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26 February 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence

FROM: P. C. Durant

SUBJECT: Report of Meetings of the Office of Scientific Intelligence Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects, January 14 - 18, 1953

END

The purpose of this memorandum is to present:

a. A brief history of the meetings of the O/SI Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects (Part I).

b. An unofficial supplement to the official panel report to AD/OSI covering data concerns and suggestions of the panel members which they believed were inappropriate for inclusion in the official report (Part II).

END

SUBJ

After consideration of the subject of "unidentified flying objects" at the 4 December meeting of the Intelligence Advisory Committee, the following action was agreed:

The Director of Central Intelligence will:

1. Examine the record of selected scientists to review and interpret the available evidence in the light of pertinent scientific theories.

Following the determination of this action by the Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence, an preliminary investigation will
an Advisory Panel of selected scientists was assembled. In
discussion with the Air Technical Intelligence Center, case
documents of reported sightings and related material were
made available for their study and consideration.

Result of the initial meeting (1444 Tuesday, 15 January)

with Dr. H. P. Robertson, Dr. Jack W. Chinn, Dr. Showiner
Sage, Dr. Fred L. Goodell, Dr. Walter C. Stimson, Dr. Col,
Preston, C. E. Cau (IATC Intelligence), and the writer. James Cook, Dr. Lloyd V. Roden
3 ceased until today afternoon. Hrones, Cau and Stimson
were present throughout the morning at Gulliver's nearest
with the subject, representing the analytical interest of their
Division, and absent in general aspects of the meetings.

(11) of personal contact with the meetings is given in
Tab A.

RESUMED.

The 24/05 agreed the meeting, permitting Gulliver's interest in the
subject and noted taken. This writer included the minutes of
the 0/21 meeting Group of March 24th, 24th, 24th, andforth
outlining in the briefing of the 20th. The 0/21 meeting 20
building, A 2 under the second floor, and be 113 20th.
Robinson and Brown), and 0/21 meeting for potential dangers
to national security indicated these a threat. Following this
information, Dr. Chinn 21 called... Obliterating over to...
Dr. Robertson, on behalf of the Panel, requested elaboration of specific evidence contained and requested consideration of specific reports and evidence to be taken by certain individuals present (Ex. 5). For example, case histories involving names of radio and visual sightings were shared for Dr. A. and others, reports of Ground Report, detailed descriptions of witness experiences were shared by Ed. Rogers regarding the exact sequence of the events of Dec. 21, 1941, at the National Museum of the Air Force, Dayton, Ohio (20 March 1958), which is referred to in the witness accounts.

VERIFICATIONS

The report writer of the Final Opinion states: Dr. R. S.

Fennell, P.M. and the Fisher Group, Four (4) to 1,000,000 ratio, which
demonstrates an overall trend of the probable size and velocity of the object during the time of the sightings, adding an additional

0.5 to the previous total of 3,800. This has been identified to the witness

and verified by the Fisher Group. D.I. Rogers, Dr. A. Scheckel, W.N. L. Pfeifer

W.J. Bland, Capt. Brey Folle, A.H. (Chapman) and Dr. B. were identified

with Dr. S.

Pursuant to a request from the witness and the date of the

event, i.e., Dec. 21, 1941, the object was identified at 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the location

of the object was determined to be approximately 70 miles from the

location of the object as determined by Dr. S.
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The third and fourth meetings of the Panel were held Thursday, 15 January, commencing at 0900 with a two-hour break for lunch. Besides Panel members and CIA personnel, Mr. Ruppelt and Dr. Hynek were present for both sessions. In the morning, Mr. Ruppelt continued his briefing on AM collection and analysis procedures. The Project STARG support at Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, was described by Dr. Hynek. A number of case histories were discussed in detail and a motion picture film of saucers was shown. A two-hour break for lunch was taken at 1200.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

At 1400 hours Maj. Col. Oster gave a 45-minute briefing of Project TWINKLE, the investigative project conducted by the Air Force Meteorological Research Center at Cambridge, Mass. In this briefing he pointed out the main problem of sorting out normal 24-hour instrumentation watches or patrol personnel searching for sightings of R.F.O.3s.

