UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA: EXPOSING THE TRUTH

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, THE BORDER, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

NOVEMBER 13, 2024

Serial No. 118–135

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability

Available on: *govinfo.gov, oversight.house.gov* or *docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

57–440 PDF WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio
MIKE TURNER, Ohio
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
GARY PALMER, Alabama
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas
PAT FALLON, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia
LISA MCCLAIN, Michigan
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri
MIKE WALTZ, Florida

JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, *Ranking Minority Member*
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
RO KHANNA, California
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
KATIE PORTER, California
CORI BUSH, Missouri
SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
ROBERT GARCIA, California
MAXWELL FROST, Florida
SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
GREG CASAR, Texas
JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
DAN GOLDMAN, New York
JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachesetts

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel
PETER WARREN, Senior Advisor
RAJ BHARWANI, Senior Professional Staff Member
KAITY WOLFE, Senior Professional Staff Member
GRAYSON WESTMORELAND, Senior Professional Staff Member
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION

NANCY MACE, South Carolina, Chairwoman

WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri
Vacancy
Vacancy

GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia *Ranking Minority Member*
RO KHANNA, California
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachesetts
Vacancy

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, THE BORDER, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

PAUL GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas
PAT FALLON, Texas
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
Vacancy

ROBERT GARCIA, California, *Ranking Minority Member*
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
DAN GOLDMAN, New York
JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
KATIE PORTER, California
CORI BUSH, Missouri
MAXWELL FROST, Florida
Vacancy
Vacancy

C O N T E N T S

WITNESSES

Opening statements and the prepared statements for the witnesses are available in the U.S. House of Representatives Repository at: docs.house.gov.

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA: EXPOSING THE TRUTH

Wednesday, November 13, 2024

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION
JOINTLY, WITH THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, THE BORDER, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:37 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Nancy Mace [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Mace, Grothman, Timmons, Burchett, Higgins, Luna, Biggs, Burlison, Perry, Garcia, Lynch, Moskowitz, Porter, and Frost.

Also present: Representatives Boebert and Ogles.

Ms. MACE. Good morning. This joint hearing of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, and the Subcommittee on National Security, the Border, and Foreign Affairs will come to order.

Good morning and welcome everyone.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time, and I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement right now.

Good morning and welcome to today's historic hearing, which I am co-chairing with Mr. Grothman whose subcommittee held an important hearing on this topic last year.

I want to thank my colleagues and the Oversight Committee, including Mr. Burchett, Mr. Burlison, Mrs. Luna, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Garcia, for their relentless drive to get answers on UAPs. They have been steadfast in demanding transparency on the sightings reported by military pilots and armed forces. Their commitment to digging for the truth is exactly what this country needs to cut through the secrecy surrounding this issue.

And many high-ranking individuals in the military and intelligence communities believe UAPs demand greater attention, and thus the purpose for this hearing today.

Former National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster said on Bill Maher's program that, quote, "There are phenomena that have been witnessed by multiple people that are just inexplicable by the science available to us."

Army Colonel Karl Nell, a member of the Federal Government UAP Task Force, said at a conference this past May that, "nonhuman intelligence exists, nonhuman intelligence has been interacting with humanity. This interaction is not new and has been ongoing, and they're unelected people in the government that are aware of that."

But UAPs remain a controversial topic. I am not going to name names, but there are certain individuals who did not want this hearing to happen because they feared what might be disclosed. But we stood firm. No amount of outside pressure would ever keep me from pursuing a subject to ground, come hell or high water.

On that score, I want to thank our witnesses for being here. We have before us a panel of individuals accomplished in the military and civilian government in science and in journalism. Some of the testimony you will hear them deliver today does not reflect well on influential individuals and agencies within the U.S. Federal Government and, perhaps, some of our contractors.

It is never easy to present such information publicly. So, I appreciate our witnesses voluntarily agreeing to being here today.

This hearing is intended to help Congress and the American people to learn the extent of the programs and activities our government has engaged in with respect to UAPs and what knowledge it has yielded. This includes, of course, any knowledge of extraterrestrial life or technology of nonhuman origin.

If government-funded research on UAPs has not yielded any useful knowledge, we also need to know those facts. Taxpayers deserve to know how much has been invested. How much has been spent? They should not be kept in the dark to spare the Pentagon a little bit of embarrassment.

The reality is, despite their enormous taxpayer-funded budgets, the transparency of the Defense Department and the intelligence community have long been abysmal. The Pentagon has failed six consecutive audits. In fact, it has never actually passed one.

Adding to this is a runaway, overclassification of documents and materials, and reluctance to declassify materials when appropriate, and, at times, an outright refusal to share critical information with Congress. In short, it is not a track record that instills trust.

So, Congress has tried in recent years to lift the veil and find out if information about UAPs is being withheld not only from the American public but also from their elected Representatives in Congress. Part of the transparency effort was legislation created in the Pentagon, the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, or AARO, but the new office is struggling to get its footing.

A recent statutorily required report from AARO intended to illuminate the government's historic assessment of UAPs was heavily criticized by those seeking UAP transparency. The report has stoked suspicions AARO is unable or, perhaps, unwilling to bring forward the truth about the government's activities concerning UAPs.

I am disturbed that AARO itself lacks transparency. Even its budget is kept from the public. So, if there is no there "there", then why are we spending money on it, and by how much? Why the secrecy if it is really no big deal and there is nothing there? Why hide it from the American people? Because I am not a mathematician, but I can tell you that does not add up.

I expect some of our witnesses to share their views on that AARO report. We will also hear, from the witnesses today, allegations of UAP-related misinformation and disinformation by government officials of which they are personally aware and directly experienced.

And we will hear testimony today concerning recent revelations about a purportedly secret UAP program whose existence and findings may have been improperly withheld from Congress. But, before we get to the witnesses, we are going to have a few more opening statements from our colleagues.

And one thing I wanted to add at the end of my closing statement is there is a document that will be entered into the congressional record today. Mr. Tim Burchett from Tennessee has this document, and we just distributed it to every Member up here on the dais, this document. But this is going to be the original document from the Pentagon about Immaculate Constellation that Michael Shellenberger delivered to Congress today.

So, thank you, Mr. Shellenberger, for this information. We are all reading it in real time now, and Mr. Burchett will enter it into the record, but 12 pages about this unacknowledged special access program that your government says does not exist.

So, with that, I would acknowledge my colleague, Mr. Garcia.

I want to say, first of all, to Mr. Connolly, who could not be here today, the Ranking Member on my Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, I want to say that I was greatly saddened to hear about the recent news of Mr. Connolly's cancer diagnosis. And I want to convey to him and to all of our colleagues, we wish our very best to you and a full and speedy recovery.

And, with that, I would acknowledge Mr. Garcia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Thank you very much, Chairwoman. I want to thank the Chairwoman and the Chairman both for their continued support and really treating this discussion and these hearings in a way that is bipartisan.

I think one thing that is very important for all of us that are interested in the conversation around UAPs, is that this is an area that both Republicans and Democrats, while we may disagree in a lot of other spaces, this is an area where bipartisanship is really important. And, in fact, I would add it is critical that we all continue to work together in a way that moves forward with the truth and important disclosure.

So, we are here to have a bipartisan and serious conversation, I believe, about our national security. We should always ground these conversations in facts, evidence, and the data in front of us.

I want to note that we have our witnesses here, and I want to thank you all for being here, and note that also amongst you are folks that also served us in our military, and I know that for many of you this is a very difficult process. But I am very grateful to have you with us today, and thank you for joining us.

I also want to note that today's hearing builds on a quite, I think, also historic public hearing that we had many months ago that Mr. Grothman and others help lead in this very same hearing room where I believe we began a really important public conversation about UAPs. And so, I want to thank him for that, and I especially want to thank Chairwoman Mace for her continued advocacy on this topic.

I also want to start with some facts. We know that there are objects or phenomena observed in our airspace, as our witnesses will testify, and also, possibly, in our oceans. In many cases, we do not know what they are, and, of course, this is why we are discussing UAPs.

Now, the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, AARO, has reported hundreds of UAPs that remain, quote, "uncharacterized and unattributed" and which, quote, "appear to have demonstrated unusual flight characteristics or performance capabilities and require further analysis." This is our own AARO office.

Now, we should not prejudge what they might be. I am certainly not going to. We need evidence. But we are detecting things, and we know that we do not understand them, and this is worth investigating.

The American people have legitimate questions, and I believe it is critical that Congress should help address them. This is about the truth, and science and facts.

Now, transparency and faith in our institutions is vital in a good democracy. Now, I am proud to say this hearing will build on that important bipartisan work, and I want to thank everyone from being involved, including Members of our Committee.

Now, in our last hearing in July, we heard testimony that a significant number of pilots of major airlines have witnessed UAPs as well, but have no real confidential way of reporting them to the government. We heard that commercial pilots, when encountering UAPs, may be hesitant to speak openly due to stigma or fear of retaliation.

We also know that AARO has reported that, and I want to quote, that "most reports still reflect a bias toward restricted military airspace, a result of reporting from military personnel, and sensors presence in such areas." And so, the lack of ability for civilian pilots raises real safety concerns and limits our ability to understand UAPs. This is a particular piece of this conversation that I am very interested in.

Now, our last hearing inspired us to introduce the Safe Airspace for Americans Act, joined by Chairman Grothman, Chairwoman Mace, and a bipartisan group of cosponsors. I see some of our leaders from Safe Airspace for Americans Act here. And that would create a safe reporting for the UAP process, which we want to continue to do.

Now, Members of both parties and senior officials in multiple administrations have now taken an interest in this issue. Mainstream media, in many cases, are beginning to take more of an interest in this issue, and we should all be proud to carry that work and build confidence for the American people.

I believe we can always be more transparent. To me, this hearing and others are simply about the truth and getting to the facts of what these UAPs actually are.

It is very important that we show that Democrats and Republicans in Congress can work together to cut through misinformation and look for a serious and thoughtful way to have the discussion in public.

Many of us have also called for additional public hearings to discuss UAPs. This should be a topic that continues on throughout the Congress so we can gather more information, data, and work with the relevant agencies to gather more information.

Finally, I just want to add that those that are here on this dais, many of us have participated also in classified briefings as well, and we have also gained a lot of important, I think, and interesting information, at least I personally have.

And so, with that information, we want to continue today's hearing, and I thank all of our witnesses for being here.

And, with that, I would like to yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Garcia.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Grothman for a 5-minute introduction.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you.

Good morning. I would like to thank our witnesses for being here one more time. This is a topic I have been interested in since eighth grade.

I would like to thank Ms. Mace for working with me on this topic and for making this a joint Subcommittee hearing.

Last year, the Subcommittee on National Security, the Border, and Foreign Affairs held a historic hearing to understand the potential national security risk of unidentified anomalous phenomena, or UAPs. We heard from former Navy Commander David Fravor, who shared firsthand experience with a UAP engaged while on duty in the Pacific.

We learned from David Grusch, a former member of the intelligence community, who revealed the supposed existence of secret government programs hidden from congressional oversight.

Additionally, former military pilot Ryan Graves informed us of the limited ways in which the military and commercial pilots can report UAP sightings.

Since that last hearing, I have led several briefings with government agencies to deepen my understanding with these issues. First, the Department of Defense Inspector General's Office informed us that the Department of Defense does not have the streamlined process for servicemembers to report UAP activity. Since then, the Joint Chiefs have implemented standards for UAP reporting across the services.

The intelligence community Inspector General informed us that whistleblowers often fear retaliation for reporting mismanagement of highly sensitive government projects or information.

Finally, AARO has expressed to the committee that, like any other Federal Government agency, it has faced challenges in its establishment, specifically, in hiring staff to manage UAP historical records and coordinating with other Federal agencies.

While these agencies have been helpful to us in understanding the challenges that come from collecting UAP data, none of them have been able to substantiate the claims made at this hearing last year by David Grusch, despite our Committee Members endlessly questioning these agencies inside and outside of the SCIF.

I hope our witnesses today will be able to provide evidence and content that is worthwhile to our pursuits of illuminating government waste and increasing transparency.

To help alleviate some of the roadblocks, I am supportive of measures that were included in last year's National Defense Authorization Act to increase transparency and improve record-keeping measures when it comes to UAPs, but I believe there is still more work to go.

I co-led the Safe Airspace for Americans Act with Ranking Member Garcia, which requires the Federal Aviation Administration to develop procedures to collect UAP data from civilian aviators. I look forward to working with Members of Congress to see if this legislation and other UAP legislation crosses the finish line.

I am deeply alarmed by the reporting of the massive drone swarm that flew over Langley Air Force Base in Virginia last December. Langley is the home of the First Fighter Wing, which maintains half of the F–22s in the U.S. Air Force inventory. Reports of this incident indicate these drones were roughly 20 feet long, flying more than 100 miles an hour in an altitude of over 3,000 feet, yet the origin of these drones and their operators remains a mystery.

