

**Grievance Definition Regarding Risk of False Memory to Human Subjects in UAP Studies
and Experienter Research at CIHS**

Daniel Rekshan, MA, CHt

School of Integral Noetic Science, California Institute for Human Science

Statement to initiate grievance process

February 10, 2025

**Grievance Definition Regarding Risk of False Memory to Human Subjects in UAP Studies
and Experienter Research at CIHS**

This document supports the initiation of a grievance process to resolve my concerns about the risk of harmful false memories in human subjects of UAP Studies and experienter research conducted at CIHS through the new Integral Noetic Science (INS) concentrations and the Worldwide Initiative for Super Experienter Research (WISER) super experienter study. I will briefly present the history of my grievance, my actions to resolve my concerns, and my understanding of the institute's response. I expect that the grievance process will initiate a committee charged with producing official statements from the institute regarding my grievance, specifically about the risk of harmful false memories in UAP Studies and experienter research. I request that the grievance committee respond to the questions listed as headings in the section *Questions for the Grievance Committee*.

This document relies upon my last ethical concerns document, [*Risk of Harmful False Memories in UAP Studies*](#), in which I defined my terms and listed my ethical concerns. In the last document, I bracketed my concerns as abstract and systemic. This document escalates my concerns from abstract to actual. I say that vulnerable human subjects of WISER, as well as the audience of UAP Studies at CIHS and all public audiences who encounter promotional materials for these projects, are presently at risk for harmful false memories. Further, I say that the on-going relationship between CIHS and Bledsoe through the WISER study puts human subjects at risk for harmful false memories and the institute at risk for breach of academic integrity.

There are two paths for me after the grievance process. First, if my concerns are resolved, I will strive to increase my income in order to pay tuition fees by the end of my leave of absence. Second, if my concerns are not resolved, then I will escalate my concerns possibly through:

1. Presentation of my documentation and the CIHS responses to the press and watch-dog organizations.
2. Discussion with legal counsel to ensure the safety of subjects and audience of CIHS research.
3. Registration of a complaint with WSCUC for possible violation of accreditation standards and policies.

Inadequate Response to Concerns of Risk

Nearly six months ago, I raised concerns about harmful false memories in human subjects by submitting a document as justification for my leave of absence, then I engaged in conversation with CIHS administration. The proposed resolution was that I collaborate with Esbjörn-Hargens to establish a best practices white paper under the auspices of the Center for Anomalous and Noetic Studies (CANS), which Esbjörn-Hargens informed me could officially begin once I re-enroll. However, the response is inadequate because:

1. I raised concerns regarding risk to human subjects in research at CIHS, which should be treated with urgency and seriousness that I have not yet seen.
2. I raised direct concerns about Esbjörn-Hargens' and my own discernment regarding UAP studies and experiencer research, indicating that we are not capable of resolving these concerns without institutional support.
3. My ethical concerns were merged with financial issues related to my inability to work in my vocation that impacted my ability to pay tuition fees, which created a paradox in which I was unable to move forward with collaboration.

In other words, I asked CIHS to help resolve my ethical concerns so that I could continue my work and studies, but CIHS informed me that I would need to continue my studies to work

with them in order to resolve the issues, thereby creating a paradox. I am still struggling with my vocational practice, having discovered that my backup plan of tech work has been undermined by the AI revolution, currently requiring the assistance of family for housing and to make ends meet, and have been unable to pay tuition fees. I simply cannot afford to re-enroll in order to resolve my concerns. I appreciate that the administration of CIHS, such as Martin, explained to me that I was becoming an ethical authority in my research, which encouraged me to trust my understanding that my ethical concerns need to be addressed by a committee or institute beyond any one expert perspective such as myself or Esbjörn-Hargens. Therefore, I am initiating the grievance process to request resolution to my ethical concerns, specifically requesting an institutional statement in response to the questions listed in this document.

Why I Care About the Risk of Harmful False Memories

After reading my concerns, I had a conversation with Martin. He initiated our conversation by asking why I cared so much about the risk of harmful false memories, which I will address after noting one concerning aspect of our conversation that I demand clarity and transparency on from the grievance committee. Martin told me a confusing story about Roswell that indicated he believed all testimony of Roswell could be explained as false memory because of some interaction with a government official who shared information with Martin. However, Martin requested I keep the story confidential, which seemed like a manipulation tactic inappropriate for the seriousness of my concerns. Consequently, I request that Martin share his story in the official grievance documentation and explain any bias or relationships that may compromise his academic transparency and integrity. Further, Martin explained to me that CIHS would not make institutional statements about these matters because the role of the institute is to administer research and education. However, CIHS actively endorses the *New Thinking Allowed*

(NTA) program, which appears to be an endorsement of third-party media through a dual-role relationship with Mishlove, a faculty member. Therefore, I request a transparent accounting of the relationship between CIHS and NTA, along with an explanation as to why CIHS endorses NTA, but not statements to mitigate risk of harmful false memories in human subjects.

