MR. SCHOFF: Ladies and gentlemen, let me remind the military that, while they are welcome here, this is a press conference and let's be sure that the press is all seated before the conference begins.

Let me introduce General Samford, Air Force Director of Intelligence, and General Remey, Director of Operations, General Staff.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I think the plan is to have very brief opening remarks and then ask for such questions as you may want to put to us for discussion and answer. In so far as opening remarks is concerned, I just want to state our reasons for concern about this.

The Air Force feels a very definite obligation to identify and analyze things that happen in the air that may have an impact on the United States and, because of that feeling of obligation and our pursuit of that interest, since 1947, we have an activity that was known one time as Project Sensor and now, as part of another more stable and integrated organization, have undertaken to analyze between a thousand
and two hundred reports dealing with this area. And out of that mass of reports that we've received, we've been able to take things which were originally unidentified and dispose of them to our satisfaction in terms of bulk where we came to the conclusion that these things were either friendly aircraft erroneously recognized or reported, hoaxes, quite a few of these, electronic and meteorological phenomena of one sort or another, light aberrations, and many other things.

However, there have remained a percentage of this total, in the order of twenty per cent of the reports, that have come from credible observers of relatively incredible things. And because of these things not being possible for us to move along and associate with the kind of things that we've found can be associated with the bulk of these reports, we keep on being concerned about them.

However, I'd like to say that the difficulty with disposing of these reports is largely based upon the lack of any standard measurement or any ability to measure those things which have been reported briefly by some, more elaborately by others, but with no measuring devices that can convert the thing or the idea or the phenomenon into something that becomes manageable as material for any kind of analysis that we know. We take some of these things and we try to get the best professional advice, if we can, from them, about them, and we're in much the same position of trying to bring to the great honest workmen of science a phenomenon that has no utility because it doesn't have the kind of measurements on it that he can use. And, as a consequence, he has to reject these things and say, "Until you can bring me something more substantial than that, I can't make any progress."

So our need, really, is to get the measurement value on these odd, in the interim, lacking sufficient measure of these things to make them ensemble to real analysis, we have to say that our real interest in this project is not one of intellectual curiosity but is in trying to establish and apprise the possibility of a menace to the United States and we can say, as of now, that there has been no pattern that reveals anything remotely like purpose or remotely like consistency that we can in any way associate with any menace to the United States.

Now, we do want to continue is the interest of intellectual curiosity or the contribution to be made to scientific measurements, but our main interest is going to
have to continue in the problem of seeing whether the things have possibility of hurt to the United States, and our present dilemma of lack of measurement that can be turned to analysis and a complete lack of pattern in any of these things which gives any clue to possible purpose or possible use, leaves us in some dilemma as to what we can do about this remaining twenty per cent of unidentified phenomena.

The volume of reporting is related to many things. We know that reports of this kind go back to Biblical times. There have been periods of them in various centuries. 1946 seems to have had a time when there was quite a flurry of reporting of this kind. Our current series of reports goes back, generally, to 1946 in which things of this kind were reported in Sweden.

There are many reasons why this volume goes up and down, but we can't help but believe that, currently, one of the reasons for volume is that man is doing a great deal more. There's more man-made activity in the air now than there was, certainly, in Biblical times or in 1946. In addition to that, our opportunities to observe have been enhanced greatly.

The difficult part of it, as far as advancing the progress is concerned, is that our ability to measure doesn't seem to have advanced in any way as well as our opportunity to observe and the greater recurrence of more disturbing things of this sort that are actually in existence from man-made air participation that we know about.

So our present course of action is to continue on this problem with the best of our ability, giving it the attention that we feel it very definitely warrants in terms of identifying adequately the growing or possible or disappearing, if it turns out to be that, menace to the United States to give it adequate attention but not frantic attention.

Now, I think with those opening remarks I could invite questions. Question, yes, sir?

THE PRESS: Have there been more than one radar sighting simultaneously -- that is, ships from several stations all concentrating on the same area?

MAJOR GENERAL SCHOPF: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: Yes, sir.
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, that is not an unusual thing to happen to this sequence at all. Phenomenon has passed from one radar to another and with a fair degree of certainty that it was the same phenomenon. To say that there have been simultaneous sightings, the same thing by different radars, I think that we could be quite sure that that has occurred simultaneously. Now, when we talk about how it all accrued, I don't know, but simultaneously in time sufficient for us to argue that there have been two mechanical observations of the same thing.

THE PRESS: Enough to give you a fix so that you can be sure that it is right in a certain place?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: That is most true.

THE PRESS: And there been any?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Most rare, I don't recall that we have had one that gives us that kind of an effect.

THE PRESS: Could that be due to limited distance?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: There are thoughts that limited close to have some influence on this. We do know that the thunderstorms activity is quite nicely identifiable by radar because we use the radar for the purposes of evitar thunderstorms and we do have now that the storm area that's coming in towards principal stations where protection in memory in terms of high winds and thunderstorms.

THE PRESS: How much money would you say the Air Force spends a year tracking down these flying saucer reports?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, the energy that's going into it at the present time is outside of anything except the normal reporting procedures. Most of our reports come from individuals or, we might say, I think, on the order of sixty odd per cent come from the civilian population straight out. I think there might be something like eight per cent come from civil airline pilots. You might find that another percentage, in the order of twenty-five, might come from military pilots. And the effort to further analyze them and profit in going after that in a big way is going to have to be related to a standard measurement that makes this material for workmen to work on.
THE PRESS: General, have you talked to your Air Intelligence office who is over at the National Airport when they were sighting all these baddies on the CAA screen?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, sir; I have.