This incident and other sightings near sensitive military installations highlights the complexity of the UAP challenge facing our Intelligence, Defense, and Homeland Security Committees.

Whether these phenomena are a result of foreign adversaries developing advanced technologies, or something else entirely, we must take them seriously, investigate them thoroughly, and assess their implications on national defense.

The repeated UAP sightings around sensitive military sites underscores the need for innovative defensive strategies beyond traditional measures. They also highlight the urgent need for updated policies to address emerging threats, as well as more effective interagency cooperation and intelligence sharing.

However, none of this is going to be possible without transparency. For far too long, critical information about UAPs has been either classified or ignored, leaving the American public and Congressmen without clarity needed to make informed decisions.

Declassifying reports and fostering a more open dialog about UAPs will not only increase the public trust but also encourage collaboration between government, the scientific community, and our allies. Quite frankly, there has been things that have been kept secret that is, I think, old enough that there is no reason it should not be released regardless of any so-called, you know, private information.

A transparent approach will allow us to share insights, identify patterns, and development new strategic defenses. As we continue to investigate these phenomena, we must do so with the mindset of protecting our country, advancing scientific discovery, and up-

holding the trust of the American people, who right now I do not think have trust. It is just obvious. I do not have trust.

We cannot shy away from the unknown, especially when the stakes are so high.

I look forward to discussing these matters with the witnesses today. I am hopeful we can learn from the testimony and come out of this hearing with actionable ideas to advance UAP transparency. Actually, the idea is just to say, in my mind, go back 15 years, and everything has to be released.

I am hopeful that we can learn from their testimony and come out of this hearing.

And, with that, I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I will now recognize Mr. Moskowitz for a 5-minute introduction.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Chairwoman.

Good morning, everyone. I first want to thank the Chairs and Ranking Members for holding the hearing today on this topic and, again, having a second hearing.

I want to thank the witnesses for coming forward today to share your expertise on UAPs and the need to build trust through transparency.

But, first, I want to mention you might be wondering why Chairman Comer has allowed me to be a Ranking Member today, but it is really only because our dear friend, Gerry Connolly, is not here. As Chairwoman Mace mentioned, he was diagnosed with esophageal cancer. And all of us on this Committee know Gerry, and he is a fighter, and we are praying for him and hoping for his speedy recovery.

So, today's hearing marks this Committee's second meeting dedicated to UAP transparency. I was pleased, as I know all of us are, on the bipartisanship that existed in last year's hearing and, even though we cannot talk about what happens in the classified settings, but bipartisanship that has existed in those settings with the questions Members have asked.

Last year's hearing was a great example of open dialog about UAPs, and we must remain committed to sharing information with the American people. And I think you see that commitment based on the people here and the commitment across the political spectrum.

I personally have worked with multiple Members of this Committee, but I want to particularly thank Congressman Burchett, Mace, Luna, and Garcia for working on bipartisan pieces of legislation.

In recent years, Congress has taken numerous bipartisan steps toward greater transparency. In 2022, in the NDAA, we created the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office to investigate unidentified flying objects. Following, AARO, along with ODNI, released an unclassified report on UAP sightings.

Of the 366 sightings included in the report, 171 remain uncharacterized with some of these appearing to have demonstrated unusual flight characteristics or performance capabilities. That is a nice way of saying we do not want to tell you what they are.

In March, AARO revealed a report on the historical record of U.S. Government involvement with UAPs, which covered investigatory efforts going back from 1945 to the present day.

Earlier this year, I joined Congressman Burchett to introduce the UAP Transparency Act, which would require the declassification of all documents related to UAPs, with many other Members of this Committee.

In Fiscal Year 2024, the NDA required the National Archives and Records Administration to establish the unidentified anonymous phenomena records collection. This collection will include digital copies of all unidentified UAP records that can be publicly disclosed.

This commitment in transparency is vitally important, and unnecessary overclassification has led to a void of information, which has allowed theories over the decades to foster.

When the American people and Members of Congress ask, "Are reports of UAPs credible?" we are met with stonewalling, we are met with responses of, "I cannot tell you," and, in fact, we are met with people not wanting us to have hearings; we are met with people not wanting us to ask you questions. In fact, many of us were told not to ask some of you certain questions on certain topics.

In the time of heightened distrust of our government institutions, I believe more transparency is not only needed but is possible. And, obviously, we can respect national security limits, but we also have to provide our constituents with the information and oversight that they have tasked us for. As part of this, government agencies must maintain open lines of communication with Members of Congress.

And there are regular questions that Americans have. What are UAPs? Are they real? Are they ours? How has this technology been developed? How do they get funded? Right?

And now we have seen—this has gone from a long time ago where you could discredit people because it is some guy living in a Winnebago. You are able to see people now. These are pilots. These are military. These are folks with serious backgrounds. This has changed the face of this because now we have video.

People will have questions. We know there are advanced technology programs. Almost 15 years ago, one of those came out of area 51 to go after Osama bin Laden. And the only reason we know about that is because one of those helicopters was downed.

Americans have questions about whistleblowers who have come forward to talk about retribution.

And so, I want to thank everyone for being involved today on trying to get more transparency. This has been bipartisan, bicameral. And, as we get into a new administration, the President-elect has talked about opportunities to declassify information on UAPs, and I hope he lives up to that promise.

And, with that, I yield back.

Ms. MACE. OK. Thank you, Mr. Moskowitz.

And I would now—Committee staff asked me to go ahead, and I will do it, to enter into the Congressional Record this 12-page document that Michael Shellenberger brought today that describes the Immaculate Constellation government program. So, we will do that now. Every Member up here has a copy of it.

The first section talks about the unacknowledged special access program called Immaculate Constellation, and the second section about USG imagery intelligence.

And Representative Luna just told me, if I say, "Immaculate Constellation," I will be on some list. Maybe a FISA warrant. So, come at me bro, I guess.

But, without objection, entered into the record.

All right. So, next we will introduce our witnesses for today's hearing. Thank you so much for being here.

Our first witness is retired Rear Admiral Tim Gallaudet, who retired from the U.S. Navy and is now the Chief Executive Officer at Ocean STL Consulting.

Our second witness is Mr. Luis Elizondo, a former Department of Defense official and author of a recent bestseller book about UAPs.

Our third witness is Mr. Michael Shellenberger, founder of the newsletter, Public, and author of a recent journalistic piece about special access programs, including one widely identified as Immaculate Constellation.

I swear the staff wants me on a list.

OK. And our last witness today is Mr. Michael Gold, a former NASA official who was also a member of the NASA UAP independent study team.

Welcome, everyone. We are pleased to have you today.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise your right hands.

This is where it gets real.

Do you solemnly swear to affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Ms. MACE. Let the record show that the witnesses all answered in the affirmative.

We appreciate all of you being here today and look forward to your testimony.

Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statements, and they will appear in full in the hearing record.

You guys may be seated.

Please limit your oral statements to 5 minutes.

As a reminder, please press the button in front of you so the microphone is turned on so that everyone in the room, Members included, can hear you.

When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes has expired, and we would ask that you please wrap it up.

So, I will first recognize Rear Admiral Gallaudet to please begin your opening remarks.

STATEMENT OF TIM GALLAUDET, PH.D.
REAR ADMIRAL, U.S. NAVY (RET.)
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, OCEAN STL CONSULTING, LLC

Dr. GALLAUDET. Thank you, Chairwoman Mace, Chairman Grothman, Ranking Members Connolly and Garcia, and Members

of the Committee. Thank you for this opportunity to testify today regarding unidentified anomalous phenomena, or UAP.

Confirmation that UAPs are real came to me in January 2015, when I was serving as the Commander of the Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command. At the time, my personnel were participating in a predeployment naval exercise off the U.S. East Coast. It included the USS Theodore Roosevelt Carrier Strike Group, and this exercise was overseen by the United States Fleet Forces Command, led by a four-star admiral who, at the time, was also my superior officer.

During this exercise, I received an email on the Navy's secure network from the operations officer of U.S. Fleet Forces Command. The email was addressed to all the subordinate commanders, and the subject line read, in all capital letters, "URGENT SAFETY OF FLIGHT ISSUE."

The text of the email was brief but alarming with words to the effect, "If any of you know what these are, tell me ASAP. We are having multiple near midair collisions, and if we do not resolve this soon, we are going to have to shut down the exercise."

Attached to the email is what is now known as the Go Fast video captured on the forward-looking infrared sensor of one of the Navy F/A–18 aircraft participating in the exercise. The now declassified video showed an unidentified object exhibiting flight and structural characteristics unlike anything in our arsenal.

The implication of the email was clear. The author was asking whether any of the recipients were aware of classified technology demonstrations that could explain these objects.

Because the DoD policy is to rigorously deconflict such demonstrations with live exercises, I was confident this was not the case.

The very next day, that email disappeared from my account and those of the other recipients without explanation. Moreover, the Commander of Fleet Forces Command and the operations officer never discussed the subject even during weekly meetings specifically designed to address issues affecting exercises like the one in which the Theodore Roosevelt Strike Group was participating.

This lack of follow-up was very concerning to me. As the Navy's chief meteorologist at the time, I was responsible for reducing safety of flight risks, yet it appeared to me that no one at the flag officer level was addressing the safety risk posed by UAPs. Instead, pilots were left to mitigate these threats on their own without guidance or support.

I concluded that the UAP information must have been classified within a special access program managed by an intelligence agency. That is, a compartmented program that even senior officials, including myself, were not read into.

Last year's UAP hearing before this Oversight Committee confirmed that UAP-related information is being withheld from senior officials and Members of Congress.

And, just this week, I learned from former DoD official Chris Mellon that satellite imagery of UAP from a few years ago still has not been shared with Congress.

Equally concerning, last year's UAP hearing also revealed that elements of the government are engaged in a disinformation cam-

paign, to include personal attacks designed to discredit UAP whistleblowers.

Having never signed a nondisclosure agreement regarding UAPs and now, as a private citizen, I have become an advocate for greater UAP transparency from the government. The continued overclassification surrounding UAPs has not only hindered our ability to effectively address these phenomena but has also eroded trust in our institutions.

While I applaud previous bipartisan legislation passed by Congress concerning UAPs, a more comprehensive approach is needed to address the broader implication of UAP on public safety and national security, as well as the socioeconomic opportunities that open UAP research could unlock.

Therefore, I recommend Congress take the following action, which I believe will receive bipartisan support: First, establish robust oversight of the executive branch's management of UAP information by directing key officials, beginning with the Director of the DoD's All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, to provide comprehensive briefings on what the government knows about UAP and does not know.

Two, enact the provisions of the UAP Disclosure Act to establish a UAP records review board to ensure independent oversight, transparency, and accountability in the government's handling of UAP information.

And, three, strengthen the UAP Disclosure Act and future reauthorizations with provisions that mandate a whole-of-government approach to addressing UAP.

In closing, I will share my personal reasons for speaking out on this topic. First, as a former science agency leader, having led the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, I have always sought the truth in human knowledge and thought.

Now that we know UAP are interacting with humanity, and these include unidentified submerged objects in the ocean, we should not turn a blind eye but, instead, boldly face this new reality and learn from it.

Additionally, at a time when leaders in government leave much to be desired, I feel obligated to share moral leadership on this issue of UAP disclosure by validating the credibility of the courageous men and women who have come out as witnesses and whistleblowers to expose the truth.

My speaking out has encouraged others to do the same, and it is my hope over time that a number of your constituents will want to know the truth about UAP, and this number will increase to such an extent that the congressional action I just recommended will become inevitable.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I will now recognize Mr. Elizondo for his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF LUIS ELIZONDO
AUTHOR
FORMER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICIAL

Mr. ELIZONDO. Greetings, Chairwoman Mace, Chairman Grothman, Ranking Members Connolly and Garcia, and Members

of the Committee. It is my honor and privilege to testify before you on the issue of unidentified anomalous phenomena, formerly known as UFOs.

On behalf of our brave men and women in uniform, and across the intelligence community, as well as my fellow Americans who have awaited this day, thank you for your leadership on this important matter.

Let me be clear. UAP are real. Advanced technologies not made by our government or any other government are monitoring sensitive military installations around the globe. Furthermore, the U.S. is in possession of UAP technologies, as are some of our adversaries.

I believe we are in the midst of a multidecade secretive arms race, one funded by misallocated taxpayer dollars and hidden from our elected Representatives and oversight bodies.

For many years, I was entrusted with protecting some of our Nation's most sensitive programs. In my last position, I managed a special access program on behalf of the White House and the National Security Council. As such, I appreciate the need to protect certain sensitive intelligence and military information. I consider my oath to protect secrets as sacred, and I will always put the safety of the American people first.

