



Updated analysis: cover-up assumed

Version 1.0 · Current as of September 2026 · specieslevel.com/plans/nhi-cover-up-assumed.html

This plan is an initial draft prepared with AI models. It is open for review by subject-matter experts and will be revised as they join the work and as world and national events change.

Summary

This tab re-runs the baseline analysis on two assumptions supplied for this exercise. It does not test them. First, the cover-up is real and AARO takes part in it. Second, PURSUE may be releasing deliberately non-useful material.

Folding them in has three big effects:

- **AARO's denials no longer count as evidence.** The main official counterweight to the insiders' claims disappears. The existence of a hidden program outside oversight moves from a divided question to settled-by-assumption.
- **PURSUE's thinness flips meaning.** Heavy redaction, stripped telemetry and recycled old material stop being signs that there is nothing to find. They become what a curated release would look like.
- **The September 14 waiver looks different.** It lets insiders disclose only to PURSUE representatives. Under these assumptions, that routes the most sensitive testimony into the apparatus doing the covering up.

One question does not move: what the cover-up is hiding. A real cover-up fits recovered non-human craft. It fits equally well with exotic human technology, or a deliberate program to promote alien stories. The assumptions remove counter-evidence but add no new positive evidence, so the non-human-intelligence claims still rest on testimony.

Proposition	Baseline tier	Updated tier
A cover-up exists; AARO is not a neutral investigator	3 (divided)	1 (by assumption)
A hidden program exists outside normal oversight	3 (divided)	1 (entailed by the assumption)
PURSUE is not meaningful disclosure	5 (contested)	1 (by assumption)

Proposition	Baseline tier	Updated tier
Some objects outperform known technology	2	2 (stronger; only independent skeptics dissent)
Non-human intelligence is present	3	2-3 (majority of remaining sources, still no public proof)
The hidden program holds non-human craft and bodies	3	3 (still divided: NHI vs human technology vs disinformation)

How the assumptions were applied

Six rules re-weight every source, applied evenly. No claim was dropped; each was re-rated.

1. AARO statements.

- AARO statements that deny or deflate NHI claims no longer count as evidence against them. That covers the 2024 historical report, the “no verifiable information” statements, and the Yankee Blue and Area 51 myth findings.
- They are now rated as possible disinformation: not disproven, just not usable.

2. AARO admissions. AARO statements that cut against its own interest keep full weight, because a cover-up has no motive to invent them. Examples: reports of performance beyond the state of the art, a process for handling UAP-derived materials, the Virginia swarm, and avionics interference.

3. PURSUE releases.

- Nothing in PURSUE counts against a claim just by being absent.
- Its contents still count as documents, but only for what they positively show. The AAWSAP injury paper is an example.

4. Sources that lean on government data. Where a skeptic’s conclusion depends on AARO’s case files or on PURSUE’s selection of material, it is discounted to that extent.

- A video analysis by Mick West stays valid for the video analyzed. What is lost is its value as evidence that “typical” cases are mundane, since curation could pick explainable cases.
- Haqq-Misra and Kopparapu’s finding that no speed can be recovered becomes evidence of curation.

5. Officials who deny a cover-up. Rubio’s August 2026 statement is read two ways: he was kept out of the compartment, or he is part of it. Either way it no longer counts as evidence against.

6. Independent sources are unchanged. That includes firsthand witnesses, GEIPAN, the Galileo Project, Knuth’s field work, Nolan’s lab work, Greenewald’s FOIA

archive, and Brazil.

- Caveat: the premise alleges a multinational cover-up. If extended that far, GEIPAN and Brazil's official findings would need the same discount. This tab applies the assumptions as stated, to AARO and PURSUE only.

What the assumptions cannot do.

- They cannot turn [2nd] testimony into [1st] evidence.
- They cannot resolve contradictions inside an advocate's own account.
- They cannot tell us which hidden thing is being protected.
- They also make the picture self-sealing. Any null result can be explained away. For that reason the final section lists tests a cover-up could not control.

