

What Are UFOs

A Bayesian Assessment

Rodney Malpert

RodMalpert.com

Centaur Research Series

Circulation Edition

October 16, 2026

Abstract

This essay asks what, if anything, lies behind the modern record of unidentified anomalous phenomena. It begins with the evidence rather than a favored explanation: the 2004 Nimitz encounter, recurrent East Coast military observations, the 1976 Tehran interception, the Phoenix Lights, nuclear and maritime reports, insider claims, the 2024–2025 Northeast wave, military-base incursions, and the September 2026 PURSUE release. It then compares six explanatory families. Using an explicit background-only prior of 80 percent conventional and 20 percent nonhuman, the paper assigns the public record an illustrative cumulative Bayes factor of about 1.9 for some nonhuman component. The resulting working posterior is 68 percent entirely conventional and 32 percent containing at least some nonhuman contribution. These are disciplined personal credences, not measured frequencies. The October 2026 quantitative analysis of PR-135 illustrates why provisional anomalies should be updated in both directions: official provenance remains valuable, while reproducible evidence of bird-like wingbeats substantially weakens the extraordinary interpretation of that video.

Working conclusion

Most reports are ordinary. The strongest public cases nevertheless leave a residual that merits disciplined investigation rather than either belief or dismissal.

1 Method and Scope

This paper evaluates the public UAP record as a mixed body of evidence. The category includes ordinary aircraft, balloons, drones, astronomical objects, sensor effects, classified systems, hoaxes, and reports too incomplete to resolve. It may also include a smaller class that is not explained by those causes. The task is not to force every case into one story, but to ask how much evidence remains after the cases are separated and their sources are weighted.

The analysis is Bayesian in structure and deliberately modest in its use of numbers. A hypothesis begins with a prior plausibility; evidence then raises or lowers that plausibility according to how expected the evidence would be if the hypothesis were true. Testimony, photographs, radar tracks, and official statements do not receive equal weight. Independent, contemporaneous, calibrated, and inspectable records count more than later recollection, anonymous sourcing, or a label such as unresolved.

The paper also separates possibility from probability. Modern physics and philosophy make several hidden-world architectures conceivable, but conceptual coherence is not evidence that one of them produces UAP. The percentages near the end expose the judgment being made so that readers can disagree with it and revise it when better data arrive; they are not outputs of a validated statistical model.

Readers chiefly interested in the evidence can focus on Sections 2, 3, 18, and 21. Sections 4 through 17 test whether shadow biospheres, local probes, extra dimensions, holography, simulation, or consciousness-first theories supply more than an imaginative vocabulary.

2 What the UAP Record Actually Contains

The UAP question is no longer intellectually represented by a lone motorist reporting a light on a highway. The public record now includes trained military aviators, shipboard radar, aircraft radar, infrared targeting systems, visual observation, contemporaneous operational disruption, formal intelligence assessments, congressional testimony, and a large classified archive. That does not establish nonhuman intelligence. It does change the evidentiary starting point.

The 2004 Nimitz encounter

The strongest publicly described case is the November 2004 encounter involving the USS Nimitz carrier group. According to Commander David Fravor's sworn congressional testimony, the USS Princeton had detected unusual objects for approximately two weeks on its Aegis system, sometimes descending rapidly from above 80,000 feet toward 20,000 feet and then remaining aloft for hours. When Fravor's flight was diverted to investigate, four aviators visually observed a small white Tic Tac-shaped object maneuvering above an area of disturbed water. It had no visible wings, rotors, rotor wash, exhaust, or conventional control surfaces.

Fravor descended toward the object. It oriented toward his aircraft, climbed, and then accelerated out of sight. The Princeton subsequently reported that it had reappeared at the flight's prearranged combat air-patrol point roughly sixty miles away. A later aircrew recorded the well-known infrared video; Fravor also reported radar jamming and the absence of a conventional infrared exhaust plume. The Department of Defense has authenticated the Navy video, though the public video does not by itself display the most extraordinary acceleration described by the witnesses.

Nimitz is not dispositive. The original radar files have not been made available for independent analysis, the most dramatic kinematic claims depend on testimony and classified or missing data, and later recollection can introduce error. But the event cannot responsibly be assimilated to an isolated misidentification. The conjunction of multiple trained observers, shipboard tracking, operational tasking, close visual observation, and subsequent infrared recording gives it substantial weight against a hypothesis under which every important case is ordinary.

The recurrent East Coast encounters

Former Navy pilot Ryan Graves testified that after his squadron received upgraded radar systems in 2014, pilots operating near Virginia Beach began detecting unknown objects repeatedly. Initially treated as software artifacts, some tracks were corroborated through infrared systems, establishing that at least some detections corresponded to physical phenomena. Graves described the encounters as sufficiently frequent to enter daily aircrew briefings. In a particularly concerning report from two other pilots, a dark cube within a translucent sphere appeared nearly stationary near a training-area entry point, forcing evasive action.

Radar upgrades create an alternative explanation as well as corroboration: a more sensitive system detects balloons, drones, clutter, electronic warfare, and objects previously filtered out. Military operating areas also generate collection bias because they contain unusually dense sensors and attentive observers. Yet those facts do not erase the pattern. They explain why reports cluster there; they do not automatically explain the reported persistence, lack of visible propulsion, unusual station-keeping, near misses, and correlation across radar, infrared, and occasional visual observation.

The 1976 Tehran interception

In the early hours of September 19, 1976, civilians and the Mehrabad airport control tower reported a bright multicolored object over Tehran. Two Imperial Iranian Air Force F-4 interceptors were sent to investigate. A contemporaneous U.S. defense-attache report, forwarded through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, records visual observations, a radar return on the second aircraft, and communications or instrument failures that reportedly cleared when the aircraft withdrew. The second crew also reported a smaller light approaching the fighter while its weapons controls failed, followed by another bright object descending toward the ground.

The case is important because the documentation was created at the time and because the witnesses included military aircrew and an air-traffic controller. It is still not a complete sensor package. The public record contains no raw radar tape, cockpit recording, gun-camera film, full maintenance history, or independently testable trace evidence. The official report largely relays Iranian accounts rather than supplying underlying data. Bright astronomical objects, autokinesis, pursuit geometry, equipment faults, and meteors may explain parts of the sequence; a conventional aircraft emergency beacon later found near the reported descent area does not establish a landed craft. None of those points cleanly reconstructs every reported feature.

Tehran therefore deserves more weight than a lone light in the sky but less than its reputation sometimes implies. It moderately supports the existence of a genuinely unresolved military encounter. It weakly supports a nonhuman explanation because the most discriminating evidence is unavailable and several ordinary mechanisms could have combined during a tense nighttime interception.

The 2026 Tehran anniversary video

Fifty years later, short clips of multicolored lights said to be over Tehran circulated online. Some posts dated them September 19 and treated the timing as an exact anniversary; news reports published on September 21 described the footage as having been recorded on Sunday, September 20. No verified original metadata, location geometry, range, altitude, speed, or scale has been made public, and no official source has identified the object. The visible lighting is compatible with an LED-equipped kite, drone, display device, or manipulated context.

The anniversary claim does not strengthen the 1976 case. If the timing was deliberate, it favors human staging because people know anniversaries and select them. Without provenance or calibrated observations, the 2026 footage receives negligible evidentiary weight.

The Phoenix Lights

The Phoenix Lights are usually remembered as one enormous V-shaped object over Arizona on March 13, 1997. The record is clearer when divided into two events. Around 8:00 to 8:30 p.m., witnesses along a long north-to-south corridor reported lights moving in a V or wedge. Some perceived separate lights; others perceived a single vast, silent body blocking the stars. Around 10:00 p.m., a separate row of lights appeared southwest of Phoenix and produced the best-known videos.

The later event has a strong conventional explanation. Maryland Air National Guard A-10 aircraft dropped long-burning illumination flares during training over the Barry M. Goldwater Range. The lights' slow descent, spacing, timing, and sequential disappearance behind the Sierra Estrella ridge fit that account. The famous video is therefore evidence for how distant flares can look extraordinary, not strong evidence for an exotic craft.

The earlier moving formation is less settled but also less instrumented. Amateur astronomer Mitch Stanley reported viewing the lights through a telescope and seeing five aircraft. A formation of military or civilian planes fits the moving V, the individual lights reported by many witnesses, and the silence expected from distant aircraft. Former Arizona governor Fife Symington later said he had seen a large delta-shaped craft, but that recollection became public years later and lacks contemporaneous instrument data. Perceptual completion can turn separated lights into the outline of one dark object, especially at night when range and scale are uncertain.

The proper verdict is not that Phoenix was fully explained or wholly mysterious. The filmed 10:00 p.m. display is very well explained by flares. The earlier moving formation remains imperfectly documented: conventional aircraft are the leading explanation, but witness reports of an apparently continuous, immense, silent structure are not fully reconciled by the surviving public evidence. No calibrated public measurement establishes extraordinary speed, acceleration, or structure. Phoenix therefore contributes little to the numerical posterior while remaining methodologically central: at least two events fused into one cultural memory, and the strongest imagery belongs to the event with the strongest conventional explanation.

The intelligence community's minimum admission

The 2021 Office of the Director of National Intelligence assessment reviewed 144 reports, primarily from military aviators. Eighty involved multiple sensors, including radar, infrared, electro-optical systems, weapon seekers, and visual observation. The report judged that most probably represented physical objects. Eighteen incidents, described in twenty-one reports, included unusual movement or flight characteristics; eleven involved reported near misses.

The assessment emphasized inadequate data and did not attribute the events to nonhuman technology. But its admissions are important precisely because they are the minimum conclusions the institutions were prepared to state publicly.

Later AARO reports show why raw unresolved counts must not be romanticized. Hundreds of cases have been resolved as balloons, birds, aircraft, drones, satellites, rocket launches, and satellite flares. Improved geometric reconstruction has explained apparently extraordinary motion in several famous videos. The 2013 Aguadilla, Puerto Rico, footage, often presented as an object splitting and entering the ocean, was assessed in 2025 as two objects traveling near wind speed without entering the water, probably sky lanterns. The GoFast video's apparent speed is substantially produced by geometry and parallax. These resolutions are genuine evidence for ordinary explanations.