I care about the risk of false memories for many reasons. First, I care because I have spent the last five years pursuing truth regarding UAP Disclosure. While I have found evidence for extraordinary experiences and powerful testimony, I have found no objective evidence for UAP Disclosure claims, much like the US Government's All-Domain All-Resolution Office (AARO). Rather, I found objective evidence of lies, delusions, or manipulations like I have outlined surrounding the [case of Chris Bledsoe](#), a primary example and advisor of the WISER study. Further, I have [found literary connections](#) between contemporary UAP claims and 1990s alien abduction research, which appropriates natural dream and sleep phenomena like hypnagogic imagery and sleep paralysis into ET/NHI contact mythologies.

There is no definitive objective evidence for UAPs and NHI encounters like clear videos of craft or beings, but there is evidence that NHI/UAP experiencers may be schizotypal, fantasy-prone, deluded, influenced by manipulative narratives, or vulnerable in other ways. Therefore, I deeply care about this issue because I know from decades of experience that careless research or statements may cause significant pain, confusion, and trauma about natural, yet powerful and uncommon, dream and sleep phenomena. It must be noted that I have taken care in other writing to elaborate my hypothesis that these dream states are ultimately real, such as in my books [Missing Time Found](#) or [Galethog the Grey's Field Guide to Anomalous Geometry](#). Further, I intend to study sleep and dream phenomena associated with ET/NHI contact reports, therefore I

must ensure that the institute overseeing my dissertation is demonstrably aware of these complex issues and any ethical implications.

The other reason that I care so much about the issue of truth in UAP/NHI experiencer claims, especially related to Chris Bledsoe, is because of my personal experience researching a UAP sighting that Bledsoe published in his book *UFO of God*, which happened during a program that Esbjörn-Hargens and my first missing time client, Berg, participated in. The light was later identified by Michael Earl, a satellite expert and professor, as a geosynchronous satellite. I spent significant time investigating the case due to the significant promotion of this sighting as a UAP and its personal connections, documented in my article [*Bledsoe's UFO of GOD is likely a Satellite \(Intelsat 29E\)*](#). I saw the UAP as a candidate for SETI-style communication but now see it as a misidentified satellite. I informed all participants in the program, including Bledsoe and Esbjörn-Hargens, of my identification of mathematical patterns in its flashing and then its later identification as a satellite by Earl, yet there has been no retraction or correction of the public record. Additionally, I was unable to find conclusive proof that Bledsoe had experienced anything other than something like delusion, confabulation, and spiritual experience. Further, I found evidence that Bledsoe could not discern between identified aircraft and UAP and that he failed a polygraph test about his encounters. It made me wonder, what if all cases supporting UAP Disclosure narratives are similarly confused or incorrect?

The final reason why I care so much about the risk of false memories regarding ET/NHI mythology and academic statements is that I am an experiencer of the phenomenon. I grew up with powerful dreams in the 1990s, which I unconsciously interpreted through the lens of UFO Abduction until the literature reviews that I performed during my time at CIHS. In fact, a reading from *Subtle Energies II* provided a crucial insight that transformed my understanding. My

powerful dreams respond to set, setting, and intention just like a psychedelic trip, therefore I know for a fact that careless statements by researchers, dramatic media or news, and social dynamics related to these topics create nightmarish experiences and a complex of real and harmful symptoms. Since many ET/NHI contact narratives involve sexual trauma, I now see any careless statement by researchers as possibly equivalent to sexual abuse of their audience, including vulnerable minors. The fact that the John E. Mack Institute is associated with WISER and the UAP Studies concentration suggests the perpetuation of 1990s alien abduction myths through CIHS, which may be equivalent to the perpetuation of sexual abuse through identifiable persuasion techniques on the public, including minors, by the forceful interpretation of natural sleep and dream phenomenon as symptoms of alien abduction or NHI/UAP encounters. I care because I do not want another generation of powerful dreamers, including my own children, to go to sleep afraid of sexual abuse from mysterious visitors like I did.