Revised Tier 1: Agreed or settled by assumption

Tier 1 now holds the six baseline points that survive re-weighting, plus four points the assumptions settle outright.

Carried over from the baseline

These still hold. None depended on trusting AARO's conclusions.

1. **A residue of cases stays unexplained.** GEIPAN (~3%), the Galileo Project (144 ambiguous of ~500,000), Ruppelt (1952), and the witnesses all confirm this without AARO. The residue may also be larger than AARO reports: its resolved tally no longer caps it.
2. **Most reports are ordinary.** GEIPAN, the Galileo Project and the advocates themselves still agree. AARO's own prosaic resolutions are now unverified but not refuted.
3. **Objects operate over U.S. military sites.** Rule 2 applies, so AARO's admission keeps full weight. So do Mellon's account of 17 straight days over Langley and Rubio's "not ours."
4. **The government has deliberately misled the public about UFOs.** The 1992 CIA letter on Blue Book's false explanations is itself a PURSUE document. That admission is against interest and keeps full weight. It establishes past deception by the same institutions.
5. **Secret UAP programs existed.** AAWSAP and AATIP are documented. Under the assumptions, these are the visible edge of a larger effort, not its full extent.
6. **No public proof of NHI exists.** This is unchanged as a fact. What changes is its meaning: a working cover-up would produce exactly this result, so the absence no longer counts against the claims.

Settled by assumption

7. **A cover-up exists.** This is now agreed by Semivan, Grusch, Elizondo, Nell, Gallaudet, Mellon, Luna, Burlison, Burchett, Kean, Knapp and Coulthart. Rubio's and West's denials are discounted by rules 4 and 5.
8. **AARO is not a neutral investigator.** Gallaudet's account of an AARO "influence operation" moves from an isolated claim to consistent with the premise. So does Mellon's complaint about late and missing reports.
9. **PURSUE is not meaningful disclosure.** Critics from both camps already called it thin: West, Colavito and Greenstreet from the skeptic side, Mellon from the advocate side. Under the assumptions that thinness is by design.
10. **At least one hidden program operates outside normal oversight.** A real cover-up requires something to cover and someone to run it. This point is entailed by the premise. What the program holds is not entailed (see Tier 3).

Revised Tier 2: Most sources agree

With AARO's dissent set aside, four points now command broad agreement. The remaining dissenters are independent skeptics, and their objections are narrowed, not erased.

1. Some objects outperform any known technology. (Stronger than baseline)

- **Agree:**
 - The firsthand witnesses: Fravor, Graves, Wiggins, Nuccetelli and Borland.
 - The insiders, lawmakers and journalists, plus Nolan and Knuth.
 - AARO's own against-interest line about beyond-state-of-the-art reports, which now keeps full weight.
- **Dissent:**
 - West still disputes specific videos on optical grounds. Those arguments do not depend on AARO and stand case by case.
 - Greenewald still says it is unproven.

2. The disclosure process is being managed, not simply withheld. (New)

- **Semivan:** only the president can truly disclose, and he wants it done with measures to control the narrative.
- **Schumer-Rounds bill:** its text calls for a "Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan" ([Congress.gov](https://www.congress.gov)).
- **ODNI:** reportedly has a preparedness plan for confirmed NHI ([Vilhauer](#)).
- **Reading under the assumptions:** PURSUE fits a slow, staged release pattern. That can be read as stalling, or as gradual public acclimation.

- **Dissent:** West and Greenewald see ordinary bureaucracy, not management.

3. Witnesses were deliberately suppressed, not just stigmatized. (Stronger than baseline)

- Several accounts shift from “alleged” to “consistent with the premise”:
 - Borland’s reprisals.
 - Grusch’s reported threats.
 - The GoFast email that vanished from Gallaudet’s account.
 - Nuccetelli’s destroyed records.
 - The officials who told lawmakers Grusch could not brief them in a secure room.
- Each individual incident still lacks independent corroboration.

