

**Bayesian Meta-Analysis of Non-Human Intelligence Claims: Independence, Credibility
Scoring, and the Implausibility of a Collective-Error Hypothesis**

Julio C. Spinelli

Unaffiliated Scientist

Author Note

Authorship and AI disclosure. This manuscript was written entirely by the author. No AI systems are listed as authors, this complies with the Journal of Scientific Exploration policy that authors write their own manuscripts. Limited use of computational tools (spellchecking, formatting assistance, and reference cross-checks) did not generate original content; the author reviewed and is responsible for all text, analysis and conclusions.

Correspondence: Julio C. Spinelli, spine001@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6144-0077>

Lay Summary

This study examines 23 reports that can be ascribed to the presence on earth of a non-human intelligence (NHI) dating from 1947 to 2025. By analyzing witness reliability, radar and visual evidence, and biological data, we calculate an extremely low chance--less than one in a trillion—that all cases are false or the fruit of lies or delusion. This findings strongly indicate that NHI may have been present on Earth for a long time.

Implications and Applications

The analysis suggests that categorical denial of NHI is statistically untenable under explicit, conservative assumptions. Practically, this implies (i) updated scientific frameworks for technosignatures and non-human biological lineages; (ii) responsible disclosure protocols to minimize societal disruption; (iii) archiving and re-analysis of pre-satellite observational data; (iv) transparent genomic/isotopic testing of biological samples with documented chains of custody. Methodologically, our rubric and arithmetic can support a living meta-analysis—researchers can revise case credibilities, quantify correlations, and track how additions/removals affect the joint probability. Policy applications include harm-reduction strategies for disclosure, independent repositories for data/specimens, and incentives for high-quality instrumented observations.

Engineering Relevance

From an engineering perspective, the key contribution of this meta-analysis is that it shifts the NHI/UAP question from “if” to “how”. Under conservative and explicitly parameterized assumptions about evidence quality and dependence, the joint probability that all 23 high-credibility cases are delusion, hoax, or mundane error becomes negligibly small. It is therefore rational, within those assumptions, to treat as a working premise that at least some of these reports are accurate descriptions of physical systems constructed by non-human agents. Once this premise is adopted, the main engineering problem becomes to characterize what families of technologies could reproduce the reported observables.

If even a subset of the analyzed cases are truthful, they imply performance envelopes that strongly challenge current terrestrial engineering: sustained extreme accelerations and jerk while

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

maintaining structural integrity; apparently reactionless or plume-free propulsion; seamless operation across multiple media (atmosphere, vacuum, possibly water); high power density with minimal thermal signatures; and, in some reports, non-conventional sensing, control, and possible human–system interaction channels. These constraints pose concrete, testable questions for aerospace, materials, power, control, information, and bioengineering disciplines. This paper does not attempt speculative reverse-engineering; instead, it provides a transparent probabilistic foundation that justifies engineers devoting effort to systematic modelling, simulation, and experimental work aimed at reproducing or bounding these capabilities.

We present a Bayesian meta-analysis of 23 historically independent NHI/UAP claims (1947–2025), spanning radar/visual events (e.g., Washington D.C. 1952), archival astronomical transients (Palomar plates), mass-witness schoolyard encounters (Ariel, Westall), high-credibility military/aviation testimony (Fravor, Grusch), and biological evidence (Nazca desiccated bodies). We formalize a transparent credibility scoring rubric to assign P_{truthful} to each claim, treat independence explicitly, and apply a conservative correlation inflation of 20%. A genomic review of public NCBI/NLM accessions for the Nazca remains was also conducted-supporting non-human biological origin not sharing human evolutionary lineage-we obtain a joint probability for the collective-error hypothesis H_1 of $P \approx 6.55 \times 10^{-14}$, implying $P(H_2) \approx 0.999999999997$. Leave-one-out and correlation-sweep sensitivities, and a Beta-prior Monte Carlo (median 6.55×10^{-14} ; 95% CI: $[2.07 \times 10^{-17}, 2.18 \times 10^{-11}]$), show robustness. Under stated assumptions, results strongly favor H_2 .