But resolution of many cases does not entail resolution of all. AARO's fiscal-year 2025 report, released in July 2026, covered 319 reports received during the reporting period. It resolved 114 and left 205 unresolved, principally because the available information was insufficient for attribution. The report also identified a much smaller subset for additional technical attention. Unresolved is not a synonym for anomalous performance, but neither is it an identification. The correct inference is heterogeneous: the category contains much clutter, much inadequate information, probable human technology, and a small residue whose nature remains genuinely open.

Transmedium and submarine reports

The relevant term for apparent movement across air, water, or space is transmedium; multimodal refers instead to observation through different sensor modes. Public claims of demonstrated transmedium performance are weaker than popular summaries suggest. The USS Omaha footage is authentic Navy imagery, but authentication establishes who recorded it, not that the object continued underwater without disturbance. The short infrared segment is visually ambiguous. Aguadilla, the most famous apparent air-to-water transition, now has a detailed conventional reconstruction. Reports from submarine personnel and former naval officials remain potentially important, but the public lacks the sonar tracks, calibrated range data, and contemporaneous documentation required to assess them independently.

Nuclear facilities

Reports connecting UAP with nuclear weapons and facilities are too persistent to dismiss casually. Former missile personnel have described luminous objects near launch complexes and apparent interference with missile systems; comparable claims have arisen around weapons laboratories, storage sites, nuclear-powered vessels, and Soviet facilities. If a nonhuman intelligence were monitoring humanity, nuclear weapons would be an unsurprising focus.

The evidentiary difficulty is causation. Missile failures are documented; unusual-object reports are sometimes documented or later recalled; the temporal and causal link between them is much less secure. Nuclear locations also receive exceptional surveillance, making

unidentified drones and incursions more likely to be detected there. AARO reported fifty unmanned-aircraft incidents near American nuclear infrastructure during its fiscal-year 2025 period, none classified as UAP. That does not dispose of the historical cases, but it demonstrates why 'near a nuclear site' cannot itself establish nonhuman interest. The nuclear pattern is a moderate cumulative update, not a smoking gun.

Congressional testimony, senior officials, and secrecy

Congressional testimony matters, but different witnesses contribute different evidence. Fravor offers firsthand visual testimony embedded in a military operation. Graves offers firsthand experience with recurrent radar and infrared detections, while some close visual details come from other pilots. David Grusch's crash-retrieval allegations were based principally on information provided to him by other officials; his position, clearances, formal whistleblower process, and willingness to testify under oath raise the cost of deliberate fabrication, but they do not eliminate sincere error, circular reporting, compartmentalized misunderstanding, or deception by sources.

Senior policymakers with access to classified briefings, including Marco Rubio while serving on the Senate Intelligence Committee, have publicly insisted that objects are operating near military installations, are not identified as American systems, and require serious investigation. Such statements strongly support the proposition that the national-security problem is real. Without more specific disclosure, they only weakly distinguish extraterrestrial technology from foreign surveillance, classified programs, drones, electronic warfare, and unresolved clutter.

Government conclusions must therefore be weighted asymmetrically. A blanket statement that investigators found no verifiable extraterrestrial evidence is weak evidence: national security, protection of sensor capabilities, bureaucratic embarrassment, and institutional self-preservation could produce similar language under several hypotheses. An official admission of unresolved multiple-sensor incidents is stronger because it runs against the incentive to minimize the issue. A case-specific analysis exposing geometry, timing, wind, satellite position, or sensor behavior is stronger still because outsiders can challenge its reasoning. Institutional authority should be discounted; technically inspectable work should not be discarded.

Secrecy explains why decisive evidence might remain unavailable, but it cannot become an all-purpose solvent. If every missing datum is interpreted as proof that the datum must be extraordinary, the hypothesis becomes unfalsifiable. The disciplined position is narrower: classification and stigma substantially weaken the negative inference from the absence of public evidence, while leaving us unable to claim that the hidden evidence proves nonhuman intelligence.

What congressional behavior shows

The modern congressional record is more probative of hidden records and an oversight problem than of a settled nonhuman conclusion. In their December 13, 2023 Senate colloquy,

Charles Schumer and Mike Rounds said that the government had gathered substantial UAP information and that multiple credible sources alleged that material had been withheld from Congress. Their proposed independent review process expressly contemplated recovered material and biological evidence as categories to be searched and reviewed. That statutory language shows the seriousness of the allegation and the breadth of the proposed search; it is not itself proof that such material exists.

Kirsten Gillibrand's November 19, 2024 AARO hearing emphasized stigma, data quality, and the national-security significance of the Langley incursions; her May 8, 2026 statement welcomed further releases while saying much more work remained. House hearings on April 29 and September 9, 2025 likewise treated unauthorized drone activity, transparency, and whistleblower protection as genuine oversight issues. Marco Rubio's public statements support the narrower conclusion that serious, cleared people made extraordinary reports and that objects near sensitive sites remained unidentified. Barack Obama's 2021 observation that some recorded objects lacked an agreed explanation supported inquiry, while his February 2026 clarification—that he had seen no evidence of extraterrestrial contact while president—cuts against treating his earlier shorthand as disclosure. Harry Reid's long advocacy establishes institutional concern, not a publicly demonstrated answer.

Cautious disclosure and the PURSUE process

A staged or cautious-disclosure interpretation deserves consideration because official language, congressional pressure, normalized hearings, and rolling video releases can acclimate the public to uncertainty. But the same pattern is expected under ordinary politics: transparency branding, attention incentives, bureaucratic compliance, protection of sensor capabilities, and an effort to legitimize reporting without endorsing an exotic explanation. The PURSUE process also has a documented proximate history: a widely discussed Obama remark, a presidential disclosure directive, and a rolling release program.

Accordingly, this paper assigns only limited independent evidentiary weight to the disclosure narrative. As a description of one possible institutional motive, deliberate preparation for eventual confirmation is plausible but presently minor—roughly a 10 to 20 percent possibility within the mix of motives, not a 10 to 20 percent probability that UAP are nonhuman. A theory that treats release, delay, denial, and missing data alike as confirmation is too flexible to carry a large likelihood ratio.

Ross Coulthart valuable reporting, limited evidentiary transfer

Ross Coulthart deserves treatment because his reporting has become one of the principal public conduits for the modern UAP story. His 2021 book *In Plain Sight* assembled military cases, historical material, government documents, and interviews into a cumulative argument that the subject could not responsibly be dismissed. His June 2023 interview with David Grusch then brought the crash-retrieval allegations to a mass audience before Grusch's congressional testimony. Coulthart's strongest contribution is therefore journalistic discovery and synthesis: he has located credentialed witnesses, made institutional claims

legible to the public, and forced allegations that once circulated only inside the UFO subculture into settings where they can be challenged.

The evidentiary limitation is equally important. Much of Coulthart's most consequential material rests on confidential sources or on witnesses whose underlying documents and sensor data are unavailable to outsiders. Multiple sincere insiders can also share a common source, repeat a compartmentalized misunderstanding, or reinforce one another without creating independent evidence. A 2023 NewsNation correction concerning the supposed leak of David Grusch's personal records is a useful warning about the difficulty of source validation in this domain. Coulthart therefore modestly increases confidence that serious people inside government believe extraordinary claims and that some relevant information remains nonpublic; his reporting, by itself, contributes much less to the likelihood that the claims are actually nonhuman in origin.

Luis Elizondo and Imminent

Luis Elizondo is evidentially different from a journalist because he is a former Defense Department counterintelligence official who worked on UAP-related matters associated with the program commonly called AATIP. His 2024 memoir *Imminent* presents the strongest insider version of the modern case: persistent military encounters, institutional resistance, alleged physiological effects, and claims pointing toward recovered materials or technology. His government background, access, and willingness to attach his name to these allegations make deliberate invention more costly than anonymous internet testimony and strengthen the proposition that UAP were treated seriously inside parts of the national-security establishment.

But the same firewall applies. Security review for publication establishes that material may be released; it does not certify that the claims are true. The public record also contains a genuine institutional dispute about the exact status and scope of AAWSAP/AATIP and about the reverse-engineering narrative. AARO's 2024 historical review reported no empirical evidence that the government or contractors had reverse-engineered extraterrestrial technology and argued that some modern claims circulate within a relatively small network of overlapping sources. That report is not dispositive - AARO is itself an interested government institution and much relevant evidence remains classified - but it is counterevidence that must be priced. Elizondo therefore adds appreciable weight to 'the government encountered and investigated a real unresolved problem' and substantially less to 'the government possesses nonhuman craft.'

The 2024-2025 Northeast drone wave and the military-base residue

The New Jersey and broader Northeast 'drone' wave is especially important because it was unusually visible to the public and illustrates why the UAP category must be modeled as a mixture rather than a single phenomenon. By mid-December 2024 the FBI had received more than 5,000 tips, generating roughly 100 investigative leads. A joint FBI-DHS-FAA-DoD assessment concluded that the mass of civilian reports included lawful commercial, hobbyist, and law-enforcement drones, manned aircraft, helicopters, and stars misidentified

as drones; the agencies said they had found nothing anomalous in the civilian-airspace wave and no evidence of a foreign nexus. The pattern is consistent with a reporting cascade: credible initial concern, intense media attention, thousands of newly attentive observers watching one of the world's busiest airspaces, and duplication of ordinary objects into an apparent swarm.

That explanation does not erase a smaller and more serious military subset. The Defense Department confirmed drone sightings over Picatinny Arsenal and Naval Weapons Station Earle. In a separate episode, Joint Base Langley-Eustis experienced repeated incursions by unmanned systems of unknown origin in December 2023; Defense officials later acknowledged that the department then had limited ability to detect, track, characterize, disrupt, or defeat them. From November 20, 2024, U.S. Air Forces in Europe also confirmed repeated small-UAS sightings around RAF Lakenheath, RAF Mildenhall, RAF Feltwell, and later RAF Fairford, with systems varying in number, size, and configuration. These incidents establish a real counter-UAS and attribution problem even if they establish nothing exotic.

