



**THE BEGIN-SADAT CENTER
FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES**



**Bar-Ilan
University**

American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?

Franc Milburn



**THE BEGIN-SADAT CENTER FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY**
Mideast Security and Policy Studies No. 189

American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?

Franc Milburn

American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?

Franc Milburn

© The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
Bar-Ilan University
Ramat Gan 5290002 Israel
Tel. 972-3-5318959
Fax. 972-3-5359195
office@besacenter.org
www.besacenter.org

ISSN 0793-1042

March 2021

Cover image: Screen capture from US Navy video of UAP declassified by the Pentagon in 2020, via YouTube.

The Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies

The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies is an independent, non-partisan think tank conducting policy-relevant research on Middle Eastern and global strategic affairs, particularly as they relate to the national security and foreign policy of Israel and regional peace and stability. It is named in memory of Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat, whose efforts in pursuing peace laid the cornerstone for conflict resolution in the Middle East.

BESA Perspectives are short pieces on timely and fundamental Israeli, Middle Eastern, and global issues. Mideast Security and Policy Studies serve as a forum for publication or re-publication of research conducted by BESA associates. Colloquia on Strategy and Diplomacy summarize the papers delivered at conferences and seminars held by the Center for the academic, military, official, and general publics. In sponsoring these discussions, the BESA Center aims to stimulate public debate on, and consideration of, contending approaches to problems of peace and war in the Middle East. The Policy Memorandum series consists of policy-oriented papers. Publication of a work by BESA signifies that it is deemed worthy of public consideration but does not imply endorsement of the author's views or conclusions. A list of recent BESA Center publications can be found at the end of this booklet.

International Advisory Board

Founder of the Center and Chairman of the Advisory Board: Dr. Thomas O. Hecht

Vice Chairman: Mr. Saul Koschitzky

Members: Ms. Marion Hecht, Mr. Robert Hecht, Prof. Riva Heft-Hecht, Mr. Joel Koschitzky, Amb. Yitzhak Levanon, Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman, Mr. Robert K. Lifton, Rt. Hon. Brian Mulroney, Mr. Seymour D. Reich, Mr. Greg Rosshandler, Amb. Zalman Shoval, Amb. Norman Spector, Ms. Drorit Wertheim

International Academic Advisory Board

Prof. Ian Beckett University of Kent, Prof. Eliot A. Cohen Johns Hopkins University, Prof. Irwin Cotler McGill University, Prof. Steven R. David Johns Hopkins University, Prof. Lawrence Freedman King's College, Prof. Patrick James University of Southern California, Dr. Martin Kramer Shalem College, Prof. Robert J. Lieber Georgetown University, Prof. Michael Mandelbaum Johns Hopkins University

Research Staff

BESA Center Director: Prof. Efraim Karsh

Research Associates: Mr. Emil Avdaliani, Dr. Efrat Aviv, Lt. Col. (res.) Dr. Shaul Bartal, Mr. Edwin Black, Dr. Yael Bloch-Elkon, Col. (res.) Dr. Raphael Bouchnik-Chen, Brig. Gen. (res.) Moni Chorev, Dr. Edy Cohen, Dr. James Dorsey, Dr. Gil Feiler, Prof. Jonathan Fox, Prof. Hillel Frisch, Dr. Manfred Gerstenfeld, Prof. Eytan Gilboa, Dr. Gabriel Glickman, Maj. Gen. (res.) Gershon Hacohen, Col. (res.) Aby Har-Even, Dr. Eado Hecht, Dr. Tsilla Hershco, Dr. Doron Itzhakov, Dr. Alex Joffe, Lt. Col. (res.) Dr. Mordechai Kedar, Mr. Yaakov Lappin, Prof. Udi Lebel, Dr. Alon Levkowitz, Prof. Ze'ev Maghen, Dr. Mark Meirowitz, Ambassador Arye Mekel, Lt. Col. (res.) Dr. Raphael Ofek, Mr. Amir Rapaport, Dr. Asaf Romirowsky, Col. (res.) Dr. Uzi Rubin, Prof. Jonathan Rynhold, Prof. Shmuel Sandler, Dr. Yechiel Shabiy, Dr. Eitan Shamir, Lt. Col. (res.) Dr. Dany Shoham, Prof. Shlomo Shapiro, Prof. Joshua Teitelbaum, Dr. George N. Tzogopoulos, Dr. Jiri Valenta, Dr. Albert Wolf

Program Coordinator: Alona Briner

Publications Editor (English): Judith Levy

American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?