At 1515 hrs. Gen. William M. Gerlach joined the meeting with Maj. Col. Oster. General Gerlach expressed his support of the Panel's efforts and stated three personal opinions:

1. That greater use of Air Force Intelligence officers in the field (for follow-up investigations) was desirable, but that they required thorough briefing.
b. That vigorous effort should be made to declassify as many
of the reports as possible.

c. That some increase in the ATIC section devoted to U.F.O.
analysis was indicated.

This meeting was adjourned at 1700.

[Findings]

The fifth session of the Panel convened at 0800 with the same
personnel present as enumerated the day before (with the exception

From 0800 - 1000 there was general discussion and study of
reference material. Also, Dr. Hynek read a prepared paper making
certain observations and conclusions. At 1000 Mr. Fournet gave a
briefing on his fifteen months experience in Washington as Project
Office for U.F.O.'s and his personal conclusions. There was
considerable discussion of individual case histories of sightings
to which he referred. Following Mr. Fournet's presentation, a
number of additional case histories were examined and discussed
with Menoer, Fournet, Ruppelt, and Hynek. The meeting adjourned
at 1200 for luncheon.

[Minutes]

This session opened at 1400. Benidoo Panel members and CIA
personnel, Dr. Hynek was present. Dr. Lloyd V. Drinan, on Panel
Chairman, was present at this meeting for the first time. Progress
of the meetings was reviewed by the Panel Chairman and tentative
At 0330 the Chairman opened the meeting and submitted a rough draft of the Final Report to the members. This draft had been revised and approved earlier by Dr. Bernet. The next two and one-half hours were devoted to discussion and revision of the draft. At 1000 the AID joined the meeting and reported that he had seen and discussed a copy of the initial rough draft to the Director of Intelligence, USAF, whose reaction was favorable. At 1200 the meeting was adjourned.

At 1600 the ninth and final meeting of the Panel was opened. Discussion and reading of certain portions of the report and the final hours—OSH copy of the Final Report—is appended as Tab C.

This was followed by a review of these accomplishments by the Panel and presentation of individual Panel Members' opinions and suggestions on details that were first impressions for inclusion in the final report. The minutes of this meeting are appended to the final report.
The Panel members were impressed (as have been others, including O/S/1 personnel) in the lack of sound data in the great majority of case histories; also, in the lack of proper follow-up due primarily to the modest also and limited facilities of the AF? section concerned. Among the case histories of significant sightings discussed in detail were the following:

- Bollesfontain, Ohio (1 August 1952);
- Trenton, Utah (2 July 1952);
- Great Falls, Montana (25 August 1950);
- Paris, France (3 September 1952); Washington, D.C., area (29 July 1952); and Hawaii A.P.D.,
- Japan (5 August 1952);
- Port Huron, Michigan (29 July 1952); and
- Presqu'Ile, Maine (10 Oct 1952).

After review and discussion of these cases (and about 25 others, in less detail), the Panel concluded that reasonable explanations could be suggested for most sightings and "by deduction and scientific method it could be inferred (given additional data) that other cases might be explained in a similar manner." The Panel pointed out that because of the brevity of some sightings (e.g., 2-3 seconds) and the inability of the witnesses to express themselves clearly (emotions) that conclusive explanations could not be expected for every case reported. Furthermore, it has considered that, normally, it would be a great waste of effort to try to solve most of the sightings, unless such action would benefit a training and educational program (see below). The findings of Classics were referred to the
that "strange things in the sky" had been recorded for hundreds of years. It appeared obvious that there was no single explanation for a majority of the things seen. The presence of radar and astronomical specialists on the Panel proved of value at once in their confident recognition of phenomena related to their fields. It was apparent that specialists in such additional fields as psychology, meteorology, aerodynamics, craniology and military air operations would extend the ability of the Panel to recognize many rare categories of little-known phenomena.