The January 2025 White House explanation that many New Jersey flights had been FAA-authorized for research and other purposes, with additional hobbyist and private activity, is relevant but incomplete because no detailed public accounting of operators, routes, dates, or research programs accompanied it. The best synthesis is therefore two-layered. Most of the spectacular civilian wave is well explained by ordinary aircraft, lawful drones, misidentification, and social amplification. A much smaller set of military-base incursions remains operationally unresolved in the public record. Those base cases deserve more weight than the civilian wave, but the publicly described objects generally behaved like drones: lingering, illuminated, comparatively slow, and without demonstrated instantaneous acceleration, hypersonic flight without expected signatures, or confirmed transmedium performance.

A foreign-adversary explanation also carries a serious operational burden. Repeated incursions over sensitive American and allied sites would imply platform access, endurance, coordination, command-and-control, successful evasion of attribution, and a willingness to risk capture or escalation. The key distinction is evidentiary. For the publicly described Northeast and base-incursion subset—slow or lingering objects, ordinary illumination, and no released measurement of extreme acceleration—foreign, domestic, or non-state human operators remain the leading class of explanation. If calibrated sensors were instead to establish the extreme accelerations, transmedium travel, or other far-beyond-public-human capabilities claimed in stronger UAP narratives, Russia or China would cease to be a credible catch-all explanation. The ambiguity lies first in whether extraordinary performance was measured, not in which human state secretly mastered impossible physics.

Bayesian impact

The Northeast episode pushes in opposite directions. The civilian cascade is positive evidence for H1 because it demonstrates how a genuine initial anomaly can generate a much larger population of mundane reports. The repeated military incursions modestly favor the

proposition that a physical unresolved residue exists. On the released record they do not strongly favor H2 through H6 over human UAS, classified programs, or attribution failure. If hidden calibrated data establish genuinely extraordinary kinematics, that comparison changes sharply; no such package is public. The present net effect is therefore small and slightly conventional.

The evidentiary verdict

The September 2026 PURSUE release

On September 18, 2026, AARO released a sixth PURSUE tranche containing official U.S. military imagery and accompanying descriptions. The strongest entries are PR-133, whose mission report described a round infrared object traveling for about five minutes at speeds up to 500 miles per hour, and PR-135, whose report described six grouped spherical objects maneuvering and frequently changing direction at an estimated 480 miles per hour. PR-140 and PR-141 add infrared and electro-optical Middle East observations from 2022 at more modest reported speeds. Official custody and provenance make these records more valuable than unattributed clips.

Their analytical completeness is much weaker than their provenance. The public files do not supply the full range solution, field of view, platform motion, line-of-sight geometry, radar track, uncertainty model, or other metadata needed to convert pixels into reliable object speed and acceleration. A technical analysis by Jacob Haqq-Misra and Ravi Kopparapu makes the central point: angular motion in PURSUE footage generally does not determine physical velocity without distance and geometry. A date inconsistency in PR-133—its title and narrative do not identify the year consistently—also counsels care. AARO's descriptions expressly avoid a final analytical judgment.

A subsequent quantitative analysis materially changes the assessment of PR-135. Haqq-Misra and five coauthors measured every object's brightness frame by frame and found independent oscillations of 7.1–7.9 hertz, within observed bird-wingbeat rates. Synthetic-object controls did not reproduce the flicker, and a parallax model showed how nearby, slow-moving birds could generate the reported ground-projected speed of 480 miles per hour. The authors conclude that a small flock of birds is the best explanation and report similar signatures in four other released military videos. The paper is a preprint submitted to Scientific Reports, and the aircraft's redacted altitude prevents a conclusive range solution. Even so, the convergent, object-specific wingbeat evidence is unusually diagnostic. PR-135 should no longer receive appreciable weight for extraordinary technology; this reverses most of the sixth-tranche increment while leaving the independent Nimitz, Tehran, East Coast, and strategic-site evidence untouched.

The public record does not demonstrate aliens, interdimensional beings, or impossible physics. It does demonstrate a nontrivial domain-awareness problem containing real physical incursions, recurring observations by credible witnesses, and a small class of cases not adequately explained in the public record. That is enough to reject both extremes. 'Every strange report is evidence of aliens' is irrational. So is 'because most reports are

conventional, there is more than a 99 percent probability that the entire residual phenomenon is conventional.' The proper Bayesian question concerns the joint pattern and the best cases, not the average quality of everything placed in the UAP bin.

3 The Competing Hypotheses

The object of explanation is not "UAP" as though it were one natural kind. The label collects balloons, aircraft, drones, satellites, astronomical objects, sensor artifacts, atmospheric effects, hoaxes, classified systems, foreign surveillance, insufficiently documented events, and perhaps a smaller residual of something else. A serious assessment must therefore model a heterogeneous mixture.

Five propositions must remain separate. First, many reports exist, including reports from credible observers. Second, a significant number correspond to physical objects or phenomena rather than hallucinations. Third, a smaller class remains unresolved after serious attention, sometimes despite multiple sensors. Fourth, some of that residue may display capabilities beyond known human technology. Fifth, some UAP may represent nonhuman intelligence. The first three are well supported in progressively narrower form; the fourth is plausible but not publicly demonstrated to scientific standards; the fifth remains unproved.

For the important residual, this paper compares six broad hypotheses. H1 is an entirely conventional ensemble: misidentification, sensor effects, atmospheric phenomena, hoaxes, classified American systems, foreign technology, and permanently underdetermined reports. H2 is extraterrestrial craft or probes, including ancient extraterrestrial probes that have become locally based. H3 is an indigenous cryptoterrestrial intelligence or a terrestrial technological lineage not descended from known human civilization. H4 is interdimensional or bulk-dwelling intelligence. H5 is intervention from a deeper simulation level. H6 is consciousness-first interface events. These are explanatory families rather than claims that every report has one cause.

These are explanatory families, not perfectly disjoint boxes. An extraterrestrial probe can become cryptoterrestrial by remaining here; a higher-dimensional world could also be simulated; a consciousness-first ontology could use an emergent geometry. The categories are separated because they carry different priors, mechanisms, and evidentiary burdens, not because reality must respect the table.

4 The Unity of Known Life and the Shadow Biosphere

Every organism ever characterized on Earth belongs to a single, remarkably unified biochemical family. Bacteria, archaea, fungi, plants, animals, and humans all share DNA and RNA as hereditary molecules, essentially the same genetic code, proteins built from the same core set of amino acids, ATP as the principal energy currency, related cellular machinery, and the same molecular handedness: predominantly left-handed amino acids and right-handed sugars.

This deep commonality strongly suggests that all known life descends from a single common ancestor, or at least from one ancient biochemical system that outcompeted and erased its rivals. But it does not prove that life arose only once. Origin-of-life chemistry may have run to completion multiple times on the early Earth. One lineage produced everything we see; another could conceivably have survived in restricted ecological niches, invisible to us for a simple reason: our detection methods are designed to find life that resembles known life.

A second-genesis organism might use different hereditary molecules, an altered genetic code, unfamiliar amino acids, opposite molecular handedness, radically different membranes, or metabolisms that standard assays do not register. If researchers search for DNA, familiar proteins, or microbes that grow in conventional culture media, radically different organisms could be filed away as minerals, contaminants, or unexplained chemistry. This is the shadow-biosphere hypothesis, advanced in the scientific literature by Paul Davies, Carol Cleland, and others. No shadow biosphere has been demonstrated. But it is a legitimate scientific hypothesis because it involves ordinary matter, ordinary chemistry, and testable predictions; you can design assays for alternative biochemistries, and people have.

5 From Shadow Biosphere to Twinned Biosphere

The stronger version is not a few exotic microbes but a second ecological order occupying the same planet: two overlapping ecologies using different chemical resources, with separate microorganisms and food chains, unable to digest or infect one another, sharing the same soil, oceans, rocks, and atmosphere while interacting only at narrow chemical interfaces. What looks biologically inert to us might be active habitat within the other system, meaning Earth's true biological complexity could be substantially underestimated.

But "twinned biosphere" actually covers several very different hypotheses, and it pays to keep them distinct, because each is hidden for a different reason.

An independent terrestrial genesis would be unfamiliar microbial life, hidden because our tests recognize only standard biochemistry. A mirror biosphere would be life of opposite molecular chirality, hidden by weak biochemical compatibility with our assays and ecosystems. A cryptoterrestrial ecology would be complex organisms in the deep ocean, crust, or atmosphere, hidden geographically. A cryptoterrestrial civilization would be an advanced indigenous intelligence, hidden deliberately or by inaccessible habitat. A higher-dimensional biosphere would be life extending into additional spatial dimensions, hidden because we perceive only three-dimensional intersections. A parallel-world biosphere would be another physical sector or universe adjacent to ours, hidden because the worlds normally do not interact. Finally, a holographic dual description would be our world represented by information on a lower-dimensional boundary; here the "second world" may be an equivalent description of our own rather than another location at all.

The first two are extensions of ordinary biology. The next two require increasingly strained assumptions about concealment. The remaining three require new or incompletely

understood fundamental physics. That gradient, from "needs better assays" to "needs new physics," is the spine of everything that follows.

6 Cryptoterrestrials Ancient Probes and Co Location

Before invoking other dimensions, there is an intermediate possibility: a nonhuman intelligence or technological residue already established within the Earth-Solar System environment. Candidates include an ancient terrestrial lineage, a primarily oceanic intelligence, something deep in the crust, a remnant of a prior technological civilization, an autonomous machine intelligence left behind by one, or extraterrestrial probes that arrived in the remote past and became effectively local.

The model's appeal is obvious. It eliminates repeated interstellar commuting, explains persistent attention to Earth, and accommodates reports extending across historical periods. A monitoring system could be small, distributed, intermittent, largely dormant, and based in places that are difficult to observe continuously: the deep ocean, the outer Solar System, subsurface lunar or Martian environments, asteroids, or stable gravitational regions. A probe network need not resemble a city and need not produce the industrial signature expected of a living civilization.