THE PRESS: And have you talked to the Andrews Field people who apparently saw the same thing?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I haven't talked to them myself, but others have.

THE PRESS: Well, could you give us an account of what they did see and what explanation you might attach to it?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I could discuss possibilities. The radar screen has been picking up things for many years; now, birds, a flock of ducks. I know there's been one instance in which a flock of ducks was picked up and was intercepted and flown through as being an unidentified phenomenon.

THE PRESS: Where was that, General?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I don't recall where it was. I think it might have been in Japan but I don't recall the location of that. That's just a recollection of where that sort of thing could happen and I do know that at Wright Field there was one of these things on the radar -- this was in 1950, I think -- maybe Captain James would reinforce that. Was that in 1950?

CAPTAIN JAMES: That's correct.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: -- in which the local radar produced the effect of the unidentifiable phenomena that caused quite a lot of concern and it was gone out and intercepted and found to be a certain kind of ice formation that was in the air in various parts of the atmosphere around Wright Field on that day.

Again, there are theories like the man who theory of light refraction which says that temperature inversion in the atmosphere can cause an image from somewhere else to be reflected in positions where it is not. If that is a correct theory, related to it is another entity with respect to the ground effect that you get in radar.
We have one instance in which a night fighter with radar is reported to have locked on, as they say, to an object in flight, which, after he'd followed it beyond this curve, found that he was locked on to the ground and he had only a very few minutes to recover because the ground target had gone up and then displaced by some phenomenon, and so locked on to it in a position where he wasn't, but, following it, he eventually found himself directed toward the ground.

Now, the conditions that seem to produce these temperature inversions and possibly the same kind of thing for ground targets being misplaced in altitude -- I don't know that it is verified that they're misplaced in altitude -- is somewhat typical of the kind of hot humid weather that we've been having here in the last three or four weeks. There's no reason to relate these phenomena to these atmospheric conditions positively, but it is a possibility.

Yes, sir?

THE PRESS: Did interceptors go up on any of the three occasions?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: None.

THE PRESS: Yes.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: What did they see on their radarscope?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I don't recall that they saw anything. Do you remember, Roger, whether anything was sighted on your radarscope?

MAJOR GENERAL RAMST: There have been no radar sightings. One or two reported (incredible) --

THE PRESS: There have been no airborne radar sightings. General Ramst, is that --

MAJOR GENERAL RAMST: That's correct.

THE PRESS: On what did they report sightings?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Lights.
MAJOR GENERAL RAMEY: In one or two instances, they reported sighting lights. In one instance, they reported looking down to an object. It is pretty clear from the discussion of the pattern of two airplanes that went out that one of them was locked on to the other one.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes.

THE PRESS: General --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: Back to the ionized cloud. Were the blips picked up recently comparable to the ionized cloud or were they different in maneuvering or motion?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, you're talking about a thunderstorm cloud which is one that we know enough about so that we can say, "That is a thunderstorm." In the same way we can look at something else and say, "That in No. No-end-no airplanes."

THE PRESS: And those recent blips were different?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Those were different.

THE PRESS: General Sanford, I understand there were radar experts who saw these sightings Saturday night or early Sunday morning. What was their interpretation of what they saw on the scope?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: They said they saw good returns.

THE PRESS: Which would indicate that these were solid objects similar to aircraft?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: No, not necessarily. We got good returns from birds.

THE PRESS: Well, you wouldn't get as large a blip from a bird as --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: No; unless it was close.

THE PRESS: Did they report that these could have been birds?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: No.

THE PRESS: Can you get a good return from a reflected ground target, General?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I'll ask Captain James——

CAPTAIN JAMES: You can get a very large return from a reflected ground target.

THE PRESS: Just as good as you might get from an object actually in flight in the air?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Actually thicker. It depends on the amount of bending.

THE PRESS: And just how sharp on the scope?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Yes.

THE PRESS: Can you get a blip from the (inertible) (inertible) created by temperature inversion?

CAPTAIN JAMES: On the ground target, yes.

THE PRESS: In other words, something that's on the ground that's reflected off a reflected cloud bank would throw off a blip on the radar screen?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Yes, sir. That's true.

THE PRESS: Would a nearby return not get that blip at exactly the same spot?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Not necessarily; no.

THE PRESS: In other words, you can have a light and something that lacks substance and material and still have a blip?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I don't quite understand that question.

THE PRESS: You can have a radar range that's created without the necessity of radar striking the solid object or a semi-solid, such as a cloud?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Well, eventually, it does have to strike an object.
THE PRESS: But you said it can be simply a reflection of something on the ground.

CAPTAIN JAMES: Well, an object on the ground is actually something back to the reflection by a curved path.

THE PRESS: I see.

THE PRESS: In other words, it doesn’t have to be in the air.

CAPTAIN JAMES: That’s correct.

THE PRESS: In the area covered by the sweep on the radar?

CAPTAIN JAMES: It has to be in the area covered by the radar set. It has to be within the range.

THE PRESS: But not in the air.

CAPTAIN JAMES: But not in the air.

THE PRESS: What sort of ground targets give these reflections?

CAPTAIN JAMES: It depends on the amount of temperature inversion and the size and shape of the ground objects.

THE PRESS: Would this reflection account for simultaneous radar sightings and visual sightings which appear to coincide on the basis of conversations between the radar operator and the observer outside?

CAPTAIN JAMES: There is some possibility of that due to the same effects.

THE PRESS: Why would these temperature inversions change location so rapidly or travel?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Well, actually, it can be the appearance or disappearance of different ground targets giving the appearance of something moving when, actually, the different objects are standing still.

THE PRESS: Would these pseudo-blips cause any difficulties in combat at all?
CAPTAIN JAMES: Not to people that understand what's going on. They do cause difficulty.