With that said, I also understand the consequences of excessive secrecy and stovepiping. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the aftermath of 9/11, which many of us remember all too well.

I believe that America's greatness depends on three elements: A, a watchful Congress; B, a responsive executive branch; and C, an informed public.

Over the last decade and a half, I learned that certain UAP programs were and are operating without any of these elements. Although, much of my government work on the UAP subject still remains classified, excessive secrecy has led to grave misdeeds against loyal civil servants, military personnel, and the public, all to hide the fact that we are not alone in the cosmos.

A small cadre within our own government involved in the UAP topic has created a culture of suppression and intimidation that I have personally been victim to, along with many of my former colleagues. This includes unwarranted criminal investigations, harassment, and efforts to destroy one's credibility.

Most Americans would be shocked to learn that the Pentagon's very own public affairs office openly employs a professional psychological operations officer as the singular point of contact for any UAP-related inquiries from citizens and the media. This is unacceptable.

Many of my former colleagues and I have provided classified testimony to both the Department of Defense and the intelligence community Inspector General, and many of us have subsequently been targeted by this cabal with threats to our careers, our security clearances, and even our lives. This is not hyperbole but a genuine fact, and this is wrong.

To fix these problems, I propose three principal actions. First, Congress and the President should create a single point of contact responsible for a whole-of-government approach to the UAP issue. Currently, the White House, CIA, NASA, the Pentagon, Depart-

ment of Energy, and others play a role, but no one seems to be in charge, leading to unchecked power and corruption.

Second, we need a national UAP strategy that will promote transparency and help restore the American public's trust at a time when the public's trust is at an all-time low. This strategy should include a whole-of-government approach, including the academic and scientific communities, the private sector, and our international partners and allies.

Third, Congress should create a protected environment so whistleblowers desperate to do the right thing can come forward without fear. As it currently stands, these whistleblowers suffer because of stigma, a code of silence, and concerns about retaliation.

These whistleblowers should be encouraged to come forward in ways that protect them against any forms of retaliation. Policies and procedures should ensure that protection.

And, for those who refuse to cooperate, it is up to the Members of this Committee and other lawyer makers to wield their subpoena power against hostile witnesses and prevent additional government funding to those UAP efforts that remain hidden from congressional oversight.

In closing, we, as Americans, have never been afraid of a challenge. In fact, we thrive on them. Whether it is eradicating polio or going to the moon, we do not run from a challenge. We take it head on.

To the incoming administration in Congress, I say to you we need immediate public transparency, and this hearing is an important step on that journey. If we approach the UAP topic in the same way as we, as Americans, have met other challenges, we can restore our faith in our government institutions.

Together, we can usher in a new era of accountable government and scientific discovery. I believe that we, as Americans, can handle the truth, and I also believe the world deserves the truth.

Thank you, esteemed Members of Congress, for your time today. It is profoundly appreciated by many.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I ask unanimous consent for Representatives Ogles of Tennessee and Boebert of Colorado to be waved onto the Subcommittee for today's joint Subcommittee hearing for the purpose of asking questions.

Without objection, so ordered.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Shellenberger for his introductory remarks.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL SHELLENBERGER
FOUNDER
PUBLIC

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Chairwoman Mace, Chairman Grothman, Ranking Member Connolly, Ranking Member Garcia, Members of the Subcommittees, thank you for inviting my testimony.

One of Congress' most important responsibilities is oversight of the executive branch, in general, and the military and intelligence community in particular. Unfortunately, there is a growing body of evidence that the U.S. Government is not being transparent about what it knows about unidentified anomalous phenomena and that

elements within the military and the IC are in violation of their constitutional duty to notify Congress of their operations.

President-elect Donald Trump and former President Barrack Obama have both said that the government has information about UAPs that it has not released.

There are other explanations for UAPs, that they represent a new form of life or nonhuman life. Current dominant alternative theories, including those put forward by AARO, are that UAPs are some kind of natural phenomenon we do not yet understand, like ball lighting or plasma. They could also be part of some new U.S. or foreign government weapons program, such as drones, aircraft, balloons, CGI hoaxes, or birds.

Whatever UAPs are, Congress must be informed, as must the people of the United States. We have a right to know what UAPs are, no matter what they are.

However, we now have existing and former U.S. Government officials who have told Congress that AARO and the Pentagon have broken the law by not revealing a significant body of information about UAPs, including military intelligence data bases that have evidence of their existence as physical craft.

One of those individuals is a current or former U.S. Government official acting as a UAP whistleblower. This person has written a report. This is the report that says the executive branch has been managing UAP/NHI issues without congressional knowledge, oversight, or authorization for some time, quite possibly decades.

Furthermore, these individuals have revealed the name of an active and highly secretive DoD unacknowledged special access program, or USAP. The source of that document told Public, me, that the USAP is a strategic intelligence program that is part of the U.S. military family of longstanding, highly sensitive programs dealing with various aspects of the UAP problem.

The new UAP whistleblower claims that the U.S. military and IC data base includes videos and images taken using infrared, forward-looking infrared, full motion video, and still photography.

The report that was just shared with Congress says Immaculate Constellation serves as a central or parent USAP that consolidates observations of UAPs by both tasked and untasked collection platforms.

Immaculate Constellation includes high-quality imagery intelligence and measurement and signature intelligence of UAPs, the whistleblower's report adds. The sources of this intelligence are a blend of directed and incidental collection capacities, capabilities, position in low Earth orbit, the upper atmosphere, as well as military and civilian aviation altitudes and maritime environments.

The report to Congress details in detail various UAPs, including spheres/orbs, discs/saucers, ovals, triangles, boomerang/arrowhead, and irregular/organic. The report describes various incidents found in the human intelligence data bases.

One involved orbs surrounding and forcing an F–22 out of its patrol area. In another incident, the crew of a Navy aircraft carrier watched a small orange/red sphere rapidly descend from a high altitude of 100 to 200 yards directly above the flight deck of the CVN aircraft carrier.

And, since my reporting on this Immaculate Constellation last month, another source came forward who told me that they saw a roughly 13-minute long, high-definition, full-color video of a white orb UAP coming out of the ocean approximately 20 miles off the coast of Kuwait. It was filmed from a helicopter.

Then, halfway through the video, the person said the orb is joined by another orb that briefly comes into the frame from the left before rapidly moving again out of the frame. The person discovered the video on SIPR, the Secure Internet Protocol Router Network, which the DoD uses to transmit classified information.

A leading UAP researcher who utilizes the Freedom of Information Act to find out what the government knows, John Greenewald, told me last year that the U.S. Government had been increasingly denying his request for UAP information. He has been doing FOIA requests for 27 years and has an archive of 3 million pages.

The government has for decades denied any interest in UFOs. He told me that the documents that he has assembled showed that behind the scenes, it was a completely different story.

Contrary to the hopes of many advocates of transparency, the government has been restricting more information since the leak of three UAP videos in 2017. The DoD organization, AARO, has been labeling many documents with a B7 exemption, which Greenewald says does not make any sense. They are stating that anything AARO does is involved in a law enforcement investigation, which allows AARO to not release it.

Greenewald says that DoD has denied the existence of UAP and AATIP-related records on multiple occasions, only to acknowledge them after an appeal was filed. He added that the Naval Air Systems Command in March 2022 stated they found no additional UAP videos. It seems strange that they had three and only those three, but other requests have been filed by The Black Vault—that is John Greenewald's group—to seek out more places UAPs might be hiding.

Then, in September 2022, the Navy admitted that the UAP-related videos and photographs existed but denied the request in full for their release saying that the requested videos contain sensitive information that are classified and exempt from disclosure.

The DoD will "deny things on a Monday and then admit to it on a Friday," said Greenewald. He said the government can and does release videos that protect secret methods of capturing it. They fall back on the sensitive platform excuse a lot, he said. However, the on-screen information can be blurred and scrubbed. The metadata can be removed.

I will show you this example here. This is a presentation from the UAP task force. This is completely absurd. It is nuts, this level of censorship, of redaction on a document. It shows the redaction of how many reports they have collected for how many years. Two of the three potential explanations are blacked out.

The Pentagon, the intelligence community is treating us like children. It is time for us to know the truth about this. I think that we can handle it.

Thank you very much.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Gold for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL GOLD
FORMER NASA ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR
SPACE POLICY AND PARTNERSHIPS
AND
MEMBER OF NASA UAP INDEPENDENT STUDY TEAM

Mr. GOLD. Thank you, Chairman Mace, Chairman Grothman, Ranking Members Connolly and Garcia, Representative Moskowitz, and distinguished Members of both Subcommittees. I am grateful to all of you, as well as your intrepid staff, for the opportunity to testify and would like to begin by discussing courage.

Courage is what it takes to tackle this topic, and courage, in the face of adversity, is what I see in front of me, beside me, and behind me.

Per my introduction, I am currently the Chief Growth Officer at Redwire Space and have had several leadership positions at NASA. That being said, I want to be clear that I am speaking exclusively on my own behalf and not for Redwire, NASA, or any other organization.

However, I am here today to speak out for science. Science requires data, which should be collected without bias or prejudice. Yet, whenever the topic of UAP arises, those who wish to explore the phenomenon are often confronted with resistance and ridicule.

For example, members of the NASA UAP independent study team, particularly those in academia, were mocked and even threatened for simply having the temerity to engage in the study of UAP.

Our best tool for unlocking the mystery of UAP is science, but we cannot conduct a proper inquiry if the stigma is so overwhelming that just daring to be part of a NASA research team elicits such a vitriolic response.

Therefore, one of most important actions that can be taken relative to exposing the truth of UAP is to combat the stigma, and this is where I believe that NASA can be imminently helpful.

The NASA brand is synonymous with hope, optimism, and credibility. If you were to take a walk down to National Mall, you would immediately see the NASA logo on T-shirts, hats, and bumper stickers. Few Federal agencies enjoy this kind of popularity. I have never seen anyone wearing an Office of Personnel Management T-shirt, which is why NASA could play such an influential role.

Specifically, NASA could, with relatively little cost and effort, host symposia on UAP or even just participate in existing panels examining the topic. NASA personnel stepping forward and participating in such discussions would make a powerful statement to the scientific community that UAP should be taken seriously and researched accordingly.

In regard to research, NASA has vast archives, much of which may contain important UAP data. Again, for relatively little cost and effort, NASA could create an AI or ML algorithm that could search the agency's archives for anomalous phenomena.

I suspect that such an effort would not only result in information that will help us to understand UAP but could result in data that will assist in other areas of scientific inquiry, such as anomalous weather or meteorite activity. Beyond its existing archives, NASA could act as a clearinghouse for civilian and commercial UAP data.

During my work on the UAP independent study team, it quickly became evident that there is no clear or well-publicized process for civilian pilots to report UAP sightings. The stigma associated with UAP hampers the number of pilots that would report such phenomena, but even for those who overcome the stigma, I believe the current FAA guidance is largely unknown and poorly understood.

In order to effectively collect UAP data, the independent study team recommended the use of NASA's aviation safety reporting system, or ASRS. The system, which is administered by NASA and funded by the FAA, provides a confidential means for reporting of safety violations in a voluntary and nonpunitive manner.

Over 47 years, the ASRS has collected nearly 2 million reports. ASRS is the perfect tool to collect UAP data, which could then be collated by NASA and shared with the public at-large.

Leveraging ASRS could create a treasure trove of UAP data, potentially hundreds of thousands of reports supporting this hearing's goal of exposing the truth.

I am grateful to our two co-Chairs and other Members who have already incorporated this idea into proposed legislation. At this hearing, as others have demonstrated, the UAP issue is justifiably dominated by national security and defense. However, I would urge the Subcommittees to keep in mind the numerous ways that NASA and the FAA, as well as commercial activities in the air, in space, and in the water can generate a massive amount of invaluable data on anomalous phenomena.

I cannot help but be excited by the potential for such an endeavor since scientific discovery is driven by anomalies. It is the existence and study of anomalies that led to the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, and nearly all of humanity's scientific breakthroughs.

This is why the study of UAPs should be embraced since, whatever is occurring, the chance to garner new knowledge, should never be ignored. We must be thorough in collecting information, fearless in making conclusions, and open to following the data no matter how mundane or extraordinary the results may be.

I began this testimony by praising the joint Subcommittee Members for their courage, and I will end by echoing that sentiment. As the saying goes, the truth is out there. We just need to be bold enough and brave enough to face it.

Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. Thank you all.

I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questioning.

I have a lot of questions, and I have a lot of witnesses. So, I would just ask, if it is "yes" or "no", to please just tell me "yes" or "no". If it requires more than that, be very succinct because I would like to go down the line and ask as many questions as possible.

So, for the Admiral this morning first, former DoD official Chris Mellon reached out to about satellite imagery from 2017 that depicts a UAP. What were the dates in 2017 when this occurred?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I cannot share with you the details, ma'am, but I can do it in a closed setting, and I could also tell you the agency that wrote a report on it.