Franc Milburn

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The BESA Center’s recent detailed [study](#) on Unexplained Aerial Phenomena (UAP) described the post-quantum revolution in military affairs unfolding as a result of studying UAP “observables” and assessed the strategic implications in terms of potential threats emanating from UAP or adversaries. This paper delves further into “beyond next generation” technologies. It is based on recent comments by Luis Elizondo, former director of the Pentagon’s Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program, as well as analyses by scientists and former DoD insiders.

The questions to be addressed are: What are the capabilities of these technologies, what decisive advantages would they provide, and how likely are they to be developed and deployed?

Franc Milburn is a strategic and operational advisor. A former UK military intelligence officer, he is an alumnus of Sandhurst and the London School of Economics and a member of the Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies. He has written for the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, the Institute for National Security Studies at Tel Aviv University, and the BESA Center. @FrancMilburn

American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?

Franc Milburn

In February 2021, the [Project Unity](#) platform spoke with Luis Elizondo, former director of the Pentagon's Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program (AATIP). That conversation, as well as conversations this author held with other relevant figures, shed new light on US Department of Defense knowledge and theories about UAP capabilities and technologies.

Project Unity: One thing I find curious is that the [Tic-Tac](#) craft involved in the [USS Nimitz](#) incident was reported to have jammed the pilots' radar. Now, due to the fact that pretty much all other radar cases with UAPs show the UAP has the ability to seemingly appear on and off radar at will, it makes the jamming seem unnecessary. Moreover, considering the craft's performance level and ability to outmaneuver the jets as well as any ordnance (had there been any on board), why do you think it would need to jam human radar?

Elizondo: Well, I think when we say "jam," that's a misnomer. I think probably the best response is "interfere." Because we suspect now, based upon the physics that we're seeing, that it may not be an actual active attempt to jam. ... What appears to be jamming is actually nothing more than a consequence or an artefact, if you will, of the object that we're seeing... Imagine if you had the ability to manipulate space-time in a localized area around you. From the outside viewer's perspective, it would be a little bit like looking at koi fish in the bottom of a pond. You would see a distortion.

Now, the object isn't really distorted, but because of the energy that is coming from the sun in the form of light energy, like waves, when it hits that localized area, what goes in is not necessarily in the same frequency that goes out. That's true not just with sunlight, but any type of electromagnetic radiation, whether it be artificial like a radar signature or something as normal as natural light. You would expect or anticipate to see a bit of distortion, and in fact... the more you have the ability to manipulate space-time in a localized area, that sight picture would become increasingly distorted.

Think of a black hole. There's a reason why you can't see inside of a black hole and that is because you are looking at an object that is truly warping space-time at the point of the event-horizon... But if you did have the ability to manipulate space-time in a localized area to the outside observer, you might experience shifts... Doppler shifts... in frequency and so I guess... it may not be active jamming, it may just simply be... a by-product... It may not be deliberate *per se*.

Project Unity: In a recent [white paper](#) written by a colleague and friend of mine, Franc Milburn, published by the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, Franc asked [theoretical physicist and Tic-Tac Tec/T³ proponent] Dr. Jack Sarfatti if a Tic-Tac with its surrounding field would be susceptible to weapons like surface-to-air or air-to-air missiles, aircraft cannon, lasers, railguns, EMP devices, or even nuclear warheads that were detonated in proximity to a UAP. Sarfatti theorized that if the warp field surrounding the UAP is strong enough, it could essentially create—and I'll quote Jack Sarfatti here: “A white hole artificial event horizon generated by the metamaterial which would prevent anything from penetrating, no matter how powerful the energy associated with the weapon used against the Tic-Tac was.”

If correct, then this would mean more advanced weapons being developed like lasers and rail guns are already obsolete, except for use against near-peer adversaries. Is this not, then, an even

better argument for development of offensive and defensive UAP technology in order to mitigate the threats presented by both near-peer adversaries and the operators of UAP, and especially to get there first before China and Russia do?

Elizondo: Sure. ...First of all you asked me to comment on Mr. Sarfatti's physics model. Well, unfortunately I'm not a physicist... I can't tell you the validity of his scientific modeling and whether something is or is not impenetrable... But if there is something out there that displays extremely advanced capabilities, whether it's a weapon system or propulsion... I think there is a potential threat. There are countries out there we know... that if they had a strategic advantage on us, they would use those in an irresponsible way. They would use them probably as a weapon of war rather than a weapon of peace. So as a result of that, I think it's incumbent upon us... to make sure that if this technology is viable, that it does not get into the wrong hands... I don't want this technology getting into the hands of an adversary. I also don't want it getting into the hands of somebody irresponsible in my own country.