THE PRESS: Then the experienced operators really can tell the difference between --

CAPTAIN JAMES: That's correct.

THE PRESS: How about the CAA report?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I don't know.

THE PRESS: Would the disappearance or reappearance of those blips be accounted for by the movement of a cloud bank that reflected a ground target?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Well, actually, it's not a cloud bank. It's a temperature inversion of the atmosphere. You see, if warm air comes in over a cool area, you have a temperature inversion and the atmosphere can be perfectly clear, and still the rays will be bent.

THE PRESS: Would that account for the fact that these images disappeared and reappeared on these screens recently?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I'm not positive about that. There's a possibility.

THE PRESS: Captain, was there temperature inversion in this area last Saturday night?

CAPTAIN JAMES: There was.

THE PRESS: And the Saturday night preceding?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I'm not sure about the one preceding, but there was last Saturday night.

THE PRESS: Was there one last night?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I don't know.

THE PRESS: Captain, did any two sets in this area get a fix on these so-called sources around here?

CAPTAIN JAMES: The information we have isn't good enough to determine that.
THE PRESS: You don't know whether Andrews Field and Washington National Airport actually got a triangulation on anything?

CAPTAIN JAMES: You see, the records made and kept aren't accurate enough to tie that in that close.

THE PRESS: What is the possibility of these being other than phenomena?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I'd like to maybe relieve Captain James just a minute. Your question is what?

THE PRESS: What is the possibility of these sightings being other than optical or atmospheric phenomena? In other words, what is the possibility of their being guided missiles launched from some other country, for example?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, if you could select out of this mass any particular one or two and start working on them and say, "What is the possibility of them being these things?" Then you come to the point and say this one is reported to have done this when required for it to do these things either one of two reasons: absolute maximum power on no man. If this is a thing in terms of a guided missile, it does these things that have been measured and reported. It can do these things if there is theoretically no limit to the power involved and there is theoretically no mass involved. That's any of the conditions that would say, well, it someone solved one of these problems, this could then be explained as one of those things. You find another one and it has -- it just develops some other purpose or no other pattern that could be associated with them, a missile. Those which we might identify as being missiles will be tracked. They'll have a track to develop something that people can put a measurement to. I don't know whether that answers the question. It satisfies some of it, but maybe not all of it.

THE PRESS: Have there been any such instance so far in which you had information that indicated that either of these two conditions were fulfilled?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Absolutely, no mass?

THE PRESS: No limit to the power.
MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: You know, what "no sense" means is that there's nothing there! (Laughter).

THE PRESS: How about the power?

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: In terms of earthly weights and earthly value.

THE PRESS: Yes.

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: And unlimited power -- that means power of such fantastic higher limits that it is a theoretical unlimited -- it's not anything that we can understand. It's like my trying to understand -- I want to be careful because I was going to say a million dollars, but I can't understand a hundred! It's one of those questions of unlimited power that just gets beyond your comprehension that has to be used to meet this.

THE PRESS: General, do you have any tentative conclusion or even a trend towards a belief of what these local radar hitches are? There's been talk that you did have the highest inversions these nights. Are you all inclined to believe that's what that is?

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: I think that we're learning progressively more and more about the radar and that these instances very likely are maybe good observations that the radar can make of something but not likely to be observations of the things that the radar was designed to observe (laughter). Now, (laughter) -- all right. Now, let's say -- we don't know much about -- and I'll be getting far afield technically -- we don't know much about the Northern Lights. We'd like to be able to measure that a little bit better. That is the kind of thought I was trying to express by saying radar was intended to observe aircraft for control of aircraft and to deal with aircraft. Now, you may have scientific advantages for observation that it wasn't intended for.

I wonder if you'd speak to my point on that, Captain James, whether I've gotten too far afield or something I don't know anything about.

CAPTAIN JAMES: Yes, sir; that's quite true. We find that sometimes the radar set will be formed in a manner not desirable and due to the fact that it doesn't happen every day everyone isn't familiar with those characteristics and it sometimes turns out to be a mystery.
THE PRESS: Well, getting back, if I may follow it up, on those local radar observations, then you come to the tentative conclusion that they’re physical phenomena? Would you say that?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I think so, yes.

THE PRESS: How is it we haven’t had them before?

THE PRESS: Well, that’s what I was going to get to, what’s the history of this thing? Radar operators in the past, when you inquire of them, have often seen similar lights in the past and because they never bothered to correlate them with flying saucers they’ve never gotten in the newspaper?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Oh, they have associated them in the past with things that were thought desirable to intercept. I said a minute ago we’re interested in echoes and similar things. There’s some history of the lack of identification of friendly aircraft which causes a lot of unnecessary interceptions in some parts of the world, but if mixed up with a lot of this sort of thing too in which we’ve had many interceptions that went out and identified a friendly that should have been established by some other method, but mixed up with these there’ve been many of these attempts to identify an unknown that mixed out in the same way that the current ones have mixed out.

THE PRESS: In other words, it is not a rare phenomenon, this thing that happened Saturday night and the Saturday before that?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: It is not a rare phenomenon.

THE PRESS: It’s not rare, and it occurs often enough so that you do have a history, and radar experts have been trying to find out what caused them, is that right?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: That is correct. Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: General Samford, has the Air Force conducted any independent research through universities or through the radar people, the Griffith people or whoever?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, sir. We have a number of available consultants, some contracts that have been initiated, some of them that are being thought of, but, again,
I think I'd like to go back to the point of the profit in this thing perhaps being a measurement first, an adequate measurement that can go to science. Reports of the same kind that we've been getting except for this additional mechanical asset or opportunity called the radar have been going on since the Bible times. Now, the radar gives an additional opportunity to observe something about that, but it still doesn't measure it with the kind of precision that is needed to put it into analysis.

