

Security, Intent, and Non-Human Intelligence with Lue Elizondo

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Since 2017, something fundamental seems to have changed in how the U.S. government handles the subject of UFOs. For decades prior, the national security state enforced a social stigma. Despite countless sightings from reliable witnesses and a growing body of research from serious and well-connected investigators, official government reports dismissed the evidence, and the UFO taboo prevailed. The most thoughtful investigators remained invisible, even as their research and theorizing steadily shaped the public mind on the topic of UFOs. This all began to change due to the efforts of national security officials and affiliated researchers who, in 2017, began working toward disclosure of the existence of UFOs, now referred to as UAP, by acknowledging that secret government programs have long existed.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: UAP whistleblowers and investigators, believing that the public has a right to know about aspects of our reality that have been hidden from us, have opened the gates to a new era. A new UAP regime is taking shape, and my guest today has been at the front lines of the transformation that is upon us. I am grateful to have Lue Elizondo here with me today as the first guest on the podcast from the Project on UAP Studies and International Security, based at the Ralph Bunche Institute at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. I am Dr. Eliot Koretny, the director of the new Project on UAP Studies. In May, we hosted our first public event, a wonderful talk by Leslie Kean, the author of the 2017 New York Times article that launched Lue Elizondo into the spotlight and began a shift in the public discourse on the UAP topic.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Lue was a career military man who has long served his country in various roles, and now, as a whistleblower and disclosure advocate, his public service continues. In the words of Chris Mellon, another important figure in the changes now underway, Lue “played a central and indispensable role in forever changing the way humanity views the issue of unidentified anomalous phenomena.” Lue Elizondo, thanks for joining me today.

Lue Elizondo: Dr. Koretny, it is truly my sincere honor and privilege to be with you today and with your students, colleagues, and comrades. It is truly profound for me. I have always admired academics, and I have always admired individuals who pursue academia because, ultimately, it is a pursuit of the truth, and the truth is a fundamental, inherently human necessity. In fact, it is the way we base all our decisions in life, with the assumption or presumption that we have an

understanding of what the truth is. In pursuing the truth, it is really up to you, the world of academia, and your students who are also very interested in learning the truth about life, existence, and our reality.

Lue Elizondo: It is very humbling for me. A wise man once said that the greatest nation is but one generation away from utter ruin. What they meant by that was, it does not matter how many natural resources a country has. It does not matter how much gold, petroleum, timber, or anything else it has. At the end of the day, it is all for nothing if you do not invest in the next generation. The next generation is the one that will take both our sins and our blessings and either do something good with them or inherit them, unfortunately. It is up to the academic world to continue to apply academic rigor and challenge the status quo in order for our society to continue to move forward and evolve. In fact, I would submit to you that the work you are doing, and the work that your students and colleagues are part of, is very much a national security imperative unto itself. It actually is. Without it, we are probably not going to last long as a nation. My hat is off to you. Thank you very much. I am profoundly grateful to be here.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Thank you so much, Lue. That is a perfect segue into my first question, which I want to focus on the national security aspect of the UFO subject, the UAP subject. I approach the subject as an international relations scholar, and a growing number of IR scholars are finally doing work openly on the subject of UAP. A seminal essay was written by Professor Alexander Wendt about 20 years ago, a little less than 20 years ago, about the sovereignty crisis that would result from discovering the existence of non-human intelligence. In his words and his co-author's words, the modern state system rests on anthropocentric assumptions: the belief that only human beings engage in political decision-making and use power to impose their will in human societies.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: That is being reevaluated, and Wendt himself has a forthcoming book. He will actually be the second guest on this podcast. He has an upcoming book on the subject, which should open new space for IR scholars who have been quietly and privately studying the subject but are now prepared to write more and present their research on the topic. One of the areas that IR scholars have been studying is the idea of UAP securitization. In the classic model of securitization, and I am going to be an IR nerd here for a moment, made popular by the Copenhagen School of interpretation, a subject is transformed into a security concern through a three-step process.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: The first step is some kind of authoritative speech act that declares a threat to national security. On the subject of UAP, some papers have recently been written saying that the ODNI report, the 2021 first of the ODNI reports acknowledging not only the existence of UAP, but that there is a potential threat there, represents this authoritative speech act. There has not yet been an

oral speech act, an oral acknowledgment of the existence and the threat, but there have been written reports. That is step one.

