



Will We Ever See a Full Disclosure Day? **What if We Get Dissed Without the Closure?**

Anthony Pantaleno, Ph.D., Psychologist, Co-founder, PATH

For nearly eighty years, humanity has been waiting for someone to answer one unsettling question:

Are we alone?

Since Roswell in 1947, thousands of books, articles, documentaries, interviews, and news reports have filled our collective imagination with stories about unidentified objects in our skies—and, increasingly, our oceans.

The question is no longer confined to the cultural fringe. Military personnel have publicly described encounters with unidentified anomalous phenomena (UAP). Government agencies have acknowledged reports that remain unresolved after investigation. Congressional hearings have brought extraordinary claims into public view.

And yet, after all these years, the promised moment of revelation has not arrived.

No indisputable craft has appeared on the 6:00 news. No publicly verified non-human biological entity has been presented for independent examination. No president has addressed the nation to announce that humanity is not alone. No evidence has emerged that is so compelling that virtually every reasonable observer must reconsider what they believe.

Instead, we have fuzzy videos, intriguing testimony, disputed interpretations, allegations of secrecy, government reports, whistleblowers, skeptics, believers, debunkers, podcasts, documentaries, congressional hearings, and endless internet speculation.

The result is not resolution but suspension: a mystery important enough to provoke fascination, fear, and political attention, yet inconclusive enough to resist consensus.

That uncertainty may be the most psychologically significant fact of all.

The disclosure conversation often assumes that the story is moving toward a final revelation. But history does not guarantee one. Governments keep secrets. Records disappear. Evidence may remain classified. Witnesses contradict one another. Institutions protect themselves. Scientific questions can remain unresolved for generations.

So perhaps the question is no longer simply:

When will disclosure happen?

Perhaps we should also ask:

What if it never does?

The Disclosure Assumption

Much of the contemporary UAP conversation rests on an assumption that is rarely examined:

Eventually, someone will tell us the truth.

Disclosure is often imagined as an approaching historical event. Documents will be released. Hidden programs will be exposed. Photographs will emerge. A craft will be displayed. Someone will finally explain what governments supposedly know.

But there may never be a single day called Disclosure Day. Instead, humanity may receive fragments: another testimony, a clearer video, another whistleblower, another hearing, or another report acknowledging that some cases remain unexplained—followed by another period of waiting.

Disclosure may unfold gradually, or it may never reach the level of certainty the public expects.

The Psychology of the Unfinished Story

Human beings do not particularly like unfinished stories. Our minds search for patterns, explanations, and endings. Ambiguity creates tension because we want to know:

What happened?

Who knows?

Can I trust them?

Am I safe?

When answers are unavailable, the mind often manufactures them.

This is fertile ground for conspiracy theories, but also for excessive skepticism. The believer may fill informational gaps with certainty:

They are here. The government knows everything.

The hardened skeptic may fill the same gaps with a different certainty:

There is nothing here. This is all nonsense.

Both positions can serve the same psychological purpose: eliminating uncertainty.

Yet uncertainty may be precisely where the intellectually responsible person must remain.

Something unusual may be occurring.

Some observations remain unexplained.

Extraordinary explanations require extraordinary evidence.

We may not yet possess enough public evidence to know the ultimate explanation.

Those statements can coexist.

What if Disclosure Comes in Inches?

Disclosure may already be happening—but so gradually that we fail to recognize it.

Governments acknowledge unidentified objects. Military pilots describe encounters. Sensors confirm unusual observations. Hearings become public. Scientists discuss the subject with less stigma. Additional records are declassified.

No single moment changes civilization. But over time, the boundaries of acceptable discussion shift dramatically.

Full disclosure, if it ever comes, may not arrive like a thunderclap. It may arrive like dawn—gradually enough that our eyes adjust along the way.

But There Is a More Uncomfortable Possibility

What if we get close—but never close enough?

Compelling evidence may remain classified. Extraordinary materials may be inaccessible to independent examination. Credible witnesses may continue making extraordinary claims without producing verifiable physical evidence. Governments themselves may possess incomplete information. The phenomenon—whatever its origin—may be inherently difficult to study.