THE PRESS: Are you getting something to do that?

MAJOR GENERAL SAM福德: We have now, hope with a camera that has on the front of it a -- will you describe what that --

CAPTAIN JAMES: It has a de-fraction grid.

MAJOR GENERAL SAM福德: Yes, a de-fraction grid on the front of it that will be useful against lights because through that de-fraction you'll be able to vary, from what substance was this light made? Was it gas? Was it incandescence? and so forth. Now, these cameras -- the lens is about a $12.5 item, or this grid is, and the camera is about a $15 item. We have on order a small quantity, two hundred plus of these. We hope to be able to distribute those into the hands of people who might have opportunity. Now, with the great diversity of people who report it's not too easy to put your finger on who has the highest opportunity to report, into whose hands such a device should go, but we think we any learn who might be the most optimum reporters. A great volume of those cameras to scatter around to try through the shotgun approach to get reports doesn't look like too valuable a project but that is one way of trying to measure what these lights are.

THE PRESS: For what purpose -- they have and similar gadgets before, I mean, to measure or to determine the origin of what generates the light. Is this a new type?

CAPTAIN JAMES: The grid is.

MAJOR GENERAL SAM福德: It's not new except that it hasn't been aimed specifically at those items or focused on those items as far as we know.

THE PRESS: General, the Captain mentioned a moment ago or had the thought that when there is temperature inversion
the men know who are observing radar. Is it all right to ask if the Air Force thinks that these objects the other night were a result of temperature inversion?

MAJ OR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I'll answer that first, try to, and then ask Captain James for an opinion. I don't think that we are quite sure that the Menzel theory of temperature inversion or that scientists are sure that that is a good theory. It's supported by some people. Other people who have equal competence, it would appear, discredit it. So the people as to whether that is the cause or not is about a fifty-fifty proposition. It's appealing. It does satisfy certain concerns. Is that a fair statement or answer to that question?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Sir, the Menzel theory applies mainly to light rays.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes.

CAPTAIN JAMES: In regard to the temperature inversion effect on radar waves that it fairly well established.

THE PRESS: There's no doubt about the latter, is there?

CAPTAIN JAMES: That's right.

THE PRESS: That's been established.

THE PRESS: And it was not --

CAPTAIN JAMES: We don't have sufficient information to say definitely that that was the cause.

THE PRESS: You said an experienced radar operator could tell the difference.

CAPTAIN JAMES: I would say no.

THE PRESS: Wasn't there a naval battle during the war in which there was a great engagement fought against an inversion of radar?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I understand that happened.

THE PRESS: You had two experts over there last Saturday night, Major Fournot and Lieutenant Helcomb, who
described themselves as radar technicians and intelligence officers. What was their opinion?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: May I try to make another answer and ask for support or negation, on the quality of the radar operator. I personally don’t feel that is necessarily associated with quality of radar operators because radar operators of great quality are going to be confused by the things which now appear and may appear in a radar. The ability to use the radar for the thing it was designed for is, I believe, dependent upon the thing that they are doing a normal act. If it does a normal act, then it becomes identified as the thing that they thought it was and then it pulls itself along through this mass of indication and they say, “That one has normal proceeds.” I think that a description of a GCA landing has some bearing on that in which to get associated with the GCA you have to make a certain number of queries and do a certain number of things and then you become identified through the fact that you obey. Other things that are in there don’t obey. If you obey, then you have an identity and you can then be followed with precision. So I wouldn’t like to say that this is a function of inadequate radar operators. I think it’s a thing that can happen to any radar operator. If he does something in there and says, “That one is neither behaving nor any other normal pattern.” What is it? Curiosity stimulus, any other kind of stimulus can result in over-suspicion at any particular time on any radar scope. These recently appear to have been such more solid returns than are ordinarily classifiable by the arguments that I have just given.

Would you address yourself to what I’ve just said?

THE PRESS: Yes. What do the experts think? That was the question.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: The experts?

THE PRESS: The ones that saw it last Saturday night. What did they report to you?

THE PRESS: Two of them saw it in --

THE PRESS: What did they say?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: They said they made good returns.
THE PRESS: Did they draw any conclusion as to what they were, whether they were clouds?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: They made good returns and they think that they ought to be followed up.

THE PRESS: But now you come to the general belief that it was some either heat inversions or some other phenomena without substance.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: The phrase "without substance" bothers me a little.

THE PRESS: Well, could you --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: -- say what we do think?

THE PRESS: Yes.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I think that the highest probability is that these are phenomena associated with the intellectual and scientific interests that we are on the road to learn more about but that there is nothing in them that is associated with material or vehicles or missiles that are directed against the United States.

THE PRESS: General, you said that -- can you stop that short of the United States, air, or the menace to the United States?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I'm sorry --

THE PRESS: Can you stop that statement short of your menace to the United States?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, that was the -- I think that is the part that I believed. Now, what was it that I would have said otherwise?

THE PRESS: Well, you said were not associated with vehicles --

THE PRESS: Materials.

THE PRESS: Missiles.

THE PRESS: Period!
THE PRESS: Material, vehicles, and missiles directed against the United States.

THE PRESS: The question whether these are hostile or not makes very little difference. What we're trying to get at is are you eliminating excluding from any consideration a missile, a vehicle, or any other material object that might be flying through the air other than sound or light or some other intangible?

