.  UR
Plural (Collective)	Urgent effort to report story; no prior experiences. Witness was watching neighbors shoot fireworks.  LL	Girlfriend is corroborating witness, with consistent story.  LR

To provide a thorough examination of this case, each source of evidence (each quadrant) would need to be explored to such an extent that sufficient enough information could potentially determine the outcome of the case, e.g. whether this case should remain truly unexplained. At first glance, many investigators would focus on information related to the craft itself. They would, and should, gather data on the grass swirls and attempt to rule out aerial fireworks as a possible explanation. However, the evaluation of this case would certainly also depend on three other factors: (1) the amount of alcohol consumed by the witness (UL), (2) the means by which the witness attempted to contact someone to report the event and the cultural influences of a July 4 neighborhood party (LL), and (3) the nature and extent of corroborating witness reports including, but not limited to, the girlfriend (LR).

For example, what if excessive alcohol consumption or a history of unsubstantiated calls to law enforcement (UL) were to be substantiated by friends and neighbors or the reporter's previous employer (LL) and other witnesses came forth to state that they were all there at the same time and didn't see a thing (LR)? How would that affect all the data gathered about the craft sighting itself? Could it possibly affect the diligence of investigators as they gather data on temperature and electromagnetic gauss meter readings surrounding the grass swirls? Could a history of domestic violence and controlling behavior of the reporter towards his girlfriend change the reliability of her corroborating witness report? Should we still trust her witness report?

Conversely, if the witness was known in the community to be a trained observer with law enforcement background (UL), well respected as a member of a neighborhood watch program (LL), and other witnesses began to come forth to corroborate the story (LR), would that change the shape of investigation in the case? Yes. Could more "weighty" evidence coming forth from these three categories have an impact on a field investigator's objectivity in such a way that enhances the merit of the case? Also yes. The point I'm trying to make is that subjectivity, not just the objective aspects of a report, already have an influence on how a case is examined. All sources of information have the potential to impact the conclusions and handling of a case. Each perspective has the potential to mutually influence the other perspectives.

Finally, one critical component to a comprehensive examination of a report concerns how the evaluator brings with them their own biases, predilections and opinions. How might the evidence presented influence an evaluator's judgment? Your judgment? Judgment in the media? We assume that a field investigator's objectivity is relatively secure and that they should make every effort to be completely objective in their summary reports. We assume objectivity and zero subjectivity as the right balance. These are not wise assumptions. I believe it should be self-evident that an investigator (the observer) becomes part of the case they are studying (the observed) in such a way that disinterested objectivity is impossible. In fact, quite the opposite is true. An investigator or evaluator, in my opinion, should not only recognize and own their subjectivity, they should embrace it and explore it fully as a potential contaminant. As such, I believe self-reflection should be a factor if not for investigator's themselves but for those who evaluate the veracity of UFO reports and ET encounter claims in general.

## A NOTE ON SUBPERSONALITIES

“Physician, heal thyself” is a phrase used in medicine. “Own it” is the goal of psychotherapy captured in Sigmund Freud’s stated goal of psychoanalysis, “Where it was, there I shall become” where “it” means denied or repressed drives and wishes and “I” means who you consider yourself to be. The field of mental health and psychotherapy, recognized generally as a completely subjective endeavor, suggests that an average person has approximately twelve subpersonalities that can serve to alter one’s perception of social situations. Subpersonalities are ways people express themselves in thoughts, feelings and actions as well as physiologically in response to psychosocial situations. Among the types explored include: parent ego state, child ego state, adult ego state, topdog, underdog, conscience, ego ideal, and harsh critic. Wilber (2000) describes the direct experience of subpersonalities as “different vocal or subvocal voices in one’s inner dialogue.” For example, as I write this paper I am aware of thoughts in my inner dialogue such as, “I wonder if this paper will be accepted?” or “Do I really know what I’m talking about?” This could be indicative of an “underdog” subpersonality that, to some extent, influences my writing.