Elizondo's inability to comment on Tic-Tac's vulnerability (or invulnerability) to specific weapon systems may not be as clear cut as stated above. He will be familiar with the [1976 Tehran UFO](#) case, in which an intercepting Phantom jet of the Imperial Iranian Air Force tried to engage a target with a Vietnam War-era Sidewinder infrared homing missile (most likely an [AIM9-B or D](#)). The weapons panel "went off" and the aircraft "lost all communications." A previous intercept attempt of the same target by another Phantom saw that aircraft lose instrumentation and communications (UHF and intercom) at a range of 25NM. These encounters were the [subject](#) of a [DIA memo](#) from USAF Col. Olin Moy with the US Military Advisory and Assistance Group in Tehran. The memo was copied all the way to the White House and Elizondo will be aware of it.

According to an [interview](#) given by the pilot, then the squadron CO and later a general:

Then I was startled by a round object which came out of the primary object and started coming straight toward me at a high rate of speed, almost as if it were a missile... I was really scared, because I thought that maybe they had launched some kind of projectile toward me. I had eight missiles on board, four operated by radar and four heat-seeking ones. The radar was locked on to the larger, diamond object, and I had to make a very fast decision as to what to do. I realized that if this moon-like second thing was a missile, it would have some heat associated with it. So I selected an AIM-9 heat-seeking missile to fire at it. I attempted to fire, and looked at the panel to confirm my selection of the missile. Suddenly, nothing was working. The weapons control panel was out, and I lost all the instruments, and the radio. The indicator dials were spinning around randomly, and the instruments were fluctuating. At this point, I was even more frightened. I couldn't communicate with the tower, and had to scream to talk to my backseater.

Another intercept that Elizondo (and the Pentagon's current [UAP Task Force/UAPTF](#)) would be aware of is the [1980 Peru](#) case, in which a pilot in a Sukhoi-22 engaged a UFO.

I reached the necessary distance and shot a burst of 64 30mm shells, which created a cone-shaped wall of fire that would normally obliterate anything in its path. Some of the projectiles deviated from the target, falling to the ground, and others hit it with precision. I thought that the balloon would then be torn open and gases would start pouring out of it. But nothing happened. It seemed as if the huge bullets were absorbed by the balloon, and it wasn't damaged at all.. I was startled to see that the "balloon" ... was an object that measured about 35 feet (10 meters) in diameter with a shiny dome on top that was cream-colored, similar to a light bulb cut in half. The bottom was a wider circular base, a silver color, and looked like some kind of metal. It lacked all the typical components of aircraft. It had no wings, propulsion jets, exhausts, windows, antennae, and so forth. It had no visible propulsion system... I had a combat experience with

an unidentified flying object that flew and maneuvered in the air without any recognizable features of aircraft, features that even today are necessary parts of any flying machine.

Elizondo, ATIP, and its successor UAPTF will also be aware of Col. John Alexander's views on the capabilities for downing UAP. [Alexander](#), a former Pentagon insider and founder of the [Advanced Theoretical Physics Group](#), an AATIP predecessor studying UFOs, also headed up white and black [directed energy weapons](#) (DEW) projects. He [told the author](#) he discounted claims of UFOs being shot down with DEW. Referring to the [Nimitz incident](#), Dr. Eric Davis, a senior scientific advisor to AATIP reporting to Elizondo and a DoD-deputized advisor to the [Nimitz](#) and [Roosevelt](#) UAP investigations, [said](#):

So that was a test that could not be performed: to see whether you could shoot one down [because the Navy F18s were unarmed].

It should be clear, however, from the aforementioned Tehran and Peru cases that Elizondo, Davis, and AATIP, would all have been aware of attempted intercepts and use of certain weapons systems against UAP. The UAPTF will also have this knowledge—both in files inherited from AATIP and because Elizondo and former deputy assistant secretary of defense for intelligence Chris Mellon are likely consulting to the UAPTF—as indicated in a cryptic [reply](#) by Elizondo to an interviewer's question about it:

I can't answer that. That would be up to the US government to answer that question. I'm not saying yes or no... it's a question you would have to bring up to the US government.

Further Elizondo statements reveal even more DoD understanding of beyond next generation technologies.

Project Unity: Something I really wanted to touch on is the infamous [Slide 9](#) that was discovered by a [fellow researcher](#)... who discovered on Christopher Mellon's web page an AATIP presentation slide which included... some pretty disturbing conclusions: "The science exists for an enemy of the United States to manipulate both physical and cognitive environments

in order to penetrate US facilities, influence decision makers and compromise national security.” The slide then goes on to list the applications of this science, which include: psychotronic weapons, penetration of solid surfaces, alteration or manipulation of biological organisms, instantaneous sensor disassembly, unique cognitive human interface experiences, and one of the most disturbing and intriguing—anomalies in the space-time construct. Now this slide, if I am correct, is essentially saying that a science or technology exists that would allow for the complete and total manipulation of both cognitive and physical environments, including the manipulation of the very fabric of space-time itself. Is that correct?