THE PRESS: Somebody from this planet or some other planet violating our air space. (Laughter)

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: The astronomers are our best advisers, of course, in this business of visitors from elsewhere. The astronomers photograph the sky continuously perhaps with the most adequate photography in existence and the complete absence of things which would have to be in their appearance for many days and months to come from somewhere else. It doesn't cause them to have any enthusiasm whatsoever in thinking about this other side of it.

THE PRESS: Have any astronomical laboratories reported any sightings whatsoever or any astronomers?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I don't recall. Captain Ruppert, do you know whether we've had reports from astronomical laboratories or observatories?

CAPTAIN RUPPERT: No, sir. None have ever had any real bearing.

THE PRESS: General, does that -- the kind of involved explanation you just gave us -- does that apply to the recent Washington sightings or upon your observations over the past years since 1946 based upon all your experience with it?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Well, our reaction to the recent Washington sightings is related to the past experience in terms of -- we have dealt with radar blips before.

THE PRESS: General, if these were vehicles or material of our own making, they wouldn't be a menace to the United States. Do you exclude that?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I'd exclude that, definitely.
THE PRESS: General, let's make it clear now you are excluding -- if you'll allow that -- you are excluding vehicles, missiles, and other tangible objects flying through space, including the subhuman bodies from other planets.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: In my mind, yes.

THE PRESS: Anything material -- would that be a clear statement?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: When you deal with a scientific man, maybe he might quarrel with you by what is the real meaning of "material." With my limited knowledge of material I would say yes. In my own view the thing is excluded as being a material evidence.

THE PRESS: In other words, General, if you remove the B-31 from that statement, it could apply to any missile, material, or object that is in the air, regardless of whether it's a menace to the United States or not?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, yes.

THE PRESS: In other words, it just isn't there.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I believe that, that there is no -- well, how, that is a little bit in error because a minute ago I said strike on these things. Now, a bird has substance, you see. I don't want to go out and say that these things are reflections of nothing. If they're reflections from the ground up in the air, they're reflections of something. That's why the thought of saying that thin thing satisfies us in having no real pattern other than that of phenomena.

THE PRESS: General, you said there'd never been a simultaneous radar fix on one of these things.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I don't think I wanted to say that.

THE PRESS: You didn't mean to say it?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I meant to say that, when you talk about simultaneously, somebody will say, "Was it on 1203 hours, 24½ seconds?" and I don't know.

THE PRESS: Well, I'd like to point out this fact that the officer in charge of the radar station at Andrews
Field told me that on the morning of July 29th, which was a
week from last Saturday, he picked up an object three miles
north of Riverdale and he was in intercom communication with
CIA and they exchanged information and CIA also had a blip
three miles north of Riverdale and on both radars the same
blip remained for about thirty seconds and simultaneously
disappeared from both sets. Now --

MAJOR GENERAL SANDFORD: Well, their definition of
simultaneous, yes. But some people won't be satisfied that
that is simultaneously.

THE PRESS: Well, it is pretty damned simultaneous
(laughter) for all purposes, it is satisfied by the Inversion
theory, Captain.

MAJOR GENERAL SANDFORD: Well, I'm talking about the
split-second people who want to say you've got to prove now
that this happened at such-and-such a time and they'll say
your observations are delayed by half a second; therefore,
you can't say it was simultaneous.

THE PRESS: And does your Inversion theory explain
away that situation?

CAPTAIN JAMES: It possibly could, yes.

THE PRESS: It possibly could, but could it?

CAPTAIN JAMES: We don't have the details.

THE PRESS: Is there any reason why it couldn't

THE PRESS: General, can we get this clarified?

MAJOR GENERAL SANDFORD: I believe -- I'm trying to
let this gentleman ask a question. Excuse me.

THE PRESS: Isn't it true, sir, that these show a
definite grouping, the sightings around atomic bomb plants or
areas? Doesn't your map at Wright Field show that?

MAJOR GENERAL SANDFORD: I find no more pattern in
this dispersal of sightings than I do in a radar screen. You
can perhaps take distribution of sightings and say that you
arrange it this way and you take this group during this period
and that gives you a dispersal that may have some significance
in it. But I'd like to have Captain Boppel develop that
because he probably knows more about what has been done to
try to plot these things out and say, "Does that have any meaning?"
I am not satisfied that any effort we've made toward a dispersal
pattern has as yet developed one shred of evidence or meaning.
Would you correct me or speak to that point?

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: We've plotted these things out on
a map and they do come out grouped around some of the atomic
installations in the country. However, there's one point,
you don't know, maybe the people in that area are a little
more gumpy and, if they see a meteor, they'll report it in
to the guards. If some fellow out in the middle of Iowa saw
a meteor, he'd just forget about it. Now, that is one pos-
sibility that we can't eliminate. A lot of the sightings
that occurred around these atomic installations have turned
out to be balloons, etc., but it may be that the story has
gone out that those are vital areas and more people are re-
porting. We don't know.

THE PRESS: What percentage of your unexplainable
ones that you've got are around there?

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: A few of them.

THE PRESS: Is it the same pattern?

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: I wouldn't say that every sighting
around an atomic installation is unexplained. There's really
no -- I don't quite follow you.

THE PRESS: His question is what percentage of the
unexplainable percentage of the sightings are grouped around
atomic energy --

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: We've never broken it down.

THE PRESS: Is it uniform to the general percentages?

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: It followed the general percentages.
In other words, if twenty per cent of the sightings are un-
explained, twenty per cent of the sightings around Los Alamos
are --

THE PRESS: Unexplained.

CAPTAIN KIFFELT: -- unexplained; right.

THE PRESS: What percentage of these have come from
technical men in science at those installations?
CAPTAIN RUPPELT: It varies with the type of people.
In other words, at Los Alamos most of the people are fairly
technical people. However, you run the guards in a place like
that. Now, that may be another factor. All these installations
have guards that stay out twenty-four hours a day and these
people are in a better position to observe than other people.