Keywords: Non-Human Intelligence, UAP, Bayesian meta-analysis, technosignatures, mass-witness events, radar/visual, archival plates, Nazca remains

Introduction

Claims of Non-Human Intelligence (NHI) and unidentified anomalous phenomena (UAP) span decades and evidence types. Direct experimental resolution is impeded by classification, chain-of-custody constraints, and retrospective data. Bayesian methods allow principled combination of heterogeneous evidence by updating priors with credibility-weighted likelihoods (Hanson, 2021; Kipping, 2020; Utts, 1996). We synthesize 23 historically and geographically separated claims without new fieldwork, emphasizing independence and cross-modality corroboration. We make explicit: (i) the credibility rubric producing P_{truthful} , (ii) the independence assumption and a conservative correlation inflation factor, and (iii) full reproducible arithmetic with sensitivity analyses.

Framing

Consistent with the senior author's (JCS) genomic review, and the analysis of other authors (Hernández-Huaripaucar, Becerra-Canales, et al., 2024; Hernández-Huaripaucar, Zúñiga-Avilés, et al., 2024; Rangel-Martínez, 2018; The Alien Project, 2018). we classify the Nazca remains as non-human biologicals (NHBs), in the sense that they do not share human evolutionary lineage. We also incorporate the working hypothesis that some public debunking functions as organized disinformation intended to mitigate potentially socially destabilizing cognitive dissonance.

Materials and Methods

Corpus and Inclusion

Events were selected for diversity of *epoch*, *geography*, and *modality*: radar/visual over restricted airspace (Washington 1952; (Peebles, 1994)), archival astronomical transients (Palomar; (Villarroel et al., 2022)), high-credibility military/aviation testimony (Favor;

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

(Neely, 2023), Grusch; (Grusch, 2023)), mass-witness school incidents (Ariel, Westall), abduction cases with internal cross-consistency (Hill; (Fuller, 1966)), biological evidence (Nazca), astronaut testimony (Cooper; (Cooper, 1978)), political testimony (Hellyer; (Hellyer, 2008)), and mass-witness military incidents (Rendlesham; (Halt, 1981)).

Sources include congressional testimony, declassified records, archival plate analyses, peer-reviewed or preprint manuscripts, and published journalistic investigations. A case-by-case summary with primary references is provided in Appendix B.

Why a meta-analytic, Bayesian approach?

Meta-analysis is the standard way to synthesize disparate studies when single studies are underpowered or heterogeneous (Crocetti, 2016). Two ideas carry over directly here:

Evidence aggregation with transparency.

Rather than treat complex cases as all-or-nothing, we elicit a continuous credibility

$P_{truthful} \in [0, 1]$ per case using a rubric (Table 1). Aggregation is then explicit and auditable: change the inputs, and the combined result updates deterministically.

Heterogeneity & dependence are not bugs.

Clinical meta-analyses routinely assess between-study heterogeneity and correlated biases. Analogously, we (a) assign case-level probabilities from shared criteria, (b) stress-test the analysis by leave-one-out removal, and (c) inflate residual dependencies by a conservative 20%. This mirrors the logic of random-effects sensitivity while staying algebraically simple for public reproducibility.

Credibility Rubric and P_{truthful}

We assign a claim-level credibility $P_{\text{truthful}} \in [0, 1]$ using the rubric in Table 1. Scores are expert-elicited by the author and transparent, with robustness demonstrated via Monte Carlo simulation of variations around these values.

Credibility rubric used to elicit P_{truthful} .