A hidden indigenous civilization faces a much greater material problem. Complex technology ordinarily requires energy production, waste streams, raw materials, manufacturing, and infrastructure. Concealing a large industrial ecology for centuries against seismic tomography, bathymetric mapping, orbital surveillance, and global commerce is extraordinarily difficult. The concealment problem grows annually as observation improves.

The distinction is decisive. 'A large advanced civilization lives secretly under the ocean' is an extravagant proposition. 'A small number of durable automated probes reached the Solar System long ago and monitor a biosphere selectively' is far less extravagant. It requires extraterrestrial technological intelligence and successful interstellar transport, but not biological occupants, repeated voyages, or a hidden planetary economy. Because machines and technosignatures may persist far longer than the civilizations that created them, the ancient-probe version is the strongest member of the cryptoterrestrial family.

7 Flatland and Higher Dimensional Life

The cleanest intuition pump for genuine interdimensionality remains Edwin Abbott's 1884 novella *Flatland*, later made famous in scientific exposition by Carl Sagan.

Imagine two-dimensional beings confined to a plane, perceiving only length and width. A three-dimensional observer hovering above their world could see inside their closed rooms, watch them without ever appearing in their plane, enter their world without crossing any boundary they recognize, lift an object out of the plane and set it down elsewhere, and appear or disappear without traversing any visible distance. If a sphere passed through

Flatland, its inhabitants would never see the sphere. They would see a point appear from nowhere, grow into an expanding circle, contract back to a point, and vanish.

By strict analogy, if a four-spatial-dimensional object intersected our three-dimensional world, we would perceive only a changing three-dimensional cross-section. It could seem to materialize abruptly, morph its shape, split into separate objects or merge, pass through barriers, vanish without flying away, and move in ways that make no kinematic sense when reconstructed in three dimensions, all while its complete trajectory remained perfectly smooth and continuous in four.

This yields an important distinction in why something might be hidden. A shadow biosphere is hidden because our biological tests are inadequate. A cryptoterrestrial civilization is hidden geographically or deliberately. A higher-dimensional biosphere is hidden because our perceptual and physical access is structurally limited. Only the third is interdimensional in the strong, Flatland sense, and only the third requires physics we do not have. (A fourth mechanism of hiddenness will be added when we reach Hoffman: things unrendered by perception itself.)

8 UAP as Craft Probes or Intersections

The conventional extraterrestrial hypothesis imagines physical craft or probes originating in another stellar system. It need not imply biological pilots or routine point-to-point voyages. A technological civilization could distribute autonomous machines through the Galaxy, after which a small local population might persist for geological periods. The alternative interdimensional, ultraterrestrial, or co-located hypothesis holds that at least some UAP are manifestations of something already 'here,' displaced from us along another spatial dimension, another physical sector, or another level of reality. Jacques Vallee argued versions of this for decades, and J. Allen Hynek entertained it more cautiously, partly because the visiting-spacecraft model seemed to fit the total report history imperfectly: too many apparent visits, too much theatrical strangeness, and too much continuity with pre-modern aerial and luminous phenomena.

If the strongest reported characteristics are physically genuine, both families possess explanatory power. Extraterrestrial probes explain structured objects, surveillance of military activity, interest in nuclear technology, and persistent operations without requiring new fundamental physics. A higher-dimensional model interprets abrupt appearance as the beginning of an intersection with our three-dimensional space; disappearance as the intersection ending; extreme apparent acceleration as the motion of a cross-section; shape change as different portions of one object becoming visible; and apparent transmedium behavior as motion along a path for which air, water, and solid boundaries are not equivalent obstacles.

On the interdimensional picture, 'Where are they based?' may be the wrong question. Their world could be physically adjacent to every point in ours yet inaccessible along our three spatial axes. The visible UAP would relate to the underlying entity as a cursor relates to a

computer user, an avatar to a player, or a fingertip dipped into an aquarium to the person outside the tank: real, causally effective, but radically incomplete.

This elegance must not be confused with confirmation. Extraterrestrial probes require no revision of fundamental physics and therefore begin with the higher prior.

Interdimensionality can explain a wider range of apparent impossibilities, but precisely because it is so flexible, it needs theory-specific predictions before any particular report can strongly confirm it. The empirical question comes first: is there a residual physical phenomenon demanding either explanation?

9 Does Quantum Mechanics Support Interdimensionality

Quantum mechanics makes reality far stranger than classical common sense allows. But "strange" is not a synonym for "another dimension," and the popular literature commits this conflation constantly. Walk through the relevant phenomena one by one.

Superposition

Before measurement, a quantum system is represented as a superposition of possible outcomes, and interference experiments prove this is not mere ignorance about which ordinary state it occupies; the alternatives jointly shape later probabilities. This resembles the dimensional hypothesis only metaphorically: reality contains more structure than any single observation reveals. But standard quantum mechanics houses that structure in an abstract Hilbert space, not in an extra spatial direction. A Hilbert-space dimension is not a direction a craft can fly into. Physicists use "dimension" in at least six distinct senses: spatial dimensions, the time dimension, dimensions of a mathematical state space, compactified dimensions in string theory, decoherent branches in some interpretations, and the higher- and lower-dimensional descriptions of holography. Conflating them is the original sin of this whole genre.

Measurement and "observer dependence." Quantum mechanics assigns a special role to measurement, but an "observer" need not be a conscious mind. A detector, another particle, or any irreversible interaction with the environment suffices. Decoherence explains why macroscopic superpositions become effectively inaccessible once a system entangles with its surroundings. It does not fully resolve why one definite outcome is experienced, but it removes most of the temptation to invoke consciousness. Quantum mechanics does suggest that properties like position and spin lack definite, context-independent classical values before measurement. It does not establish that consciousness creates reality, nor that UAP materialize when humans look at them.

Entanglement and nonlocality

Entangled particles show correlations that no local hidden-variable theory of the kind constrained by Bell's theorem can reproduce, a result confirmed repeatedly in the loophole-closing experiments recognized by the 2022 Nobel Prize. But the fine print matters. Each individual outcome is random; no experimenter can choose an outcome; the correlations

only become visible when results are later compared through ordinary channels. Entanglement therefore cannot transmit controllable information faster than light, and it does not straightforwardly explain anything relocating instantaneously. Could hidden higher-dimensional proximity underlie entanglement, with two points far apart in our space being adjacent in a deeper geometry, like distant points on a folded sheet? Conceivably, and we will return to a serious version of that idea under ER = EPR. But a classical signal sneaking through an extra dimension is precisely the kind of hidden-variable mechanism Bell experiments constrain. Any such theory must reproduce the exact quantum probabilities without enabling forbidden signaling, and none has.

The light-speed limit

Relativity forbids matter, energy, and usable information from moving locally through spacetime faster than light, and quantum mechanics does not repeal this. A higher-dimensional path could in principle create an apparent shortcut, like an ant crossing a folded sheet through the surrounding space. General relativity even admits wormhole geometries, but known traversable-wormhole constructions require exotic negative-energy conditions, and none has ever been observed. An object using such a shortcut would not locally exceed light speed; it would take a shorter path through a larger geometry, and from inside our space it might seem to vanish here and reappear there. This is the strongest conceptual bridge between UAP phenomenology and real physics, and it remains a hypothetical mechanism with zero empirical instances.

Tunneling

Quantum particles cross classically forbidden barriers, but tunneling follows from the wavefunction, involves no excursion into a large hidden dimension, and becomes fantastically improbable for macroscopic objects. It is not a credible mechanism for aircraft-sized objects passing through matter.

Vacuum energy

The quantum vacuum has structure: ground-state fluctuations with measurable consequences like the Casimir effect. This shows that apparent emptiness is physically rich. It does not show that the vacuum hosts an inhabited parallel biosphere or that limitless energy can be extracted from it. Invoking "zero-point energy" without a quantitative mechanism explains nothing.

Many-worlds

The Everett interpretation treats the universal wavefunction as evolving continuously, with decohered branches containing different outcomes. Those branches are not neighboring places a few feet away in a spare direction, and decoherence is precisely the reason macroscopic branches cannot readily communicate or recombine. Many-worlds supplies an image of coexisting realities; it supplies no mechanism for traffic between them. "Parallel quantum branch" and "adjacent spatial dimension" are different propositions.

10 Could Higher Dimensions Explain Quantum Strangeness

Three answers follow, in ascending strength.

The weak answer, conceptual compatibility yes

Both ideas reject the assumption that ordinary three-dimensional macroscopic appearances exhaust reality. Quantum states encode more than any single observation reveals, just as a higher-dimensional object contains more than its cross-section shows.

The moderate answer, possible theoretical unification genuinely open

Serious approaches to quantum gravity suggest that spacetime, connectivity, and perhaps dimensionality itself emerge from patterns of quantum entanglement. If so, nonlocal quantum relations and geometric connections could be two descriptions of one deeper structure. This is not a pop-science analogy; it is an active, mathematically sophisticated research program, discussed below.

The strong answer, extra dimensions explain quantum mechanics no

No established theory shows ordinary quantum mechanics to be the shadow of higher-dimensional classical mechanics in a way that resolves its strangeness and is empirically confirmed. Extra dimensions do not automatically deliver the Born rule, definite measurement outcomes, Bell correlations, contextuality, wave-particle duality, or the persistence of the no-signaling constraint. Any higher-dimensional account must reproduce the entire quantitative structure of quantum theory, not merely make its mysteries sound more intuitive.

11 Why Black Holes Led to Holography

The holographic principle begins with a discovery about black holes. Ordinary intuition suggests that the information a region can hold should grow with its volume. Black-hole thermodynamics instead ties the maximum entropy of a black hole to the area of its horizon. Gerard 't Hooft proposed that this area law might be general, and Leonard Susskind developed it into the holographic principle: all the information needed to describe a gravitational region may be represented on its lower-dimensional boundary.