THE PRESS: Have any of the scientists though, for
instance at Los Alamos, the scientists or technical people,
reported these things?

CAPTAIN RUPPELT: Yes; they have. We have reports
from very high technical people.

THE PRESS: If your reports, some of them, come from
these technical people, what type of information would the
Air Force like to have?

CAPTAIN RUPPELT: The Air Force would like to have --
what sort of information?

MAJOR GENERAL RUMSFORD: Go ahead.

CAPTAIN RUPPELT: The Air Force would like to have
a site, speed and altitude and what-have-you on these things.

THE PRESS: Number of men inside it? (Laughter)

THE PRESS: In view of practicalities what would an
ordinary citizen do if he saw one? Would you be interested in
his information? What can he do to help you?

CAPTAIN RUPPELT: Actually, we are very much interested.
However, there isn't much we can do with their information.
It's possible that you might get a series of sightings. In
other words, if you get everybody up and down the East Coast
looking, you might be able to spot a ground track from it,
but the information we get from the general public or from
a scientist -- there's no difference. In other words, well,
let's take a meteor-like object, for example. If you're out
some night and see a meteor, what can you tell me about that
meteor? You don't even know in which direction it was going.
Actually, it looked to you maybe like it was going across the
sky from east to west, but you're not sure. You're just looking
at a horizontal projection of that meteor. And a scientist
the same way. Just because he's a scientist doesn't mean he's
got better eyes.
THE PRESS: What about a report, for example, about
one week ago from an engineer who sighted six or seven who
followed a definite pattern and then all turned in the same
direction and went straight up at an estimated speed -- I
forget what he said it was.

CAPTAIN BUFFER: I couldn't pick that one out from
the mass and size -- I'm not familiar with that one.

THE PRESS: Have you investigated those so-called
saucers here in Washington?

THE PRESS: The ones we've been seeing here on radar
screens.

CAPTAIN BUFFER: We've got the data on them.

THE PRESS: Have you investigated them yourself?

CAPTAIN BUFFER: Well, what do you mean by that.
Now -- gone out and personally talked to all these people?

THE PRESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN BUFFER: No; I haven't.

THE PRESS: Has anybody from the Air Force talked
to Harry Barnes, who's the Senior Controller in the CAA radar?

CAPTAIN BUFFER: We have a report from the CAA
Controller.

THE PRESS: But nobody's interviewed him?

CAPTAIN BUFFER: I couldn't tell you that.

THE PRESS: General, you started to say you wanted
certain means of measuring these things and you mentioned
this camera. Were you going to name others or is that the
only thing you have in mind as a possible way of identifying
and measuring these phenomena?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Mr. Griffing is here from
the Electronics Section. Would you address yourself to that,
Mr. Griffing?

MR. GRIFFING: I didn't hear the question.
THE PRESS: The question was we'd ask what -- the
General had said the greatest need now was to get some way
of measuring these reports in terms that you can turn them
over to a scientist and I asked him what was he seeking in
that way, what he was getting. He mentioned this camera.
I connected the question with some way of measuring the gases
and lights. I asked him were there other things than that
that he might mention that they're now ordering or preparing
for that purpose.

MR. GRIFFING: The refraction camera should tell
whether it's an incandescent source or whether it's illuminous
gas. Well, that would immediately tell whether it was a
meteor or reflection of a headlight, a mirage theory and it
might also identify what kind of gases.

THE PRESS: What other than this camera? Are there
any other tools that you're seeking now?

MR. GRIFFING: There is another proposal which also
uses 4-fraction grating, which is a continuously operating
Schmidt telescope, and that will give a continuous record over
the night.

THE PRESS: What's this?

THE PRESS: That's a telescope to photograph the
total heavens in one whole picture?

MR. GRIFFING: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: Would you repeat that? What is this
Schmidt telescope?

CAPTAIN JAMES: It's a type of telescope.

THE PRESS: What type of telescope are you talking
about, Mr. Griffing?

MR. GRIFFING: The Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t, telescope
is an optical system that has a wide aperture. That is, you
can have a wide range of aperture, in this case, about 150
degrees, or nearer the whole hemisphere can be photographed
in one plate and you can have a continual record of what
happens in the sky at night, meteor trails or what-have-you
and make a photographic record.

THE PRESS: Where is this being used?
MR. GRIFFING: This is a new development, this particular one, but there have been ones similar to this in use in many observatories. Palomar has a Schmidt telescope.

THE PRESS: Are you ordering a number of these for placing around the country?

MR. GRIFFING: That is a possibility.

THE PRESS: Is that a movie-camera type?

MR. GRIFFING: Not exactly. The plate is exposed for ten minutes and then is replaced with another plate and then goes through the night. That is, one can expose a photographic plate for ten minutes without overexposure, in fact, a longer time, but a continual record will be made. Any motion that can be indicated with a timed exposure can be found with considerable accuracy.

THE PRESS: Does the Air Force have access to any of those right now?

MR. GRIFFING: That particular thing is not in production yet.

THE PRESS: How much does it cost?

MR. GRIFFING: Shall I go into it, General?

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: Well, go ahead.

MR. GRIFFING: The cost will be between three and five thousand dollars apiece.

THE PRESS: General, has there been any indication that any of these radar sightings have been made by electronic countermeasures being used by U. S. Strategic Air Command bombers practicing?

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: No; they haven't. We've investigated that and come up negative.

THE PRESS: Is that Schmidt camera telescope the only one, astronomical telescope that's capable of being used on a project like this?