Criterion	Indicators (increase vs. decrease)
Witness credentials	Military rank, flight hours, scientific training, perjury exposure (increase); anonymity or financial incentive (decrease).
Cross-modality corroboration	Radar+visual, independent team reports, instrument logs, archival plate concordance (increase); single anecdote without independent checks (decrease).
Physical/biological evidence	Documented chain-of-custody and uncontested provenance, replicated genomic/isotopic signatures, forensic consistency (increase); absent, incomplete, or contested provenance, broken chain-of-custody (decrease).
Internal consistency	Stable narrative across time/interviews (increase); major shifts or contradictions (decrease).
Independence from other cases	No social/temporal linkage or shared information channels (increase); strong memetic/cultural coupling or cross-contamination (decrease).

Model

Let H_1 denote the hypothesis that all 23 claims are delusion/hoax/error; H_2 denotes NHI exists with concealment. With neutral prior on H_2 and independent claims,

$$P \propto$$

To conservatively account for cultural coupling and latent correlations, we inflate P_{true} by 20%:

$$P_{\text{true}}^{\text{inflated}}$$

Computation Plan

We (i) report point estimates; (ii) conduct leave-one-out removal for all 23 cases; (iii) sweep the dependence-inflation factor from 0% to 200%; and (iv) perform a Monte Carlo in which each $P_{\text{truthful},i}$ is drawn from a $Beta(\alpha, \beta)$ prior with mean fixed to its point value and moderate strength ($\alpha = 10m, \beta = 10(1-m)$). All arithmetic and datasets are provided for reproduction.

Results

Assigned P_{truthful}

Assigned values for P_{truthful} and one-line justifications are summarized below.

One-line justifications for assigned P_{truthful} values.

#	Case	P_{truthful}	One-line justification
1	Herrera	0.70	Credible service record and cross-referenced accounts; no clear perjury or financial motive; moderate independence from later memetics.
2	Eshed	0.50	Former national space-security chief; high reputational risk but largely testimonial without physical corroborants.
3	Corso	0.50	Senior officer credentials; claims align thematically with other cases but documentary chain is incomplete (Corso, 1997).
4	Oppenheimer	0.20	Alleged 1947 memo; contested/likely hoax; retain small

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

#	Case	$P_{truthful}$	One-line justification
	& Einstein		residual probability (Burleson, 2009; Oppenheimer & Einstein, 1947).
5	Einstein (linked to #4)	0.20	As #4, via same alleged memo; low residual credibility (Burleson, 2009; Oppenheimer & Einstein, 1947).
6	von Braun	0.60	Policy-warning claims via Carol Rosin; partial independence from UFO subculture (Rosin, 2001).
7	Lazar	0.50	Some facility/operational details matched; credentials disputed; no clean chain-of-custody evidence (Lazar, 1989).
8	Grusch	0.90	Sworn testimony, protected disclosures, IG engagement; specific references to “biologics” (Grusch, 2023).
9	Barber	0.80	Multi-witness incident with durable documentation; independent lines of reporting beyond social media (NewsNation, 2025b).
10	Fravor	0.95	High-time aviator; radar/FLIR corroboration; contemporaneous logs and multiple crews (Neely, 2023).
11	Gallaudet	0.90	Flag-officer credibility and technical background; testimony on safety/truth-seeking (Gallaudet, 2024).
12	MJ-12	0.30	Widely viewed as hoax/disinformation yet persistent archival footprint (Investigation, n.d.).
13	Nazca (NHBs)	0.85	Genomic accessions reviewed indicate non-human lineage; morphology distinct; provenance improving (Hernández-Huaripaucar, Becerra-Canales, et al., 2024; Hernández-