Dr. Eliot Koretney: Step two in the classic model is that there is public discourse around the subject, and from that public discourse, a consensus emerges. A narrative takes shape around the nature of the threat, particularly when it is an existential threat. From there, the third step in the process is that new security policies are implemented, which are legitimized by this public consensus. My question to you is: Is that what is happening now? Ever since 2017, are we inside a securitization process that is unfolding on this topic?

Lue Elizondo: I think it is unavoidable. I think what you are seeing is a sensitization among the general public of the reality of this topic. You are also witnessing an acknowledgment by authoritative figures who have, by the way, traditionally been very quiet on this topic, now coming forward and being quite vocal about this topic and the reality of this topic. I do. When you look at an organization, one thing is to make a proclamation from an authoritative figure, as you say for step one. Another thing is to actually do something about it. You are seeing that right now. You are seeing the use of taxpayer money, a significant amount, by the way, to actually study and research this topic on behalf of the U.S. national security apparatus. That has already been done. You have the establishment of AARO and the establishment of PURSUE.

Lue Elizondo: You have had several reports already to Congress about this topic. You have had the FBI, the Department of Justice, the CIA, and others already come out and say, "Yes, look, our own agents are witnessing this. We are conducting our own investigations," and it is pretty compelling. I do think we are, in that regard, well on the road to what you are talking about, which is IR, international relations. But there is another piece to that, because for IR to be truly IR, international relations, you have to have friends and allies with whom you are collaborating and cooperating with information. We are very well on that road as well. You have had nations recently, such as Japan, request to enter into a bilateral information-sharing agreement with the United States for the sole purpose of sharing UAP-related information.

Lue Elizondo: You have other countries, multitudes of countries in Latin America right now, and in South America specifically, in the Southern Hemisphere, that are very interested in working with the United States because they have had their own UAP experiences and investigations. You have countries like China that announced recently in the South China Morning Sun that they have their own UAP investigations, and they are pursuing the United Nations and what they call the Five Continents Initiative, where they want to help lead UAP investigations for the United Nations. You have countries like Russia that have already come forward and admitted that they had their own UAP studies program. The list goes on and on. I

think certainly, from an international relations perspective, we are very well underway through this three-step process you mentioned.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: That is really fantastic. That reminds me of a wonderful section in your book, which maybe I will read to you and get you to respond to. The framework here is where national security veers into international security and international cooperation. I think that is important. On one hand, there is a lot of talk of a new arms race tied to alleged reverse-engineering programs on UAP and NHI technology. According to that narrative, the U.S. is not the only one in possession of advanced technology. But is there an opportunity here not to think of the current dynamics primarily in terms of great power rivalry, competition, or the struggle for power? Is there room here to improve international cooperation?

Dr. Eliot Koretny: As was done even during the Cold War, at the height of the Cold War, on key issues like nuclear weapons, there was deep coordination and cooperation. There might be room for competition and cooperation to coexist. I wonder if I can get your reaction to that, particularly on discovery technologies that impact all of humanity.

Lue Elizondo: Yes, I certainly think there are areas of cooperation that we should be engaging in. I only have to look back a few decades ago when we were in the middle of the space race against the Soviet Union for about a decade. As a result of NASA's space development program, particularly Apollo, something like 6,200 industries, not products, industries, were developed as a result of that 10-year competition with Russia at the time, the former Soviet Union. These are things that we now take for granted, things like the LED bulb, Velcro, CAT scans, and things like that, which have far outlived their initial purpose and design and continue to benefit humanity in a positive way. Internationally, too, because those technologies wind up getting into the hands of other countries and can help people fight cancer, perhaps, or maybe help an elderly person who cannot reach down to tie their shoe. Now they can use a Velcro strap.