The word "hologram" is an analogy, and a frequently abused one. It does not mean the universe is a translucent image projected by a machine. It means a lower-dimensional description can contain all the information needed to describe an apparently higher-dimensional world: a statement about representations, not about projectors.

12 Maldacenas Advance AdS/CFT

In 1997 Juan Maldacena gave holography a precise form. In certain theoretical settings, a gravitational (string) theory in a higher-dimensional "bulk" is exactly equivalent to a quantum field theory without gravity living on that bulk's lower-dimensional boundary: a higher-dimensional gravitational theory can be equivalent to a lower-dimensional quantum

field theory without gravity. This is not a loose resemblance; the two sides are conjectured to encode identical physics in different mathematical languages. A black hole in the bulk corresponds to a thermal quantum state on the boundary. Geometric relationships in the bulk correspond to entanglement structures in the boundary theory. The correspondence has accumulated enormous theoretical support: countless nontrivial quantities match on both sides, it has clarified deep black-hole puzzles including the information problem, it provides working tools for strongly coupled quantum systems, and it stitches gravity, geometry, quantum information, and field theory together with startling consistency.

One qualification is mandatory. The best-understood correspondence involves anti-de Sitter spacetime, a negatively curved universe, paired with highly symmetric field theories. Our universe is not anti-de Sitter. Holography is extraordinarily productive and probably reveals something profound about quantum gravity, but it has not been experimentally established as a complete description of our actual cosmos. "Strong theoretical evidence from black-hole thermodynamics and string theory" is accurate; "observational proof that our universe is a hologram" is not.

13 Entanglement May Build Space Itself and ER = EPR

The most important bridge between quantum weirdness and holography is the possibility that spatial geometry emerges from entanglement. In holographic models, highly organized entanglement on the boundary corresponds to a connected bulk spacetime; altering the entanglement alters the geometry; deleting entanglement can make regions of bulk space literally pull apart. Space, on this view, is woven from patterns of quantum information.

This inverts the ordinary picture. We usually imagine particles sitting in a pre-existing space and then becoming entangled. The deeper description may be that entanglement structure produces space and its notion of distance. If so, quantum nonlocality looks mysterious only because we treat space as fundamental when it is emergent: two systems far apart in emergent space can remain adjacent in the underlying informational structure. This still forbids controllable faster-than-light signaling, but it explains why quantum correlations are not governed by spatial separation the way classical influences are.

Maldacena and Susskind pushed this to a striking conjecture, ER = EPR: entangled black holes can be understood as connected by a nontraversable Einstein-Rosen bridge (a wormhole), and related geometric connections may underlie entanglement generally. This does not mean every entangled photon pair hides a traversable tunnel; the relevant wormholes are nontraversable and permit no signaling. But it makes the kinship between nonlocality and hidden geometry rigorous rather than poetic. What appears as nonlocal entanglement in one description may appear as geometric connection in another. That is remarkably close in spirit to Flatland's lesson: apparent separation and apparent discontinuity may be artifacts of perceiving an incomplete geometry.

14 Interdimensional Biospheres and Holography

Such a biosphere could be compatible with holography, but holography does not predict one. Three models must be kept apart.

Model A a literal extra spatial dimension

Our three-dimensional world might be a brane embedded in a higher-dimensional bulk, as in string-inspired braneworld scenarios, with other matter occupying a neighboring brane or region. If the sectors coupled weakly but occasionally, UAP could be read as objects crossing between branes, higher-dimensional objects intersecting ours, or technology manipulating bulk geometry. This is the closest fit to the twinned-biosphere idea. It is speculative and is in no way entailed by holography.

Model B our world as an emergent bulk

If our three-dimensional space emerges from quantum information encoded in a lower-dimensional system, a sufficiently advanced intelligence might not travel through emergent space at all. It might manipulate the underlying informational degrees of freedom from which position, distance, and matter are generated. To us this could look like instantaneous relocation, disappearance, altered inertia, passage through barriers, shape transformation, and nonlocal coordination. The analogy is not "a craft flew through the fourth dimension" but "an actor edited the code from which spatial position is rendered." Intellectually coherent as speculation; nothing in established holographic theory shows such manipulation is possible, much less that anything does it.

Model C boundary and bulk as dual descriptions

The lower-dimensional boundary and the higher-dimensional bulk may not be two worlds at all, but two complete descriptions of one reality. That is the actual content of holographic duality. A bulk object and its boundary representation are one physical entity written in two mathematical languages. So it is a mistake to imagine beings living "on the holographic screen" and projecting craft into our world; the screen may not be a place.

This also dissolves an apparent tension. Flatland explains our world by adding a dimension; holography says a higher-dimensional world can be completely described by fewer. These are compatible because holography's deepest lesson is that dimensionality may not be fundamental. The same reality can carry a lower-dimensional quantum description and a higher-dimensional geometric one, with the bulk clearer for gravity and experience and the boundary more fundamental for information. Asking "which dimension is the real one?" may be like asking whether an electron is really a wave or a particle. A hypothetical twinned realm, then, need not sit "above" us in a geometric direction. It could be another sector of the same quantum state, a differently connected region of the entanglement network, a neighboring brane, or a dual representation of things we perceive geometrically.

15 Generated Minds and Participatory Worlds

Holography says spacetime may be derived from quantum information. The simulation hypothesis makes a structurally parallel claim with a different substrate: spacetime may be generated by processes in a deeper reality. One distinction matters here because it separates two very different simulation architectures.

S2 generated inhabitants

In the familiar computational model, the simulated person is produced by the simulation itself. Bostrom's observer-counting argument operates mainly here and depends on a strong form of computational functionalism: the right computation must be sufficient for consciousness.

S1 participatory simulation

A pre-existing conscious subject instead inhabits a simulated body through a full-immersion interface. The simulated brain is the mandatory in-world control and representation system, but not necessarily the ultimate generator of the subject. Rejecting substrate-independent consciousness would weaken S2 while leaving S1 conceptually available.

The distinction does not make UAP more probable by itself. Its relevance is architectural. In a participatory simulation, an external intervention need not appear as an unexplained force pushing simulated matter. The simulator can translate an outside intention or command into an ordinary in-world precursor, after which every event follows local law: external command -> simulator/interface -> ordinary in-world state -> in-world effect. An internal physicist could reconstruct a causally complete sequence and still miss the external source, just as a scientist inside a game could correctly model an avatar's acceleration while failing to infer the player.

Applied to UAP, a rendered object could therefore possess a complete local sensor history without missing momentum, broken conservation, or an obvious "glitch." That result improves the coherence of H5, but it also reduces the evidentiary value of generic lawfulness: ordinary craft, sensor effects, extraterrestrial probes, and deeper-level interventions can all leave lawful local records. A mechanism that can reproduce almost any observation is harder to refute and correspondingly less confirmed by ambiguous strangeness.

Quantum mechanics adds little direct support. Measurement is not consciousness-triggered rendering; environmental interaction produces decoherence without a mind. Classical simulation of entanglement scales badly, while a base civilization using quantum computation merely pushes quantum physics down one level. Even if our world were simulated, UAP-as-intervention still requires operators who intervene, permit the intervention to be noticed, and choose a conspicuous but ambiguous presentation. Participatory simulation raises the coherence of the architecture; it supplies no favorable UAP likelihood without theory-specific predictions.

16 Consciousness First Interfaces and Objective Idealism

Donald Hoffman's program makes two claims of very different strength, and the broader family of objective idealism adds a third. Evaluating them fairly requires separating a defensible theory of perception from a speculative theory of fundamental reality and then separating both from what UAP evidence actually supports.

Interface perception

Evolution tunes perception to fitness rather than metaphysical transparency. Hoffman's formal work with Chetan Prakash dramatizes this point through the desktop metaphor: spacetime objects may function like icons that guide successful action while hiding implementation details. The strongest defensible conclusion is not that perception bears no relation to reality, but that it is a compressed, species-relative control model. This adds perception-hidden to assay-hidden, geography-hidden, and structure-hidden.

The consequence cuts both ways. A lossy interface makes it coherent that recurrent structures are ordinarily omitted or rendered only under unusual conditions. But it also weakens high-strangeness testimony, because perceptual construction, memory, expectation, and cultural templates are alternative sources of the reported strangeness. A theory of perceptual compression is at least as naturally a theory of UAP misperception as a theory of hidden agents.

Conscious realism

Hoffman's stronger claim is that spacetime and physical objects, including brains, are representations of networks of conscious agents. This is not entailed by the physicists' claim that spacetime may be emergent. Emergence from quantum information remains different from emergence from consciousness. Hoffman's conscious-agent program is mathematically ambitious but has not yet recovered established physics or produced a confirmed novel prediction that selects it over physical or informational competitors.

Objective idealism more broadly

Consciousness-first ontology need not take Hoffman's specific form. Dissociative analytic idealism, cosmopsychism, and other forms of objective idealism treat the experienced physical world as derivative from a deeper conscious order. Related philosophical arguments give these families some standing as accounts of mind and physical reality. That standing is background ontology, not UAP evidence. A probability about consciousness or survival answers a different question and rests on different likelihoods, so it cannot be imported into this analysis.

The same causal architecture nevertheless reappears. If physical events are interface representations of deeper conscious dynamics, an apparent object need not enter spacetime from elsewhere. A deeper interaction could be rendered as a locally lawful sequence of radar returns, visual appearances, or material motion. This narrows the classical interaction objection in the same way participatory simulation does: the physical event is the interface-level expression of the deeper process, not a second substance being shoved from outside.

Relation to UAP

Under a consciousness-first picture, UAP might be ordinary misperceptions, interface failures, icons for otherwise hidden agent interactions, or stable renderings produced by the deeper order. The conceptual fit is genuine but radically underdetermined. Without a theory specifying when such events occur, which sensors should agree, how observers should differ, and what could falsify the account, objective idealism does not predict the UAP record. It improves the ontology menu, not the evidential bridge.