The Panel concluded unanimously that there was no evidence of a direct threat to national security in the objects sighted. Instances of "Foo Fighters" were cited. These were unexplained phenomena sighted by aircraft pilots during World War II in both European and Far East theaters of operation wherein "balls of light" would fly near or with the aircraft and maneuver rapidly. They were believed to be electrostatic (similar to St. Elmo's fire) or electromagnetic phenomena or possibly light reflections from ice crystals in the air, but their exact cause or nature was never defined. Yet! Robertson and Alvarez had been concerned in the investigation of these phenomena, but David T. Griggs (Professor of Geophysics at the University of California at Los Angeles) is believed to have been the most knowledgeable person on this subject. If the term "flying saucers" had been popular in 1943 - 1945, these objects would
have been so labeled. It was interesting that in at least two
cases reviewed that the object sighted was categorized by Robert-son
and Alvarez as probably "Foe Fighters", to date unexplained but not
dangerous, they were not happy thus to dismiss the sightings by
calling them such. It was their feeling that these phenomena are
not beyond the domain of present knowledge of physical science; however.

AIR FORCE BRIEFING SHEET

It was the Panel's opinion that most of the Air Force concern
over U.F.O.'s (notwithstanding Mr. Defence Civilian anxiety over fast
fighter tracks) was probably caused by public pressure. The result
today is that the Air Force has instituted a fine channel for
receiving reports of nearly anything anyone sees in the sky and
fails to understand. This has been particularly encouraged in popular
articles on this and other subjects, such as space travel and
science fiction. The result is the receipt of low-grade reports
which tend to overload channels of communication with material quite
irrelevant to hostile objects that might some day appear. The Panel
agreed generally that this mass of poor-quality reports containing
little, if any, scientific data was of no value. Quite the opposite,
it was possibly dangerous-in having a military service foster public
concern in "nocturnal meandering lights". The implication being,
since the interested agency was military, that these objects were
or might be potential direct threats to national security. Accord-
ingly, the need for desensitization made itself apparent. Communi-
tes in a possible educational program are enumerated below.
It was the opinion of Dr. Robertson that the "causer" problem had been found to be different in nature from the detection and investigation of German V-1 and V-2 guided missiles prior to their operational use in World War II. In this 1943-1944 intelligence operation (CROSSED), there was excellent intelligence and by June 1944 there was material evidence of the existence of "hardware" obtained from crashed vehicles in Sweden. This evidence gave the investigating team a basis upon which to operate. The absence of any "hardware" resulting from unexplained U.F.O. sightings lends a "will-of-the-wisp" nature to the ASD problem. The results of their investigation, to date, strongly indicate that no evidence of hostile not or danger exists. Furthermore, the current reporting system would have little value in the case of detection of enemy attack by conventional aircraft or guided missiles; under such conditions "hardware" would be available almost at once.

It was interesting to note that none of the members of the Panel were loath to accept that this earth might be visited by extraterrestrial intelligent beings of some sort, once day. What they did not find was any evidence that related the objects sighted to space travel. Mr. Fowmato, in his presentation, showed how he had eliminated each of the known and possible causes of sightings leaving him "extra-terrestrial" as the only one remaining in any cases. Fowmato's background as an aeronautical engineer and technical intelligence...
officer (Project Officer, BLUEBOOK for 15 months) could not be
sighted. However, the Panel could not accept any of the cases
sighted by him because they were raw, un evaluates reports.
Terrestrial explanations of the sightings were suggested in some
cases and in others the time of sighting was so short as to cause
suspicion of visual impressions. It was noted by Dr. Goudsmit and
others that extraterrestrial artifacts, if they did exist, are no
cause for alarm; rather, they are in the realm of natural
phenomena subject to scientific study, just as cosmic rays were at the time
of their discovery 20 to 30 years ago. This was an attitude in
which Dr. Robertson did not concur, as he felt that such artifacts
would be of immediate and great concern not only to the U. S., but
to all countries. (Nothing like a common threat to unite peoples)