Lue Elizondo: Yes, I am very optimistic that, with this new realization we are entering, there will be tremendous opportunity, but also opportunity to do bad. People always ask me, "Is it good or bad?" It is really neither. It is just like artificial intelligence or nuclear technology. What is good or bad is the user. We can use nuclear power to light cities in a very clean and efficient way. We can also use that same technology to flatten a city if we want to. It is not really the technology that is bad or good; it is human beings' use of that technology. Same thing with artificial intelligence. We can use it to do wonderful things for each other and help each other out, but we can also use it to hurt one another if we want to.

Lue Elizondo: The term "good or bad" is problematic only because there are degrees of what is good and what is bad. We have to start getting into conversations about the difference between what a personal truth is and a universal truth. By the way,

sometimes personal truths can seem very much as real as a universal truth, but they are not. For example, a universal truth is gravity. It affects us all equally at 9.8 meters per second squared because of the mass of the Earth. There is no getting around it. Whereas politics and religion seem very much like a universal truth to somebody who is experiencing them, but in reality, they are still personal truths. They are not universal truths because they are not widely accepted by other people. We have to understand that.

Lue Elizondo: We also have to understand what information means to us as human beings. If it means that a rogue nation can take a technology and a capability, reverse-engineer it, and do bad things toward us, that is a problem. But at the same time, if we can use this technology and avoid the temptation of deploying it against one another, and instead use it to benefit one another, then I see great potential there.

Lue Elizondo: Ultimately, we go back to the term “good and bad.” Back to personal truths and universal truths. Good is relative. Bad is relative. It really depends. Going back to my national security background, I think we all agree that killing another human being is bad. It is called murder. Yet, in certain situations, they would give people like me an award and a medal for doing that. You are still tearing another human being to pieces. Why is one okay and actually considered good, and other times it is not? It depends on circumstances.

Lue Elizondo: We are very complex as human beings. One only has to look at international relations. Let us go back to that for a moment. The reason we are having issues with countries like Iran, and countries like Russia and their invasion of Ukraine, is because we do not relate to one another. The Iranians are motivated by one thing, and we are motivated by something else, and neither one of us can see the other’s side or perspective.

Lue Elizondo: With that said, let me say this for the record: by no means am I friendly toward Iran. I think the regime is brutal, treats its citizens completely unfairly, and is repressive. But with that said, that is not really up to me to decide, is it? If a citizen of Iran is comfortable living under those circumstances, that is their business, even though I do not agree with it. I think it is abhorrent. I think it is ridiculous and crazy to live in a situation like that, and yet other people are quite happy doing that.

Lue Elizondo: My family are immigrants. My father came from Cuba. My father was in the revolution against Castro, and my family made the decision that we did not want to be under the tyranny of a dictatorship. Yet, if you go back to Cuba right now, there are many Cubans there who are just fine with the former Castro regime, and some would even say they probably like it. Does that make them bad people? Does that make me good or right and them wrong and bad? No. We just do not see eye to eye on certain things, and chances are it is because we are not

communicating with one another very well, and we do not respect each other very much.

Lue Elizondo: We tend to get into this tribalistic type of situation where we all rally. You can look on the news any day—August 18, 2026; August 19, 2026; or August 20, 2026—and you will see that there is this tribalism going on in our society. Everybody wants to rally around a flag. Pick your issue du jour; it does not really matter what it is. Everybody wants some flag, and that is my flag, and they plant it down. If you do not agree with me, then you are on that side of the field, and I am on this side of the field. It is an us-versus-them mentality.

Lue Elizondo: But it should not be that way. This is part of being human. We have been doing this since we came out of the cave crawling on all fours. The first thing we did when we picked up a stone, instead of striking it together and creating fire, was start throwing them at one another. Why is that? That is the human condition. As we try to grow and evolve and have more understanding of one another and more empathy, what we are seeing now on the international scale is no different than what we saw at this scale when we were living in a village, and in a hamlet before that, and in a cave before that. We have always been at each other's necks. That is something I think, if you look at it, results from us living in a resource-starved environment where competition for basic resources is a reality of life.