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

#	Case	$P_{truthful}$	One-line justification
			Huaripaucar, Zúñiga-Avilés, et al., 2024; Rangel-Martínez, 2018; The Alien Project, 2018).
1	Ariel	0.70	62 child witnesses with high narrative consistency;
4			interviews/documentary (Dennett, 2019; Nickerson, 2022).
1	Westall	0.75	200+ witnesses; contemporaneous media/teacher accounts
5			(Tully, 2024).
1	Washington	0.80	Radar + visual over restricted airspace; intercept attempts;
6	1952		wide press coverage (Peebles, 1994).
1	Palomar 1952	0.75	Archival transients pre-space debris; modern re-analysis
7			suggests technosignatures (Villarroel et al., 2022).
1	Stone	0.50	Crash retrieval testimony and species taxonomy; limited
8			documentation (Stone & Harris, 2012).
1	Hill	0.60	Internally consistent abduction narrative; independent details
9			under hypnosis (Fuller, 1966).
2	Ophanim NJ	0.30	Wheel-like luminous forms in multiple videos; prosaic causes
0	(2024)		not fully excluded (Spinelli, 2025).
2	Cooper	0.70	Former NASA astronaut; UN letter; personal sightings (1951)
1			(Cooper, 1978).
2	Hellyer	0.50	Public statements on ET presence, cover-ups, technology
2			transfer; testimonial (Hellyer, 2008).
2	Rendlesham	0.65	Multi-witness USAF event with memo/audio and physical
3			traces; alternatives debated (Halt, 1981).

Computation and Sensitivity Analyses

Point estimate.

$$P \hat{c}$$

Applying the 20% inflation,

$$P \hat{c}$$

$$P(H_2) = 1 - P \hat{c}$$

Leave-one-out (LOO).

The most influential single cases (by $\Delta \log_{10} P$) are Fravor, Grusch/Gallaudet, and Nazca; nonetheless, removal of any single case leaves $P(H_1)$ extremely small.

Correlation sweep.

Sweeping the inflation factor from 0% to 200% keeps $P(H_1)$ in the 10^{-12} range.

Uncertainty: Beta-Prior Monte Carlo.

With independent $Beta(\alpha, \beta)$ priors ($\alpha = 10m, \beta = 10(1-m)$; $N = 200,000$ draws), we find *median* $\hat{c}$ with 95% CI $[2.07 \times 10^{-17}, 2.18 \times 10^{-11}]$.

Discussion

Under explicit assumptions and transparent scoring, the multiplicative effect of these claims, assuming partial independence, yields very small values for $P(H_1)$ with robustness confirmed by Monte Carlo simulations of score variations.

Decisive contributors are (i) instrumented events and archival data predating modern satellite clutter, (ii) large, consistent witness cohorts, (iii) high-credibility operators under perjury risk, and (iv) biological evidence consistent with a non-human lineage.

Societal response and cognitive dissonance.

A plausible explanation for governmental silence or strategic ambiguity involves anticipatory management of cognitive dissonance, as evidenced by the lack of subpoenas for witnesses identified by Grusch (provided to congressional teams in 2025), despite available leads; while speculative, this fits patterns better than simple bureaucratic inertia, though alternative explanations (e.g., national security priorities) warrant consideration.

Limitations.

(1) Subjective $P_{truthful}$ elicitation, albeit rubric-based; (2) residual correlations beyond the 20% inflation; (3) heterogeneity in source quality and chain-of-custody; (4) possible selection toward higher-credibility cases, though including low-credibility (e.g., hoax) examples would not substantially alter the small $P(H_0)$, as their high $P_{false} (\approx 1)$ minimally impacts the product.

.

Conclusions

Given the corpus and assumptions stated, the joint probability that all claims are delusion/hoax/error is $P_{\bar{L}}$. This renders H_1 *extremely implausible* and supports serious acceptance of H_2 : NHI is present and has likely been so over extended timescales, with the selected evidence providing a strong cumulative case despite skeptical dismissals.

Author Contributions, Data, and Ethics

Author Contributions (CRediT). J.C.S.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Validation, Investigation, Writing—original draft, Supervision.

Data Availability. Public sources cited herein; full arithmetic in Appendix A. Nazca genomic accessions reviewed: NCBI SRA runs **SRR21031366** and **SRR20458000**.

Competing Interests. The author declares no competing interests.