Fall (2003) cites a “common example of the harsh critic who, when confronted with her own and/or others’ fallibility, responds with judgmental thoughts; with angry, superior feelings; with critical words and punitive actions; and with tense physiology.” If one were to take the time to acknowledge their own thoughts, feelings, actions and physiological responses in a given situation, they might provide very important information about a psychosocial situation in which they find themselves. As discussed in the white paper “Ancient Aliens”, the preconceived notions and biases of a “true believer” will color their experience. Budd Hopkins (2010) defines “true believer” to encompass those who firmly believe in the existence of ET and to those who firmly deny all evidence of ET, regardless of the evidence presented. The term pseudoskeptic applies to the latter. Why? Because both types truly believe their positions and have predetermined what is and is not acceptable first. Only then do they evaluate evidence. But that evidence is evaluated according to their preset beliefs about the nature of reality and what is and is not possible. The subjective experience of the UFO/ET reporter, the subjective experience of the UFO/ET investigator and the subjective experience of the UFO/ET evaluator all interplay in a way that has the potential to contaminate evidence. Is this not obvious? This is the central reason why it is important to incorporate subjectivity and inner dialogue in some fashion to the field of UFOlogy.

In his (2009) book “The End of Materialism” paranormal researcher Charles Tart describes what he calls “forms of knowing” and “forms of not knowing.” Forms of knowing are what Tart calls the “essentials of science” which include the ways of experience, authority, reason and revelation or noetic knowing. The way of experience provides knowledge gained from first-hand direct experience of something. The way of authority refers to knowledge obtained by someone familiar with a subject and considered an authority. The way of reason refers to knowledge that can be obtained by methods of logical reasoning. (Forms of logic are summarized in the white paper “Integral UFOlogy.) The way of revelation or noetic knowing refers to knowledge

obtained by way of an altered state of consciousness (ASC); that is, knowledge obtained outside conscious awareness and normal experience, authority or reason.

Forms of not knowing are considered by Tart to be distortions of science that arise as pathologies. These pathologies, I contend, are precisely the influence of subpersonality characteristics that act as an underlying stream of “mental noise.” Tart lists and describes twenty-one such pathologies, some of which include: a compulsive need for certainty, premature generalization, denial of ignorance, a need to appear certain and confident, under- or over-respect for authority, intolerance of ambiguity, and an inflexible, neurotic need to be tough. Awareness of these distortions is of critical importance or else the paranormal researcher will likely risk the impact these distortions may have on their study of a phenomenon. Incidentally, the reader should note that one of Tart’s pathologies, rubricizing, may very well be the foundation of this white paper and noted as a potential pathology of mine. Rubricizing refers to “forcing reality into categories so that they have an authoritative quality about them.” The author is aware that the proposed method of organizing UFO/ET reports and data into categories based on integral philosophy may very well not encompass additional perspectives that may be pointed out in the future. The reader is encouraged to think about the worth of this method of categorizing. Some data and observations may not fit well into these categories.

#### A NOTE ON PHILOSOPHY

A.C. Grayling, in his (1998) book “Philosophy 1: A Guide through the Subject,” writes, “the aim of philosophical inquiry is to gain insight into questions about knowledge, truth, reason, reality, meaning, mind, and value.” Different philosophical perspectives have offered various approaches in history. At a time when religion (the subjective) and science (the objective) were inseparable, Rene Descartes ushered in a form of inquiry known as modernism by separating mind and body. This led to a view of the universe held today as scientific materialism which pronounces physical matter as the sole form of reality. The mind is seen as a byproduct or epiphenomenon. Notions of love, justice and compassion, since they have no physical location in time and space, are not ultimately real or knowable. In more recent times a rebound effect called postmodernism challenged this “flatland” view of reality. Postmodernism points out that subjectivity of the individual or intersubjectivity within a culture define what is real and not real. This had led to equally implausible propositions in such films as “The Secret” that describe how “you create your own reality” or “reality is socially constructed.” If you concentrate hard enough, a parking spot in front of Wal-Mart will open up to you. Really? In clinical terms this is known as a delusion of reference. Or, the color yellow does not exist if your culture has no description of it (which is a variation on the idea that a falling tree does not make a sound if there’s no one there to hear it.)

The extreme ontologies of the modern and postmodern worldviews result in what has been known as the mind-body problem in philosophy. Extreme modern views leave us with a world in which there are no interiors or subjective experiences whatsoever. Whereas extreme postmodern views leave us with a world in which there are no exteriors

or objective reality. Integral theory posits that both are partially right and partially wrong.