Ms. MACE. OK.

So, who has the imagery?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I can tell you that in a closed setting.

Ms. MACE. Can you describe what was depicted in the satellite imagery, just a description?

Dr. GALLAUDET. It was a UAP, ma'am.

Ms. MACE. That is it? No other description?

Dr. GALLAUDET. The term that the analyst used, they call it the button. It was a disc-shaped object.

Ms. MACE. OK. Where was it?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I cannot tell you that, ma'am.

Ms. MACE. OK.

All right. Mr. Elizondo, you state in your testimony that, quote, "Advanced technologies not by our government or any other government are monitoring sensitive military installations around the globe," end quote.

If these technologies are not made by any government, who is making them? Private companies? Or are you implying they are crafted by a nonhuman intelligence?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Well, ma'am, that is precisely why we are here. The problem is that, temporally speaking, over decades, not just the last 10 years, before—to put this in perspective——

Ms. MACE. Are these private companies you are implying, or is this nonhuman intelligence?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It may be both.

Ms. MACE. OK.

Mr. ELIZONDO. When it comes to Blue Force Technologies, I would not be able to discuss——

Ms. MACE. OK.

Are you read into secret UAP crash retrieval programs?

Mr. ELIZONDO. We would have to have a conversation in a closed session, ma'am. I signed documentation 3 years ago that restricts my ability to discuss specifically crash retrievals.

I submitted for my book, through the DOPSR process, which took a year for it to be reviewed, and what is in the book is what I was told I am allowed to talk about.

Ms. MACE. Has the government conducted secret UAP crash retrieval programs? Yes or no?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes.

Ms. MACE. OK.

Were they designed to identify and reverse engineer alien craft? Yes or no?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Does the U.S. Government have any reverse—OK. You have already answered that question about retrieval programs.

Do any U.S. contractors have the same?

Mr. ELIZONDO. I would prefer to address that in a closed session, ma'am.

Ms. MACE. OK.

In your book, you mentioned government employees who have been injured by UAPs placed on leave and receiving government compensation for their injuries. Is that correct?

Mr. ELIZONDO. That is correct.

Ms. MACE. How can the government deny we have recovered craft if they are paying people because they have been injured by recovered craft?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, that is a great question. That is why I think we are here again, because I have seen the documentation by the U.S. Government for several of these individuals who have sustained injuries as a result of a UAP incident.

Ms. MACE. That is a crazy idea, right? The hypocrisy and the logic.

OK. Mr. Shellenberger, I am going to say it again to be very clear. Immaculate Constellation. What is its mission, and how are they funded?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Its mission is to—as I stated, its mission is to—it is an unacknowledged special access program. Its mission is to document UAPs.

Ms. MACE. OK.

And do you, for your story and your report, do you have more than one credible source, sourcing?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Ms. MACE. OK.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Ms. MACE. And then why do you believe your sources to be credible? How do you judge the veracity of the documentation you have been provided about this program?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I checked the sources, and they are who they say they are. They are current or former government officials. I should also—I want to also add that I did not specify that they were Defense Department employees. I did not specify the agency nor the gender.

Ms. MACE. Would they have included non-government employees, people that are not employed by the government?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. These are—I am comfortable saying that these are government or previously government employees.

Ms. MACE. Any of them currently employed by a private contractor or private contractors?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I would rather not say.

Ms. MACE. OK.

What is the key takeaway, in just a few seconds, about the Immaculate Constellation document you provided us today?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I think that what the American people need to know is that the U.S. military and intelligence community are sitting on a huge amount of visual and other information, still photos, video photos, other censor information, and they have for a very long time, and it is not those fuzzy photos and videos that we have been given, there is very clear——

Ms. MACE. High res?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. High resolution.

Ms. MACE. How many visuals, graphics, videos, photos?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I mean, I have been told hundreds, you know, maybe thousands.

I mean, I also wanted to say, because there was some conversation around concern around the reviewing of these materials revealing the source collections, but some of these are shot from helicopters using normal videos of oceans. I just think that is absurd that somehow you are going to be revealing some secret U.S. technology by revealing that you photographed orbs off the coast of Kuwait.

Ms. MACE. OK. Thank you.

I have 8 seconds.

Mr. Gold, did the NASA independent study team get briefed on what you call AAWSAP? Very quickly.

Mr. GOLD. I flagged the Advanced Airspace Weapon Systems Applications Program to our Chair and our DFO. We did not get briefed. But I believe it is definitely worth looking into. That was probably the largest UAP review effort ever and I think produced a lot of interest data—including revealing Nimitz. I do not know if my fellow witness might want to—he did yeoman's work on it—might want to comment.

Ms. MACE. OK.

All right. I am going to turn to Mr. Moskowitz, who will be recognized for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

So, Mr. Gold, you gave a whole diatribe for a couple of minutes about UAPs, science, data collection, stigma. A lot of non-believers in all of this would just ask a very simple question. Why? Why is it so hard, right? Like, why are people, any time they ask, why are they always thwarted? Why are they always judged? Why do they always have misinformation spread? Why is there always retribution? Why is it always met with inure? What is the why? If it does not exist, why is it such a problem?

Mr. GOLD. I think if you go through the history of science, Representative, it is always difficult for breakthroughs and new information regardless of whether it is UAP or any other kind of discovery.

In science, we are supposed to be open, but when you break with the orthodoxy of what is believed, whether it is Galileo saying that the Earth does not rotate or the Earth rotates around the sun or the sun does not rotate around the Earth, it is always challenging for new beliefs. And the more extraordinary those discoveries, the more extraordinary those new beliefs, it is very difficult.

So, I think this is natural. There is natural conservatism when it comes to science, but this issue in particular has been very difficult where, again, even to attempt to study it becomes problematic.

But every hearing like this, every news report, every video documentary—I was privileged to be part of something Dan Farrow was putting together. I think many of us have interviewed for it, documenting 30 different government officials, every brick in the wall will help get us closer to getting to the truth.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I appreciate that.

Mr. Elizondo—do I have that correct?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I am a recovering lawyer, so I am going to put my hat on for a second. You said you signed a document. Love that. Who gave that to you?

Mr. ELIZONDO. The U.S. Government, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. Do you have a copy of it?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It is stored in the SCIF right now. I do not have possession of it. The U.S. Government does.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. What department of the U.S. Government gave you this document?

Mr. ELIZONDO. I will say the Department of Defense. Unfortunately, I cannot say in this forum much more than that.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. You specifically said the document said you cannot talk about crash retrieval. Well, you know, you cannot talk about fight club if there is no fight club.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Correct.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. I am just making an observation.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. So, that document that you signed that you said exists specifically said you cannot talk about crash retrieval?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Correct, sir. It was a limitation on what I—because already I had been speaking publicly about the topic, and so the document said, "You can continue saying X, Y, Z, but you cannot discuss the topic of crash retrieval."

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Give me the atmosphere of signing this document. You are in a room by yourself?

Mr. ELIZONDO. I am in a SCIF with a security officer, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Just one on one? Anybody else?

Mr. ELIZONDO. There may have been an assistant as well. It was in a SCIF within a Department of Defense facility.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Give me your background real quick.

Mr. ELIZONDO. My background is I went to school to study microbiology and immunology. I entered into the U.S. Army, and after a very short stint in military intelligence, I became a counterintelligence special agent as a civilian. Later on, I became a special agent in charge, running investigations and counter terrorism and counter espionage primarily with some experience in counter insurgency and counter narcotics.

And then, in 2009 timeframe, when I came back to the Pentagon after a tour with the Director of National Intelligence, I quickly became part of a program that was originally called AAWSAP. That evolved into the program now called AATIP, which is where those videos that we now see, the GOFAST, the GIMBAL, the FLIR, that was part of our effort, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Right. So, you are not some conspiracy theorist. You actually have a legitimate background.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Well, sir, I am certainly not a conspiracy theorist. I am fact-based, just a fact——

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. So, when you are in this room—I want to paint the picture for everybody. You are in this room. You are by yourself. You are in the SCIF. You are handed a document. How long is the document?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It is about a page front and back. So, basically, you have some things they call trigraphs, which I cannot, again, talk——

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. How long were you given to sign the document?

Mr. ELIZONDO. As long as I needed, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. And what if you did not sign it?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Well, I suspect there would be repercussions. I would not have access to certain information.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Were you allowed to conduct—ask a lawyer or you were not allowed to talk—you were not allowed to ask for a lawyer to review the document?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It was an option, but they probably would not have allowed me to because the document itself was pretty explicit about you have to be—you are putting me in an interesting—let me try to thread the needle here.

There are certain documents that we have in the U.S. Government that allow people to have access to certain programs, whether it is a specialized—I am being very generic here—whether it is a special access program or controlled access program, SAP, CAP, whatnot.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. How many people have to sign that document?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It depends how many people are going to get access to the information, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK.

Last question. Doctor, real quick, can you tell us about the Omaha incident in greater detail? I have read your background, right. Some people would label you as a member of the deep state since you worked in government for a long period of time.

But can you tell us more about that incident? You have written a lot about that.

Dr. GALLAUDET. I wrote a lot about incidents like it, Congressman, but that specific incident involved the USS Omaha, the tour combat ship of the U.S. Navy operating off of Southern California. I do not remember the exact date. It was within the last decade, but what the watch standers on the bridge observed was a UAP. Again, something that was aloft but had no observable exhaust or control surfaces. So, it was something that could not be explained.

And then they saw it enter the water from the atmosphere and going through the air/sea interface and so, thus, exhibiting transmedium travel.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you.

I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I will now recognize Mr. Grothman for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes, we will start with Mr. Gallaudet. During a previous UAP hearing, Navy Commander David Fravor discussed the Tic Tac object engaged in 2004. Are you familiar with the incident, the Tic Tac incident?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. That is almost 20 years ago, right?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. It has been said there are more videos, documents, and reports related to this incident. Do you believe the information regarding the Tic Tac incident should be available to all Members of Congress?

In your expertise, what reason would the Department of Defense possibly have for not releasing information that is over 20 years old?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Thank you, Congressman.

I do not think there is any good reason to withhold information and important data, especially of a national security concern, from Congress.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Well, what would they say?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I will speculate, sir, that they do not want to share that kind of information because it reveals weaknesses in our ability to monitor and protect our airspace.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

In your written testimony, you claim last year's UAP hearing before this Oversight Committee confirmed that UAP-related information is—well, it is not only being withheld, but that elements of the government are engaging in a disinformation campaign, to include personal attacks designed to discredit UAP whistleblowers.

Could you elaborate on that statement a little?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Earlier this year, I met with the DoD's All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, and what I thought would be a 90-minute meeting just to meet with leadership turned out to be an hours-long influence operation on me, where I was—they attempted to convince me of the validity of the very flawed and error-ridden historical records report.

In addition, they tried to have me question very valid UAP reports like the Tic Tac incident, even coming to a—stating possibly that the Tic Tac was American technology. And then, of course, if you ask David Fravor or Alex Dietrich, the two witnesses, they were convinced it was otherwise.

And then—and they also cast discredit on various UAP whistleblowers and witnesses to——

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

Mr. GALLAUDET [continuing]. Question their validity and credibility as witnesses.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

We will go to Mr. Elizondo. I hope I got that right or at least not that wrong.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Close enough, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. You are familiar with the recent drone incursion over Langley Air Force Base?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. The owners of the drones remain unclear. The U.S. military has not been able to give us in Congress an answer.

Given your experience with the Department of Defense and the intelligence community, how frequently are UAP sightings over military installations?

And, second, I suppose hypothetically you could have incursions over just, say, regular airports. Is it obvious these incursions are more likely over military facilities than just a random airport out there?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir, there is definitely enough data to suggest that there is certainly some sort of relationship between sensitive U.S. military installations, also some of our nuclear equities, and also some of our Department of Energy sites.

There is a long historical record that some of your colleagues may have, documentation that demonstrates this. This is not a new trend; this has been going on for decades. And that information has been obfuscated, unfortunately, from folks like you and this Committee.

And I think that is problematic because, ultimately, at the end of the day, we have a significant situation here. We have some-

thing that can enter into U.S. airspace, completely with no attribution——

Mr. GROTHMAN. And how long has this been going on?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, decades. And there is information that will hopefully be entered into the record at some point.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Can you think of any possible reason why they cannot release any information they have on something, say, 15 or 20 years old?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, if I could echo my colleague here, Admiral Gallaudet, I think one of the big issues that we have in the intelligence community and Department of Defense is we do not want to broadcast any potential vulnerabilities or weaknesses in our national defense systems or in our intelligence collection platforms.

Therefore, when you have a conversation where you address a problem for which there is no solution, it makes that a very uncomfortable conversation to have.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

We will switch to Mr. Shellenberger.