Elizondo: That’s a pretty fair assessment.

Slide 9

DoD Threat Scenario (AATIP Sub-Focus Areas)

The science exists for an enemy of the United States to manipulate both physical and cognitive environments in order to penetrate U.S. facilities, influence decision makers, and compromise national security

- Psychotronic weapons
- Cognitive Human Interface (CHI)
- Penetration of solid surfaces
- Instantaneous sensor disassembly
- Alteration/Manipulation of biological organisms
- Anomalies in the space/time construct
- Unique cognitive human interface experiences

DoD Advantages

- DoD has been involved in similar experiments in the past
- DoD has relationships with renowned subject matter experts
- DoD controls several facilities where activities have been detected

What was considered “phenomena” is now quantum physics

The interviewer then [delves deeper](#) into the implications of the slide with Elizondo.

Project Unity: The slide also mentions how the Department of Defense has been involved in similar experiments in the past and has relationships with renowned subject matter experts, finishing off by saying that the Department of Defense controls several facilities where activities have been detected...the renowned astrophysicist and ufology expert [Jacques Vallee](#) has made statements about... exquisite [holographic technologies](#) possessed by the US government... credible investigators and government insiders have alluded to... United States special forces engaging in psychological warfare testing operations on US soldiers. Some have even claimed... these activities were responsible for a portion of the alleged UAP sightings over nuclear facilities, and may have been conducted as “penetration tests”... One proponent... Dr. Jacques Vallee... [is] hypothesizing that [man-made illusions](#) have... been behind a number of famous cases over the years... Are you aware of any extra-terrestrial/UAP-related tests ever having been perpetrated against the United States military or the civilian population?

Elizondo: By Americans? By the American government?

Project Unity: Yes, or by another foreign adversary... human.

Elizondo: Not by the American government.

The above replies complement those from another recent [Elizondo interview](#):

We live in a three-dimensional world where time is a function of the fourth dimension and we experience time as linear... But we now know in the quantum world that space and time...are joined together and we know that space-time is flexible. It is called relativity, and we see it around a mass of objects all the time and not just Earth... So the linear universe that we experience, to some degree,

really isn't. What if there were things that had the ability to experience... a much bigger transition where more elements of the future and the past are experienced as in the present, and can do that also physically? What if there were species out there that experienced the universe with an extra level of dimension? ... You and I are having this conversation... right here, right now. But if I were to have the ability to have this conversation right here but five minutes ago, or five minutes from now, we would never meet, we would be like two ships passing in the night. Is it possible that maybe somewhere these things, these UAP, have the ability? We experience them when they are right here right now and every other time we don't, because we're simply not intersecting with that extra-dimensional space of time.

Elizondo expands in [another](#) interview:

There may be realities all around us that we simply don't perceive. We're very limited as a species... we live in a three-dimensional space, X, Y, Z axis and time, which is a function I guess of the fourth dimension and that's expressed in a linear motion for us. But that's not to say there are not other things all around us. We sense the universe through the five primary senses... We look at the world through a very narrow band of the electromagnetic spectrum, of the electro-optical spectrum.

If we relate these comments to the [3rd UAP observable characteristic](#)—low observability or stealth, both with a naked eye and electro-optically—then there is clearly a decisive advantage for the country that can harness this technology first, bearing in mind that currently, the principles of [stealth](#) technology are to reduce radar, infrared, electromagnetic (EM), optical and acoustic signatures. Interestingly, UAP do not appear to produce sonic booms. Dr. Sarfatti, quoted in [BESA's first UAP paper](#), stated:

The strong gravity near field distortions will bend electromagnetic waves bouncing off the Tic-Tac, causing

apparent mirage shape-shifting and even stealth cloaking, if desired by the controlling, probably fully conscious AI post-quantum computer (autonomous drone).

The author commented in the original paper that UAP:

...unfolded wings and control surfaces that resembled a black 707 and that were emitting “reverse Doppler” and false commercial jet acoustic signatures, in an apparently deliberate effort to evade detection. Various craft apparently tried to mimic conventional aircraft sounds—jet engine and sometimes propeller sounds—but were unable to produce a normal Doppler sound. Sarfatti claims that according to his theory about how UAP hulls work, their metamaterials use reverse Doppler. He believes this corroborates his theory that the craft were anti-gravity.

For this paper, the author asked Dr. Sarfatti if the intelligences behind UAP wanted to be really stealthy (assuming one could ascertain who or what “they” are and what their intentions may be). Why could they not do a better job on the reverse Doppler effect? If “they” are going to the trouble of seemingly mechanical shape-shifting and potentially going stealthy, then why wouldn’t they address the acoustic give-away signature?