4. Congress is being denied information it is entitled to. (Stronger than baseline)

- Supporting points:
 - Luna’s missed video deadline.
 - Burlison needed a whistleblower “dead drop” to obtain the Yemen video.
 - AARO’s Volume 2 is years late.
 - The disclosure law has been stripped in conference three times.
- All of these now read as obstruction rather than delay. The conference stripping points to resistance extending into parts of Congress itself.

Revised Tier 3: Still divided

The assumptions establish that something is being hidden. They do not establish what. Three explanations each fit the premise, and the sources split among them.

What the cover-up is hiding

Explanation	Who holds it	What fits it	What strains it
A. Recovered non-human craft, and possibly bodies	Grusch, Elizondo, Nell, Semivan, Gallaudet, Coulthart, Knapp, Luna, Burchett, Nolan; Burlison and Mellon lean this way	The multi-decade testimony. The bill’s language on “biological evidence of non-human intelligence.” AARO drafting a materials-handling process. The 2010 AAWSAP paper suggesting “advanced systems” already deployed	All of it is [2nd] testimony or inference. Grusch’s account has grown over time. No allied government has corroborated it (Nick Pope)

Explanation	Who holds it	What fits it	What strains it
B. Exotic human technology (black aerospace and weapons programs, dressed up as UFOs)	Rooted in AARO's own findings, which are now discounted. Still argued independently from the CIA's documented U-2 and OXCART cover stories	The 1992 CIA letter proves UFO stories were used as cover before. Much of what witnesses see near test ranges and bases fits advanced drones	Would not explain decades-old reports before such technology existed, or Fravor's 2004 performance claims, if accurate
C. A deliberate belief program (insiders fed alien stories to mislead adversaries, test loyalty, or shape policy)	Raised by commentators such as Ross Douthat and aerospace writer Nick Cook. Kirkpatrick's "circular reporting" version is discounted with AARO	Yankee Blue shows fake alien-program briefings happened inside the Air Force. The insider network is small and interconnected. Many claims trace to the same few people	Would make the sincere insiders unwitting carriers, not liars. Does not explain firsthand radar and visual cases

The explanations are not mutually exclusive. A real non-human program could be shielded by human-technology cover stories and by planted disinformation at the same time. Under the assumptions, Explanation C gains weight in one specific way: a cover-up that includes AARO is exactly the kind of body that could run it.

Other divided questions

Extraterrestrial or something stranger.

- Unchanged from the baseline. Semivan, Luna and Grusch point to interdimensional or consciousness-linked explanations.
- Loeb's Galileo Project searches for physical extraterrestrial artifacts.
- The assumptions do not bear on this question.

Is the September 14 waiver an opening or a funnel? (New)

- **Opening:** Luna, Burlison and advocacy groups welcome it as the first protected path for insiders.
- **Funnel:** under the assumptions, a channel that permits disclosure only to PURSUE, and explicitly not to the public, sends the most dangerous testimony straight into the apparatus doing the covering up.
- **Coalition response:** a coalition of whistleblowers has asked the president for permission to speak publicly instead ([New York Post](#), cited via [Fragments of Coherence](#)). That is consistent with the funnel reading.

Where Rubio stands.

- **Compartmented out:** he has raised the possibility that UAP information is held so tightly that even presidents get it only on a need-to-know basis. That supports this reading.
- **Knowing participant:** he admitted using the UAP topic as a diversion with reporters, and he has since handed off the portfolio. That supports this reading.
- The assumptions cannot pick between the two.

Revised Tier 4: Single-source claims, re-rated

Every claim in the baseline’s Tier 4 was re-rated against the six rules. **Up** means the assumptions removed the main counter-evidence. **Down** means the claim relied on AARO or PURSUE being honest. **Unchanged** means the assumptions don’t touch it. None of these claims becomes proven.