My Engagement with CIHS About my Concerns

On September 3rd, 2024, I submitted a 200 page document of ethical concerns regarding alien mythology in research at CIHS to Esbjörn-Hargens for his review, which I intended to submit to CIHS as justification for my leave of absence application. He advised me to rework the material into a shorter document, which I did. The appendixes of the larger document, [*The Ethical Implications of Unquestioned Mackian Research at CIHS*](#), document communications between all named parties as evidence for my concerns. On September 10th, 2024, I submitted the 16 page document to CIHS, [*Risk of Harmful False Memories in UAP Studies*](#), addressed to Martin, the Dean of Research, as justification for my leave of absence. I explained that my ethical crisis regarding harmful false memories in UAP and experiencer studies caused a

financial crisis such that I could no longer pay tuition because I was unable to continue my donation-based dreamwork/hypnosis practice in service to experiencers

The document, *Risk of Harmful False Memories in UAP Studies*, outlined my concerns about harmful false memories related to UAP studies and experiencer research, specifically represented by the new Anomalous Studies and UAP and Consciousness Studies concentrations and the Worldwide Initiative for Super Experiencer Research (WISER). My concerns were focused on abstract and systemic issues related to UAP Disclosure and experiencer narratives that appear to derive from 1990s alien abduction research influenced by John E. Mack. In addition to the abstract concerns, I presented my concerns that use of Chris Bledsoe as a primary case study and advisor of WISER may lead to harmful false memories in human subject research at CIHS because he has a history of presenting identifiable aircraft as UAP while sharing his compelling and suggestive stories. I presented [statements from the *New Thinking Allowed*](#) program as examples of my concerns because the program was endorsed by CIHS. Finally, I outlined a list of possible resolutions to my concerns such as updating CIHS policies to mitigate risks of false memory and endorsing the publication of a white paper regarding ethical research methods for UAP and experiencer studies.

After submitting the document, I had video conversations and email correspondences with CIHS administration and faculty: Martin, Gomes, Esbjörn-Hargens, Yeghian, and Mishlove. While I had sought an institutional response for a variety of reasons, Martin, Esbjörn-Hargens, and Gomes indicated that CIHS would not respond to my proposed resolutions because the institute focused more on general administration. Rather, they indicated that the Integral Noetic Sciences department or the Center for Anomalous and Noetic Study, both headed by Esbjörn-Hargens, are the most appropriate places to address my concerns. Gomes suggested that

I collaborate with CANS to produce a white-paper about UAP studies and experiencer research best practices in order for the research to continue. In discussing the logistics of the collaboration, Esbjörn-Hargens directed me to produce 1-page proposals and then indicated that I would need to be enrolled for official collaboration with CANS. However, I find this response to be inadequate to resolve my concerns for the reasons listed above. Consequently, I request that the CIHS administration present a plan of action that accommodates their bureaucratic needs while addressing the present risk of harmful false memories to human subjects. After all, there are only a handful of responsible individuals at CIHS and I do not care if CIHS, CANS, INS, or whatever bureaucratic division responds to the risk, only that action is taken to mitigate the risk.

My Professional Practice with Experiencers and the Risk of False Memory

In my last document, I reported merged ethical and financial concerns because I had merged my professional practice with ET/NHI contact and UAP Disclosure narratives. When I began to question false memories, I questioned myself and unconsciously froze. I have deeply engaged in self-reflection and spiritual growth to address these concerns in my own practice. Through the process of researching and raising my concerns, I have found a compromise that enabled me to start practice. Personally, professionally, and academically, I believe that regression hypnosis and investigation in ET/NHI contact cases is misidentified shamanic dreamwork and that the misidentification is the major cause of harmful false memories. Therefore, I see that association with careless accredited research is actually the cause of the risk.

If the cause of harmful false memories is the misidentification of authoritative research or regression hypnosis as something other than dreamwork, then the solution would be to clearly identify the practice as dreamwork. Further, it appears that researchers can reverse false memories through sensitization and education protocols. Consequently, I shifted my practice to

a) clearly identify it as dreamwork, b) include the risk of harmful false memories in informed consent, and c) orient my entire practice as psycho-spiritual and not authoritative research. In other words, I am practicing as a spiritual counselor, dreamworker, or shaman, rather than as an authoritative researcher. I now understand that the risk for harmful false memories is exacerbated by authoritative research and advanced credentials, therefore I see my continued participation in accredited studies to possibly be an ethical liability unless I can prove that my ethical concerns are resolved, perhaps through statements and policy updates endorsed by CIHS.