I may have erroneously oversimplified the last 500 years of philosophical inquiry here by attempting to describe it in one paragraph. However, I would simply like to point out the potential impact yours and my view of the universe can have on the phenomena we are examining. The important thing to remember is that ignorance of one's own point of view or holding a dismissive attitude toward a reasonable challenge to one's worldview and its potential influence can cause a variety of problems. As such, the philosophical position and predilections of an investigator or evaluator, I believe, have a tremendous impact on the case they are examining. For example, a UFOlogist who considers themselves a "scientific materialist" would tend to dismiss most if not all of a report that does not involve solely objective, observable and measurable facts in a case. They might describe the subjective point of view of the reporter as an afterthought at best, or dismiss it altogether at worst. A subjective account does not warrant significant merit or attention to someone with a flatland view of reality. Likewise, a field investigator who would characterize themselves as a "social constructivist" may tend to give more attention to the subjective language and cultural components to a case. As a result, they may not be as skilled or knowledgeable in the use of scientific equipment to measure evidence of a reported phenomena, but will lend more importance to how a subjective account can act as the main determinant as to whether a case is worthy of further study. Regardless, the position of each investigator has the potential to influence what is reported in the case and how it is reported. This is true not only with respect to a UFO/ET evaluator's philosophical leanings, but especially with respect to their sub-personality characteristics.

Therefore, I suggest that a brief description of the evaluator themselves (as well as their philosophical perspective) should be stated clearly as potential contaminants of the evidence they are about to present in a report. Furthermore, the role of the evaluator, I believe, is especially important in considering claims that are out of the realm of ordinary experience, such as the UFO/ET phenomenon. Discovering a way to navigate the world by successfully "owning" attributes of our own personality (our "shadow elements") should be recognized as an important consideration for anyone seriously evaluating evidence of the possibility of extraterrestrial life.

It is for this reason that I believe a brief biographical sketch of the investigator/evaluator is needed to provide an ultimately complete report. Again, I am not suggesting that personal and private information of a field investigator be shared, nor their complex interpersonal family dynamics, social history or bad habits. I am also not recommending psychotherapy of UFO investigators to uncover their subpersonalities before they choose to pursue the study of UFOs and extraterrestrial life; although I would not discourage anyone from doing this. What I do suggest is thoughtful attention and exploration from the point of view of the investigator - a transparent "self-assessment" of relevant factors arising from within the evaluator themselves - that might have the potential to contaminate the data in a case they are investigating. At a minimum I

suggest a simple appreciation of the importance of subjectivity in order to reduce the amount of interference it may cause.

#### THE BABY AND THE BATHWATER

Inner dialogue is not psychosis. Inner dialogue or “self-talk” is part of the human experience and a result of normal growth and development. It is a feature of consciousness. It is also a form of “mental noise” that has the potential to alter the way data is interpreted. The more people who examine and disseminate a UFO/ET report, the greater the subjectivity involved. And the greater the subjectivity, the greater the complexity and the greater the distance separated from a UFO/ET event. Imagine a separate examination of the subjective nature of the reporter, plus a separate examination of the subjective nature of each of the corroborating witnesses! It would be easier to just focus on the objective and measurable aspects of a report. It would be easier to dismiss subjectivity in all respects. But that would result in a partial and incomplete treatment of a case report.

The current state of UFOlogy, and in MUFON I believe, already gives a lower priority to subjective variables to a great extent. Subjective data seems accepted only insofar as it has the clear potential to explain a case away as unfounded or hoaxed. For example, a reporter with a diagnosed condition of paranoid schizophrenia would likely have their case summarily dismissed and closed. There is good reason for this. I suspect one of the reasons this already occurs in MUFON is to increase the legitimacy, credibility and “scientific basis” of UFO investigation. We should use certain subjective facts in a case (the truthfulness and motivation of the reporter) as reasons to exclude a case and consider the report tainted and therefore unfounded. This is a tenet of abductive reasoning as discussed in detail in the white paper “Integral UFOlogy.” A simple and more economical explanation is not that someone actually had a waking experience of being abducted by little green men, but rather that their psychotropic medication needed to be adjusted.