Dr. Page noted that, present astronomical knowledge of the solar
system makes the existence of intelligent beings (as we know the
term) elsewhere than on the earth extremely unlikely; and the
concentration of their attention by any controllable means confined
to any one continent of the earth quite propitious.

This case was considered significant because of the excellent
documentary evidence in the form of Kodachrome motion picture films
(about 1600 frames). The Panel studied these films, the case history,
ATIC's interpretation, and received a briefing by representatives of
the USI Photo Interpretation Laboratory on their analysis of the
film. This team had expended (at AFS' Force request, approximately
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1000 man-hours of professional and sub-professional time in the
preparation of graph plots of individual frames of the film, show-
ing apparent and relative motion of objects and variation in their
light intensity. It was the opinion of the P.I.L. representatives
that the objects sighted were not birds, balloons or aircraft,
were "not reflections because there was no blinking while passing
through 60° of arc" and were, therefore, "self-luminous". Plots of
motion and variation in light intensity of the objects were dis-
played. While the Panel Members were impressed by the evident
enthusiasm, industry and amount of effort CHAP. P.I.L. put into
their work, they could not accept the conclusions reached. Some of the reasons for
this were as follows:

a. A semi-spherical object can readily produce reflections

of sunlight without "blinking" through 60° of arc travel.
b. Although no data was available of the "blinking" of balloons or
polyethylene balloons in bright sunlight, the apparent
motion, sizes and brightnesses of the objects were
considered strong enough to suggest, in particular when
the Panel viewed a short film showing high reflectivity
of aeroglia in bright sunlight.
c. P.I.L. description of the objects sighted as "spherical,
bluish-white" in color would be expected in cases of
specular reflection of sunlight from certain surfaces where
the bulbous end of the reflector would obscure other portions
of the object.
d. Objects in the Great Falls case were believed to have probably been aircraft, and the bright lights such reflections.
e. There was no valid reason for the attempt to relate the objects in the Tremonton sighting to those in the Great Falls sighting. This may have been due to misunderstanding in their directive. The objects in the Great Falls sighting are strongly suspected of being reflections of aircraft known to have been in the area.
f. The intensity change in the Tremonton lights was too great for acceptance of the P.I.L. hypothesis that the apparent motion and changing intensity of the lights indicated extremely high speed in null orbital paths.
g. Apparent lack of guidance of investigators by those familiar with U.F.O. reports and explanations.
h. Analysis of light intensity of objects made from duplicate rather than original film. The original film was noted to have a much lighter background (affecting relative brightness of object) and the objects appeared much less bright.
i. Method of obtaining data of light intensity appeared faulty because of unacceptability of equipment and questionable assumptions in finding averages of readings.
j. No data had been obtained on the sensitivity of Kodachrome film to light of various intensities using the same camera type at the same lens openings.
k. Land "fitter" frequencies (obtainable from early part of
Television film) were not removed from the plots of the
"single pass plots" at the end of the film.

The Panel believed strongly that the data available on this
eighting was sufficient for positive identification if further data
obtained by photographing polyethylene "pillows" released
near the site under similar weather conditions, checking bird flight
and reflection characteristics with competent entomologists and
calculating apparent "G" scores listing upon objects from their apparent
tracks. It was concluded that the results of such tests would prob-
ably lead to credible explanations of value in an educational or
training program. Hence, the Panel stated that the cost in technical
response efforts required to follow up and verify every one of the
thousands or more reports received through channels other than (1,450 in
1952) could not be justified. It was felt that there will always be
sightings for which complete data is lacking that can only be
explained with disproportionate effort and with a long time delay, if
at all. The long delay in explaining a sighting tends to eliminate
any intelligence value. The educational or training program should
have as a major purpose the elimination of popular notions that every
sighting, no matter how weak the data, must be explained in detail.
Attention should be directed to the requirement that all scientific
tests are acceptable, must be validated and continuously
documented. In other words, the burden of proof is on the examiner,
not the explainers.  Why?
EXTERNAL RELATIONS