The primary reason you are here today is because you published an article on the news publication that you own—called Public, right?—alleging that a new, unnamed government whistleblower has come forward asserting that a highly classified program exists dedicated to recovery and reverse engineering of UAP technologies.

Can you give us what specific evidence you have or that your source provided you to substantiate the claims about the existence of the Immaculate Constellation program?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Well, you have the report in front of you now, so you can see it for yourself. But I checked the report, and I did not find it based on existing cases; it was new cases for me. At least, I had not found anybody—so that solved—that answered for me that it was not obviously circular reporting, which is one of the big concerns in this space.

I also had the name of the program confirmed by more than one additional source. So—yes. And then, of course, I checked to make sure that the source was who they claimed to be.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I should also say that when I said before it was this data base, it is a much broader program than that. It also includes human intelligence and then, as you mentioned, the retrieval and the——

Mr. GROTHMAN. Any knowledge of what country these things originated in?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. No. No, I have no idea.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

Ms. MACE. OK. I will now recognize Mr. Burchett for 5 minutes of questions.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thanks, Chairlady.

I request unanimous consent to enter into the record documents provided to us regarding legacy UAP programs and psychological operations, Lue Elizondo.

Ms. MACE. So, ordered.

Mr. BURCHETT. I also want to thank my buddy Jeremy Corbell for providing these documents and access to some whistleblowers.

Mr. Elizondo, what is the last position—your last position with the Federal Government?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, I was the Director of National Programs Special Management Staff, managing a White House special access program on behalf of the National Security Council.

Mr. BURCHETT. How would you characterize UAPs?

Mr. ELIZONDO. An enigma, sir, and a frustration.

We are talking about technologies that can outperform anything we have in our inventory. And if this was an adversarial technology, this would be an intelligence failure eclipsing that of 9/11 by an order of magnitude.

Mr. BURCHETT. Are there classified Department of Defense materials related to UAPs that you believe could be safely disclosed to the public without compromising national security?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir, I do. I would never, ever try to endorse providing some sort of information that could compromise what we call a "blue force" technology or capability, but I do believe there is a lot of information regarding this topic—and I have been very vocal about it—that should be shared not only with the public but, most importantly, with Members of Congress.

Mr. BURCHETT. Are you familiar with my friend David Grusch?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Absolutely, sir. I had the privilege and honor of working with him myself several years ago at U.S. Space Force.

Mr. BURCHETT. Last year, as you know, he testified that the U.S. has run a multi-decade UAP crash, retrieval, and reverse engineering program.

Would you agree with that?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURCHETT. Are there UAP programs operating without—without—proper congressional oversight?

Mr. ELIZONDO. One hundred percent.

Mr. BURCHETT. What are they?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Unfortunately, sir, I would have to have that conversation in a closed session.

Mr. BURCHETT. I know you said that, and a lot of people are frustrated with those kind of answers, but we are asking those kind of questions so you all know what the heck we're up against.

You also mentioned in your opening statement that the Pentagon's Public Affairs Office employs a psychological operations officer as the singular point of contact for UAP-related inquiries.

Why the heck would they do that?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, that is a great question. I would ask the Pentagon.

There is a long history here of that individual providing misleading and false information to the public through various news outlets and media outlets in order to discredit this topic. I have personally been victim to it.

We have the documentation to substantiate where this information has been absolutely inaccurate that has been provided time and time again. And it turns out that that individual was also working with former leadership of AARO at the time as well.

Mr. BURCHETT. And we punish them by giving them multimillion dollars more than they ask for every year.

Admiral Gallaudet, you mentioned in your opening statement an email you received from the operations officer of the Fleet Forces Command regarding unknown objects almost colliding with U.S. military planes.

Did anyone respond with knowledge of what the objects were?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I have received no response, sir.

Mr. BURCHETT. Did the operation—did the exercise get canceled?

Dr. GALLAUDET. The exercise did not get canceled.

Mr. BURCHETT. Why do you think the Commander of Fleet Forces operations officer never discussed the incident again?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Sir, I am speculating, because I did not have an exchange with him, but I believed it to be part of a special access program, the information and the video, which we know now it was. And he realized he could not share that openly with the recipients of the email, and, therefore, the email was pulled from everybody's account.

Mr. BURCHETT. Again, tell us what happened to the email from the Commander of Fleet Forces.

Dr. GALLAUDET. The day after I received it and all the other recipients received it—which were all the subordinate commanders of U.S. Fleet Forces, so one-and two-star admirals, including strike group commanders—the email was wiped or deleted from our accounts——

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

Mr. GALLAUDET [continuing]. And then no one talked about it.

Mr. BURCHETT. All right.

Have you specifically had any experience with submersible objects?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Sir, I have not—no personal experience, but I have had witnesses on submarines come to me and say they have seen on sonar data——

Mr. BURCHETT. Correct.

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. How would you characterize those, and how did they move?

Dr. GALLAUDET. The one instance that I was—that was revealed to me was in the 1980's on a nuclear-powered submarine, a ballistic missile submarine, that the object exhibited the characteristics of a Russian torpedo in terms of its speed of movement and closing rate with the submarine. And then it slowed and followed the submarine slowly in its wake for a period of minutes and then rapidly exited the scene.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

Dr. GALLAUDET. And nothing that we know of technology-wise could replicate that.

Mr. BURCHETT. And the speed of these objects was faster than anything that we have or anybody else has that would be manned. Is that correct?

Dr. GALLAUDET. It was on the order of a——

Mr. BURCHETT. Underwater.

Dr. GALLAUDET [continuing]. Torpedo, so——

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir.

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir. But as it exited, it did——

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, I do not exactly know how fast a torpedo is, but I expect it does better than my old outboard Scott-Atwater, so I will take that as a yes.

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

Have you any experience with the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office, AARO?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, Congressman. As I mentioned previously, I have met with them.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

You heard Mr. Elizondo describe psychological operations for those contacting the Department of Defense about UAPs. You mentioned a similar influence operation by AARO.

Why are Federal agencies invested in running information operations about UAPs if they do not exist?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

But I will make a statement on AARO's behalf. They have new leadership. The office has reached out to me to meet again, and I take that as a good-faith effort. And we will see where that goes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you.

Chairlady, I have run over. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Tennessee.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Higgins.

Mr. BURCHETT. That is a first for me.

Ms. MACE. You are the king of Tennessee.

Mr. Higgins, you are recognized for 5 minutes of questions.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Elizondo, Mr. Shellenberger notes in his—in the report that we have been given for this hearing—I believe, Mr. Shellenberger—let me shift—you are author of this report?

Mr. ELIZONDO. I am sorry, sir, I am not the author of——

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Shellenberger, were you the author of this report? There is——

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. No, I was not.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. No name on it.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. No.

Mr. HIGGINS. Do you know the author?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. You do. And how would you estimate that madam or gentleman, the author?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. The person is a current or former U.S. Government employee.

Mr. HIGGINS. And it states here that it is the public version of the author's report.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. So, where might one find the non-public version of the author's report?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. HIGGINS. Would that be with the Department of Defense?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do not know.

Mr. HIGGINS. But you do know the author.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. Do you know what the author's sources were?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. The author's sources are described in the report—these data bases, the Immaculate Constellation program——

Mr. HIGGINS. All right. But you expressed some confidence in the sources——

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I would.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Earlier in testimony.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. You expressed confidence. So, do you know those sources?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. Are they within the Department of Defense?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I cannot say.

Mr. HIGGINS. You cannot say or you will not say?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I will not say.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK. Why not?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Because I protect my sources, and I think the——

Mr. HIGGINS. But you are not naming them. It is a big department. Many of us on my side of the aisle would say it is far too big.

So, you are talking about the Department of Defense, sources from within the Department of Defense?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I am uncomf—I am not willing to reduce——

Mr. HIGGINS. OK.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER [continuing]. The potential universe of my—where my sources might be.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK.

Moving on, in this report, Mr. Elizondo, for reference, several types of allegedly alien craft or possibly alien craft or unknown AARO phenomena, what we used to call UFOs, are described—spheres and orbs, disks and saucers, oval or Tic Tac, triangular shape, boomerang and arrowhead, and irregular or organic.

Mr. Elizondo, does that summarize to you the types of craft that we are discussing today?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, that is the general morphology, historical speaking, of many UAPs——

Mr. HIGGINS. OK. So, those descriptions are very different craft. Is it your assessment that they would come of different origins?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It is possible, but this also could be a matter of utility.

And let me just state for the record, I never read the report that—or the article that Mr. Shellenberger put out. The reason is——

Mr. HIGGINS. That is a good point. We are just referencing it——

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. For descriptive purposes for the American people.

Mr. Shellenberger, in this report, it is striking to me that, regarding the descriptions of experiences with these various craft, several of them include biological effects and several do not.

Are you familiar with what I am talking about?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK. So, spheres and orbs, triangular craft, and irregular or organic craft include some descriptions of biological effects, including feelings of unease, electronic device malfunctions, long-term psychological effects such as anxiety or insomnia have been noted, feeling of being watched, a shared awareness with the triangle craft. And under the irregular and organic craft, biological effects include physical sensations of warmth or cold and unexplained smells and psychological distress.

So, these are very specific descriptions of the reactions of human beings which allegedly have been noted from a study here, a report. All of those experiences would have been described by the sources that the author used?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I am not sure I understand your question, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. This is a very broad description of biological effects, and it is striking to me that they are present with relation to some types of craft——

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Right.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. But absent in others. This would require a great deal of research and study. Can you explain that?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. My understanding is that this is—the data base is very large. It includes both the images, the videos, the still images, as well as the human intelligence, the reports, the raw data from individuals having these experiences.

So, in answer to your question, yes, I mean, I think we are looking at a very large amount of data collected over many decades.

Mr. HIGGINS. And that data is held by the Department of Defense?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Well, I will say that, after I published, I was told that this program—that the USAP was actually managed by the Department of Defense but held at the White House.

Mr. HIGGINS. Roger that.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. But that is a single source, and I do not have multiple sources to verify that.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, sir. I did my best to trick an answer out of you, but—I was partially successful.

Madam Chair, I yield.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I would now recognize Mr. Frost for 5 minutes of questions.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Madam Chair.

In addition to serving on this Committee, the Oversight Committee, I also serve on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, where we often discuss how essential data and evidence are used in science and used at departments such as NASA. During a hearing, NASA Administrator Nelson affirmed the importance of NASA in helping us to understand UAP.

Mr. Gold, if the government does not have the data it needs on UAP because, say, someone who saw something is concerned about stigma, public backlash, et cetera, or maybe there is just not good systems in place, how are we supposed to ultimately figure out what is going on?

Mr. GOLD. Yes. Thank you for the question.

And let me compliment Administrator Nelson, that there would not have been a UAP Independent Study Team if it was not for his leadership and courage.

We are talking about data and where we can get data from. As I described, NASA has whole archives of data, much of which, I believe, will likely have information that will help inform UAP; we need only look. And, again, in an era with AI and ML, we can relatively quickly and easily go through it. So, I think it is something that we should encourage NASA to do.

However, per Chairman Grothman's comment about UAP focusing on national security sites, I believe there is something, sir, that you may have heard of called "sensor bias," that because we have got more cameras, more monitoring of national security, we do not know how extensive UAP activity may be over civilian areas.

Now, this is to the second part of your question, where we are not collecting the data. We are not collecting sufficient data from pilots. We are not collecting sufficient data from civilian and commercial activities. And this is, again, where ASRS, I think, could substantially change that, get the data out there, and allow us to do good science.

Mr. FROST. Yes. Thank you.

I mean, on the data, you know, I am a really big proponent of transparency, but obviously there is always a little bit of balance that we have to have in government on transparency as well. I mean, last year, NASA appointed a Director of UAP Research and Response, to the recommendation by the Independent Study Team.

In the final report, there's a quote: "Despite numerous accounts and visuals, the absence of consistent, detailed, and curated observations means we do not presently have the body of data needed to make definite and scientific conclusions about UAP."

Can you just talk really quickly about that balance of security and transparency?

Mr. GOLD. So, I can say, having served at NASA, it is the most transparent organization I have ever been in. When we would have conversations with executive leadership, things would leak out almost instantly. So, I can assure you, intentionally or not, NASA is very transparent. I do not know if many of you have worked with engineers or scientists; they love to talk.

So, I believe that NASA is a paradigm of transparency, but we must have the ability and the data to be able to be transparent with.

Mr. FROST. Uh-huh.

Mr. GOLD. And if we are not gathering that, if we are not looking at it, then we cannot bring NASA into the game and get to that good science that you need.

Mr. FROST. You know, it was about a year ago, I was touring a facility with a pretty senior government official. We went by a certain hangar, and they said, "Yes, that is—you know, a company leases that out. We do not really know what is going on in there. We have no way of knowing what is going on in there." And there was a few of those, in fact, while we were driving around this facility.