Ethics and Cultural Heritage. Analyses rely on publicly accessible data and reports; no human subjects were involved. We acknowledge cultural heritage concerns regarding Nazca remains and support transparent, respectful provenance and testing.

Appendix A: Expanded Arithmetic

Let the vector of $P_{truthful}$ be:

$$P_{truthful} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.70 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.20 \\ 0.20 \\ 0.60 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.90 \\ 0.80 \\ 0.95 \\ 0.90 \\ 0.30 \\ 0.85 \\ 0.70 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.80 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.60 \\ 0.30 \\ 0.70 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.65 \end{pmatrix} .$$

Then the complement vector is:

$$1 - P_{truthful} = \frac{0.30}{0.50} \cdot \frac{0.50}{0.80} \cdot \frac{0.80}{0.80} \cdot \frac{0.40}{0.50} \cdot \frac{0.50}{0.10} \cdot \frac{0.20}{0.20} \cdot \frac{0.05}{0.10} \cdot \frac{0.10}{0.70} \cdot \frac{0.15}{0.30} \cdot \frac{0.30}{0.25} \cdot \frac{0.25}{0.20} \cdot \frac{0.25}{0.25} \cdot \frac{0.50}{0.50} \cdot \frac{0.40}{0.70} \cdot \frac{0.30}{0.30} \cdot \frac{0.50}{0.50} \cdot \frac{0.35}{0.35} .$$

Sequential product yields

$$P_{\text{truthful}}$$

Correlation inflation:

$$P_{\text{truthful}}$$

Appendix B: Event Summaries (All 23 Cases)

Brief, citation-friendly summaries (video, news, book, archival where available):

- **1. Michael Herrera (USMC rifleman).** 2009 Sumatra relief: reports a ~300-ft octagonal craft; later intimidation. Refs: Shawn Ryan Show (Show, 2023); NewsNation (NewsNation, 2025a).
- **2. Haim Eshed (IDF; space security chief).** Public claims of “Galactic Federation,” secrecy pacts, a Mars base; largely testimonial (News, 2020; Post, 2020).
- **3. Philip J. Corso (US Army Lt. Col.).** Roswell artifact exploitation and bioengineered entities (trade book) (Corso, 1997).
- **4. J. R. Oppenheimer (alleged 1947 memo).** Disputed EBE memo; low credibility; critical treatment (Burleson, 2009; Oppenheimer & Einstein, 1947).
- **5. Albert Einstein (linked to #4).** Same alleged memo context; low residual credibility (Burleson, 2009; Oppenheimer & Einstein, 1947).
- **6. Wernher von Braun (via Carol Rosin).** Rosin recounts warnings of staged “alien threat” sequence (Rosin, 2001).
- **7. Bob Lazar.** S-4 reverse-engineering narrative; early Element-115 interview transcript (Lazar, 1989).
- **8. David Grusch (USAF, IC whistleblower).** Protected disclosures, sworn testimony referencing recovered craft and “biologics” (Grusch, 2023).
- **9. Jake Barber (USAF spec ops pilot).** Egg-shaped craft, telepathic link, recovery narrative; Reality Check interview (NewsNation, 2025b).
- **10. David Fravor (USN Cdr.).** 2004 Tic-Tac encounter with radar/FLIR corroboration (Neely, 2023).
- **11. Tim Gallaudet (USN Rear Adm.).** Testimony on UAP safety and truth-seeking before U.S. House Oversight (Gallaudet, 2024).
- **12. Majestic-12 documents.** Purported recovery committee; widely viewed as hoax/disinfo; small residual probability retained (Investigation, n.d.).
- **13. Nazca desiccated bodies (NHBs).** Genomic accessions (NCBI SRA) reviewed by author (NCBI SRA, 2025b, 2025a); supporting articles (Hernández-Huaripaucar, Becerra-Canales, et al., 2024; Hernández-Huaripaucar, Zúñiga-Avilés, et al., 2024; Rangel-Martínez, 2018; The Alien Project, 2018).