17 Four Architectures One Epistemic Problem

The analysis now contains four broad architectures beneath or beyond experienced spacetime: holographic or emergent physics; literal higher-dimensional structure; computation in a deeper reality; and consciousness-first ontology. They offer different answers to what is fundamental, but each can make an 'already here' phenomenon conceptually intelligible. None, by that fact alone, makes UAP more likely.

They are not epistemic peers. Holography is a quantitative physics program with major internal confirmation in specific theoretical settings. Extra macroscopic dimensions are live in some physical models but unconfirmed. Simulation is a philosophical and anthropic family whose force varies sharply between S2 and S1. Objective idealism is a serious metaphysical family, while Hoffman's specific conscious realism remains a promissory research program. A common diagram does not confer a common evidential status.

They may also be observationally underdetermined from inside the world. The same lawful event could be described as ordinary emergent physics, a simulator's state transition, or an interface representation of deeper conscious dynamics. The simulation/Descartes architecture makes this especially clear: local causal closure does not logically prove that the local physical description is ultimate. But a possibility that survives causal closure has merely escaped refutation; it has not acquired confirmation.

The governing rule is therefore unchanged but now more exact: multiplying substrates multiplies conceivability, not probability. Arguments for participatory simulation or objective idealism may raise their standing as possible world architectures. They do not give either architecture a UAP likelihood. The empirical question remains whether the observed record is more expected under one specified mechanism than under conventional error, human technology, extraterrestrial probes, or other competitors.

18 The Bayesian Analysis: An Explicit Prior and Sequential Update

Everything to this point establishes both conceivability and a disputed body of evidence. Bayes' theorem says that the posterior probability of a hypothesis is proportional to its prior probability multiplied by the likelihood of the evidence under that hypothesis. The arithmetic is simple. The hard questions are what proposition receives the prior, what evidence is held out for updating, and which reports are sufficiently independent to multiply rather than merely repeat one another.

The hypothesis space

For the residue of important cases, take six broad hypotheses. H1 is an entirely conventional ensemble. H2 is extraterrestrial craft or probes, including ancient probes that have become locally based. H3 is indigenous cryptoterrestrial intelligence. H4 is interdimensional intelligence. H5 is deeper-level simulator intervention. H6 is consciousness-first interface events. Keeping all extraterrestrial artifacts in H2 lets the same astronomy-based category appear in both prior and posterior; H3 bears the separate concealment burden of an advanced lineage arising or persisting on Earth.

Why metaphysical probabilities do not transfer automatically

A probability assigned to simulation, idealism, or survival in another inquiry cannot simply be copied into this one. Bayesian inference is question-specific. Structural arguments may revise background priors: the participatory model remains possible even if computation alone cannot create consciousness; external action can coexist with a locally complete causal sequence; and objective idealism includes more than one interface architecture. None of that supplies a new UAP observation or a direct likelihood ratio for the UAP record.

This distinction prevents a subtle form of double counting. If unexplained UAP helped motivate simulation or idealism, and the resulting ontology probability were then used as independent evidence that UAP are simulator or interface events, the same anomaly would travel around the model twice. The final analysis therefore permits only a modest reallocation within the exotic tail unless theory-specific predictions or new data discriminate among the mechanisms.

The first correction a case rate is not an ensemble probability

Suppose ninety-five or even ninety-nine percent of individual reports are mundane. It does not follow that there is a ninety-five or ninety-nine percent probability that every important UAP class is mundane. If one thousand reports contain ten genuinely independent, unusually well-documented events, the inferential problem concerns those ten. The high base rate of balloons explains why a randomly selected report is probably a balloon; it does not determine the probability that Nimitz, recurrent East Coast encounters, and every other high-quality residual case are balloons or errors.

This distinction is the central correction to the skeptical argument. 'Most reports are ordinary' is strongly supported. 'The phenomenon is entirely ordinary' is a compound

proposition whose probability must be assessed against the strongest evidence and the cumulative pattern.

The astronomical and artifact prior

A prior on extraterrestrial visitation should not begin with UAP testimony, but neither should it begin with the social fact that no extraterrestrial presence has been officially recognized. The appropriate background includes the enormous number of planets, the abundance of potentially temperate rocky worlds, the age of the Galaxy, the early appearance of life on Earth, the existence of at least one technological species, and the possibility that machines or technosignatures persist far longer than their biological creators.

The Drake equation is not a measurement because its biological, technological, and longevity terms remain poorly constrained. But modern exoplanet science has shifted the astronomical terms decisively. NASA's conservative synthesis of Kepler results estimated at least hundreds of millions of rocky, potentially habitable-zone worlds around Sun-like stars in the Milky Way. The probability of intelligence on any one world could be very small while the probability of at least one earlier technological civilization in the Galaxy remains substantial.

The usual focus on simultaneously broadcasting civilizations may also be misplaced. A civilization might last only thousands of years while autonomous probes, beacons, archives, industrial relics, or self-repairing machines persist for millions. If even one civilization developed reliable interstellar probes, Galactic exploration could occur on a timescale much shorter than the Galaxy's age without faster-than-light travel. The relevant prior is therefore not merely 'another civilization is alive and transmitting now,' but 'at least one durable artifact from any earlier civilization has reached or survived in the Solar System.' A pre-UAP prior in the range of roughly five to fifteen percent is defensible, with a much wider range also rational because the unknown biological terms span orders of magnitude.

The Fermi question, properly stated

The so-called Fermi paradox is conditional. If technological civilizations are common, if some expand or send probes, if their activity is detectable by us, and if we have seen no evidence, then something in that chain requires explanation. But 'we have seen no evidence' often means only 'we possess no evidence accepted by prevailing institutions as unambiguous proof.' That is not a neutral premise when the UAP record is the evidence under dispute.

If even a small fraction of the strongest historical and modern observations represent extraterrestrial probes, the paradox largely dissolves. They are present, intermittently observed, and not openly communicative. Nor must exploration resemble conspicuous human colonization. Small autonomous systems could monitor biospheres, minimize interference, conceal themselves, operate from oceans or remote Solar System locations, and reveal themselves only during limited operations. The absence of ambassadors and Dyson spheres is not equivalent to the absence of probes.

The conjunction penalty, repaired

Exotic hypotheses do require conjuncts. H4 requires some macroscopic higher-dimensional structure, stable complex organization within or beyond it, intelligence, controllable coupling to our sector, and a mechanism producing the observations. H5 requires simulation to be true, some operator or higher-level process to intervene, intervention to be rendered detectably, and intervention to take this particular form. S1 makes the first link more robust to anti-functionalism and makes lawful local rendering coherent, but it does not supply the later links. H6 requires some consciousness-first ontology, differentiated agents or processes, interface-level interaction, and this phenomenology. Broad objective idealism makes H6 less dependent on Hoffman's exact theory, but again leaves the UAP-specific links open. Those chains keep H4 through H6 below H2.

But multiplying arbitrary values such as one in ten for every link produces decorative precision, not knowledge. The conjuncts are not independent, their conditional probabilities are unknown, and a many-world opportunity structure can overwhelm a low per-world probability. Once a technological civilization capable of autonomous probes exists, long-lived local surveillance, repeated observations, and concealment may be mutually reinforcing consequences rather than separate one-in-ten miracles. The conjunction penalty establishes an ordering; it does not justify a posterior of one in a million.

What the prior is prior to

A prior can be defined before all UAP evidence, or it can be an empirical-Bayes prior already informed by older sightings and then updated with newer cases. This paper uses a background-only prior: it conditions on astronomy, known physics, human fallibility, the history of unsuccessful extraordinary claims, and surveillance capabilities—but not on Tehran, Phoenix, Nimitz, the East Coast encounters, nuclear reports, the modern military record, or insider testimony. Those observations enter afterward as evidence. This prevents the same sighting from increasing the prior and then increasing the likelihood again.

Why there is no clean reference class

The Jesus-historicity problem permits at least a rough historical reference class: named religious figures, movements, and traditions in a known social environment. UAP present no comparably clean denominator. A randomly selected sighting is the wrong unit because the claim is not that a random report is nonhuman; it is that at least one important class within a long global record has a nonhuman cause. Conversely, 'extraordinary beings are usually imaginary' is too broad: it combines dreams, folklore, fraud, distant lights, military radar tracks, and close multiple-observer events as if their evidence were interchangeable.

Partial reference classes still matter. Official investigations show that most reports with adequate information resolve as balloons, aircraft, drones, satellites, astronomical objects, sensor effects, or other ordinary causes. That strongly predicts a predominantly conventional corpus. Yet the same investigations retain a smaller unresolved subset, and the 2021 intelligence assessment acknowledged numerous multiple-sensor reports. Unresolved

does not mean nonhuman; it means the case-rate reference class cannot by itself establish that the entire ensemble is conventional.

A working background prior

No frequency database determines these figures. They are explicit working credences chosen to be revisable. H2 receives 15 percent because planets are common, the Galaxy is old, and durable probes could outlast their makers, while the decisive Drake-equation terms remain uncertain by orders of magnitude. Five further percentage points allow lower-prior nonhuman architectures without pretending that conceptual coherence predicts UAP. The resulting prior is 80 percent conventional and 20 percent nonhuman—not because 80 percent of reports are ordinary, but because no nonhuman artifact or calibrated impossible-performance package has been publicly verified, most investigated reports resolve conventionally, and every exotic family requires at least one major unconfirmed proposition.

Hypothesis	Background prior
H1 — Entire residual conventional	80%
H2 — Extraterrestrial craft or probes	15%
H3 — Indigenous cryptoterrestrial intelligence	1%
H4 — Interdimensional intelligence	1%
H5 — Simulator or deeper-level intervention	1%
H6 — Consciousness-first interface events	2%

Likelihoods and the flexibility penalty

Flexible explanations require a penalty. A hypothesis that can accommodate disappearance and persistence, solidity and shape change, physical traces and no traces, benevolence and hostility, has not thereby predicted any of them. Interdimensional, simulation, and consciousness-first interface theories presently lack usable likelihood functions: no specified probability distribution over observations, no risky predictions, and little that could count against them. The local-causal-closure point increases this flexibility: a deeper intervention can be rendered either as apparently impossible behavior or as an entirely lawful sequence. That makes the model harder to refute but correspondingly less confirmed by generic anomalies.