So we already use subjectivity to exclude and discount UFO/ET reports. Do we use subjectivity as a basis to include reports as well? Do we use subjective characteristics of UFO/ET reporters to help substantiate a claim? Lesley Kean’s (2010) book “UFOs: Generals, Pilots and Government Officials go on the Record” attempts to do just that. The assumed credibility of generals, pilots and government officials suggests their stories should be given more weight. Why? Because we should be able to rely on their subjectivity more than others. But what if the credibility of some of these credible witnesses is challenged? Are we to discount their story as being financially motivated because they are behind on their mortgage payments and owe the IRS a bunch of back taxes? Another example is Dr. Steven Greer. Dr. Greer founded the Disclosure Project that annually sponsors authenticated presenters with solid backgrounds at the National Press Club. Dr. Greer’s reputation as an emergency room physician helped establish the Disclosure Project as a reputable venture. However, even now skeptics seem to enjoy ascribing the word “fanatic” to him, citing as evidence Dr. Greer’s background interest in telepathy and his work establishing C-SETI, among other stories

of odd claims he has made. UFO investigators and reporters seem just as likely as a politician to have their social history revealed in order to attack and “disprove” the worth and value of what they have to offer. In that respect, Dennis Kucinich’s 2008 announcement in the US presidential debate that he saw a UFO at Shirley MacLaine’s house was a perfect storm. It illustrated how an individual’s political career and interest in UFOs laid waste to their credibility – their subjective trustworthiness.

To use the metaphor of “throwing out the baby with the bathwater,” there seems to be very little room for including any aspect of a reporter’s subjective experience (the baby) because of their suspicious cultural associations and an assumed incredulity of the subject matter they are reporting (the bathwater.) On one hand, UFO/ET reporters, simply because of the nature of what they are reporting, are required to surpass a higher level of scrutiny and standard than that of any other field of study. At the outset of this paper, I maintained the worth and value of Carl Sagan’s maxim “extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.” To that extent, there should be no quarrel. We should indeed have higher scrutiny in UFOlogy than any other field of inquiry.

However, there remains the other side of the story. Who will be left, I wonder? Whose reports out there remain that are worth believing? Who among us have the capacity to provide us a story (a baby to use the metaphor) that is worth believing? Who can give us a story that is not tossed out or ridiculed? Historically, the only people we believe are ourselves. It comes in the form of what many UFO reporters and ET abductees repeat. They simply say, “I know what I saw.” The only other people who might have a story we tend to believe are people with whom we have close, personal relationships – people we know and trust. These are people with whom we share an immediate cultural membership. That might be friends, family members, co-workers – people with whom we are familiar and are able to pass our test of trustworthiness. In other words, the only reports worth believing, ultimately, are based on subjective and intersubjective characteristics. I encourage the reader to consider this as you take in the story of John Foster in Part II of this paper.

## CONCLUSIONS

Disregarding evidence merely because of characteristics of the source from which it originated is precisely what is meant by the expression “throwing the baby out with the bathwater.” Conversely, accepting evidence merely because of the reputation of the source from which it sprang is equally problematic. What we need, and what I have presented here is a method to put all sources of evidence on the table in such a way they can be examined singularly and as a whole. The strength of a UFO/ET report, I believe, should be based on whether it has been given a “fair shake” of evaluation from the points of view of subjective, objective, intersubjective and interobjective.

What I offer here is a way to quantify the unquantifiable. I seek to elevate subjectivity and intersubjectivity to the same status and appreciation as that of quantifiable and measurable objective and interobjective data. Realizing full well that subjectivity has no physical aspect, no location in time and space, it nonetheless has just

as much of an impact on our judgment as to the relative truth and veracity of any other aspect of a UFO/ET claim. In fact, we use it all the time anyway. So why not make that explicit? Why not create an intentional effort to avoid surreptitious use of hidden beliefs and opinions and instead open them up for all to see? That, in my opinion, would be a new and more functional use of the phrase “disclosure project.”

## APPENDIX A: INTEGRAL UFOLOGY REPORTING FORMAT ITEMS

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF INVESTIGATOR (synopsis of the history, background and experience of the evaluator, their philosophical perspective, known biases, opinions on relevant matters):

CASE SUMMARY: (General description of UFO/ET report itself, as provided by the reporter.)