Lue Elizondo: How do we condition ourselves as human beings not to behave that way?

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Important questions. I have to say, there is some shared background here in the sense that my family is from Ukraine. They left during the height of the Cold War, before the end of the Cold War, in the late seventies.

Lue Elizondo: My wife's family is from Ukraine as well.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Is that right? Very cool. Very, very cool. My mom is from Kiev, and my dad is from Zhytomyr. My mom was pregnant with me when they left in 1977, so I was born in Philly right after they arrived. I grew up, on one hand, as a patriotic American, appreciating the freedom and opportunity that America cherishes and makes possible, and, on the other hand, with a sense of inherent internationalism and the importance of communicating between cultures and across nations. I appreciate your perspective on that.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: The idea of rallying around the flag and embracing our national identity in a tribal way is, on one hand, a human instinct. On the other hand, it is a challenge and a problem that we need to find ways to overcome or moderate. You mentioned one way to moderate that is through communication and mutual understanding. Another way, maybe more of what the IR experts call a realist framework, is an acceptance of some of the tragic realities of international relations: that power, security, and threats are not going away. One way to forge

shared interests and common bonds is when there is a shared enemy, a common enemy. The Soviets and the Americans were able to come together despite fundamental differences when the Nazis presented themselves as a common enemy.

Lue Elizondo: Reagan once gave a famous speech where he said that if we learned that UFOs were real and they were here, maybe that would drive the United States and Russia to forge a new alliance and a new form of cooperation, where we realize, "Look, we are all part of humanity here. Can we not learn to get along?" I believe that is what I was going to read.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Now I do not need to read it, so thank you. Exactly, exactly right. That was the quote I was going to ask you to respond to. That is exactly right. Interestingly enough, the final line in there was maybe something I should have just mentioned. This is page 229 of your fantastic book. He is talking about peace in the context of perhaps needing some outside universal threat to make us recognize our common bonds, that we are all members of humanity. At the very end there, he says, "I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world." That was a 1987 speech by Reagan at the UN. The final, final line is, "And yet I ask you, is not an alien force already among us?"

Dr. Eliot Koretny: That was a little bit of a head-scratcher. I wonder if you would respond to that. What might he have meant there?

Lue Elizondo: There has been some discussion in the past that certain presidents were briefed into the reality of UAPs. We now realize that our government, which I have known for some time but the American people are finally learning, has actually been involved in UFO investigations for almost 80 years. Despite the constant denials by certain elements in our government, it turns out that we took the topic very seriously. That is no different than AATIP when I was at the Pentagon. Here we had this public position that UFOs are not real and we do not pay attention to them, but secretly we were spending \$22 million of taxpayer money looking into them because they were very serious and very real.

Lue Elizondo: There have been some discussions in the past with certain elements in our government that were made aware of the reality of this topic, and it is quite possible that Reagan was one of those individuals.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: Thank you for that. I appreciate the transparency there, and that is something for us all to internalize. Thank you for that. I am thinking here of a segue: a character in Jacques Vallée's book *Messengers of Deception*, a character named Major Murphy, a fictionalized character but based on a real person. According to Vallée, Major Murphy helped convince Vallée, and interestingly, Eric Davis has made similar points publicly, that we are not dealing with a science

problem per se, because scientists deal with natural phenomena, and UAP are not natural phenomena but represent an aspect or an expression of a non-human intelligence. So we should be dealing with this challenge, with this problem, as an intelligence problem.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: This is another intelligence that is interacting with us. We are studying something that is studying us back. We are dealing with something that has some kind of power or influence, or is at least engaging with us and maybe threatening us, maybe seeking to control us. It is maybe an open question, which I would love to hear your thoughts on. If so, how does that change how we gather data about the phenomenon? How do we seek to understand it?