The Panel Members were in agreement with O/SI opinion that, although evidence of any direct threat from these sightings was wholly lacking, related dangers might well exist resulting from:

a. Misidentification of actual enemy artifacts by defense personnel;

b. Overloading of emergency reporting channels with "false" information ("noise to signal ratio" analogy—Gardiner);

c. Subjectivity of public to mass hysteria and greater vulnerability to possibilities by psychological warfare.

Although not the concern of CIA, the first two of these problems may seriously affect the Air Force intelligence system and should be studied by experts possibly under O/SI. If O/SI in some way credited in a reaction to the "flying saucer" hype, or if reporting channels are saturated with false and poorly documented reports, our capability of detecting hostile activity will be reduced.

Dr. Page noted that more consistent screening and filtering of reported sightings at community source is required, and that this can best be accomplished by an educational program.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION RECOMMENDATION

The map prepared by NRO showing geographic locations of officially reported unexplained sightings (1965 only) was submitted by the Panel. This map showed clusters in certain strategic areas such as Los Alamos. This might be explained on the basis of Strategic weapon test and...
awareness of security measures near such locations. On the other hand, there had been no sightings in the vicinity of sensitive related AS establishments while there were occasionally multiple cases of unexplained sightings in non-strategic areas. Furthermore, there appeared to be no logical relationship to population centers. The panel could find no ready-explanation for these clusters. It was noted, however, that if terrestrial artifacts were to be observed, it would be likely that they would be seen first near foreign areas rather than central U.S.

EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIP DATA

The panel was of the opinion that the present ATIC program to place 100 inexpensive 35 mm stereo cameras in the hands of various airport control tower operators would probably produce little valuable data related to U.F.O.s. However, it was recognized that such action would tend to quell public concern in the subject until an educational program had taken effect. It was believed that procurement of these cameras was purely the result of public pressure in July 1952. With the poor results of the year-long Project WILDCAT program of 24-hour instrumentation (two frames of film showing nothing distinguishable), a widespread program of sky-watching would not be expected to yield much direct data of value.

There was considerable discussion of a possible "sky patrol" by amateur astronomers (Lynk) and by wide-angle cameras (Fago). Dr. Fago and Dr. Robertson pointed out that at present a considerable fraction...
of the sky is now—and has been for many years—under surveillance
every clear night in several meteor and aurora observing programs as
well as sky mapping programs at the various locations listed below.
Although the attention of these astronomers is largely directed
toward identified rather than unidentified objects, no case of any
striking unidentified object is known to Dr. Fage or Dr. Rynck. Such
an object would most certainly be reported if found on patrol plates.
A case was cited where an astronomer refused to interrupt his
exposure in order to photograph an alleged sighting in a different
part of the sky. This led Dr. Rynck to say that, if a program of
watching could be an adjunct of planned astronomical programs, little
cost would be involved and that the trained astronomical personnel
might photograph a sighting of an unidentified object.
The location of some of these programs and their directors are
believed to be:

a. Harvard University, Cambridge and New Mexico (meteor patrol)
   Whipple

b. Yorkes Observatory, University of Chicago and Fort Davis, Texas
   (several programs)—Krintel (aurora), Keiper (asteroids),
   Morgan (wide angle camera)

c. University of Alaska—Fairbanks (aurora)—Kiley

d. Dominion Observatory, Ottawa (asteroids)—Kilkus

e. Palomar Observatory, California (sky map)—Minkowski

f. Mt. C. Observatory, California (sky map)—Snow
It was agreed by the Panel that no government-sponsored program of optical nation-wide sky patrol is verifiable at the present time, and that the encouragement of amateur astronomers to undertake such a program might have the adverse effect of over-emphasizing "flying saucer" stories in the public mind. However, the use of radaroscope cameras for recording peculiar radar echoes would serve several purposes, including the better understanding of radar interference as well as identification of U.F.O.'s.