H2 is less flexible. A probe hypothesis predicts structured physical objects, strategic observation, intermittent detection, avoidance of capture, possible concentration near military or nuclear capabilities, and performance beyond familiar craft. It does not uniquely predict these things, but the modern military record is more probable under H2 than under a world containing only misperception and random clutter. H1 also predicts much of the

record: many low-quality reports, cultural contamination, a strong inverse relation between strangeness and data quality, and continual resolution of cases as ordinary objects. The evidence consequently supports H1 strongly without driving every alternative to zero.

Correlated evidence and historical continuity

Ten thousand reports are not ten thousand independent experiments. Witnesses share media, myths, sensor systems, operational environments, and expectations. Reports also undergo severe selection: ordinary explanations disappear from memory while unresolved cases are repeated for decades. The effective sample size is therefore far smaller than the raw count.

Yet correlation does not reduce the historical record to nothing. Reports of structured aerial objects, luminous globes, abrupt appearance, transformation, impossible motion, beings, physical traces, and strategic attention recur across cultures and before modern aviation. Human psychology can generate continuity because pareidolia, altered states, narrative archetypes, and social contagion are themselves persistent. A long-running external phenomenon also predicts continuity. The record is a moderate upward update for persistence, not a decisive discriminator of origin.

The sensor-density update, moderated

The lack of an openly available, calibrated, independently analyzable sensor package demonstrating impossible performance is an important negative update. If conspicuous craft operate frequently, modern radar, satellites, astronomical surveys, ubiquitous cameras, and sensor fusion should eventually produce decisive evidence. Yet smartphones remain poor instruments for distant fast objects, military sensors are optimized for defense rather than open scientific measurement, automated systems filter anomalies, and the best military data are commonly classified. Increased sensor density therefore weighs against a frequent, overt phenomenon, but much less strongly against rare, small, adaptive, concealed, or locally based probes.

Government information under competing hypotheses

Government denials have low discriminating value because ordinary uncertainty, national-security secrecy, bureaucratic embarrassment, and deliberate concealment could generate similar language. Admissions of unresolved multiple-sensor incidents have more weight because they run against incentives to minimize the subject. Congressional statements alleging withheld records increase the probability of compartmentation and oversight failure, but they do not independently authenticate recovered technology. The September 2026 PURSUE release adds official provenance and structured observations, but the later PR-135 wingbeat analysis demonstrates that useful conventional tests remain possible even with redacted metadata and sharply reduces the evidentiary weight of that video's reported speed.

How the observational record enters

The observational evidence is not required to be discredited one report at a time before H1 can retain probability. H1 is a mixture: one report can be an aircraft, another a balloon, another a classified system, another an honest perceptual error, and another permanently underdetermined. But H1 must explain the distribution of the strongest cases. If several genuinely independent, well-documented clusters are appreciably more likely under H2 than under H1, their likelihood ratios multiply and the ensemble probability of H1 falls even while most ordinary reports remain ordinary.

Independence does substantial work. Witnesses share stories, cultural imagery, sensor platforms, operating environments, and institutional source networks; resolved cases disappear while anomalies are repeatedly anthologized. The proper units are therefore relatively independent evidentiary clusters—Tehran, Phoenix, Nimitz, recurrent East Coast observations, nuclear and maritime reports, the Northeast civilian wave, military-base incursions, PURSUE releases, and insider claims—not every light or statement.

Taken together, the pre-September record received an illustrative cumulative Bayes factor of about 1.9 in favor of some nonhuman component. The sixth PURSUE tranche initially appeared to supply a small positive increment. The October PR-135 analysis, however, gives the tranche's most suggestive grouped-object video a strong conventional explanation and identifies comparable wingbeat signatures in four other releases. Official provenance still supports the existence of genuine unresolved military observations, but it no longer justifies a net numerical increase here. The cumulative illustrative factor therefore returns to about 1.9. Applying 1.9 to prior nonhuman odds of 20:80 yields posterior odds of about 32:68.

Mode 1	Hypothesis	Prior	Posterior
H1	Entire residual phenomenon conventional	80%	68%
H2	Extraterrestrial craft or probes	15%	23%
H3	Indigenous cryptoterrestrial intelligence	1%	3%
H4	Interdimensional or bulk-dwelling intelligence	1%	2%
H5	Simulator or deeper-level intervention	1%	1%
H6	Consciousness-first agent or interface events	2%	3%

Sensitivity to the prior

Because the likelihood evidence is not overwhelming, reasonable priors still matter. Holding the illustrative Bayes factor of 1.9 constant, a 10 percent nonhuman prior yields about 17 percent; a 20 percent prior yields about 32 percent; and a 30 percent prior yields about 45 percent. This spread is not a defect to conceal. It is the honest consequence of uncertainty in the Drake terms, artifact behavior, data quality, and evidentiary independence.

Nonhuman prior	Posterior at Bayes factor 1.9
10%	17%
20%	32%
30%	45%

What would move the numbers

The posterior would rise sharply with complete radar, infrared, optical, acoustic, and telemetry packages showing the same object; independently verified acceleration incompatible with material human craft; documented continuation through the air-water boundary without expected disturbance; recovered material with demonstrably artificial and nonterrestrial provenance; repeatable signaling; or communication containing correct, previously unknown science. H4 would require something more specific: transformations, selection rules, or conservation-law signatures predicted in advance by a quantitative higher-dimensional model.

H5 or H6 would require reproducible, theory-linked structure: controllable responses to interventions, observer-dependent effects predicted before observation, cross-sensor asymmetries derived from an interface model, discoverable resource limits or code-like

regularities, or information unavailable to any in-world source. Merely looking strange is not enough.

The posterior would fall if the Nimitz sensor history were conventionally reconstructed, the principal East Coast patterns were traced to balloons, electronic warfare, radar processing, or drones, the best classified cases systematically resolved under independent review, and improved open instruments continued to find no anomalous performance. The correct posture is neither faith nor reflexive disbelief. It is active discrimination among hypotheses that are now all live, but unequally supported.

19 The Strongest Case for Already Here

The strongest argument for a persistent co-located phenomenon is cumulative rather than spectacular. Anomalous aerial and luminous events recur across historical periods; modern reports concentrate around sophisticated military observation; some apparently involve strategic assets; witnesses repeatedly describe abrupt appearance, transformation, disappearance, unusual station-keeping, and apparent indifference to ordinary aerodynamic constraints; and the phenomenon remains elusive despite recurring proximity.

Vallee's insight is that this pattern resembles neither simple interstellar tourism nor random error. It resembles a phenomenon embedded in the human environment, interacting selectively, adapting its presentation to culture, and retaining control of the encounter. A local probe network, hidden terrestrial presence, higher-dimensional intelligence, or interface phenomenon fits that structure better than repeated biological expeditions launched independently across interstellar distances.

The conventional reply remains formidable. Human perceptual mechanisms are stable across history, while cultural imagery supplies changing costumes. Military sensors detect clutter precisely because they are sensitive. Strategic sites are heavily watched. Ambiguous events survive; explained events disappear from the canon. Secrecy then creates an evidentiary environment in which both genuine anomalies and mythology thrive.

The fair conclusion is not that historical continuity is neutral in every respect. It modestly favors persistence over a purely modern media artifact and makes ancient probes or co-location more competitive relative to continual recent arrival. It does not distinguish cleanly between external persistence and persistent human cognition. Combined with Nimitz and recurrent modern military observations, however, it contributes to a cumulative case that deserves probabilities in percentage points rather than millionths.

20 The Integrated Hierarchy

The full hypothesis is best stated as a ladder, but confidence does not mechanically fall by an order of magnitude at every rung. Each level incurs different costs and receives different evidence.

Level 1: familiar hidden life. Earth contains ordinary undiscovered organisms. Virtually certain; most microbial diversity remains uncharacterized.

Level 2: a biochemical shadow biosphere. Earth contains life from an independent genesis with unfamiliar chemistry. Scientifically legitimate, testable, and unconfirmed.

Level 3: extraterrestrial or local machine intelligence. Durable probes from an earlier civilization operate in, or have become resident within, the Solar System. This requires no new physics, benefits from enormous astronomical opportunity and artifact longevity, and is the leading nonhuman interpretation of the strongest UAP evidence.

Level 4: cryptoterrestrial intelligence. An advanced indigenous lineage persists in concealed terrestrial environments. It solves interstellar distance but creates a severe industrial and ecological concealment problem; it is more plausible as a sparse machine presence than as a large biological civilization.

Level 5: an overlapping higher-dimensional ecology. A second realm intersects ours and we perceive only occasional cross-sections. This fits Flatland and some high-strangeness phenomenology, but requires unconfirmed physics and lacks discriminating predictions.

Level 6: derived spacetime and UAP as interfaces. Our spacetime emerges from quantum information, a deeper simulation process, or consciousness-first dynamics, and some agency manipulates or enters through that substrate. Participatory S1 shows how an external subject or operator could generate ordinary local causal precursors; objective idealism shows that the physical event might be an interface rendering of deeper conscious dynamics. These are coherent architectures, but none presently supplies the missing UAP likelihood or a confirmed discriminating prediction.

The ladder therefore branches. Extraterrestrial probes may be ontologically ordinary but empirically extraordinary. Holography may be theoretically profound while contributing almost no direct probability to UAP. Interdimensionality may fit the reports elegantly while remaining lower-prior than machines operating under known physics. Conceptual depth and empirical probability are different axes.

21 Final Assessment

What is established

Known terrestrial life forms one biochemical family, though a second genesis remains possible. Quantum mechanics violates classical intuitions about separability, definite properties, and locality, while permitting no controllable faster-than-light signaling. Black-hole entropy scales with area; holographic duality gives mathematically powerful equivalences between certain higher-dimensional gravitational theories and lower-dimensional quantum theories; entanglement and geometry are deeply connected within those models. The Galaxy contains an enormous population of planets, including hundreds of millions of plausible temperate rocky worlds. The UAP record includes credible military witnesses, multiple-sensor observations, real physical incursions, and a small unresolved residue.