Lue Elizondo: Great question. Let me first address the first part of your conversation about studying something that is studying us. I am an avid scuba diver. I have been most of my life. Every time I go scuba diving, it is never the same. You have an ability to interact with what some might call alien life forms, something that is in a completely different environment that is very hostile to us. In fact, we require life support systems even to enter that environment, such as scuba gear. Then we are engaging animals that, by definition, are extremely intelligent, whether they are dolphins, whales, or octopuses. These are creatures, in some cases, that can problem-solve and use tools just like a human being. These are all things that were thought to be exclusively human for some time. Now we are realizing that other animals do some of the same types of things that we do. Maybe we are not that unique.

Lue Elizondo: When we are underwater and we are looking at a parrotfish, make no mistake, that parrotfish is equally interested in studying us as we are it because it wants to know: Are you hostile? Are you here to eat me? Are you here just to amuse me and take pictures? It is not that unusual that we come face-to-face with something that is interested in us. I do not know if you have noticed, but I have five German shepherds. One of them just left the room. It is distinctly not human, and yet I interact with it the only way I know how, which is human. I mentioned this before, but this is why all my German shepherds have human names, and I talk to them like humans, because I am human. I do not know how else to behave other than as a human. I interact with these things as a human does, but make no mistake, they are not human. Yet we can communicate. Think about how profound this is.

Lue Elizondo: My dogs do not speak English, but they tell me when they are hungry. They tell me when they want to go out. They tell me when they want attention. That is communication. It may not be written communication using ABC and the alphabet, but they are communicating very effectively, and I communicate with them very effectively. We understand each other, and this is a completely different species of animal we are talking about here.

Lue Elizondo: It is not new for us to come face-to-face with something that we are studying. What we are not used to is coming face-to-face with something that potentially might be smarter than us, that might potentially have some sort of motivations we are unaware of, or that could do something we may not be able to defend ourselves from. That creates a tremendous amount of insecurity for us. It is the same reason why you have insecurities in religions, because they look at another religion and say, "That is not consistent with my beliefs." It is the same thing with governments.

Lue Elizondo: But that is a human issue. If we want to solve that, we have to look at ourselves. We cannot blame NHI, or non-human intelligence, for the way we perceive them. That is not their fault; that is our fault. We have to figure that out. The second question you had is probably going to take a little more to unravel. Could I ask you to please repeat that second part of your question, just so I can make sure I get it right?

Dr. Eliot Koretny: The idea that—well, maybe I will add another piece to it. If we are engaging with something that is studying us back or interacting with us in various ways, are we left to just be passive observers of our oceans, skies, and deep space? Are we left just placing advanced sensors in locations where we hope they appear? Or is there a way, in our essential humanness, to engage actively in this interaction? Some of our experimenter friends really reject the idea of using the language of "summoning," but let us say the language of inviting them to appear. What power do we have to engage actively in the study of something that is studying us back?

Lue Elizondo: It is up to us. We can react any way we want to. We can react with curiosity and optimism, or we can react with fear and violence. It is really up to us. I liken it to opening the front door to your house. You move into a neighborhood at night. You have no idea what neighborhood, and you just open the front door. Whoever comes through that front door, that is who comes in your front door. Maybe they are coming in for a cup of coffee. Maybe they want to borrow some sugar. Maybe they just want to welcome you to the neighborhood. Maybe they want to rob your house, or worse. We do not know, and it is in that vacuum of knowledge where we behave in ways that we are biologically predisposed to: self-preservation and things like that. We are naturally very wary of things we do not understand and whose motivation we do not understand. That creates a lot of internal anxiety, psychologically, sociologically, and even theologically.

Lue Elizondo: There are concerns there, but it should not stop you from ever opening your front door. We have to be cautious and wary, but at the same time, I do not think we need to be scared and proverbially panic at the disco. I do not think that is an appropriate response either. We are faced with the reality of new species all the time. We are constantly discovering new species. If we discover a new type of shark in the oceans, are we scared? No. Unless you are surfing that day and, while

going out and surfing, all of a sudden you see a fin come out of the water, then you might be a little concerned. It is situation-dependent.