Source	Claim	Rating	Why
Grusch	Multi-decade retrieval program; non-human craft and “biologics”	Up	AARO’s “no verifiable information” is discounted
Grusch	1933 Italy recovery via the Vatican and Five Eyes	Unchanged	No independent record either way; not addressed by AARO or PURSUE
Grusch	People harmed or killed; funds misappropriated	Up	The main rebuttal was official denial
Grusch	“Several” kinds of NHI, up to “sentient plasmoid life”; 25-100 craft; live occupants; telepathic contact	Unchanged	Rests on his word alone. His 2023-to-2026 shift, from not having seen photos to having seen them, is internal to his account
Nell	NHI beyond reasonable doubt; vouches for Grusch	Up	Official contradiction discounted
Gallaudet	GoFast email vanished (2015); a 2024 AARO meeting was an influence operation	Up, strongly	Now consistent with the premise rather than an outlier

Source	Claim	Rating	Why
Mellon	Hundreds of base incursions a year; 17 days over Langley; AARO stalling	Up	AARO's admissions and delays now read as confirmation
Elizondo	Legacy program with contractors; recovered specimens	Up	Official denial discounted
Elizondo	His AATIP role	Up	The 2019 Pentagon denial is discounted
Elizondo	Orbs at his home; remote viewing; brain-structure pattern	Unchanged	Personal and paranormal claims; the assumptions don't bear on them
Semivan	Military knew since 1947 it couldn't compete, and covered it up; a "tradition of disbelief"	Up, strongly	The assumption largely adopts his framing. Caveat: he had no program access; this is inference
Semivan	Not human; possibly interdimensional; managed disclosure; ontological shock	Unchanged	About what is hidden and how to reveal it, not whether it is hidden
Shellenberger's source	Immaculate Constellation program	Up	The 2024 Pentagon denial is discounted; absence from PURSUE is expected
Coulthart	Trump briefed on the legacy program; alleged gatekeepers; China and Russia watching; Elizondo inside the program	Up, modestly	Official silence no longer counts against. Anonymous sourcing is unchanged
Luna	Evidence of non-human origin seen in a secure facility	Up	Her view of classified material is no longer offset by AARO
Burlison	Yemen video via "dead drop"; contractors hold records	Up	The need for a dead drop now reads as obstruction
Knapp	Documents show officials admit UAP	Unchanged	Documentary claim, checkable

Source	Claim	Rating	Why
	outperform all known aircraft		independently
Nolan	Brain injuries; isotope anomalies; 100% confidence in NHI	Unchanged	Lab work outside AARO. The injury cases came to him via government and aerospace contacts, a pathway the assumptions make harder to read either way
Vilhauer	ODNI preparedness plan for confirmed NHI	Ambiguous	It came from ODNI, part of the governance structure. It could be candor or narrative management
AARO	2024 report found no evidence of alien technology	Down	Rule 1
AARO via WSJ	Yankee Blue hazing; planted Area 51 photos	Down, but not void	Could be disinformation. Could also be true, and explain part of the insider stories (Tier 3, C)
AARO	238 cases resolved as satellite flares; 114 prosaic resolutions	Down	Unverifiable. Satellite flaring is a real, well-documented effect
AARO	About 100 UAP off Virginia; avionics interference; materials-handling process	Unchanged, full weight	Rule 2: against interest
PURSUE	AAWSAP injury paper: advanced systems possibly “already deployed”	Up	A positive document that survived curation. Why release it is itself a question (see next sections)
PURSUE	1992 CIA letter admitting false Blue Book explanations	Unchanged, full weight	Against interest