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: Probably not.
MR. GRIFFING: It's not the only one, but it is the most practical telescopic method. Any telescope can be used but the probability of getting a flying object is very remote. Because it has such a wide aperture it makes it more useful.

THE PRESS: Well, are you planning any other measurement tools other than this camera and telescope?

MR. GRIFFING: Well, of course, the difficulty is if we have a high-powered instrument, we can't guarantee that they'll intercept flying objects as there are other simple measurements that can be made with trained personnel. There are measurements of time. One can time the appearance and disappearance with his own watch and then check his watch. Accurate measurements of time are one thing and simple measurements of angle can be made by trained people with very crude apparatus, and they can tell whether an object is one mile or fifty miles high.

THE PRESS: Haven't we already had some trained personnel, so-called trained personnel, who timed these appearances?

MR. GRIFFING: There perhaps have -- Captain Rappolt can answer that. The point is in any of these operations there have to be two simultaneous observers to get altitude. You can't use one observation, and it may be that two simultaneous observations have not been in the reports.

THE PRESS: General.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I think that the gentleman here has been waiting quite awhile with a question, if you don't mind.

THE PRESS: General, you mentioned that eight percent of the reports come from airplane pilots. Some of these men have, as much as twenty years' flying time, twenty years' experience in flying. What's the reaction of the Air Force to creditable observers like that who give you a detailed description?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: It's very high. We react to them as saying this is an important item.

THE PRESS: Do you classify that, some of those things, as phenomena?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, what else can we call it? His terms of the statement about it are not placeable in anything else as phenomena. I have one that's a friend of mine who is an Air Force officer, reported from the Middle East. He said, I thought that my mental processes were adequate to avoid seeing those things, but I did see something that didn't belong there. He was no more able to put a precise measurement on it although he had competent witnesses. He's a creditable observer. We're not trying to discredit the observers. That's the reason that I said that we have many reports from creditable observers of incredible things. They also say they're incredible.

THE PRESS: Are these phenomena capable of change of direction and speed such as has been reported?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: There is nothing else known in the world that can do those things except phenomena! (Laughter)

THE PRESS: General, while we're in this mass of areas for a minute, suppose some superintelligent creature had come up with a solution to the theoretical problem of levitation, would that not be meaningless in our observations either by radar or by sight? No gravity.

THE PRESS: A balloon has no gravity but its rate of movement is distinctly limited.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I don't know whether I can give any answer to that, sir, that makes any sense because I'm not a metaphysicist. I think, probably, just to return to saying that -- we believe most of this can be understood gradually by the human mind.

THE PRESS: So far as we know, have any of these manifestations been reported over Russia or any of the satellites?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, we don't know if there have been any reported over there, no.

THE PRESS: General, maybe or perhaps General Boney, you have described fighters over the district here in the last few weeks. Is there any kind of a policy as far as the rest of the country of the Air Defense Command on such sightings?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I would like General Boney to speak to that, if he will, please.
MAJOR GENERAL RANDY: There's no special policy as a result of these reports. We have a standard operating procedure that would call for an investigation or report that can be tracked on a reasonable assurance of some sort of intercept or some direction to (inaudible). Those instructions are standard, however, and are not especially caused by this.

THE PRESS: General, is it true that there was a two-hour delay between the sighting of those objects last Saturday night and the dispatch of the jets from New Castle?

MAJOR GENERAL RANDY: Yes; that is true because there was never a track established. As soon as a track was established to tell the airplanes the direction to go in and the authenticity of the thing was established, then the pilots got off. As long as there's a sporadic report with no identification, no track established, there's no use in sending a very short-range short-field-duration interceptor in the air because he wouldn't know where to go or what to do.

THE PRESS: In other words, it was the decision of the operations officer that occasioned the delay and not any error in transmission of the alert.

MAJOR GENERAL RANDY: That's correct; yes, sir.

THE PRESS: General, it's been rumored that the Air Force has been picking up blips of this sort for quite awhile but waited until civilian radar picked it up. Is that true?

MAJOR GENERAL RANDFORD: I think I mentioned earlier our past experience in dealing with these things in many areas where we have had, oh, hundreds of fruitless intercept efforts in response to radar blips. It's not new with us at all.

THE PRESS: But of the same caliber as recently as the past couple of weeks, I mean, the same caliber blips. I think we've all heard about this blip, but is that the thing that you suspected before in the past by the Air Force? That's what I wanted to ask.

MAJOR GENERAL RANDFORD: Well, I can only say that I feel fairly sure that they were the same or reasonably the same. No two blips on a radar are alike.

THE PRESS: Have these been better, clearer, bigger?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I wouldn't say better or
closer. These are good returns. Other people have said,
"These are good returns."

THE PRESS: General Samford, to clear that point up,
I think Captain James indicated earlier in this reference to
temperature inversion you may say that these are good returns.
Can you get good returns on this temperature inversion reflection?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes.

THE PRESS: Can you get a return that's as sharp as
the ones you get off of an aircraft?

THE PRESS: That moves.

THE PRESS: Captain James said they were sharper,
larger, earlier ago.

CAPTAIN JAMES: I said it depended upon the target.

THE PRESS: I'm referring to these soon Saturday
night. Were those good returns? Could the good returns have
been caused by this reflection against this heat (incredible)?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: We think so. We think that
that is probable.

THE PRESS: General, do you think that's probably
what they were?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: My own mind is satisfied
with that, but my obligation to learn more is not. My own
mind is satisfied with that explanation.

THE PRESS: General, if after six years of studying
these things you're now convinced that they do not constitute
a threat to the safety of the country, is the Air Force thinking
about turning this over to some other scientific investigating
body or something?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I think that we would
want to move into it with them rather than to say turn it over.