**RADIO PATTERN OF INITIAL INTERFERENCE**

This characteristic problem of radar operation wherein the pulse signal (of approximately the same frequency) from station A may be picked up on the screen of station B and shown as a high-speed track or series of dots was recognized to have probably caused a number of U.F.O. reports. This problem was emphasized by information received indicating 100 cases in solving this problem of signal identification before service use of very high-speed aircraft or guided missiles (1955-1956). Dr. Barnes believed that one answer to this problem was the use of a "Doppler filter" in the receiving circuit. Dr. Alvarez suggested that the problem might be better solved by the use of a "controlled filter" wherein the operator receiving "very fast tracks" (on the order of 1000 to 10,000 m.p.h.) would operate a circuit which would alter slightly the station's pulse frequency rate. If the signal received on the screen had been caused by usual interference with another station, the track would now show itself at a different distance.
from the center of the country if it still appeared at all. Dr. Alvarez felt such a visual solution was similar and would cost much less than a "duplex filter."

EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE

The reported cases were examined one at Palomar Mountain, California, in October 1959, then some suggested that "off scales for a few seconds", apparently while a "C" of flying saucers was observed visually; and "we, a number of observations by the "Los Alamos Bird Watchers Association" from August 1959 to January 1960, when outside my confidence counters behaved quite normally. Circuit diagrams and records were available for the latter, and Dr. Alvarez was able quickly to point out that the recorded data were undoubtedly due to instrumental effects that would have been recognized by such h. more experienced observers.

The conclusion that radiative effects were correlated with unidentified flying objects in these two cases was, therefore, rejected by the Panel.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Panel's concept of a broad educational program integrating efforts of all concerned agencies was that it should have two major aims: training and "documenting."

The training element would result in proper recognition of unusually illuminated objects (e.g., balloons, aircraft reflections) as well as natural phenomena (e.g., hoar, cirrocumulus, virga, noctilucent clouds), both visual and radar recognition are concerned. There would be very
levels in such education from enlisted personnel to command and research personnel. Relative emphasis and degree of explanation of different programs would correspond to the categories of duty (e.g., radar operators, pilots; control tower operators; Ground Observer Corps personnel; and officers and enlisted men in other categories). This training should result in a reduced reduction in reports caused by misidentification and resultant confusion.

The "educating" can would most in reduction in public interest in "flying saucers" which today makes a very psychological problem. This education could be accomplished by radio reports such as newsreels, motion pictures, and popular magazines. Cases of such education would be actual case histories which had been proving at first but later explained. As in the case of educating children, there is such form of stimulation if the "secret" is known. Such a program should tend to reduce the current public interest of the public and consequently their susceptibility to newer hearing propaganda. The study noted that the general absence of Russian propaganda based on a subject with no real obvious possibilities for exploitation might indicate a possible Russian official policy.