Questions for the Grievance Committee

As a PhD student who is still learning the academic system, I had many expectations that failed to meet reality. I expected that an appropriate response to my concerns would be to pause the survey, form a committee, update study policies with false memory research, go through another round of IRB approval, perhaps dismiss Bledsoe, and then make a few public statements. However, I found the response to my ethical concerns to be inadequate for reasons already discussed. Consequently, I am initiating this grievance process to resolve my concerns. Since my previous expectations of resolution were not met, I am initiating the grievance process to request an official response from the institute about my questions and concerns. This section lists my questions, along with some context and requests for each question.

In my first round of submitting ethical concerns, I had asked the institute to take action, but the institute deflected responsibility back to Esbjörn-Hargens as the program director, who has not yet taken discernable action. As I understand from my conversations with Yeghian about the grievance process, there will be a committee formed to produce an official statement on behalf of the institute. The committee will then issue statements in response to my grievance document. To be clear, I am requesting that CIHS make official statements about the liability of

risk of harmful false memories in human subjects in order to protect themselves and their participants from harmful false memories and the potential for litigation as a result.

Is There Truly a Risk of Harmful False Memories in UAP/NHI Studies, Why or Why Not?

Either there is a risk of harmful false memories or there is not. I have raised concerns about harmful false memory based on literature review, personal experience of false memories, and professional experience as a hypnotist. I have found the concerns to be so significant that I stopped practicing hypnosis, thereby causing my merged financial and ethical crisis. Most CIHS staff suggest that a) they are ignorant of the complexities of UAP studies and false memory, therefore defer to Esbjörn-Hargens or b) there is no major concern for human subjects.

However, while I do understand the risks on a personal and professional level as a hypnotist and dreamworker, I do not have a clear statement or understanding of the risk in the context of accredited research and education, therefore I am asking CIHS to provide a clear and direct statement regarding the risk of harmful false memories in accredited UAP/experiencer studies. If CIHS defers to Esbjörn-Hargens' expertise, I would ask that they endorse a statement prepared by Esbjörn-Hargens about the risk of false memories that would satisfy the criteria for a complete term paper (specifically 3-6 peer-reviewed references on the topic).

Who is Liable for Harm Caused to Human Subjects Related to False Memories?

I believe that there is a risk of harmful false memories to human subjects in UAP/experiencer research, especially if care is not taken to safeguard against false memories. I have seen no specific actions taken by CIHS or Esbjörn-Hargens to safeguard human subjects against the risk of harmful false memory. If a subject of WISER or any future UAP/experiencer research approved by the CIHS IRB would develop harmful false memories due to their participation, who would be liable for the harm?

I understand that researchers have limited liability for harm caused to human subjects because of bureaucratic oversight and the idea that research is conducted in good faith. However, I understand that willful negligence of the researcher or their oversight committees may represent a breach of good faith research. This document, supported by my last ethical concerns document, informs CIHS that I see an active risk of harm to human subjects in research through false memory and similar dynamics. Therefore, it seems to me that CIHS, Esbjörn-Hargens, or the members of the grievance committees may be liable for any related harm because I have officially notified the institute of my concerns and they have not been addressed. Consequently, I request an official statement from CIHS regarding who is liable for harm related to false memories possibly induced by participation in UAP studies or experimenter research at CIHS?

Are AARO Claims About Fanatic Believers in UAP Disclosure Valid, Why or Why Not?

AARO is the official government office set up to resolve claims regarding UAP Disclosure. Their [2024 report](#) suggests that recent UAP Disclosure claims derive from a small group of people with fanatic belief in UAPs as extraterrestrial technology:

AARO assesses that the inaccurate claim that the USG is reverse-engineering extraterrestrial technology and is hiding it from Congress is, in large part, the result of circular reporting from a group of individuals who believe this to be the case, despite the lack of any evidence (page 10).

While the AARO director, Dr. Kirkpatrick, has been hesitant to name the group of individuals, it is clear that the group centers around Robert Bigelow because he was the government contractor who was reported on by the famous 2017 New York Times article that established mainstream credibility of UAP Disclosure narratives. In the video presentation of an [interview](#) with Kirkpatrick, reporter Greenstreet named several members of the group, which

included three WISER advisors: Kelleher (who no longer appears as an advisor), Kean, and Nolan. If the official position of the US government about UAP Disclosure is valid, then I must pose the question, is the WISER study advised by UAP fanatics who selectively reject scientific evidence in favor of extraterrestrial mythology? Consequently, I request that CIHS, CANS, or INS leadership make statements disambiguating the WISER advisory board from the UAP fanatics implied by Kirkpatrick and named by Greenstreet, such as Kean and Nolan.

