Holstonia Bigfoot Investigations
Perception Series No. 3

Paranormal Attribution and Interpretive Expansion in Anomalous Encounter Reports: Boundary Conditions and the Limits of Biological Inference

Daniel H. Kegley
holstonia-investigations.org

Version of Record: This document constitutes the authoritative version of this work. Please cite the version available at holstonia-investigations.org. Revised editions, if issued, will be explicitly identified.

Abstract

Reports of anomalous encounters frequently include attributions of paranormal or non-biological abilities to the observed phenomenon, including claims of invisibility, cloaking, telepathy, or interdimensional travel. Such interpretations are often grouped under the term “woo” and dismissed wholesale, obscuring critical distinctions between perceptual phenomena, speculative biological mechanisms, and metaphysical explanations. This paper functions as a methodological boundary statement within the Holstonia framework. Drawing on perception science, cognitive psychology, explanatory reasoning, and philosophy of science, the analysis distinguishes observation classes from interpretive

overlays and establishes evidentiary and operational limits for what can be evaluated within constrained inference. The goal is not to adjudicate metaphysical claims, but to discipline their treatment so anomalous reports remain analytically coherent, biologically grounded where appropriate, and epistemically bounded.

---

1. Introduction: The Problem with “Woo”

The label “woo” is commonly applied to anomalous encounter reports that include paranormal or supernatural interpretations. While rhetorically efficient, the term collapses distinct epistemic categories into a single dismissal. This collapse obscures meaningful analytical distinctions between ambiguous perception, speculative biological hypotheses, and metaphysical explanations that exceed operational constraints.

Scientific inquiry depends not only on evidence, but on clearly articulated boundaries regarding what kinds of explanations are admissible within a given framework (Popper, 1959; Lakatos, 1970). Without such boundaries, anomalous research risks either uncritical acceptance or reflexive rejection. The Holstonia framework addresses this problem by separating observation, interpretation, and attribution, and by specifying which classes of explanation can be meaningfully evaluated using observational data.

---

2. Observation Versus Attribution

Perceptual science has long emphasized that perception itself is an inferential process rather than a direct recording of reality (Marr, 1982; Gregory, 1997). Observations consist of sensory experiences—visual ambiguity, sudden disappearance, indistinct form, or unusual sound—while attributions are explanatory models imposed on those experiences.

For example:

- Observation: an object becomes visually indeterminate against a complex background.
- Attribution: the object “cloaked.”
- Further attribution: the object employed advanced or non-physical technology.

Only the first describes perceptual input. Subsequent statements represent increasingly speculative causal explanations. Conflating these levels leads to interpretive escalation and category error.

Holstonia treats observations as analyzable data and attributions as hypotheses whose plausibility depends on compatibility with biological, ecological, and physical continuity.

---

3. Interpretive Escalation Under Uncertainty

Humans exhibit a strong preference for coherent explanations, particularly under conditions of ambiguity, threat, or incomplete information (Kahneman, 2011). Cognitive research shows that when immediate explanations fail, individuals often adopt more elaborate causal narratives rather than tolerate uncertainty (Lombrozo, 2016).

Interpretive escalation typically proceeds through:

1. ambiguous perceptual input,
2. emotional arousal and attentional narrowing,
3. failure of immediate conventional explanation,
4. search for explanatory coherence,
5. adoption of culturally available explanatory frameworks.

This process is consistent with research on causal learning and explanatory reasoning (Gopnik & Tenenbaum, 2007) and does not imply deception or irrationality. It reflects normal human cognition operating under uncertainty.

---

4. Perceptual Phenomena Commonly Labeled as “Cloaking”

Many reports described as “cloaking” involve perceptual outcomes rather than explicit claims of invisibility. These include edge loss, color blending, figure–ground confusion, and sudden loss of track when attention shifts.

Vision research demonstrates that contrast, motion, depth cues, and attentional allocation strongly influence object persistence and detectability (Marr, 1982; Gregory, 1997). In cluttered natural environments, these factors routinely produce perceptual disappearance without any physical vanishing.

Within Holstonia, such reports are classified as **visual ambiguity events**. They are evaluated in terms of perceptual conditions, not assumed mechanisms.