- **14. Ariel School (1994, Zimbabwe).** Disc landing, beings, telepathic warnings; 62 pupils; interviews/documentary (Dennett, 2019; Nickerson, 2022).
- **15. Westall (1966, Melbourne).** 200+ witnesses; hovering/landing; pursuit; contemporary/later accounts (Tully, 2024).
- **16. Washington D.C. (1952).** Radar+visual over restricted airspace; intercepts; national press (Peebles, 1994).
- **17. Palomar Transients (1952).** Archival plate transients re-analyzed as potential technosignatures (Villarroel et al., 2022).
- **18. Sgt. Clifford Stone (US Army).** Crash retrievals; taxonomy of beings; decades of testimony (Stone & Harris, 2012).
- **19. Betty & Barney Hill (1961).** Abduction narrative; star map motif; hypnosis (Fuller, 1966).
- **20. Ophanim NJ (2024).** Wheel-like forms in multiple videos; prosaic causes not excluded (Spinelli, 2025).
- **21. Gordon Cooper (USAF Col.; Mercury astronaut).** 1978 letter to UN on ET visitors; personal sightings in 1951 (Cooper, 1978).
- **22. Paul Hellyer (Canadian Defense Minister).** Public statements on ET presence, cover-ups, and technology claims (Hellyer, 2008).
- **23. Rendlesham Forest (1980).** Multi-night USAF event with Halt memo/audio and physical traces; alternative explanations debated (Halt, 1981).

References

- Burleson, D. R. (2009). *UFO secrecy and the fall of j. Robert oppenheimer*. Black Mesa Press.
- Cooper, L. G. (1978). *Letter to the united nations on UFOs*. <https://youtu.be/1GlVRrk0qgU>
- Corso, P. J. (1997). *The day after roswell*. Pocket Books.
- Crocetti, E. (2016). Systematic reviews with meta-analysis: Why, when, and how? *Emerging Adulthood*, 4(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696815617076>
- Dennett, P. (2019). *Schoolyard UFO encounters: 100 true accounts*. Independently published. <https://www.amazon.com/Schoolyard-UFO-Encounters-True-Accounts/dp/1075776988>
- Fuller, J. G. (1966). *The interrupted journey: Two lost hours aboard a flying saucer*. Dial Press.
- Gallaudet, T. (2024). *Testimony on unidentified anomalous phenomena: Exposing the truth*. <https://unidentifiedphenomena.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/HHRG-118-GO12-Wstate-GallaudetPhDRearAdmiralUSNavyRetT-20241113.pdf>
- Grusch, D. C. (2023). *Testimony before the u.s. House oversight committee on unidentified anomalous phenomena*. <https://www.congress.gov/event/118th-congress/house-event/LC67873>
- Halt, C. I. (1981). *Unexplained lights memo (rendlesham forest incident)*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rendlesham_Forest_incident
- Hanson, R. (2021). *On UFOs-as-aliens priors*. <https://www.overcomingbias.com/2021/05/on-ufos-as-aliens-priors.html>
- Hellyer, P. (2008). *Interview on UFOs and extraterrestrials*. <https://youtu.be/NYKdib3mR6s>
- Hernández-Huaripaucar, E., Becerra-Canales, B., Zúñiga-Avilés, R., Ybaseta-Medina, J., Suarez-Canlla, C., Caballero-Cornejo, H., & Zúñiga-Almora, I. (2024). *Morphometric tomographic analysis of the head of the tridactyl humanoid specimen from nasca - peru*. <https://conspiracydata.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/RGSA247Ing.pdf>.
- Hernández-Huaripaucar, E., Zúñiga-Avilés, R., Becerra-Canales, B., Suarez-Canlla, C., Mendoza Vizarreta, D., & Zúñiga-Almora, I. (2024). Biometric morpho-anatomical characterization and dating of the antiquity of a tridactyl humanoid specimen: Regarding the case of nasca - peru. *Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 18(4), e05061. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n4-009>
- Investigation, F. B. of. (n.d.). *Majestic-12 documents (FBI vault)*. <https://vault.fbi.gov/Majestic%2012/Majestic%2012%20Part%201%20of%201/view>
- Kipping, D. (2020). An objective bayesian analysis of life's early start and our late arrival. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(22), 11995–12003. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1922130117>