To what extent do you think that some of the UAP out there comes from off-the-books or unauthorized experimental aircraft?

Mr. GOLD. I mean, I think probably the vast majority of UAP are drones, experimental aircraft, weather conditions. Which is, again, why I say, if we reviewed the data, I think we are going to discover a lot about things we were not even thinking about. But there is a percentage that is not. And looking into those anomalies is how discoveries will be made.

And relative to science, Congressman, if I can say, when NASA studies black holes, when NASA studies galaxies, we have instruments that are tailored to do so. With UAP, we are using cockpit gun cameras or cell phones. We could never do good science with that.

And let me tell you, the NASA budget is under pressure. We need to make sure that the Artemis program is funded fully. We need to beat China to the Moon and maintain our presence in low Earth orbit. So, NASA would need more money to do this.

But I think tailored instruments that would look at UAP, in the same way that we have tailored instruments to look at astronomical data, is important to gathering valuable and uniform information.

If we were studying black holes by using fighter cockpit cameras, we probably would not know that much about black holes.

Mr. FROST. Huh. A hundred percent.

Well, I think it is important that Federal leaders take the necessary steps to ensure that UAP does not pose threats to the American public as well and that we have the necessary budgets to collect this data so we can actually see what is going on.

And I am fully supportive of funding the Artemis mission. I think it is very important. Also, a personal note: The pilot is a frat brother of mine. He is a member of the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated. And so, I would love to see my fraternity make it to the Moon.

Mr. GOLD. But Redwire is building the cameras for Artemis, so we will take some pictures of your frat brother and get them to you.

Mr. FROST. There we go. Thank you so much.

I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I will now recognize Mrs. Luna for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Elizondo, to your knowledge, can you name the country and around timeframe that the first back-engineered UAP program started?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, unfortunately, I would not be able to have that conversation in public.

Mrs. LUNA. Can anyone on the panel name that?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I cannot.

Mrs. LUNA. None of you? OK.

This next question is for Mr. Gallaudet.

To your knowledge, have any USOs ever outpaced our submarines?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. LUNA. At what magnitude?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I do not have the exact speed, but, again, a witness came to me—a credible former submarine officer who observed it on sonar data. And this was in the 1980s in the North Atlantic

during a storm. And it outpaced his submarine by orders of magnitude.

Mrs. LUNA. Are you aware of any hotspots that currently exist off our shores in North America?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Not with sufficiently credible data, ma'am.

Mrs. LUNA. OK. We have heard reports of there potentially being hotspots, maybe entry and exit points. Have you heard of any of that?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I have not, ma'am, but my colleague here, Mr. Elizondo, does discuss some USO activity that he has observed in certain DoD data bases.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Elizondo, in regard to these aircraft being piloted by whatever they might be—nonhuman biologics—would you agree that it is likely that they are being piloted by some mind-body connection?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, I think it is safe to presume here that they are being intelligently controlled, because they in some cases seem to anticipate our maneuvers, and in other cases they seem to—and I came across an email where the word "stalked" was used, in a—it was a very secure email between Navy officers discussing their ships being pursued by a UAP.

Mrs. LUNA. In our previous panel, we had Grusch, and he had testified to say that some of these were interdimensional beings. Can you speak on that at all?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, I am not qualified, certainly as a scientist or otherwise, to speculate points of origin.

I look at everything from a scientific perspective. So, if you look at, for example, instantaneous acceleration, which was one of the observables of the program that I belonged to, AATIP, the human body can withstand about 9 g-forces for a short period of time before you suffer negative biological consequences—blackouts and ultimately red-outs and even death.

In comparison, our best technology, the F–16, which is one of—it is an older platform but one of our most highly maneuverable aircraft, manned aircraft, made by General Dynamics, can perform at about 17 or 18 g-forces before you start having structural failure, meaning that the airframe begins to disintegrate while you are flying.

The vehicles we are talking about are performing in excess of 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 Gs.

Mrs. LUNA. So, are you—I guess, would it be safe to infer that they are living craft?

Mr. ELIZONDO. You know, I am not prepared at this point to state for the record is something alive or not, because even that definition—sorry, there was a time in science where we thought that life required oxygen, and we now know that is not true. There are anaerobic bacteria that thrive in environments that lack oxygen.

And, also, same with photosynthesis. When I was in college, I was told everything is derived from photosynthesis as a form of energy. In reality, that is not true. There are things that live off of chemosynthesis.

So, we are constantly having to reevaluate our understanding of what the definition of "life" is.

Mrs. LUNA. Uh-huh.

Do any of you ever come across reports from people that claim to have firsthand experiences with these entities, whatever they might be, or these aircraft and then, as a result, whether or not they are religious, find that these things will automatically disappear?

Anyone? This is open to any of you on the panel. So, just real quick, because I am running out of time.

Lue?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, I have always been a nuts-and-bolts kind of guy. When I was at AATIP, I was focusing more on the performance characteristics and less on the potential occupants.

Mrs. LUNA. OK.

The reason I ask is because it seems like, just based on our conversations, that we have had people that say that there are good and bad of whatever these things are.

And so, my concern from a national security perspective is, A, is that true? B, are you guys hearing reports of that?

And, C, I think moving forward in regard to technology—Mr. Gold, if you can answer this real quickly—some of these aircraft, it seems that they are operating off of energy that we do not currently have.

But just yes or no, in your opinion, if we were able to obtain that, would that impact humanity for the better or negative?

Mr. GOLD. It would certainly save us some money on funding on Artemis.

And——

Mrs. LUNA. Definitely.

Mr. GOLD [continuing]. This is a national security issue, that if there is such technology out there, we are not the only country that might have access to it. We do not want to be on the wrong end of technological surprise.

Mrs. LUNA. OK.

Thank you guys for your time.

Ms. MACE. All right. Thank you.

I will now recognize Mr. Garcia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

And I apologize for stepping out. My Governor is here, upstairs. So, I am going, trying to get in between meetings, so apologize for that.

I want to just start by just asking everyone on the panel, our witnesses—and I had a chance to read all the testimony before. But just to set the agenda, just if you can go down real briefly, do you believe, just for the record, that the Federal Government, any part of the Federal Government, is knowingly concealing evidence about UAPs from the public?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELIZONDO. One hundred percent.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GOLD. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

I also want to just go down the line—and I know many of you have already said this, but I just—for the record, again, just briefly: What do you believe UAPs could be or are?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Strong evidence that they are nonhuman higher intelligence.

Mr. ELIZONDO. I echo my colleague's comment, sir.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Genuinely do not know.

Mr. GOLD. Do not know, but we must find out.

Mr. GARCIA. OK. Thank you. I appreciate those answers, gentlemen. I think this is obviously another remarkable hearing with just really important information, so I thank all of you for answering the questions.

Admiral, I just want to go back to one thing. Now, last year, our Subcommittee heard from two retired Navy pilots, Lieutenant Ryan Graves and Commander David Fravor, regarding UAPs. Actually, I think Ryan is here in the audience, and been a great person to get to know and to have conversations with. He, of course, has been involved in the Safe Airspace for Americans Act, with Chairman Graves, with Chairwoman Mace, for UAP reporting by civilian aviation personnel.

Can you discuss briefly why it is important for civilian pilots to be able to report UAPs and why these legal protections are critical for our national security?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, Congressman. Thank you. And I did invite Ryan Graves as my guest, as I am on his advisory board for the Americans for Safe Aerospace.

And that legislation, that you supported and introduced, I fully support as well. And I think it is important that more civilian pilots, commercial pilots report so we can better understand and learn and do research on UAP, as well as remove the stigma so more citizens report on what they observe.

And, also, it will only contribute to aviation safety when we have a better understanding of where these UAP are, how they operate, and at what frequency and what capability level.

So, it is important for aviation safety, and it will be important for moving science and research forward.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, sir.

And I want to just reiterate to my colleagues, I mean, this is a very bipartisan piece of legislation, and we have just got to continue to get this through the Congress.

And it is incredibly important that civilian pilots have the opportunity to safely report the UAPs that they are seeing or encountering in the air. And I cannot express how critical this piece is, of what I believe is a larger collection of evidence and facts, actually happen.

We have been approached by pilots, I have talked to folks that have been engaged with our office and others, and there is still enormous stigma, and essentially we do not have a system where folks are feeling free to be able to report what they are seeing. And so, I just want to reiterate that advocacy.

Mr. Gold, in your testimony, you discuss NASA's Aviation Safety Reporting System, a confidential, nonpunitive reporting mechanism.

In the Safe Airspace for Americans Act, we explicitly allow for civilian reporting, of course, of UAPs.

Can you explain why the NASA task force recommended the use of the Aviation Safety Reporting System?

Mr. GOLD. The Aviation Safety Reporting System is an existing system that is trusted, that has taken hundreds of thousands, now millions, of cases. And, again, recognizing budgetary constraints, this seems like the perfect way to be able to gain more data.

And when it comes to the stigma, sir, it is something that pilots are used to reporting on, that crew is used to reporting on.

So, it is a great way to get data, to overcome the stigma, without spending really that much more additional money since the system exists.

Thank you so much for your support of that. Thank you for what Ryan Graves does. This is a commonsense means to expose the truth of UAP for the purpose of this hearing.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

And I just want to also add: Now, earlier this year, as part of the House defense authorization bill, the NDAA, I had filed an amendment to include the UAP Disclosure Act, which would create a UAP Records Review Board with exercise of eminent domain over UAP-related material, modeled actually on the JFK Assassination Records Collection Act, which is widely known. Now, the amendment was blocked, but thankfully the Senate included the amendment by Senators Rounds and Schumer for the UAP Disclosure Act.

So, I just again want to say that we should be pushing and ensuring the UAP Disclosure Act, which is bipartisan in its support, should move forward.

And if I can just briefly also—particularly, Admiral, can you just briefly, as I close my time, explain why the UAP Disclosure Act would be critical for us and our national security?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Thank you, Congressman.

Yes, I believe the UAP Disclosure Act is important for national security; as well as advancing potential socioeconomic benefits resulting from UAP research; as well as public safety, as we referred to previously, regarding aviation.

And this act will allow for greater transparency and open research. And that is why I am also a member of the UAP Discloser Fund as an advisor and the Sol Foundation as a senior strategic advisor, which is advocating the same.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you very much.

I yield back.

Ms. MACE. All right. Thank you.

I would like to recognize Mr. Biggs for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for holding this Committee.

Thank you to the witnesses.

Admiral, the video that is called the "Go Fast" video, the email that you have talked about being deleted, I just want to briefly cover this.

You said that the email—the author was asking whether any of the recipients were aware of the classified technology demonstrations that could explain the objects that were observed. And then you said the email disappears; then you guys have a series of meetings; the Commander of Fleet Forces and his operations officer never discussed the incident again.

Is that accurate?

Dr. GALLAUDET. That is accurate, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. And even during weekly meetings, it was never discussed again.

My question for you is—you were in those meetings. Did you personally hear that nothing was going on about that?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir, I was in those meetings. And——

Mr. BIGGS. Did you make inquiries about that?

Dr. GALLAUDET. No, I did not, sir, because I inferred, since I had been read in to other special access programs, that this UAP video was part of one that I was not read in to, or any of the recipients or the author of the email, and that an intelligence agency basically pulled it back and instructed the author of the email, "Hey, this is—you just conducted what they call 'spillage' into a lower classification level." And when that is done, the procedures are basically to remove any of the communications.

Mr. BIGGS. You are going to silo it.

So, Mr. Elizondo, you said in your report and your testimony today, "Government work on UAP subjects still remains classified. Excessive secrecy has led to grave misdeeds against loyal civil servants, military personnel, and the public—all to hide the fact that we are not alone in the cosmos."

Fair?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. All right.

And all of you—and, Mr. Shellenberger—by the way, I have read several of your books, Mr. Shellenberger. Excellent stuff.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Thank you.

Mr. BIGGS. What I would say, too, is: You were asked about the veracity of the author of this report. Are you comfortable with the veracity?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

And then—and I will get to you in a second, Mr. Gold. We will talk about Kuhnian and Lakatosian scientific advancement and our obviating that through these processes. But we will get to that in a sec.

Because what I want to really get to is, the ultimate question really becomes this: For what purpose is the Federal Government overclassifying—because that is what they are doing; they are overclassifying—and forbidding the public from getting access to this?

And if you know, if you have an explanation, I am curious. Because I know what I have been told. I just want to know from your perspective, why do they overclassify?

Mr. Elizondo, you look like you are finger-on-the-button, ready to go.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir. Forgive me.

I think there are several reasons. I think at the time when this first—this reality became evident to the U.S. Government, we were in the middle of a cold war with then-Soviet Union, and we did not want to tip our hands to what our knowledge base was on this topic. We did not want to broadcast that to the community.