Additionally, I would request the courtesy of a statement disambiguating CIHS-associated studies and research from Bigelow's activity or influence in UAP studies and experiencer research for several reasons. First, Bigelow is central to UAP Disclosure narratives and is a primary funder of consciousness studies, as implied by the AARO report. Consequently, the concentration name *UAP and Consciousness Studies* implies a theoretical tie to Bigelow or Bigelow-influenced UAP Disclosure narratives (the fact Kelleher was listed as an early advisor is literary proof of the connection). Second, the WISER study is proposed to be the third major ET/NHI experiencer study in the literature, which began with the Bigelow-funded *Unusual Events Survey* that was published in the 1992 booklet [*Unusual Personal Experiences*](#) and mailed to 100k mental health workers by the Bigelow Holding Corporation. Based on my research, client work, and personal experience, this booklet and its promotions is the cause for significant induction of harmful false memories of alien abduction. Consequently, I request clarity as to how WISER or CIHS IRB committees will mitigate the risk of harmful false memories given the influence of Bigelow and the Unusual Events Survey on UAP studies and experiencer research.

Why is Bledsoe a Primary Case Study and Advisor of the WISER Study When There is Such Delusion or Deception as I Have Documented with his UAP Sighting at the Monroe Institute?

Even if the WISER advisory board and the greater CIHS community is free from the circular reporting group of individuals who will not heed scientific evidence at the center of UAP disclosure narratives, the presence of Bledsoe as an example and advisor of WISER suggests that there are no effective filters or checks regarding fanatic belief or delusion in the study participants or advisors. Although CIHS acknowledges Esbjörn-Hargens as leader of the WISER study, the institute and its IRB does hold an ethical and legal obligation to ensure the safety of human subjects, which I have warned may be jeopardized by such fanatic belief or careless research practices.

Earl identified the famous UAP as a satellite in January, 2024, and I forwarded the information to all related parties. Bledsoe was informed that Earl identified the Monroe UAP as a satellite, but has not corrected the record and continues to publish his book unchanged. Esbjörn-Hargens has been aware of the identification of the satellite, yet continues to promote Bledsoe as an example and advisor. When I confronted Esbjörn-Hargens about Bledsoe, he suggested that Bledsoe was “ontologically generous” and that the generosity may be a requirement for the “experience of the phenomenon”. Therefore, I am concerned that the academic integrity of WISER and, perhaps, Esbjörn-Hargens, has been compromised by some unacknowledged arrangement with Bledsoe. Consequently, I request that CIHS, as the institution employing Esbjörn-Hargens and providing ethical oversight of the WISER study, investigate the relationship of Bledsoe, the WISER study, and Esbjörn-Hargens for any academically

compromising arrangements. For example, Bledsoe connected Esbjörn-Hargens with the Danny Jones podcast, which yielded significant publicity for the WISER study and the INS department.

Will CIHS Confirm or Deny Esbjörn-Hargens' Promotion of The Experiencer Group as a Safe-Space for Abductees on CIHS-Endorsed Media, If or If Not, Why?

I have raised concerns that harmful false memories of alien abduction or ET/NHI encounters may be caused by a decentralized and primarily unconscious social system involving support groups, hypnotists, researchers, and content producers. Media about ET/NHI contact may suggest that natural sleep and dream phenomena, which are often associated with fear and nightmarish experiences, are actually traumatic because they may be seen as evidence for ET/NHI contact. Schizotypal, fantasy-prone, or otherwise vulnerable people may respond to the media, then seek out a group, hypnosis, or to report their experiences. Their interactions may generate false memories understood as real memories because the supporter or media producer is unaware of false memories, sleep paralysis, or best practices with vulnerable populations.

I am concerned about The Experiencer Group for several reasons and bring forward my concerns because Esbjörn-Hargens recommended them as a safe-space for experiencers on [CIHS-endorsed media](#), which was in direct contradictions to concerns I held about false memories that he has been aware of since April 5th, 2024. The group was publicized by Blumenthal as a modern-day abductee group, presenting testimony of its founders to support UAP Disclosure narratives. The group was founded by professional media production and content creators, not support professionals, with whom Esbjörn-Hargens is friends. The situation, to my eyes, seems like a recipe for the priming or induction of traumatic and harmful alien false memories. Since the group was recommended by a Dean of CIHS on CIHS-endorsed media to CIHS faculty, I request that CIHS make an official statement to support or deny

Esbjörn-Hargens' endorsement of the group. I request an institutional response because Esbjörn-Hargens has personal connections with the group that may cause bias.