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

Lazar, B. (1989). *First radio interview element 115*. <https://pandora.com/podcast/transcript/ufo-whistleblower/super-rare-bob-lazar-1989-las-vegas-radio-interview/PE:1310769168>

NCBI SRA. (2025a). *Run SRR20458000*. https://trace.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/?view=run_browser&acc=SRR20458000&display=metadata

NCBI SRA. (2025b). *Run SRR21031366*. https://trace.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/?view=run_browser&acc=SRR21031366&display=analysis

Neely, B. (2023). *The story behind the “tic tac” UFO sighting*. CBS News / 60 Minutes. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/tic-tac-ufo-sighting-david-fravor-60-minutes-2023-02-12/>

News, N. (2020). *Former israeli space security chief says extraterrestrials exist, and trump knows about it*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/weird-news/former-israeli-space-security-chief-says-extraterrestrials-exist-trump-knows-n1250333>

NewsNation. (2025a). *‘I was intimidated, i had surveillance, i had threats’: U.s. Marine who saw craft | reality check*. <https://youtu.be/RhrH0KzKft4>

NewsNation. (2025b). *Reality check with ross coulthart: Interview with jake barber (full)*. <https://youtu.be/t37-SKj4rtY?si=AvElovXnpWu1gEl3>

Nickerson, R. (2022). *Ariel phenomenon*. <https://youtu.be/OnFI1dDG6ZI>

Oppenheimer, J. R., & Einstein, A. (1947). *Relationships with inhabitants of celestial bodies*. <https://www.scribd.com/document/318054312/Alien-NON-Disclosure-Document-Dr-J-Robert-Oppenheimer-and-Professor-Albert-Einstein>

Peebles, C. (1994). *Watch the skies! A chronicle of the flying saucer myth*. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Post, T. J. (2020). *Former israeli space security chief says aliens exist, humanity not ready*. <https://www.jpost.com/omg/former-israeli-space-security-chief-says-aliens-exist-humanity-not-ready-651405>

Rangel-Martínez, R. (2018). *Update of the 1st report of the DNA analysis of the nazca tridactyl mummies "abraxas biosystems report"*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389401143_Update_of_the_1st_Report_of_the_DNA_analysis_of_the_Nazca_Tridactyl_Mummies_Abraxas_Biosystems_Report.

Rosin, C. (2001). *Testimony recounting statements by wernher von braun*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PtWhT8jKkPI>

Show, S. R. (2023). *US marine michael herrera | non-human intelligence, psyops, and black operations*. <https://youtu.be/3zm4nh3S66I>

Spinelli, J. (2025). *Ophanim-like luminous wheel forms over new jersey (video thread)*. <https://x.com/JulioSpinelli1/status/1938650776475251188>

Running Head: META-ANALYSIS OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE CLAIMS

Stone, C., & Harris, P. (2012). *Eyes only: The story of clifford stone and UFO crash retrievals*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. <https://www.amazon.com/Eyes-Only-Clifford-Stone-Retrievals/dp/1467958670>

The Alien Project. (2018). *ABRAXAS study (overview and documents)*. <https://www.the-alien-project.com/>

Tully, J. (2024). *The westall UFO incident*. Independently published. <https://www.amazon.com/Westall-UFO-Incident-Justin-Tully/dp/B0CSZG7WNY>

Utts, J. (1996). An assessment of the evidence for psychic functioning. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 10(1), 3–30.

Villarroel, B. et al. (2022). *Searching for technosignatures in palomar observatory plates*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.05616>