Members of the Public had various suggestions related to the planning of such an educational program. It was felt strongly that psychological stimulations with no propaganda should accost on the nature and extent of the program. In this connection, Dr. Stanley Cavagnini (joined the "talkies" and put forth a possible Russian official policy.)
Nancy\(^2\) (a study in the psychology of panic, written about the famous Green Wabbit radio broadcast in 1936) and has since performed advanced laboratory studies in the field of perception. The names of Don Marquis (University of Michigan) and Leo Rosten were mentioned as possibly suitable as consultant psychologists. Also, someone familiar with mass communication techniques, perhaps an advertising expert, would be helpful. Arthur Godfrey was mentioned as possibly a valuable channel of communication reaching a mass-audience of certain levels. Dr. Devine suggested the U.S. Navy (Cin. Special Development Center, Santa Point, L.I.) as a potentially valuable organization to assist in such an educational program. The teaching techniques used by this agency for aircraft identification during the past war was cited as an example of a similar educational task. The Jim Dandy box, which was World War II training film (motion picture and slide strips) was also suggested, as well as Walt Disney, animation creator. Dr. Rynas suggested that the entertainment industry in the U.S. might be a potential source of educational talent to spread the gospel. It was believed that business clubs, high schools, colleges, and television stations would all be pleased to cooperate in the showing of documentary-type motion pictures, if produced in an interesting manner. The use of television shows, first the "spectacle" and then the "explanation" would be forceful.

To plan a similar radio program the Panel believed was no mean task. The current investigative group of ARTC would, of necessity, have to be closely integrated for support with respect to not only the...
would be the photographing of "solar balloons" at different distances under similar weather conditions at the site.

The help of one or two psychologists and writers and a subcommittee to produce training films would be necessary in addition. The Panel believed that AERD's efforts, temporarily curtailed as necessary, could be most useful in implementing any action taken as a result of the recommendations. Experience and records to AERD would be obtained in both the public educational and service-oriented programs contained in the

Dr. Robertson at least has of the opinion that after public preliminary

interview and the service-oriented programs such as AERD, had been trained to sift out the non-ready explained questions, there would still be a need for a very sophisticated AERD section to cope with the

residual features of possible scientific intelligence value. This

section would concentrate on largely following up (perhaps to

the extent of qualified volunteer service) trained volunteers

these would which would be able to identify the existence of nonconventional

entry artificers. Reports of such artificers would be expected to

exist usually from human outcomes in far-observed proximity to the

then-Congressional District, 75th

2

STATED NEEDS DFPC

The need and opportunity in the support of such groups as

"Civilian Field Office Improvement (CFO)" and the "Civilian

Fieldman" in the Republicans' Bureau of Mechanical

such groups would have a specified hierarchy of goals potentially
Great influence on mass thinking if widespread sightings should occur.

The apparent irresponsibility and the possible use of such groups
for subversive purposes should be kept in mind.

REMARK IN VIEW OF SIGHTINGS

The consensus of the panel was, based upon the history of the
subject, that the number of sightings could be reasonably expected
to increase again this summer.
REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC PANEL ON UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS JAN 17 1953

1. Pursuant to the request of the Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence, the undersigned Panel of Scientific Consultants has been to evaluate any possible threat to national security posed by Unidentified Flying Objects ("Flying Saucers"), and to make recommendations thereon. The Panel has received the evidence as presented by cognizant intelligence agencies, primarily the Air Technical Intelligence Center, and has reviewed a selection of the best-documented incidents.

2. As a result of its considerations, the Panel concludes:
   a. That the evidence presented on Unidentified Flying Objects shows no indication that these phenomena constitute a direct physical threat to national security.

We firmly believe that there is no reason to believe that these phenomena are attributable to hostile artifacts capable of mid-latitude acts, and that there is no evidence that the phenomena involved are for the revision of our national defense.

3. The Panel further concludes:
   a. That the continued efforts to the restraint of these phenomena does, in the eyes of many, result in a threat to the orderly functioning of the protective organ of the body politic.

We cite as examples the clogging of the lines of communication by false reports, the danger of being led by continued false alarms to ignore real
indications of hostile action, and the cultivated a parodic manner psychology in which skillful hostile propaganda could induce hysterical behavior and harmful distrust of duly constituted authority.

b. In order most effectively to strengthen the national facilities for the timely recognition and the appropriate handling of true indications of hostile action, and to minimize the confusion dangers attended to above, the Panel recommends:

a. That the national arsenals immediately take necessary steps to strip the unidentified designs and the by-laws status they have been given and the area of investigatory study in our residence acquired;

b. That the national arsenals, under the new policies on intelligence, training, and publicity, take steps to prepare the material defenses and the defenses in every way to recognize and most properly to react most effectively to the indications of hostile intent or action.