What Steps Will CIHS Officially Take to Mitigate the Risk of Harmful False Memories in UAP Studies and Experiencer Research?

I now officially inform CIHS that UAP studies and experiencer research, as conducted during my time at CIHS, appears to me to risk harmful false memories in human subjects. I hold a MA in East-West Psychology, two hypnosis/healing certificates, have conducted dozens of ET/NHI missing time regression sessions, am an experiencer of the phenomenon myself, and have held a 4.0 GPA during my time at CIHS. In my ethical concerns document, I identified my concerns as abstract and systemic out of respect and courtesy for Esbjörn-Hargens and CIHS. This grievance letter escalates my concerns. I now say that human subjects of the WISER study are actively at risk of harmful false memories. Further, I say that accredited and explicit research into UAPs and NHIs within the context of UAP Disclosure claims also risks harmful false memories, unless clear and documented steps have been taken to mitigate these risks. Finally, I now raise concerns of academic integrity through conflict of interest related to Esbjörn-Hargens' relationship with Chris Bledsoe and, perhaps, the John E. Mack Institute.

While it may seem trivial to be concerned about a [single webpage](#) with a small survey, I say that the question, "are you a super experiencer?" may be a leading question, which has been overloaded with unconscious implications of traumatic alien abduction primed by individuals like Chris Bledsoe or organizations like the John E. Mack Institute, which are clearly associated with the study. Further, the informed consent of the survey is priming toward traumatic memories of anomalous experience, but does not mention false memories.

Either my concerns are valid and action must be taken or else my concerns are not valid and action need not be taken. I raised my concerns six months ago and CIHS suggested a resolution through collaboration that is impossible for me to participate in. The WISER study continues with no mention of false memories in its informed consent, Bledsoe is still listed as an advisor and example, and I still am unclear why or how The Experiencer Group mitigates obvious false memory risks. Therefore, I must assume that CIHS have not seen my concerns as valid or urgent. Consequently, I request that CIHS as an institute take action to mitigate the risk of harmful false memories or else inform me why my concerns are invalid.

Conclusion

After raising my concerns with CIHS, I sought ways to return to active practice with experiencers through my dreamwork and hypnosis services. My hope was to resolve my ethical concerns through conversation with CIHS as the ethical authority of UAP studies and experiencer research conducted in the INS department. I assumed that CIHS faculty, as ethical experts on human subject research, would quickly and easily dispel my concerns by presenting documentation of their considerations regarding harmful false memories, which I hoped would hold as many references to peer-reviewed literature as required for a term paper. Further, I had hoped to add one or two sentences to the Research Policy and Student handbooks that required researchers to follow the International Association of the Study of Dreams for ET/NHI contact research because, at least in research literature, these phenomena are primarily defined in terms of dreams. Finally, I had requested support for the unique aspects of my research.

However, CIHS leadership indicated that Esbjörn-Hargens and myself were responsible for resolving my concerns through a collaboration that is officially impossible until I resolve my vocational crisis to pay the fees necessary for collaboration. Why should I have to pay to resolve

the risk to human subjects in research that the CIHS IRB approved? I hold a 4.0 GPA at CIHS, so why have my concerns been essentially ignored? If my perspective is invalid, then what value does an education at CIHS have? I was told that CIHS faculty are experts in ethical research, so why is it so hard to find proof that CIHS, INS, CANS, or Esbjörn-Hargens is aware of and has mitigated the risk of harmful false memory in UAP studies and experiencer research?

Consequently, I request clear and direct statements about the risk of harmful false memories in UAP studies and experiencer research at CIHS. If my ethical concerns are not met with the seriousness and urgency that they deserve, then I will take drastic steps to resolve my concern about risks to human subjects of research at CIHS, which is also a risk for the public audience of authoritative statements regarding UAP/experiencer studies. My actions may include escalating my concerns to the press or watch-dog organizations, discussion with legal counsel, or registering a complaint with the accreditation board. Therefore, I urge the grievance committee to urgently and seriously consider my request and concerns to safeguard the audience and human subjects of UAP studies and experiencer research at CIHS against the risk of harmful false memories.