Mr. BIGGS. The cold war is long over.

Mr. ELIZONDO. It is, sir. It is, sir.

There is also, then, the philosophical argument that the Department of Defense and the intelligence community is solution-oriented, and when you do not have answers, it is a really tough spot to be in.

Mr. BIGGS. It is easier to be quiet and suppress if you do not have the answer.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Indeed, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Mr. ELIZONDO. In fact, there is a very real example when we built the U–2 spy plane and flew it over then-Russia and were taking reconnaissance. And when we first started flying the aircraft, it flew so high and so fast we thought they were not tracking us. In reality, they were tracking every flight.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes.

Mr. ELIZONDO. It wasn't until the Russians could develop the SA–2 surface-to-air missile and successfully shoot them down——

Mr. BIGGS. And I would suggest to you also, along with Lakatos and Kuhn, you also have a problem with Kenneth Arrow's path dependence and increasing returns. That is one reason why they will not disclose it, is it is too painful to admit.

But I just want to read a couple things from Mr. Shellenberger's—what he gave to us today, because I think this is interesting stuff, and I just want to convey this to you.

"On USG networks, there exists infrared footage of and imagery of a grouping of vessels engaged in SIGINT and MASINT collection at night in a specific area of the Pacific Ocean. In this footage, which was in close proximity to the vessels, a large equilateral-triangle UAP suddenly appears directly over the ships. Three bright points are seen at each bottom corner of the UAP, which is observed to slowly rotate on its horizontal access." And he goes on to describe that.

And I just want to read one more. And I am doing this because I think it is interesting; this stuff is interesting as anything. So, let us get this one here, right here.

"While performing a routine Airspace Surveillance and Control Mission in the Eastern Air Defense Sector, an F–22 fighter observed multiple UAP contacts at mission altitude. Moving to intercept, the F–22 pilot noted multiple metallic orbs, slightly smaller than a sedan, hovering in place. Upon vectoring toward the UAPs, a smaller formation of the metallic orbs accelerated at rapid speed toward the F–22, which was unable to establish radar locks on the presumed-hostile UAPs. The F–22 broke trajectory and attempted to evade but was intercepted and boxed in by approximately three to six UAPs."

And then I will leave that there, because I just have no more time left. I—well, she is not looking. So, let us just get into—let us get into part of this——

Mr. GOLD. I thought I would be saved by the bell.

Mr. BIGGS. No, no. Let us talk about Kuhnian, Lakatosian type of scientific development. And the problem that we have here is, you have institutional blockage of what would be normal development of scientific ideas.

And if you want to expand on that, Mr. Gold?

Ms. MACE. We are over time, so be very fast, please.

Mr. GOLD. I will just say, I am a recovering attorney, so please take it easy on me on the science. But all breakthroughs have been heretical at first, and that is the challenge that we face, particularly with something as extraordinary as this, which is why gathering the data is so important.

And I will just end by saying, by the way, the overclassification of material is in no way limited to UAP. That is occurring throughout the government, as well as the inability to get people classifications in a timely and efficient measure and then to have those classifications be broad enough to be useful. So, this is a larger issue that I hope that Congress will remedy.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. I have been generous.

All right, Mr. Burlison, I will recognize you for 5 minutes of questions, please.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Elizondo, I—or, does any branch of the U.S. Government or defense contractors possess technology?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, there is documentation, that I believe was submitted for the record, that was approved for release by the U.S. Pentagon, by the Department of Defense Office of Prepublication and Security Review. And it states that one of the reasons why my predecessor program, AAWSAP, was trying to collect material of unknown origin and——

Mr. BURLISON. And was it successfully collected?

Mr. ELIZONDO. It was not. What happened is that there was an aerospace contract company that requested to divest itself of the material——

Mr. BURLISON. OK.

Mr. ELIZONDO [continuing]. That was collected in the 1950s. Unfortunately, that did not actually occur.

Mr. BURLISON. So, let us dive into that. That is the Bigelow Aerospace, correct?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. So, there was a journalist, Christopher Sharp, who said that there was a transfer between Lockheed Martin, Bigelow Aerospace, and the CIA allegedly blocked this.

Can you describe that?

Mr. ELIZONDO. What I can say is that it was blocked. Why it was blocked, I can only surmise. I was part of some conversations later on with some of those contract personnel where they had told all of us that is accurate.

What we required was a memo from the Secretary of the Air Force in order to make that complete, and that never occurred. And so, when Secretary Mattis became Secretary of Defense, I decided it would be appropriate for me to try to receive a memo from him, as SecDef, as Secretary of Defense, if we could not get a memo from the Secretary of the Air Force to transfer that material.

Mr. BURLISON. So, if that material exists today, who is in possession?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, I would not be able to have that conversation in an open hearing. We would probably have to have that in closed.

Mr. BURLISON. OK. My question to you then is, if we were in a secure setting, if we were in a SCIF, would you be able to provide or get access to something, whether it is visuals or material that we could put our hands on, or biologics, that would convince me, that would show me that we have nonhuman origins?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, that decision would not be mine. That would be to the gatekeepers still in the U.S. Government.

Mr. BURLISON. And who would we—so, if you were in our shoes, where would you go from here? How would you get that information? How would—where is—you know, a lot of times we just don't know who to ask, because we do not know where to go next.

So, if you were in our shoes, where would you go?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Well, I prefer to answer that question in a closed session. However, we established AARO for that very purpose. And, unfortunately, under its previous leadership, it failed. So, one would hope that they would have the authorities necessary to do that. Let us hope that this new iteration of leadership will be successful.

Mr. BURLISON. In the discussions, it is simply about material? Or is there discussion about—it was previously testified that there was biologics that were collected. Are you aware of any of that?

Mr. ELIZONDO. I am, sir, aware of the reporting that biologics have been recovered. Again, my focus was more nuts and bolts, looking at the physical aspects of these phenomenon, how they interacted around military equities and nuclear equities.

So, I am certainly not a medical expert. I would not be able to probably provide you a whole lot of value in that, simply because I do not have the expertise.

Mr. BURLISON. But was anything described as that we have possession of bodies?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. Is it multiple types of creatures? Or——

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, I could not answer that. I can tell you anecdotally that it was discussed quite a bit when I was at the Pentagon. The problem is, the supposed collection of these biological samples occurred before my time, in fact before I was even born.

Mr. BURLISON. And was this part of the Lockheed Martin discussion? Or was this completely—the biologics—was it completely separate?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Separate yet related.

Mr. BURLISON. OK.

Has anyone made contact?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, I am sorry, could you specify——

Mr. BURLISON. Has there been any, to your knowledge, any communication with a nonhuman life form?

Mr. ELIZONDO. So, the term "communication" is a bit of a trick word, because there is verbal communication like we are having now; the problem is, you also have nonverbal communication.

And so, I would say definitively yes, but from a nonverbal—meaning, when a Russian reconnaissance aircraft comes into U.S. airspace, we scramble two F–22s, and we are certainly communicating intent and capability.

I think the same goes with this. We have these things that are being observed over controlled U.S. airspace, and they are not really doing a good job of hiding themselves. They are making it pretty obvious they have the ability to even interfere with our nuclear equities and our nuclear readiness.

Mr. BURLISON. Is the U.S. Government and our contractors, are they pulling, you know, technology from this? Are they reverse-engineering this?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, as I previously stated—and please forgive me—I am not authorized to discuss specifics about crash retrievals. Again, I signed documentation with the U.S. Government.

What I can say was, after a very thorough review process by the Pentagon, what I wrote about. And that was my limit, unfortunately, that I was given.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Timmons for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Elizondo, you just said something interesting. You said, they do not seem to be hiding. They do not seem to be hiding. The UAP sightings are becoming increasingly brash, if you will.

And, you know, we have been hearing about these for years, but they have generally been isolated and not as consistent and over critical military installations.

Would you say that's fair? Is this becoming increasingly—is it happening more and more?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Great question, sir. Let me see if I can answer this for you.

Certainly, there seems to be some indication that they are being provocative, meaning that they are in some cases literally splitting aircraft formations right down the middle. So, that is an air safety issue.

The question is, is the frequency increasing? And, really, the response is, it depends. Yes, it is possible that there is an increase in frequency, but it is also possible that there is heightened awareness now, and there is also more pervasiveness of technology out there that is collecting this information and that can record this information.

So, we are not quite sure yet if it is actually an increase in numbers of these events or is it that we have better equipment now to record these things and we have a better ability, if you will, to analyze these things and——

Mr. TIMMONS. And that is my next question. It seems that a lot of these sightings occur near military installations. Do you think that these UAPs are intentionally targeting military installations, or do you think that we have increased abilities to monitor surrounding military installations?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, it may be both.

Part of my concern is, we have something in the Department of Defense and the intelligence community called IPB, initial preparations of the battlespace. And we use equities like ISR—intelligence,

surveillance, and reconnaissance—and other types of equities and technologies to prep the battlespace.

And, certainly, you know, if I was wearing my national security hat, even if there was a two-percent chance that there was some sort of hostile intent here, that is two percent higher than we really can accept.

And so, we must figure out—there is a calculus, capabilities versus intent, in order to identify if something is a national security threat. We have seen some of the capabilities, yet we have no idea on the intent. And so, this is why this discussion is somewhat, I think, problematic from a governmental perspective, because we have no idea.

Mr. TIMMONS. Sure. Thank you.

Mr. Shellenberger, you are particularly familiar with the Langley Air Force Base incident a year ago? Are you familiar?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Just from what I read in the news.

Mr. TIMMONS. Just from what you have read?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. TIMMONS. I would imagine a large percentage of the American population became aware of that with the *Wall Street Journal* article. Would you agree with that?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. TIMMONS. And were you aware of that incident prior to the *Wall Street Journal* article?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. No.

Mr. TIMMONS. To the rest of the panel, was the *Wall Street Journal* article the first time that y'all were made aware of what was essentially an over–2-week UAP frenzy over Langley Air Force Base? Were y'all aware of this prior to the *Wall Street Journal* article? Anybody. A show of hands.

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes, Dr. Gallaudet. Could you give me your—how did you become aware of it?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Well, a colleague of mine, who I referenced previously, Chris Mellon, he wrote an extensive article about this, that there were other incursions of drones over Langley before this, as well as many, many military installations over the last five decades.

Mr. TIMMONS. And it is my understanding that there has been an ever-increasing-in-number and—I am trying to think how to say this, because I wear two different hats. I am still in the Air Force.

So, I mean, it seems that they are becoming increasingly brash. And the question that we really have to figure out is, is it China or is it nonhuman? And I think that is the biggest question the American people want to know.

If it is China, it is scary because they have a lot of technology that we cannot explain. And if it is nonhuman, that is scary because we do not know the intent.

Would you say that's fair?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, Congressman.

And, in fact, I really believe that we should use this hearing as a catalyst to improve and bolster our air defense capabilities and our maritime domain awareness capabilities, because obviously

there are holes in it, whether it be UAP of non-HI direction, or NHI direction, or, as you say, sir, China or any other adversary.

Mr. TIMMONS. Are y'all aware of any task force at the Pentagon or in the national security apparatus that is trying to assess the answer to that question?

Dr. GALLAUDET. At the current moment, sir, no, but that is a great point.

From 2020 to 2022, there was a UAP task force in the DoD succeeding where Mr. Elizondo worked, led by Jay Stratton, who had the first comprehensive, whole-of-government approach to UAP, which involved pathways to declassification and to increased transparency, as well as assessing the national security risk of UAP.

This was a really well-established approach, and we have all advocated that something like it return.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you.

I am running out of time. The last thing is that we need authorities. Law enforcement, military do not have authorities to actually engage, and we need to—Congress needs to act to give those authorities to local law enforcement and the military so they have clear guidelines on how to assess these issues going forward.

I yield back. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I would like to recognize Ms. Boebert for 5 minutes of questioning.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Now that we have all been cautioned in this Committee hearing that the mention of Pentagon's Immaculate Constellation program could put us on a list—well, I already find myself on many lists, I am sure, so—I speak my mind often, so why not just keep going with it? May as well just go all out and say it: The Earth is flat, birds are government drones, and we have never set foot on the Moon. And Joe Biden received 81 million votes in the 2020 election.

So, let us just see how many lists we could get on here today.

But, Mr. Shellenberger, I wanted to ask you: I think I understand from this hearing that you would agree that classifying information like this is not in the best interests of the people. Is that correct?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes, I mean, with the caveat that of course, you know, I would support classification necessary to protect secrets essential to national security. But I think it is pretty obvious that there is overclassification.

Ms. BOEBERT. Over-classification, yes.

