Concrete Next Steps for UAP Disclosure

A practical policy brief outlining tangible paths toward UAP documentation, official government analysis, and lawful disclosure of crash-retrieval and reverse-engineering programs.

This brief recommends several tangible steps for UAP disclosure, covering three categories of information: compelling UAP documentation, reports, videos, and other data; official case assessments and intelligence analyses; and documentation of U.S. crash-retrieval, reverse-engineering, and related programs.

AUTHORS

Christopher Mellon

Adm. Tim Gallaudet

Kirk McConnell

Mike Gold

Executive Summary

As the Administration continues to disclose what it calls “new, never-before-seen” videos and other files related to unidentified anomalous phenomena (“UAP”), numerous options for disclosure remain unexplored. This policy brief recommends several tangible steps for UAP disclosure, which covers three categories of information: (1) troves of compelling UAP documentation, reports, videos and other data; (2) official case assessments and intelligence analyses of these phenomena; and (3) documentation, including reports, photographs and videos, of U.S. crash-retrieval, reverse-engineering, and related programs.

The official release of several tranches of UAP records undeniably demonstrates that the government is sitting on far more UAP data than it had admitted. At the same time, swathes of American and global audiences, including the scientific community and influential lawmakers, remain skeptical that UAP may represent non-human intelligence (“NHI”). As discussed in Part II, obtaining high-quality data of UAP exceeding human capabilities should convince skeptics and policymakers alike to follow the facts. A picture is worth a thousand words. Granted, this approach is incremental, requiring patience.

Part III discusses a necessary corollary to releasing better data: disclosing taxpayer-funded case assessments and intelligence analyses to inform Congress and the American people what conclusions their government has reached about the capabilities and intentions of these phenomena. Raw data is not disclosure.

As discussed in Part IV, the release of evidence that the U.S. government has overseen clandestine UAP programs would be decisive for disclosure. That would include acknowledgement and disclosure of UAP crash retrieval operations and the recovery of NHI “biological” and other materials.

Despite sworn testimony from credible whistleblowers alleging the existence of these programs, no element of the United States government has acknowledged their existence. To be clear: the government should reveal such programs, while protecting legitimate national security interests.

Focusing efforts on disclosure of less than all three categories of data outlined above is rejected as inadequate, even self-defeating. Fortunately, we need not sacrifice any effort on the other’s altar. An increasingly large cohort of lawmakers and executive branch officials are pursuing disclosure of each of these categories, i.e., the release of UAP data, intelligence products, and evidence of UAP crash retrieval and reverse engineering programs. But that process is slow, and more unquestionably should be done.

This policy brief provides a few suggestions for each line of effort—where to look, what to release, and how to protect whistleblowers to arrive at the truth. Given the monumental nature of the UAP issue, no single paper can possibly cover everything. But what follows are some ripe areas for action.

From File Dumps to Evidence

Ongoing disclosures by the Administration represent historic progress. The government now says these releases involve dozens of agencies and millions of records. One can debate what these materials show, but one cannot seriously argue that the government had nothing to disclose. Unfortunately, much vital evidence is redacted or omitted entirely. File dumps consisting of grainy videos of phenomena potentially defying conventional physics are insufficient.

First, in this regard, formation of the UAP Science Advisory Council is an important, if long overdue, step (having been struck from the draft bill that ultimately established the All-Domain Anomaly Resolution (“AARO”) in 2022 on baseless secrecy concerns). That council should be adequately staffed and funded, its independence ensured, its membership broadened, and its access to UAP sensor data opened.

Like the review panel contemplated by the UAP Disclosure Act, the UAP Science Advisory Council—and any other advisory committees formed—should be resourced to advise the President on the release of UAP records.

Second, actionable evidence requires raw sensor information of all types of UAP—including mensuration and kinematics of UAP—so that the UAP Science Advisory Council and broader scientific community can scrutinize the data and reach informed conclusions.

The statutory definition of UAP was broadly defined by Congress to capture UAP in the air, space, and sea domains. Yet disclosures so far have largely captured only the air domain, neglecting the pervasiveness of these phenomena.

Third, the inadequacy of low-quality sensor data needs to be remedied by locating and releasing high-resolution UAP imagery taken from satellites. Data from Space Fence and other platforms that have observed UAP in orbit or in space or entering or exiting the atmosphere similarly should be released.

“Swamp gas” and other silly excuses seeking to provide prosaic explanations for anomalous observations are largely inapplicable to the space or undersea domains.

Fourth, UAP data from America's Solid State Phased Array Radar System—the world's most powerful—should be scoured and released. Many of these radars are positioned to have corroborated UAP sightings like the Tic-Tac incident in November 2004, observed by a carrier strike group and decorated naval aviators operating off the California coast.