Sarfatti replies:

Reverse Doppler may not easily show up in bounced signal from radars. [This is] because the frequency shift of the incoming wave is canceled by the reverse path through the warp field of the reflected wave, assuming static warp field of course. The effect for radar needs to be calculated carefully under the dynamic conditions of a Tic-Tac in a dogfight with an F35. EM/sound waves in air originating at a Tic-Tac passing through the warp field will show reverse Doppler more strongly. They do not intentionally mechanically shape-shift. The shape-shifting is simply gravity lensing bending of EM signals by the dynamically changing warp field, same as bending of light by the sun that Eddington measured in

1919, confirming a prediction of Einstein's 1916 GR field equation that is the basis of my explanation as well. Shape-shifting is not mechanical: it's a mirage, an optical illusion... Though they could do that with smart [metamaterials](#), there is no evidence that it's not simple gravity lensing.

Elizondo next provides answers that the author never realistically expected to be given.

Project Unity: Dr. [Eric Davis](#) has repeatedly stressed the [importance](#) of the 38 Defense Intelligence Reference [Documents](#) from the precursor program of AATIP known as [AAWSAP](#) (Advanced Aerospace Weapon Systems Applications Program), in terms of extrapolating the physics and engineering of 2009 out to 2050, to determine whether or not the Americans can approximate the capabilities of Tic-Tacs/UAPs in a scenario where the UAPs might become a future threat to the US.

Now, Eric Davis [talks about](#) the 1977 Colares (Brazil) case where UFOs purportedly utilized beams to kill and injure people. In the 1960s, NASA [aerospace] engineer Dr. Paul Hill [theorized](#) about UFOs employing heat beams, paralyzing beams, [and] force beams, and that the UFO propulsion or power systems could be utilized as a weapon. Dr. [Jack Sarfatti](#) has theorized UAP having high frequency gravity [weapons](#) capable of disrupting aircraft weapon systems, jamming radars and communications and affecting missile launch circuitry, emitting beams of gravity curvature that range in power from that of an electromagnetic pulse to essentially tearing an F-18 apart.

My question is, how realistic is the time frame given by Davis for the US military to achieve these capabilities and also to convince Congress to allocate the money for a huge [Manhattan Project](#)-style effort to get there?

Elizondo: That timeline isn't up to me...Congress and government is going to respond...if they feel there is an

interest by the people to do X, Y, Z, then they are going to lead the charge in doing that and making sure it is properly resourced. To put it bluntly, I think we're at a point where it probably, it's no longer a theoretical question whether or not this type of science is real or possible; I think it is now just a technical challenge and scalability. I do believe that we now have a much better understanding of the physics and the mathematics. Based upon our continued exploration into quantum physics, we are beginning to realize that a lot of the observations we are seeing associated with UAP really are just rooted in advanced physics. And I think the time will come when we are able to exploit that.

Interestingly, [another question](#) would appear to indicate that full understanding of UAP tech would necessitate access to as yet unavailable technologies:

Dr. Eric Davis once stated that during his time in AATIP, he located the reverse engineering programs holding the craft, and if they had been able to get access to the program, then they would have dramatically increased their understanding. During your time as the director of AATIP, did you locate programs that were working on the reverse engineering of non-terrestrial vehicles?

Elizondo: I can't answer that question, unfortunately.

Diving deeper on the advanced physics, [Elizondo says](#) in another interview:

The bottom line is we came really far in understanding there were some interesting commonalities, whether we're talking about [UAP] discs or cigar shapes or triangle shapes. We had some scientists and mathematicians looking at this and I think we are a lot closer now to understanding the potential physics behind these things than we ever have been before. I cannot go into detail of what that is and what that looks like, but I think we are a lot closer to that prize than most people think.

It turns out that a lot of the observations we've seen from instantaneous acceleration, hypersonic velocities, low observability, [trans-medium travel](#), and of course the positive list or anti-gravity... For many years we looked at these; we tried to figure out each one of these observations from the perspective of some sort of exotic technology. And one of the findings from AATIP was that it may very well be that all of those observables are actually a result of the manifestation of a single technology. And if you know how to do X, all these other things can now occur... So that was a crossing of the river moment for us. It was very exciting for us and it turned out that the math worked and same with some of the scientific models.

Sarfatti says that from a strict physics perspective,

There is no acceleration and no hypersonic velocity in Tic-Tac Tech/T³. Tic-Tac stands still relative to its local gravity field in weightless free float. It's the space around it that is warping, so that it appears like instant acceleration and hypersonic velocity to outside observers like [Commander Flavor](#) using electromagnetic wave signals coming from the warp field. It is in [John Archibald Wheeler's](#) terms: acceleration without acceleration; hypersonic velocity without hypersonic velocity.