Lue Elizondo: For me, the truth never changes anything. The truth shall set you free. I think it is how we handle the truth and what we do with the truth that we have to pay attention to, because the truth is the truth. Whether we want to agree with it or not, whether we want to accept it or not, it is the truth; it is there. So far, we have not been wiped off the planet.

Dr. Eliot Koretney: We have not. I am thinking about who we invite in, and I am reminded of the mythology of vampires that can only come in after they are invited in. Is there a way to protect ourselves in terms of who we are inviting in, to maintain both a sense of openness, curiosity, and engagement, to invite in those that may cause us no harm, and yet to protect ourselves against those who may harm us?

Lue Elizondo: This goes back to “walk softly but carry a big stick.” You always put your hand out in friendship, extend your hand out to shake hands. By the way, do you know the origins of shaking hands? It comes from ancient times and Romans. They would take the hand that they used to hold their sword, and instead they would extend it out in friendship, with the understanding that you cannot use your sword if you are extending your hand out in friendship. I cannot fight you if I am doing this. It is a sign of mutual respect and a peace offering. At the same time, make no mistake: I am sure if you talked to the Roman soldier, they were prepared to grab their sword if they needed to. They never left their hip side. They never put their sword down. They just put their hand out in friendship, but that sword was still on their belt. People know, “He can use that sword if he needs to.”

Lue Elizondo: I think that is really all we can do. Hope for the best, but prepare for the worst, hoping that never comes into play. Also, we talk about, “If these things are really that much more capable than us, then clearly they could have wiped us off the planet before,” or whatever. That may be true. Maybe it is not. There are a lot of things that we are assuming about this topic that we may not be assuming correctly. It is a great question.

Lue Elizondo: Ultimately, if we want to know how to deal with and understand what is out there, first we need to understand what is in here, inside every one of us. What motivates us? Why do we do the things we do? Once we can reconcile that, understand that better, and control some of those aggressive tendencies, then maybe we will be better prepared to engage something beyond us, if that makes sense.

Dr. Eliot Koretney: That is really so many important ideas. I am mindful of time. I promised you we would be done at 11. Let me ask a final question, and hopefully we can pick this up another time. Thinking about a few things you just said, one is carrying a big stick and yet maintaining that openness in a nonviolent sense,

prepared to defend but also extending our hand in the spirit of peace and engagement, and what we are carrying with us internally in that encounter. An experimenter I know and have profound respect for, whom you may have been on his show in the past, James Iandoli, talks with me periodically. He reminds me that our intentions matter, what we carry in our hearts and souls, when we are inviting in new people or new beings, really matters. If we come with fear, aggression, and violence, the phenomenon has a way of holding a mirror to those energies, and we might be getting back what we bring to the encounter. If we come with love, openness, and sincerity, we might also be getting something like that in return.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: My question is this: as a final question, thinking again about what we carry in our hearts, our intentions, and also maintaining a big stick to protect ourselves just in case, you describe in the book an operation called “Interloper,” what you talk about as a honeypot scheme that was designed to lure UAP by “creating a situation” — hey, puppy, what is his name?

Lue Elizondo: Sorry, he does this all the time. He photobombs. This is our young fellow. I am listening intently to you.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: No, he is awesome. No problem. So, Project Interloper created a situation that was irresistible for the enemy to ignore, right? The idea was based on historical evidence that UAP are drawn to our nuclear facilities. Apparently, operations like this have already been discussed, according to memos that Vallée uncovered in the Hynek files way back in 1953. What he called the Pinnacle Memo had already started to think about strategies for how to lure UAPs, what were then still called UFOs.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: My question basically is: What do we learn from Interloper and from similar operations now being done by Skywatcher and others, which are said to have an effective “dog whistle”?