Source	Claim	Rating	Why
PURSUE	The unresolved “mother orb” case with ~40% unexplained	Unchanged	An open case either way. Under the assumptions, the lack of sensor data may be withheld rather than absent
West	Yemen object was a balloon; PURSUE clips are mundane	Partly down	Case analyses stand. The inference that typical cases are mundane loses force if the cases were selected
Haqq-Misra and Kopparapu	No speed recoverable from any of 112 PURSUE videos	Reinterpreted	Now evidence that telemetry was stripped
Greenewald	The waiver largely restates earlier protections	Unchanged; sharpened	If protections existed and produced nothing public, that supports the funnel reading
GEIPAN, Galileo, Knuth, Brazil	Their data and positions	Unchanged	Independent of AARO and PURSUE, unless the cover-up is taken as multinational

Revised Tier 5: The ten contradictions, re-resolved

Of the ten baseline contradictions, the assumptions settle two outright and tilt four toward the advocates. Four are left untouched, because the evidence in them does not come from AARO or PURSUE.

Item	Baseline status	Under the assumptions
Is there a cover-up?	Contested	Settled: yes (by assumption)
Is PURSUE real disclosure?	Contested	Settled: no. Hegseth’s “unprecedented transparency” is itself part of the managed narrative
Legacy retrieval program exists	Contested	Tilts yes. AARO Volume 1 is discounted. The program’s contents are still disputed (Tier 3)

Item	Baseline status	Under the assumptions
Elizondo's AATIP role	Contested	Tilts to Elizondo. The Pentagon's 2019 denial is discounted
Immaculate Constellation	Contested	Tilts to it existing. The denial is discounted and absence from PURSUE is expected
Source of UFO myths	Contested	Tilts to advocates, not fully. Yankee Blue is now suspect but could still be true in part
Is the Sept 2026 waiver new?	Contested	Replaced by a sharper question: is it an opening or a funnel? (Tier 3)
Yemen "Hellfire orb"	Contested	Unchanged. The video came from a whistleblower, not PURSUE, and West's optical analysis doesn't rely on AARO. Withheld targeting data now reads as deliberate
Grusch's own access (2023 vs 2026)	Contested	Unchanged. An inconsistency inside his account. A cover-up does not explain why his story expanded
Varginha, Brazil	Contested	Unchanged, unless the cover-up is extended to Brazil's military

Revised matrix: how much each source now counts

This matrix shows how much evidential weight each source carries once the assumptions apply. The biggest shifts: AARO and PURSUE drop out as a counterweight. Insiders whose main obstacle was official denial gain. Independent data sources are untouched.

Source	Baseline role	Weight now	Reason
AARO / Dept. of War	Main "no" voice	Down , except against-interest admissions	Rules 1 and 2
PURSUE	Official record	Down as a sample; individual documents keep their positive content	Rule 3

Source	Baseline role	Weight now	Reason
Rubio	Denied a cover-up	Down	Rule 5
Semivan	Inference-based “yes”	Up	His core claim, a long-running cover-up, is now the premise
Gallaudet	Isolated AARO critic	Up	His influence-operation account fits the premise
Grusch, Nell, Elizondo	Secondhand “yes”	Up on program existence; unchanged on specifics	Denials discounted; still [2nd]
Mellon, Luna, Burlison, Burchett	“Yes” or leaning yes	Up	Obstruction now read as deliberate
Kean, Knapp, Coulthart	Reported the claims	Up , modestly	Anonymous sourcing still unverifiable
Fravor, Graves, 2025 witnesses	Firsthand	Unchanged (already strong)	Never depended on AARO
Nolan, Knuth, Loeb	Data-driven, mostly open	Unchanged	Independent data. Loeb’s council, which advises the official governance board, may now be reading curated data
Greenewald	Documents-first skeptic	Unchanged	FOIA records are real. His “no documents” position fits a cover-up too
West	Main independent skeptic	Partly down	Case analyses stand; generalizations from government samples weaken
Haqq-Misra and Kopparapu	Data-limits finding	Reinterpreted	Now evidence of withheld telemetry
GEIPAN, Galileo Project	Independent residue counts	Unchanged	Outside the assumed cover-up

Signs that fit the assumptions, and signs that strain them

More of the observed record fits the assumptions than strains them. But the strains are real, and they point to a narrower version of the premise: a limited or partial cover-up

rather than a total one.