And so, in most instances, if they cannot tell us what, do you think at some point they will at least tell us why?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. You know, President-elect Trump has repeatedly committed to greater transparency both on the UAP issue, on JFK files, on——

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER [continuing]. COVID origins and many other things. So, I think that we need to make sure that the next administration is held accountable for that.

Ms. BOEBERT. Agreed.

And this is for all four of you. Yes or no, please. I have many questions I want to get to.

Are there any known instances of recovered materials or technologies that are not of human origin and may be connected to any advanced bioscience defense programs within the USG?

Dr. GALLAUDET. I do not know.

Mr. ELIZONDO. I would not be able to answer that, ma'am.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do not know.

Mr. GOLD. I do not know.

Ms. BOEBERT. OK.

So, there are rumors that have come up to the Hill of a secretive project within the Department of Defense involving the manipulation of human genetics with what is described as "nonhuman genetic material" potentially for the enhancement of human capabilities—hybrids.

Are any of you familiar with that, yes or no?

Dr. GALLAUDET. No, ma'am.

Mr. ELIZONDO. I am not, ma'am.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I am not.

Mr. GOLD. No, ma'am.

Ms. BOEBERT. OK.

I would like to know, with Immaculate Constellation, how does this relate to UAP activities, Mr. Shellenberger, in oceanic environments? Are there any instances where the Navy or other maritime forces have encountered UAPs that could not be explained by known technology or natural phenomena?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes, the Immaculate Constellation covers both terrestrial and oceanic, and there is actually a number of cases described in the report that occur in the ocean.

Ms. BOEBERT. And do you believe that there is a concerted effort by the Pentagon to keep Congress out of the loop regarding these UAP activities specifically in our waters?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT. I think it is about five percent of our ocean that has actually been studied in detail by man, and we have studied more of space than we have of our own oceans.

And so, are there any accounts of UAPs emerging from or submerging into our water, which could indicate a base or presence beneath the ocean's surface?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I do not know about a base, but, you know, as I mentioned, I had a different source entirely describe this pretty extraordinary footage that exists of orbs—of an orb coming out of the ocean and being met by another orb.

Ms. BOEBERT. Some would say that there is multiple hotspots where we see frequent activity.

So, in your investigations, have you come across any data or visual evidence like sonar readings or underwater footage of these UAPs?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I have not beyond what is in the report.

Ms. BOEBERT. You have written about UAPs not only in the air but in underwater. Are there any specifics on what you have learned about the UAP activity in our oceans? Particularly, have you spoken with sources who have provided any evidence or eyewitness accounts of these UAPs interacting with our Naval forces or being detected by our underwater surveillance systems?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Nothing beyond what is in the report and then the specific case that I mentioned with the orbs.

Ms. BOEBERT. So, this report says it all; there is no other information that we are aware of regarding the activity within our waters?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I have other sources that have told me—that have shared a significant amount of information, but they are not comfortable with me sharing it at this point.

Ms. BOEBERT. OK.

Are there any technological capabilities observed in these oceanic UAPs that seem to defy our current understanding of physics or our engineering capabilities?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. It seems like they all do.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes. I would agree with that.

And my time is up, but I do appreciate your bravery, your courage for coming here and speaking today.

And it seems like there is still some questions that we need answers to, and we will not relent until we get those to the American people.

Thank you all.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

I move to allow myself and the Ranking Member 5 additional minutes for questions.

Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Elizondo, were you read in to the Immaculate Constellation program?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Ma'am, I would not be authorized to confirm nor deny the existence of any ongoing or past program, especially as it relates to a special access program, either by name or trigraph.

Ms. MACE. OK.

And then, does the U.S. Government or private contractors, do they work with other foreign countries—China, for example—to exchange data, quote, "from a source," that intelligence data, about UAP?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Let me see if I can answer that a little bit more generally, ma'am, if I may.

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Mr. ELIZONDO. We do have foreign materiel exploitation programs. That is something that is widely known, and that term itself is unclassified. How exactly that works becomes a bit sensitive. It is a discussion we could certainly have in a closed session if you would like.

We do work with international partners and allies quite often, not just in military exercises and workups but in other intelligence efforts as well.

Ms. MACE. In terms of material, that is given to private contractors, is certain material given to certain contractors because of their experience? So, for example, if it is related to submerged and undersea propulsion, would it go to a general contractor like General Dynamics?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, ma'am, absolutely correct. Different contractors have different levels of expertise——

Ms. MACE. What is Lockheed's expertise?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Aerospace, ma'am.

Ms. MACE. And in the UAP space? That is all that—they would not do submerged?

Mr. ELIZONDO. No, I did not say that ma'am.

Ms. MACE. OK.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Lockheed Martin and others do quite a bit of work both in our atmosphere, in space, and even underwater. There are certain efforts to—it is a tough question you are asking. You are putting me on the spot here.

Ms. MACE. I'm asking—I'm looking for the answer.

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, ma'am. No, they are involved in a lot. I would rather let Lockheed Martin explain the different domains that they are involved with. I am——

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Mr. ELIZONDO [continuing]. Probably not authorized to discuss that. But they are involved in a lot of different areas and domains.

Ms. MACE. Admiral, flight safety risks for our pilots, based on what you have experienced and seen in your career?

Dr. GALLAUDET. They are extensive.

In the one exercise I referred to where I received the email that was then deleted was, the pilots—and this is worth bringing out. There are debunkers out there who have said the "Go Fast" video was just a balloon. That was only one video that was released. There were dozens of these encounters that pilots, friends of Ryan Graves, who is in this room right here, witnessed and caused significant safety concerns.

And to almost call out an exercise and shut it down, which is very compressed and the carrier is getting ready for deployment and the pilots have to get certified to land on a carrier, it is extreme, to say the least.

Ms. MACE. All right.

I have two last questions.

Real quickly, Mr. Shellenberger, how do we get more whistleblowers to come forward?

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. Well, this hearing, you know, is very important. And, obviously, you know, I cannot encourage whistleblowers to obtain information, but I can guarantee that I will protect them and go to prison to protect their identities——

Ms. MACE. OK.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER [continuing]. If they come to me.

Ms. MACE. Yes, sir.

OK, my last question. The first hearing we had on this, I had never been briefed on UAPs or what they were—biologics, nonhuman, et cetera.

How would you define, each of you—my last question—how would you define nonhuman biologics, nonhuman intelligence? What are we actually talking about?

Admiral? And we will go down the line.

Dr. GALLAUDET. I do not think it is a stretch, when you look at the diversity of life on this planet and the size of this universe, to think that there would be more diverse, higher-order, nonhuman intelligence throughout the universe, and that is probably what is visiting us.

Mr. ELIZONDO. I would take the scientific approach. The definition would be the ability to react to a stimulus in a manner that requires an intellectual thought process.

Mr. SHELLENBERGER. I just do not know.

Mr. GOLD. I think we must be modest in our assumptions, that we are looking for intelligence. That could be biological; it might not.

Ms. MACE. "Nonbiological." "Nonbiological intelligence." What does that mean, though?

Mr. GOLD. Artificial intelligence, ML, machines.

We assume that all intelligence would be like us, and every time we look out into the universe, we are humbled relative to what we do not know in terms of the forms of intelligence and what it may take.

I can assure you I probably cannot answer your question, but I think the ultimate answer is going to surprise us all.

Ms. MACE. And then Mr. Garcia has a few closing marks.

Mr. GARCIA. And I know we are about to hit votes here, so I will be brief.

Just, I want to thank you all for being here. I want to thank Chairwoman Mace, especially, for holding this important bipartisan hearing. And I want to thank all the Committee Members that are interested in this topic.

I think our commitment to all of you and to all the folks that have contacted us and certainly to the advocates and the pilots is that we need to continue investigating UAPs. I think the country owes—the country is owed explanations. And to ensure that the safety of national security is always protected, this is a conversation and questioning that must continue. So, I am very grateful to all of you.

And I also just want to just add, just personally, I think it is really important, for me, two things guide my questioning and my observations on UAPs. One is, we should always be guided by facts, science, and data, and stay serious on those issues. And the second thing is, I think that we should not limit our imagination and our thoughts and our curiosity on what UAPs could actually be. And I think those two things, for me, are really important.

And I am grateful for all of you to be here.

So, with that, I yield back.

Ms. MACE. OK.

And we have Mr. Ogles who is on the way. He is going to be here any second; is that correct?

Check. And he will be the last Member with questions that we have today. And then we are going to—we have votes. So, we want to thank you all for being here.

I want to thank Mr. Garcia and folks on both sides of the aisle for being here today and being patient. We have a lot more questions, and I hope that this will open the door to more hearings in the future.

I obviously would like to know how much taxpayers are spending on this. You have the right to know. But, also, if we are spending money on something that does not exist, why are we spending the money? And if it does exist, why are we hiding it from the public?

And, of course, our national security is a huge issue, because if there is technology that could harm us or allies that are in the hands of our adversaries, we obviously want to stay ahead of that to the best of our ability to ensure that that technology is not in the hands of someone who could use it against us or our allies anywhere in the world.

So, Mr. Ogles, you are just in time, babe. I will recognize you for 5 minutes of questioning before we head on out today.

Mr. OGLES. Well, thank you all for being here.

And, Madam Chairwoman, I am out of breath because I sprinted to get here. But this is an important hearing. I think we all know that there is something going on.

Mr. Elizondo, based on your knowledge of UAP sightings, do you believe it is fair to say that they are especially common near nuclear sites?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Yes, sir, Mr. Congressman, I absolutely am convinced of that, as are my colleagues inside the government.

Mr. OGLES. And the reason why I pose that question—and this has been one of my talking points from the beginning—is, you know, Oak Ridge is in Tennessee. The so-called weather balloon that drifted, that we now know was controlled, it passed near Oak Ridge. It obviously is a sensitive site, both of interest to our adversaries and to whatever else this is.

Because we know that at military installations, at sensitive locations such as nuclear facilities, that we are seeing this take place. So, the question is, what is it?

Do you believe they have caused irregular activity? And why might they be interested in those sites?

Mr. ELIZONDO. Sir, in some cases, actually, regular activity. You would be surprised. There is actually documentation right now that has been submitted. It is not just Oak Ridge. It is Savannah River Site, SRS. It is also Los Alamos. A lot of our sensitive R&D locations appear to be under some sort of surveillance and monitoring.

Why? Well, because a lot of innovation comes out of those areas. A lot of new technologies, a lot of, if you will, disruptive technologies that we use for our national defense originates out of those locations, and advanced concepts and physics as well. So, if I was doing any type of reconnaissance, even on a foreign adversary, that is a great target to start with.

Mr. OGLES. Sure. And, again, this has been one of my talking points. I do have questions, what role might the Department of Energy or its subsidiaries or affiliates have in this type of technology or possessing this type of technology, whether it' is ours or others?

Mr. Gallaudet, I think your testimony has been pretty clear, but would you please reiterate: Do you believe UAPs pose a threat to pilots?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir, absolutely. They were threatening Navy pilots during the exercise that my people were involved with in 2015, and it is my understanding that they are risking pilot safety, commercial and military, today.

Mr. OGLES. Well, considering—and I understand that there is a need, in some cases, to keep certain technologies secret. But you believe that it is posing a threat to our personnel, correct?

Dr. GALLAUDET. Yes, sir.

Mr. OGLES. So, I think it is reasonable to conclude that if there is a threat to our personnel who are serving our country faithfully, that there be oversight.

Dr. GALLAUDET. One hundred percent, Congressman.

And, in fact, that is the one thing that we have not talked about enough during this hearing, the fact that the government, the executive branch, not sharing with Congress what it knows about UAP infringes on your legislative and oversight responsibilities to such an extent that it is very concerning. I mean, what else are we—if you look at national security or intelligence or foreign affairs or appropriations, you all have oversight and legislative responsibility regarding those. This UAP issue may be the greatest issue of our time, and it is being hid from you.

Mr. OGLES. Well, I mean, and to your point, I think we have seen over the decades that we have certain adversaries, like China, like Russia, that, technologically speaking, are not as advanced as us, that they lack some of the lethality that we have, and that we have seen that they have gone after our technologies and in some cases succeeded, in particular with missile technology.

And so, again, my concern: Whether this technology emanates from us or otherworldly, that we know that we possess it. And where is the accountability? Where are the stopgaps? What are the guarantees that if this were to fall in enemy hands that it is not immediately weaponized against us?

And I will say this. It is clear from my experience and what I have seen that there is something out there. The question is, is it ours, is it someone else's, or is it otherworldly?

And, Madam Chairwoman, I would posit that, as the legislative body, as the regulatory body, we must know. And anyone who prevents us from gaining access to that information, I would consider that criminality. Because we have U.S. personnel who may very well be in harm's way, we have technology that ultimately may threaten our very existence.

With that, Madam Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence, and I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Ogles.

And with that and without objection, all Members will have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and to submit additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their response.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]