---

5. Speculative Biological Mechanisms: Plausibility Without Assertion

Some observers have proposed speculative biological explanations for cloaking-like perceptions, such as unusual hair morphology producing subsurface scattering and reduced edge contrast. Subsurface scattering is a well-documented optical property of biological tissues and contributes to the visual appearance of skin, fur, and feathers across taxa.

While no empirical evidence supports such a mechanism in an unclassified primate, the hypothesis does not violate physical law and remains biologically conceivable. Following Bunge's (1983) distinction between speculative realism and pseudoscientific assertion, Holstonia treats such hypotheses as admissible **only when framed as conjecture**, not as established traits.

Speculation is methodologically acceptable; unbounded assertion is not.

---

6. Metaphysical Attributions and Demarcation

Claims involving portals, interdimensional travel, or non-physical transitions differ categorically from biological speculation. They invoke causal mechanisms that bypass continuity, detection, and constraint, rendering them non-operational within observational field research.

Philosophy of science has long addressed the need for demarcation between empirically tractable explanations and those that cannot be evaluated through observation or testable inference (Popper, 1959; Lakatos, 1970). Holstonia does not assess the metaphysical truth of such claims; it classifies them as outside the evidentiary domain of the research program.

This boundary is methodological, not ideological.

---

7. Paranormal Attribution as Cultural and Psychological Data

Although metaphysical explanations are not treated as properties of the observed phenomenon, they remain analytically meaningful as cultural and psychological data.

Their distribution and thematic structure reflect explanatory preferences, tolerance for ambiguity, and narrative availability within specific communities.

Research on belief formation and pattern perception demonstrates that humans readily detect agency and structure under uncertainty, particularly when culturally reinforced narratives are available (Nickerson, 1998; Shermer, 2011). Paranormal attributions therefore inform analysis of report construction rather than species behavior.

---

8. Why Boundary-Setting Is Not Dismissal

Explicit demarcation is sometimes misinterpreted as dismissal. However, methodological boundary-setting is foundational to scientific inquiry. Lakatos (1970) emphasized that research programs are defined as much by what they exclude as by what they pursue.

Holstonia applies symmetrical constraint: biological speculation is permitted but bounded; metaphysical explanations are documented but not operationalized. This preserves analytical coherence without impugning witness sincerity.

---

9. Implications for Documentation and Analysis

Reports containing paranormal attributions should be preserved in full, but parsed analytically. Recommended practices include:

- separating perceptual description from explanatory interpretation,
- noting terminology sources where possible,
- documenting whether attributions were immediate or retrospective,
- avoiding aggregation of metaphysical claims as biological traits.

These practices protect both data integrity and interpretive discipline.

---

10. Integration with the Holstonia Framework

This paper completes a triad of methodological constraints:

- non-encounters constrain inference from absence,
- narrative contamination constrains inference from presence,
- paranormal attribution constrains inference from explanation.

Together, these constraints define the operational envelope within which anomalous reports can be evaluated without escalation or collapse.

This boundary analysis follows earlier treatments of non-encounter data and narrative contamination, completing a set of constraints that address absence, construction, and explanation within anomalous encounter reports.

---

11. Conclusion: Naming the Boundary Preserves the Inquiry

Scientific inquiry does not fail because extraordinary explanations are proposed; it fails when boundaries are left implicit. By distinguishing perceptual phenomena, biologically speculative mechanisms, and metaphysical attributions, Holstonia preserves analytical clarity while respecting witness experience. Naming the boundary is not an act of dismissal, but of stewardship. Without such boundaries, ambiguity overwhelms analysis; with them, it becomes productive.

References

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
Bunge, M. (1983). *Treatise on basic philosophy, Vol. 6: Epistemology and methodology*. Reidel.
Gopnik, A., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2007). Bayesian networks, Bayesian learning and cognitive development. *Developmental Science, 10*, 281–287.
Gregory, R. L. (1997). Knowledge in perception and illusion. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 352*, 1121–1127.
Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*. Cambridge University Press.
Marr, D. (1982). *Vision*. W. H. Freeman.
Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 175–220.
Popper, K. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery*. Hutchinson.
Shermer, M. (2011). *The believing brain*. Times Books.