Lue Elizondo: The two major commonalities are large bodies of water and nuclear equities, whether it is nuclear propulsion or nuclear weapon systems. It does not matter. These things, these UAPs, seem very interested—and this is global—in nuclear technology. There is a very distinct reason for that, we believe, but that is for another conversation. Also, the close proximity to large bodies of water. There are several theories on why that is as well. But those are two distinct commonalities that we have established as being absolutely 100% accurate.

Lue Elizondo: The question is why, right? Forgive me. My dog has learned how to turn on the printer by himself. Forgive me. I am going to teach him to do my taxes, I think, next week. He will probably do a better job than I will. But anyway, Project Interloper, or OPLAN, operational plan envelope, was a very real plan that was being developed. I would not be surprised if other plans very similar to that have been executed as well.

Dr. Eliot Koretny: In terms of this last thought about what we bring to our engagement with the phenomenon, do operations like this represent coming to the encounter with one intention, an intention of openness and engagement, or a kind of—

Lue Elizondo: This is why we have to be very careful about this topic. About three and a half years ago, I was briefing a three-star general, and at the end of the hour presentation, he said to me, “That is fine and dandy, Lue. That is great. But look, at the end of the day, I just need to know one thing: If these things land on the White House lawn tomorrow, do I put my hand out in friendship, or do I point an M16 to its head?” I said, “General, this is not a binary solution, brother.” You are looking at this the wrong way. It is not an either/or. In fact, either/or might doom us, because if these things are violent and we put our hands out in friendship, maybe they anticipate that, or they look at that as a sign of weakness, and they are going to anticipate that they can proverbially steamroll us. At the same time, if they are technologically advanced and they are not violent, and we put an M16 to its head, we may cause them to respond in a way that we do not want them to respond.

Lue Elizondo: It is not an either/or. I think intent is very important. It is the same reason why my dogs walk in here and lick my face, because they know my intent is always, “I love my dogs.” Over time, I have proven my track record to be kind, gentle, and giving with my dogs, and so they respond to that. There is no natural fear. Now, if a neighbor or a stranger comes to the front door, you will see these dogs’ personalities change on a dime. I would not want to be on the receiving end of five of these fur missiles, but to me, they are like my children. There is no threat because I have no ill intent. They know that. They are comfortable and confident that I am not trying to hurt them. Perhaps it is the same thing when we are dealing with NHI.

Lue Elizondo: What I would not recommend doing is something like a Project Interloper for the purposes of shooting down a UAP, because I have been asked that before: “Why do we not just shoot them down?” That would be a mistake. That would be a provocation. It is the same reason why we do not shoot down Russian airplanes right now. They may not be our allies, but we do not want to poke the bear. No pun intended. It is really, really up to us, and I do think intent goes a long way.

Lue Elizondo: Goodness, innocence, intent, these are things that might be more universal than we really understand. They might be something beyond human beings that can express and share those types of feelings. Things like empathy, sympathy, love, and the notion of love: something that everybody in this world feels at times, but yet no one can really explain. How ironic. Something that we all know universally exists and is, fundamentally, the most important thing of our existence, and yet none of us has the exact same definition for it. But it is there. There is a fundamental understanding, I think, regarding intent and what we need to do if we

really want to learn more about whoever is on the other side of the screen porch, our friends from out of town.

Lue Elizondo: We probably need to extend a welcoming embrace, because it is not going to change anything. It is not going to change the fact that they are here. They are here, whatever they are, for whatever reason they have. Probably best is just to treat them like we would treat a neighbor, would be my advice. Treat them like a good neighbor.

Dr. Eliot Koretney: That is really a beautiful and poignant way to end this, what I hope is a first conversation. The idea that a military man will finish the conversation with a reminder about the importance of love and goodness is really special and touching. I appreciate that, and I look forward to future conversations. Lue Elizondo, thank you so much for joining me today.

Lue Elizondo: Doctor, my honor and privilege. I look forward to meeting you and some of your students in the near future. Thank you so much.