Regardless of the terminology, the military advantages are game-changing and revolutionary. [Elizondo has previously stated](#):

The first observable is *sudden or instantaneous acceleration*... the human being can withstand approximately 9 Gs for a short period of time while we're in a G suit. From a materials science perspective, some of our most highly maneuverable aircraft [like the [F-16](#)] can experience Gs of up to 20 before wings begin to fail. The objects we're witnessing are expressing G forces well in excess of 200. So as one can imagine, instantaneous acceleration would be very important for any country who wants to increase their maneuverability.

The next observable is *hypersonic velocity*. Not to be confused with supersonic...The faster an aircraft flies in the atmosphere, the more changes in its environment. Friction on the nose; friction on the leading surfaces; heat coming from the engines and even acoustic signatures: are all detectable... As one can imagine, rapid deployment, enemy evasion, and first strike capability would be enhanced. In some cases, these objects [UAP] have been observed flying 8,000 miles an hour and faster. There are few, but very few things that mankind has developed that can fly that fast in the atmosphere and we know what those look like.

... *multi-medium travel*... An aircraft looks like it's an aircraft because it is a product of its environment. We, as mankind, design things to function in specific environments... An airplane you can expect to have a nose, a tail, wings, control surfaces... A rocket that's designed for a vacuum doesn't need wings and doesn't have a jet engine... It has thrusters and uses a chemical explosion to get into orbit... A submarine does not look like a plane or a rocket.... [It] uses a combination of water and air to create buoyancy. And that is why a plane does not look like a rocket and a rocket does not look like a submarine and they all perform quite differently. Yet what we are seeing are things that can operate as freely in the atmosphere as they can in a vacuum, as they can under water, without changing their physical properties. And from a military perspective, one can imagine how advantageous this would be.

... *positive lift [anti-gravity]*... Here is our aircraft... In order to fly, it requires an understanding of physics and the forces that are applied to this aircraft: thrust, lift, drag, weight. And in order to achieve lift, one would normally require some means of propulsion—and there's only a few choices: propeller, jet, rocket, lighter than air and a few others... You need sustained movement forward to maintain lift. And yet what we are witnessing are vehicles that can perform like an airplane, like a helicopter, and frankly, like vehicles we just

don't understand... One can see from a military perspective... If we had this technology, this capability, it would provide a strategic advantage. Now, if any nation had just one of these capabilities, it would be an absolute game changer in the way we do national security and defense.

The key questions are therefore: Is it feasible to develop this technology, how much will it cost, and how long will it take to deploy?

Dr. Eric Davis has [repeatedly posited](#) the year 2050 as the forward-looking point for understanding the advanced physics and engineering.

Project Unity: How realistic would funding for such a project be (building or designing this technology and making these breakthroughs) given more immediate and tangible [threats](#) presented by near-peer adversaries, regional trouble-makers like North Korea and Iran and the war on terror?

Elizondo: Well, let's look at the last time the US was in a similar situation in the world. Let's take right after World War Two and the Korean War. We had a lot going on... We had a lot of issues we were dealing with and yet we still decided to put a man on the moon. And it took us 10 years, but keep in mind [that] just a decade before, we were still using aircraft with propellers to fly across the ocean... I think when we decide as a people to do something, then all sorts of things are possible. Let's not forget that on the Apollo mission alone, something like 6,200 major innovations were invented... and all of this was a result of competition between the United States and Russia to see who was going to be the first person on the moon.

I think it's too early to answer that question..because we still need more data, we need more transparency, and we need more discussion... The establishment of a UAP [Task Force](#) was a step in the right direction towards that goal: being able to put our time, resources, and talents into that topic. So maybe I'm a little bit more optimistic than some when it comes to your question, as far as will the government ever

galvanize itself to pursue this endeavor. I do. I think once it accepts the reality that these things [UAP] are real, then it's almost a *fait accompli*. I can't see how they wouldn't, if that makes sense.

The author asked two very different experts for their opinions on feasibility, cost, time, and resources. Dr. Sarfatti said the time to have operational T³ platforms and weapons systems would depend on the money and resources allocated, but could be “three to five years if adequate.” He estimates the cost to be “probably tens of billions—how much to design [an] F-35 or a supercarrier?” He believes that a small, tech-advanced country like Israel could mount the project necessary to achieve T³ with sufficient funding and technical expertise.