Or consider an even stranger possibility:

What if a non-human intelligence exists but has no interest in introducing itself to us?

Human beings often assume that contact would be mutually desired. Perhaps that assumption says more about human psychology than it does about hypothetical non-human intelligence.

We imagine ourselves waiting for them.

Perhaps they are not waiting for us.

The universe may not provide the explanation we want.

Getting Dissed Without the Closure

That possibility may be the ultimate cosmic insult.

Humanity spends generations asking:

Are we alone?

And the answer might conceivably be:

No—but nobody is particularly interested in explaining things to you.

No landing on the White House lawn. No interstellar summit. No exchange of philosophical wisdom. No advanced technology handed over to rescue us from ourselves.

Just ambiguity.

If so, humanity would face a profound psychological challenge: learning to live meaningfully without a definitive ending.

The Need to Know Is Also a Need for Control

Much of human anxiety arises from difficulty tolerating uncertainty. In psychotherapy, people routinely ask:

Will my relationship survive?

Will my child be okay?

Will the medical test come back negative?

Will I find another job?

Will I ever stop feeling this way?

We want certainty because it creates the illusion of control. Mature psychological functioning requires something more difficult: learning to live meaningfully when certainty is unavailable.

The disclosure question may become humanity's largest exercise in uncertainty tolerance.

We can remain curious without becoming obsessed, skeptical without becoming dismissive, and committed to transparency without treating every unanswered question as proof of conspiracy. We can examine extraordinary claims without automatically believing them—and prepare psychologically for possibilities that have not been established as fact.

Skepticism Is Not the Enemy

Skeptics have an essential place in the disclosure conversation.

Extraordinary claims should be challenged. Evidence should be independently examined. Witness testimony should be evaluated. Alternative explanations should be considered.

Science advances through disciplined skepticism—not ridicule, but testing.

The danger comes when either side becomes incapable of changing its mind.

Belief without evidence becomes faith.

Skepticism that refuses to consider evidence becomes dogma.

The healthier position lies somewhere between them:

Show me.

And until you can show me:

I will remain curious.

What PATH Can Prepare For

The Psychological Alliance for Transparency and Humanity (PATH) was not created because we know disclosure will occur.

We do not.

Nor should any responsible mental health organization pretend otherwise.

PATH exists because the psychological consequences of a major disclosure involving non-human intelligence could be significant enough to warrant preparation. That preparation must also include the possibility of non-disclosure: prolonged ambiguity, conflicting information, distrust, sensational claims, disappointment, conspiracy thinking, and profound questions without definitive answers.

Psychological preparedness should not depend on predicting what governments—or hypothetical non-human intelligence—will do. It should strengthen something more durable:

Our capacity to tolerate uncertainty without surrendering curiosity, critical thinking, compassion, or psychological stability.

Maybe Closure Is the Wrong Goal

For nearly eighty years, the modern UFO/UAP story has repeatedly seemed to approach some great revelation. And still we wait.

Perhaps tomorrow changes everything. Perhaps another eighty years pass. Perhaps the mystery ultimately has a terrestrial explanation. Perhaps some portion of it does not.

We simply do not know.

That may be frustrating, but it is also the most intellectually honest position available.

Human beings have always stood at the edge of the unknown. We once stared across oceans we had never crossed and looked through telescopes at worlds we could not reach. We wondered what caused disease, what stars were made of, and whether anything existed beyond our galaxy.

The unknown is not an embarrassment.

It is where inquiry begins.

So perhaps the psychological challenge of disclosure is larger than preparing for the day someone finally tells us the truth. Perhaps it is preparing for the possibility that nobody ever will.

And if we get dissed without the closure?

We keep asking. We keep investigating. We keep questioning our assumptions. We remain skeptical. We remain open.

Most importantly, we continue to live fully on this remarkable little planet while occasionally looking toward the sky.

Because whether or not someone—or something—eventually answers us, humanity still has plenty of unfinished business right here at home.

PATH's guiding principle:

Be skeptical ... but have a plan. The alternative is really unthinkable.