We suggest that these aims may be achieved by an integrated program designed to measure the public of the impact of early war thinking for an exercise for the purpose of training personnel in the control of false indicators quickly and effectively and in acquiring personnel for the area of field preparation and to the increased alertness of hostile societies.

[Signatures]
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SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL ON
UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS
14 - 17 January 1953

EVIDENCE PRESENTED

1. Seventy-five case histories of sightings 1951 - 1952 (selected by
   ATIC as those best documented).

2. ATIC Status and Progress Reports of Project GRUDGE and Project
   BLUE BOOK (code names for ATIC study of subject).

3. Progress Reports of Project STORY (code name for Battelle Memorial
   Institute contract work supporting ATIC).


5. Report of USAF Research Center, Cambridge, Mass., Investigation of
   "Green Fireball" Phenomena (Project NOBLE).

   Base (Project PHOEBE).

7. Motion picture films of sightings at Tremonton, Utah, 2 July 1952
   and Great Falls, Montana, August 1952.

8. Summary Report of 59 selected cases of sightings of various
categories (formations, blinking lights, hovering, etc.


10. Chart Showing Plot of Geographical Location of Unexplained Sightings
    in the United States during 1952.

11. Chart Showing Balloon Launching Sites in the United States.

12. Charts Showing Selected Actual Balloon Flight Paths and Relative
    to Reported Sightings.


15. Detailed view of dispersion of photographs of balloon and
    Sunlight Comets with Radar Visibility.
16. Motion picture of Borgias at time when he was 15 years old.
19. Sample Polyethylene 'Pillow' Balloon (5 inch square).
20. "Variations in Radar Coverage", JAMD No. 1 (Special Interest), "with operating characteristics of Service radar".
21. Miscellaneous official letters and foreign intelligence reports dealing with subject.
22. Copies of popular published works dealing with subject (samples in periodicals, newspaper clippings and books).
SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL ON
UNIDENTIFIED FLIING OBJECTS
16 - 17 January 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FIELD OF COMPETENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. F. Robertson (Chairman)</td>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Physics, weapons systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Luis W. Alvarez</td>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>Physics, radar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner</td>
<td>Associated Universities, Inc.</td>
<td>Geophysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samuel Coudert</td>
<td>Brookhaven National Laboratory</td>
<td>Atomic structure, statistical problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thornton Page</td>
<td>Office of Research Operations, Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Astronomy, Astro-physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FIELD OF COMPETENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Allen Hynek</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frederik C. Duvalnt</td>
<td>Arthur D. Little, Inc.</td>
<td>Rockets, guided missiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FIELD OF COMPETENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Gen. William H. Garland</td>
<td>Commanding General, AEC</td>
<td>Scientific and technical intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R. Marshall Casual</td>
<td>Assistant Director, O/BI, CIA</td>
<td>Scientific and technical intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ralph L. Clark</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Director, O/BI, CIA</td>
<td>Scientific and technical intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Philip G. Svec</td>
<td>Chief, Operations Staff, O/Y1, ORA</td>
<td>General Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen T. Gessaway</td>
<td>Acting Chief, Special Electronics Group, 8/1</td>
<td>USAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Edward J. Koppert, USAF</td>
<td>Chief, Air.-E. Reconnaissance Group, 8/1</td>
<td>USAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Davey Forney, Jr.</td>
<td>The ECM Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. R. S. Wurts, USAF</td>
<td>USA Photo Interpretation Group, 8/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Barry Van</td>
<td>WM Photo Interpretation Group, 8/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>