Fifth, files from the UAP Task Force ("UAPTF"), a predecessor organization to AARO, should be inventoried and released. It is hard to believe that AARO, empowered by binding law more than five years ago with sweeping access to UAP data across the government, has not found UAPTF's files in its own backyard.

For example, one UAPTF file is a clear image of a UAP that resembles a "button." Another is a video of a UAP so close to the pilot who filmed it that he loudly exclaims, "Oh, shit!" Where are these records, and why have they not been released?

These videos should not be classified, any more than the Navy UAP videos published by the New York Times should have been.

Sixth, in obtaining these and other types and sources of UAP data for release, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and other Intelligence Community ("IC") elements should requisition all Intelligence Information Reports from relevant agencies that reference UAP or similar terms, along with all their attached photos, videos, and other ancillary or related records.

Sifting through reams of UAP data may be thankless work. But releasing a crystal-clear picture or video of UAP could change the trajectory of this conversation overnight. That conversation is long overdue.

Data is Not Disclosure

Despite releasing some data, the government has withheld its analysis. But has the IC thoroughly examined the data, distinguishing UAP from balloons and foreign systems? Has it analyzed observations of UAP the current director of the Central Intelligence Agency once found to travel “at speeds that exceed the sound barrier without a sonic boom?”

In an age when countries spend billions to produce the fastest jet fighter, it strains credulity that endeavoring to understand the advanced capabilities (and motivations) of UAP has not been undertaken at any time over the last 80 years.

Nor has the government explained why UAP files have been kept secret for so long—often well beyond the 25-year period after which information is presumed to be declassified by executive order.

It has not explained a recent, disturbing report that the government propagated a disinformation campaign as far back as the 1950s to create false UAP documents as a “smokescreen for real secret-weapons programs.” The government should clarify whether these supposedly false documents are now being released to the American public as truth, and, as demanded earlier, verify to Congress and the American people that such a disinformation campaign has stopped—for good.

The government should do more than “let the people decide for themselves,” given the complexity of this topic and decades of official obfuscation. Rather, the Administration should release its analyses of the capabilities and intentions behind UAP. The American people paid for this analysis. They are owed its honest conclusions.

So are Congress and other policymakers who are responsible for providing for the common defense and developing a comprehensive strategy around UAP. Do any of these phenomena represent a threat? If so, then the Administration should specially commission a National Intelligence Estimate on UAP that can be released to the public.

Protect Whistleblowers and Consider Strategic Grants of Immunity

Credible witnesses who analyzed UAP as part of a Pentagon task force have testified before Congress that the government has conducted a decades-long, highly classified crash retrieval and reverse-engineering program. It is time to tear off the band-aid.

As the Administration reportedly considers a national security directive or equivalent order to foster UAP disclosure, witness protections are essential. For its part, Congress should consider targeted UAP whistleblower protection legislation and empowering a special committee to investigate these claims.

The Disclosure Foundation continues to shepherd whistleblowers to Congress, fight for their protections, and investigate these programs.

On its own, the Administration should announce that current and former governmental employees (and contractors) are released from nondisclosure agreements to the extent they purport to restrict disclosures of UAP information to Congress.

Covered persons should include political appointees and senior officials excluded from the protections of the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act—and any other person having such information. Because these alleged UAP programs encompass so many agencies and, therefore, congressional oversight committees, the Administration should foster broad-based disclosure to Congress.

A statement by the Administration reassuring potential witnesses that it would not seek prosecution or civil suit or engage in employment retaliation for going to Congress would also be welcome. As demonstrated previously, the executive branch lacks authority to prosecute or sue whistleblowers for disclosures to Congress. But a statement by the Administration would set the record straight.

As Congress deepens its inquiry into the government's UAP programs, it is important to protect legitimate national security interests that maintain America's strategic edge. But that interest, while compelling, should be narrowly construed.

We cannot give a blank check to those evading Congress or the executive branch's political leadership. The Administration, including the Department of Justice, should consider strategically granting immunity to witnesses who can identify illegality related to any UAP programs.

The current effort by the Administration to release UAP evidence is simply unprecedented and represents a monumental undertaking. The suggestions in this policy brief are intended to assist that effort.

Conclusion

The challenge is to hone the UAP data presently being released into meaningful assessments and to facilitate the prompt release of clear and convincing evidence, such as crash retrieval and reverse-engineering programs or evidence of UAP in space.

The opportunity we have is to open the next chapter of disclosure consistent with the desires of the President, Congress, and the vast majority of the American people.