Observed signs that fit

- **Heavy redaction.** 64 of 71 files in PURSUE Release 6 are redacted.
- **Stripped telemetry.** None of the 112 PURSUE videos carries the range and geometry data needed to measure speed. That is exactly the data that would separate prosaic from exotic cases.
- **Recycled material.** Much of Release 1 had been public for decades (Colavito, Greenstreet). Release 6's 37 AAWSAP papers were already available through FOIA; only office names were newly unredacted.
- **A missing report.** AARO's Volume 2, promised for 2025, is still unpublished.
- **Missed deadlines.** Luna's video deadline passed with nothing produced. Burlison had to obtain the Yemen video by a whistleblower drop.
- **A funnel-shaped waiver.** Disclosure is allowed only to PURSUE. Officials stressed it is "not a declassification directive."
- **Lost records.** The GoFast email vanished (Gallaudet). Records were destroyed under retention schedules (Nuccetelli).
- **A legislative pattern.** The disclosure law's teeth were stripped in conference in 2023, and the whole act failed in the FY2025 and FY2026 defense bills.

Observed signs that strain them

- **The AAWSAP injury paper.** A curated release that hides NHI would have little reason to publish a 2010 paper hypothesizing "advanced systems already deployed."
- **AARO's own admissions.** AARO chose to disclose a swarm of about 100 objects, avionics interference, and a UAP materials-handling process. That sits oddly with a pure denial role.
- **The "mother orb" case.** AARO published an analysis that leaves a multi-witness case at about 40% unexplained, rather than forcing a prosaic answer.
- **Real protections.** An NDA waiver, even a narrow one, lowers the barriers a total cover-up would want kept high.
- **The Science Advisory Council.** It includes advocates such as Gallaudet and Nolan, and a skeptic, Michael Shermer. That mix is an unusual choice for a body meant to rubber-stamp a cover-up.

What reconciles them

A "limited hangout" model reconciles both lists. In it, genuine but low-value concessions are released to relieve political pressure while the core stays compartmented. Semivan, Mellon and Luna's descriptions of a staged, controlled process fit this reading.

Tests a cover-up could not control

Under these assumptions, nothing AARO or PURSUE says can confirm or refute the core claims. Only evidence arriving by routes outside the assumed cover-up can. Seven such routes exist, roughly in order of how soon they could deliver.

1. **Independent sensors.** The Galileo Project, UAPx and civilian all-sky networks collect data no agency curates. A single well-instrumented case with range, speed and multiple sensors would test claims of beyond-known performance directly.
2. **Material in private hands.** Nolan's isotope work and any contractor-held material could be analyzed by independent labs. The House bill's eminent-domain clause would force such material into the open, if it survives conference.
3. **Contractor and FFRDC records.** MITRE, RAND and MIT Lincoln Laboratory records are held outside the agencies in question. MITRE is already complying with Burlison's request.
4. **Witnesses going public, not to PURSUE.** The whistleblower coalition's request to speak publicly is the key test. Immunity from the White House would let named firsthand witnesses of craft or bodies testify under oath in open session. Refusal is itself informative under these assumptions.
5. **Congressional subpoena.** A Senate-confirmed review board with subpoena power, from the House bill, would sit outside AARO's chain of command.
6. **Foreign governments.** Brazil's promised file release, and any statement from Five Eyes partners, would test Grusch's claim of a multinational effort. So far, former UK MoD UFO desk head Nick Pope says the UK was never told.
7. **Internal consistency checks.** Grusch's claimed 25-100 craft and named facilities are specific enough to be falsifiable by anyone given access. His offer of a "field trip" to the sites is a direct test if accepted.

If one or more of these routes delivers, claims move up a tier regardless of the assumptions. If all stay closed for years despite the waiver, immunity talks and the disclosure law, the cover-up premise itself should be re-examined. It is the one hypothesis here that can explain any outcome.