What is plausible but unproved

Life and technological intelligence have arisen elsewhere. Durable probes from an earlier civilization could have reached the Solar System and persisted long after their makers. Some important UAP cases may represent technology beyond present public human capabilities. Spacetime may emerge from quantum information; some form of holography may describe our universe; perception is certainly a compressed and interest-relative model rather than a transparent window. Participatory simulation and objective idealism are coherent world architectures that survive several familiar objections, including the claim that local causal closure automatically proves local physical ultimacy.

What is highly speculative

A hidden indigenous civilization occupies the oceans or crust. A higher-dimensional biosphere overlaps Earth. Beings move controllably between dimensional sectors. Simulators intervene visibly. Conscious agent networks manipulate our perceptual interface. UAP are manifestations of any one of these specific mechanisms.

The principal empirical conclusion is neither debunking nor disclosure. Most reports are mundane, and increasingly sophisticated analysis continues to resolve celebrated cases. Yet the strongest public record still includes trained witnesses, multiple-sensor reporting, unresolved strategic-site incursions, official video releases, and sustained congressional concern. The September 2026 tranche adds weight through provenance, while the October PR-135 wingbeat study shows why reported speed without a validated range solution can be deeply misleading. On the stated model, the cumulative record modestly favors some nonhuman component relative to the 80:20 background prior, producing a 68:32 posterior rather than certainty in either direction.

The principal theoretical conclusion is equally double-edged. Modern physics has destroyed the assumption that experienced three-dimensional spacetime must be the final architecture of reality. Holography, emergent geometry, participatory simulation, and consciousness-first

theories offer several vocabularies in which something could be co-located with us yet ordinarily inaccessible. The analysis shows that deeper causation can coexist with complete local causal sequences: an intervention may be rendered as an ordinary in-world precursor rather than a violation of law. But quantum strangeness is not a blank check for other strangeness. Extra dimensions are not portals, entanglement is not transportation, holography is not a populated screen, local causal closure does not prove simulation or idealism, and a simulated or consciousness-first world does not imply visible UAP interventions.

The defensible judgment is therefore probabilistic rather than categorical. On the public record, an entirely conventional ensemble remains the leading hypothesis at roughly 68 percent. A nonhuman component receives roughly 32 percent, concentrated in extraterrestrial or ancient-probe explanations rather than in the more flexible metaphysical branches. The modest downward revision is itself evidence that the framework can absorb a strong conventional analysis rather than treating every unresolved release as cumulative confirmation. The numbers are personal credences, not frequencies or official findings; their purpose is to expose assumptions and show how new evidence changes them.

The most important question is no longer whether respectable people are permitted to consider the subject. They are. The question is whether future evidence can discriminate among ordinary clutter, human surveillance systems, extraterrestrial machines, cryptoterrestrial persistence, and deeper architectures of reality. That requires open calibrated data, independent analysis, protected reporting, and theories willing to make predictions that can fail. The idea has graduated from science fiction to disciplined speculation. The extraterrestrial-probe hypothesis has gone further: it is now a serious empirical possibility awaiting decisive evidence. Interdimensionality remains behind it - conceptually coherent, suggestive, and unproved.

22 Project Development and Attribution

This synthesis was developed as a human-AI research collaboration. Rodney Malpert framed the central questions, set the evidentiary and Bayesian standards, supplied objections and case priorities, and directed revisions. ChatGPT (OpenAI) performed the principal research synthesis, source comparison, adversarial weighing, hypothesis separation, Bayesian allocation, restructuring, drafting, and editing. Other frontier models were used for cross-checking and criticism. Agreement among models is a robustness check on exposition and arithmetic, not independent empirical confirmation of UAP claims.

Responsibility remains divided in the ordinary way: sources support the factual record; the author is responsible for the paper's judgments; and the models do not possess classified access or independent eyewitness knowledge. All numerical allocations are illustrative and should be revised when better evidence becomes public.

About the Author

Rodney Malpert holds a J.D. and M.A. from Cornell University. His research uses human-AI collaboration and explicit probabilistic reasoning to examine philosophical, historical, and public-policy questions.

Website and current papers: RodMalpert.com

23 Sources and Further Reading

- U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and U.S. defense attache, Reported UFO Sighting Iran, September 19, 1976. This contemporaneous four-page report is the central public document for the Tehran interception and records the claims relayed by Iranian military personnel.[Official report](#)
- Robert Sheaffer, The Phoenix Lights Become an Incident, Skeptical Inquirer, 2016; James McGaha and Joe Nickell, Alien Lights at Phoenix, Stephenville, and Elsewhere, Skeptical Inquirer, 2015. These essays separate the earlier moving formation from the later flare event and present the leading conventional reconstructions.[Phoenix analysis](#)
- Cybernews, UFO over Tehran Viral Iran Video Shows Mysterious Lights in Night Sky, September 21, 2026; The Indian Express, UFOs over Tehran Mysterious Multicoloured Lights Spark Debate, September 21, 2026. These reports document the circulating 2026 clips and, importantly, the lack of verified range, altitude, speed, scale, or official identification.[2026 report](#)
- Ross Coulthart, In Plain Sight: An Investigation into UFOs and Impossible Science, 2021; NewsNation interview with David Grusch, June 2023. Coulthart's work is used as investigative synthesis and a route to named witnesses, not as independent confirmation of every underlying claim.
- Luis Elizondo, Imminent: Inside the Pentagon's Hunt for UFOs, 2024. The memoir is evaluated as named insider testimony whose claims still require independent documents, data, and corroboration.
- U.S. Department of Defense, All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, Report on the Historical Record of U.S. Government Involvement with Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena, Volume I, March 2024; Fiscal Year 2024 and Fiscal Year 2025 Consolidated Annual Reports; Puerto Rico Object and GoFast case-resolution reports.[AARO](#)
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Preliminary Assessment: Unidentified Aerial Phenomena, 2021. NASA, Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Independent Study Team Report, 2023.[2021 assessment](#)
- David Fravor, Ryan Graves, and David Grusch, written statements and testimony before the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, July 26, 2023.
- FBI and Department of Homeland Security, Joint DHS FBI Statement on Reports of Drones in New Jersey, December 12, 2024; FBI, DHS, FAA, and DoD, Joint Statement on Ongoing Response to Reported Drone Sightings, December 16, 2024; U.S. Department of Defense, Joint Staff Addresses Drones Over New Jersey Military Installations, December 14, 2024; U.S. Air Forces in Europe and Air Forces Africa, Statement on Installation Security in the United Kingdom, November 26, 2024.
- Will Sommer, For Cable News UFO Story Has Ratings Payoff and Reporting Pitfalls, The Washington Post, August 18, 2023. This account discusses NewsNation's correction concerning the provenance of records about David Grusch.

Edwin A. Abbott, *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, 1884. Jacques Vallee, *Passport to Magonia*, 1969. J. Allen Hynek, *The UFO Experience*, 1972.

Paul Davies and colleagues, *Signatures of a Shadow Biosphere*, *Astrobiology*, 2009; Carol Cleland, *The Quest for a Universal Theory of Life*, 2019.

Steve Bryson and colleagues, *The Occurrence of Rocky Habitable Zone Planets around Solar Like Stars from Kepler Data*, *Astronomical Journal*, 2021; Jason T. Wright and colleagues, *The Case for Technosignatures*, *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 2022; Rasmus Bjork, *Exploring the Galaxy Using Space Probes*, *International Journal of Astrobiology*, 2007.

Jacob Bekenstein, *Black Holes and Entropy*, *Physical Review D*, 1973; Gerard 't Hooft, *Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity*, 1993; Leonard Susskind, *The World as a Hologram*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 1995; Juan Maldacena, *The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity*, 1997; Mark Van Raamsdonk, *Building Up Spacetime with Quantum Entanglement*, 2010; Juan Maldacena and Leonard Susskind, *Cool Horizons for Entangled Black Holes*, 2013.

Nick Bostrom, *Are You Living in a Computer Simulation*, *Philosophical Quarterly*, 2003; Donald Hoffman and Chetan Prakash, *Objects of Consciousness*, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2014; Donald Hoffman, *The Case Against Reality*, 2019; David J. Chalmers, *Absent Qualia Fading Qualia Dancing Qualia*, 1995.

Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, scientific background on the 2022 Nobel Prize in Physics, covering experimental tests of Bell inequalities.

U.S. Senate, Congressional Record, colloquy of Senators Charles Schumer and Mike Rounds on UAP disclosure, December 13, 2023; Senate Armed Services Committee, Hearing to Receive Testimony on the Activities of the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, November 19, 2024; House Oversight Committee hearings on unauthorized drone activity, April 29, 2025, and UAP transparency and whistleblower protection, September 9, 2025. These sources establish oversight concern and allegations of withheld information, not the truth of every underlying allegation.

All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, Records Release Program and PURSUE imagery, sixth release, September 18, 2026, including DOW-UAP-PR133, PR135, PR140, and PR141. Official provenance is stronger than analytical completeness; the public packets omit variables needed for decisive kinematic reconstruction.

Jacob Haqq-Misra and Ravi Kopparapu, *On Inferring Physical Velocities from AARO PURSUE UAP Videos*, arXiv:2608.12445, 2026. The analysis explains why distance, field of view, platform motion, and observation geometry are required to infer physical velocity from angular image motion. Jacob Haqq-Misra, Ravi Kopparapu, Richard Cloete, Omer Eldadi, Michael Shermer, and Abraham Loeb, *Six Objects Reported at 480 mph in a Declassified Military Infrared Video Show Brightness Flicker at Bird Wingbeat Rates*, arXiv:2610.08692v3, October 13, 2026. This non-peer-reviewed preprint reports independent 7.1–7.9 hertz brightness oscillations, control tests, and a parallax model favoring nearby birds for PR-135.