He agreed with the author that there would be numerous military advantages for Israel, including: the ability to fry/interfere with Iranian radars and satellites; destroy missiles, including those in electromagnetic-shielded silos; construct platforms that can loiter almost indefinitely over the battle space and remain near-invulnerable; move a platform from low-earth orbit to low altitude in seconds; and penetrate Hezbollah bunkers/firing positions to destroy weaponry and personnel without collateral damage, to name a few. Iran’s [main supply routes](#) to Syria and Lebanon would also be vulnerable at any point—including inside Iran, with distance and fuel problems solved and far reduced possibility for pilot loss—assuming platforms are not fully autonomous.

[Col. John Alexander](#) is far less sanguine about prospects for successful development of UAP tech. No stranger to billion-dollar budgets and an expert on how project financing and development pipelines work, he told the author:

[The] Manhattan [Project] today would be \$23 billion... OK, so what are you going to give up for \$23 billion? Because you are going to have to trade some programs. It's a zero-sum game. In the budget process? In order to convince the decision-makers, the people who control the budget, that they are going to reallocate... Well, at that amount you would have to go back to Congress, because you would exceed all

budgetary thresholds... It's not quite the [X-35](#), but you're talking major platforms and that would have to be agreed to.

And in order to do that, you have got to get users convinced... to put out a requirement that says "we absolutely need this." And they have to prioritize all the things they say they need... and \$23 billion would be a very high priority item. ... You've got to start by getting users out there saying, "We really need this capability" and not "Gee, it would be nice if we had it." Because if they say: "We need this," you have to say: "What are you not going to build in its place?"

Then you've got to have the developers who come along and say: "We can meet that requirement and this is about what it will cost." I submit that you may find a few individuals who are personally interested—and this is where I differentiate between the individual interest and the institutional interest, or institutional responsibility.... You then have to come up and say: "OK, we're going to allocate this amount of funds."

Then you've got oversight—and in a case like this, it would go all the way to Congress – and you have to go in and justify that level of expense... It would be certainly interesting. I just find it extraordinarily improbable that you're going to be able to meet all of those requirements. You get hard requirements that you say: "Here's the probability of success" and the oversight people say: "We will verily commit \$23 billion... \$10 billion..."... Pick your figure.. You used Manhattan as an example—That was \$2 billion at the time; \$23 billion today. Pick your number; it would still be big.

Talking about cost-overruns with major platforms like [F-22](#) and [F-35](#), Alexander says:

That's been one of the problems with developers coming in, doing their proposals and low-balling. I think in reality, on big-ticket items like major platforms, almost everybody anticipates that.

He also mentions the possibility of getting billions of dollars into a project only to see it canceled.

There are [already] going to be serious questions as to whether [the current DoD budget] is sustainable. And now when you're on the national priority list... Healthcare is going to be right up there...a major driver at the moment.

Discussing the threat narrative, he comments:

The issue of everything is a threat: I can make that argument and I did originally and the reason I did that... was that if you want money, you've got to be doing something that the Department of Defense deals with and they deal with threats... There is no "department of interesting ideas." And again, in the budgetary process, the way it works, is you have a 1 to N priority list and you run out of money long before you get to N. And so you start with "you must fund," "like to fund" and then you get to "here's things we'd fund if we could." Frankly, right after 9/11, you actually did get into that kind of funding... but normally, you're running out of funding... It's all [on] a competitive basis... And you start inter-service, between the Army, Navy and Air Force, or Space Force now, as to what your trade-offs are, then on big-ticket items, you're carrying those across the board to all services.

The Apollo moon mission is a great example. During those years, 4% of the budget of the US government went on Apollo. That's compared to 0.4% now that's going into NASA [for fiscal year 2021, [NASA's budget](#) is increasing 3% to \$23.3 billion]. There you had a national objective that was established, that was deemed achievable... We had enough experience in space to make that leap... That was more than about going to the moon. The real strategic issue of Apollo was establishing America's technological dominance to the world.

Let's put this in real terms. When he [Elizondo] did have the program [AATIP] going, it was ostensibly \$22 million over five years. If you compare that to "Oh by the way I want \$23 billion"... you're talking about a multibillion-dollar annual

program and justification of that. And there's another problem here that has to do with belief systems... Not just belief that something is happening, but that it is a potential threat...and I strongly suspect that like we have in the remote viewing program [religiously oriented people who will object] that says: "That's the work of the devil"...getting into religious arguments and things like that are likely to recur.