PERSPECTIVE 1: Subjective, intentional information from obtained from the reporter. (What did the reporter, feel, think and sense before, during and after the experience? Notes on altered states, comments as to apparent motivation or possible contaminating personality components of the reporter. Contradictions? Did the story change?)

PERSPECTIVE 2: Subjective impressions of the reporter's subjective accounts from the point of view of the investigator. Are they lying? What appear to be their motivations? What facts do you believe they are certain of? Which do they not appear to be as certain about? What thoughts and emotions and reactions surfaced in your awareness as you heard their report? Who do they remind you of?

PERSPECTIVE 3: Intersubjective, cultural information known of the reporter themselves or obtained from individuals associated with them from within their cultural group/s. (Influence on the report based on statements from others within a group the reporter belongs to? Aberrant or typical? How do they interact with their friends/family/colleagues? Does the reporter have the potential to influence corroborating witnesses? Comments as to apparent cultural contaminants or pressures.)

PERSPECTIVE 4: Subjective impressions of the reporter's culture from the point of view of the investigator. What did it feel like to be immersed among the reporter's friends/family/colleagues? Did you notice a pressure toward conformity or nonconformity? Do they remind you of groups of which you are a part? Did you feel accepted? Unwelcome? Did they fear making the report? Why?

PERSPECTIVE 5: Objective, behavioral information obtained from the reporter. (MUFON CMS or NUFORC data, what in the report is objective, observable and potentially measurable with either human senses or with known scientific equipment?)

PERSPECTIVE 6: Analysis from the point of view of the investigator of objective information provided in the report. Given your knowledge of the physical sciences, what in the report can be proven? Disproven? Measurable? What means of measurement or analysis might be needed in this case?

PERSPECTIVE 7: Interobjective, social information known of the reporter, their employment, association with organizations. (Provide a social history sketch of involvement in churches or other social institutions relevant to their report and note the presence or absence of corroborating witness statements.)

PERSPECTIVE 8: Analysis from the point of view of the investigator of social factors present in the case. Is there corroboration of witnesses that, in your opinion, would lend support to the case or cause you to question it? Is it reliable and consistent? What type of confirmation would be needed that could verify or lend support to the report?

CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS: Investigator/Evaluator assessment of case. (Provide a summary of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the UFO/ET report. What stands out the most? What are your recommendations as to the disposition of the report?)

REFERENCES

- Combs, Allan (2009) *Consciousness Explained Better: Towards in Integral Understanding of the Multifaceted Nature of Consciousness*. Pargon House: Omega Books.
- Fall, Kevin A., Miner Holden, Janice, and Marquis, Andre, (December 9, 2003), *Theoretical Models of Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Publisher: Routledge.
- Foster, J.R. (2009) *To Earth From Heaven*. Lincoln, NE: JR Foster
- Foster, J.R. (2009) *Eminent Discovery: A Lifetime of UFO Experiences*. Lincoln, NE: JR Foster.
- Grayline, A.C. (1998) *Philosophy 1: A Guide through the Subject. Volume 1*, Oxford University Press.
- Kean, Lesley (2010) *UFOs: Generals, Pilots and Government Officials Go On the Record*. Crown Publishing.
- Hopkins, Budd (2010) Four Classic Attitudes to the UFO Abduction Phenomenon, *MUFON Journal*, February, No. 502.
- Snodgrass, Steve (2010) *Integral UFOlogy: A Rubric for Evaluating Extraterrestrial Contact*, Manuscript submitted to University of Nebraska at Omaha UFO Study Group.
- Snodgrass, Steve (2010) *Phoning Home: UFOlogy and the Evolution of Consciousness*, Manuscript submitted to University of Nebraska at Omaha UFO Study Group.
- Snodgrass, Steve (2010) *A Report on Ancient Aliens, Psychic Phenomena and a Suggested (Phenomenological) Approach to UFOlogy*, Manuscript submitted to University of Nebraska at Omaha UFO Study Group.
- Tart, Charles (2009) *The End of Materialism: How Evidence of the Paranormal is Bringing Science and Religion Together*. Harbinger Publications, Co-published with the Institute of Noetic Sciences.
- Wilber, Ken (2006) *Integral Spirituality: A Startling New Role for Religion in the Modern and Postmodern World*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (2000) *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (1995) *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: The Spirit of Evolution*, Boston: Shambhala