Alexander poses the question: "What are you willing to bet that you can, in fact, make a breakthrough?" Using the example of Desert Storm in 1991, he says Iraq had advanced Soviet air defenses that were neutralized in 30 minutes and the Americans had a 10-year tech advantage over the Iraqis. He asks:

If you are going to have to counter something [T^3/UAP tech] that is far, far in advance, the probability of survival is nil. What are you willing to spend for what advantage? You are in a zero-sum game. There are not infinite resources. The question to [Condon](#) was not: "Are UFOs real?" It was: "Are UFOs a threat?" We have not been obviously invaded yet. What's your trade-off? How much do you think you will gain, what is your probability of success, and how much in resources are you willing to spend to achieve that? You've got to develop the market internally in DoD. If we are going to commit X percent of our resources to achieve something... you would have to build up a huge audience... A substantial percentage are going to say: "Bullshit," or won't even talk to you. You've got to get to a consensus of people who are willing to set the budget and be able to defend that, both internally and externally.

Asked about Elizondo's *fait accompli* remark, Alexander opines:

I think they [Elizondo and Mellon] are highly optimistic. I wish them well. They are friends and I would like to see them get some funding.

But he ends on a cautionary note:

Even if they understood Tic-Tac...Tic-Tac would be one variant of thousands [of UAP].

Recent BESA Center Publications

Mideast Security and Policy Studies

- No. 160 The West Bank's Area C: Israel's Vital Line of Defense, *Gershon Hacohen*, January 2019 (Hebrew), April 2019 (English)
- No. 161 The Islamic State's Religious Nationalism: Challenging the Existing International Order, *Galit Truman Zinman*, April 2019 (Hebrew only)
- No. 162 Israeli Nuclear Deterrence in Context: Effects of the US-Russian Rivalry, *Louis René Beres*, June 2019
- No. 163 A Geopolitical Crossfire: Al Azhar Struggles to Balance Politics and Tradition, *Dr. James M. Dorsey*, August 2019
- No. 164 EU Funding of Illegal Palestinian Settlement in Area C, *Edwin Black*, September 2019
- No. 165 What Happens to Israel If the US and Israel Go to War? *Louis René Beres*, September 2019
- No. 166 Trump's Trade Wars: A New World Order? *James M. Dorsey*, November 2019
- No. 167 Land Combat Vehicles: Protection Comes First, *Maxi Blum*, November 2019
- No. 168 The Soleimani Killing: An Initial Assessment, *Hillel Frisch, Eytan Gilboa, Gershon Hacohen, Doron Itzhakov, and Alex Joffe*, January 2020
- No. 169 Iranian Missiles and Its Evolving "Rings of Fire", *Uzi Rubin*, January 2020
- No. 170 Operation "Shahid Soleimani": Iran's Revenge, *Uzi Rubin*, February 2020
- No. 171 The Coronavirus Crisis: Origins and the Way Forward, *Hanan Shai*, April 2020 (Hebrew only)
- No. 172 The San Remo Conference 100 Years On: How the Jewish National Home Entered International Law, *Efraim Karsh*, April 2020
- No. 173 The Coronavirus Pandemic: Getting Back to Normal While Controlling the Disease, *Maxi Blum*, April 2020 (Hebrew)
- No. 174 Coronavirus, China, and the Middle East, *Mordechai Chaziza*, June 2020
- No. 175 The Trump Peace Plan: Aiming Not to Make a Deal but to Make a Deal Possible, *Douglas J. Feith and Lewis Libby*, June 2020
- No. 176 The COVID19- Crisis: Impact and Implications, *Editor: Efraim Karsh*, July 2020
- No. 177 Palestinian Activists at Human Rights Watch, *Gerald M. Steinberg and Maayan Rockland*, July 2020
- No. 178 Israel Versus Anyone: A Military Net Assessment of the Middle East, *Kenneth S. Brower*, August 2020
- No. 179 The EU and Israel as Genuine Strategic Partners, *Florin Pasatoiu and Christian Nitou*, August 2020
- No. 180 The Israel-UAE Peace: A Preliminary Assessment, *Editor: Efraim Karsh*, September 2020
- No. 181 The American Public and Israel in the Twenty-First Century, *Eytan Gilboa*, October 2020
- No. 182 Iran Behind the Scenes During the Second Israel-Lebanon War, *Raphael Ofek and Pesach Malovany*, November 2020
- No. 183 The Pentagon's UAP Task Force, *Franc Milburn*, November 2020
- No. 184 The Second Nagorno-Karabakh War: A Milestone in Military Affairs, *Uzi Rubin*, December 2020
- No. 185 Iran's Killing Machine: Political Assassinations by the Islamic Republic, *Ardavan Khoshnood*, December 2020
- No. 186 The Battle for the Soul of Islam, *James M. Dorsey*, January 2021
- No. 187 The Caspian Sea as Battleground, *James M. Dorsey*, February 2021
- No. 188 The Abraham Accords: Contrasting Reflections, *Shmuel Trigano*, March 2021
- No. 189 American Development of UAP Technology: A Fait Accompli?, *Franc Milburn*, March 2021