THE PRESS: Is there any thought of that, bringing
in other governmental scientific bodies perhaps?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes.
THE PRESS: Have you any program along that line? You spoke in the beginning that you wanted the methods of measuring things. You mentioned two or three little things like the possibility of buying new cameras and telescopes. Is there a program being set up to go about this scientifically, and what other organization are you thinking of bringing in on it?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I believe that Colonel Power of the Technical Analysis Division at Dayton is here. Are you sure, Power?

COLONEL POWER: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Would you address yourself to that point, please?

COLONEL POWER: Our idea of that is to implement our present study with instruments wherever possible, as Mr. Griffting mentioned, the refraction grid cameras and other pickups that we might get.

THE PRESS: How many of these telescopes have been ordered, the Schmidt telescopes?

COLONEL POWER: The Schmidt telescopes are not on order by us. The refraction grid cameras are an item which we are...

THE PRESS: Is the Schmidt telescope project an Air Force project or...

MR. GRIFFTING: Yes, yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I think the point that the gentlemen over here wanted to have answered in can you explain from memory the kind of structure that I know that you have in ATR for; well, I’ve seen it somewhere in my memory that you have this step and this step and this step.

COLONEL POWER: We have several steps in analyses and that might explain to you one reason why we cannot give you an instantaneous answer. I mean this requires a study just like any technical problem. First of all, we need technical data. Our first step is to collect the data and check it against other identified objects such as balloons, if aircraft or missiles or such things as meteors are following that, and it comes back and we make an analysis of it within our own groups. We have specialists in our own organizations, people on electrodynamics, physics, geophysics, and various
other specialists that would fit into this. Following that, if it is necessary, we will send it to consultants or specialists in the field. Your mention of a contractor -- we are considering that with the idea, if we can't come out with an answer, of giving it to a contractor to study it. That won't be a short-time job.

THE PRESS: Are you taking a new approach in this whole thing?

COLONEL ROSS: I would say implementing the past approach.

THE PRESS: Going at it more systematically.

COLONEL ROSS: Yes, I think that's the thing to stress. In a lot of these things you can't get technical data and without technical data you can't get a technical answer very well.

MAJOR GENERAL SANFORD: Maybe I have a thought that might help in answering that problem. When we started to say this is an obligation we must learn more about, we thought initially that we could learn something from volume of reports. We say we want all the reports we can get and then see if through that volume maybe we can make a pattern. I think we're beginning to believe now that the things which we can come from volume are not necessarily the things which we value. In other words, volume can come from any different things. It can come from external stimulus. It can come from an unusual opportunity. It can come from such a variety of meaningless things so that the volume of reports is not going to be our answer. We have thought we'd get thousands and thousands of reports and out of those we will develop something that has pattern. We're now becoming convinced that only through better reports with equipment or with a trained reporter specifically attempting to report the valuable things about these items are we likely to produce material that is suitable for a scientific analysis. The stuff we have now isn't enough meet on its basis to interest scientific people.

THE PRESS: Well, General, would you say a qualified observer would be the pilot from New Castle -- I believe his name was Lieutenant Patterson -- who got within what he estimated was two miles of this object last Saturday? Have you questioned him?
other specialties that would fit into this. Following that, if it is necessary, we will send it to consultants or specialists in the field. Your mention of a contractor -- we are considering that with the idea, if we can't come out with an answer, of giving it to a contractor to study it. That won't be a short-time job.

THE PRESS: Are you taking a new approach in this whole thing?

COLONEL ROBEE: I would say implementing the past approach.

THE PRESS: Going at it more systematically.

COLONEL ROBEE: Yes. I think that's the thing to stress. In a lot of those things you can't get technical data and without technical data you can't get a technical answer very well.

MAJOR GENERAL BALENOF: Maybe I have a thought that might help in answering that problem. When we started to say this is an obligation we must learn more about, we thought initially that we could learn something from volumes of reports. We say we want all the reports we can get and then see that through that volume maybe we can make a pattern. I think we're beginning to believe now that the things which we can learn from volumes are not necessarily the things which we value. In other words, volume can come from many different things. It can come from external stimuli. It can come from an unusual opportunity. It can come from such a variety of meaningful things so that the volume of reports is not going to be our answer. We have thought we'd get thousands and thousands of reports and out of these we will develop something that has pattern. We're now becoming convinced that only through better reports with equipment or with a trained reporter specifically attempting to report the valuable things about these things are we likely to produce material that is suitable for a scientific analysis. The stuff we have now hasn't enough meat on its bone to interest scientific people.

THE PRESS: Well, General, would you say a qualified observer would be the pilot from Newcastle -- I believe his name was Lieutenant Petersen -- who got within what he estimated was two miles of this object last Saturday? Have you questioned him?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: He has no measurement that you can make in scientific hands.

THE PRESS: Well, other than his eye as a pilot.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: He says -- if the quality of the observer is that of seeing something, he was a qualified observer. If the quality of measuring something, he is not a qualified observer.

THE PRESS: Well, the reason I'd implied that he'd be qualified is he was probably concentrating with all of his intensity upon this object that he was pursuing. He must have been thinking about it pretty intensely; therefore, can probably give you some pretty good information. Have you questioned him about it?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, he had motive; he had direction; he had interest; he had opportunity. But he had no measuring devices to assure this thing, or these things that need to have measurement before it can become anything other than a sighting.

THE PRESS: Well, do you explain his sighting on the basis of this heat inversion theory too, now?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Not necessarily. That very likely is one that sits apart and says insufficient measurement, insufficient association with other things, insufficient association with other probabilities for it to do any more than to join that group of sightings that we still hold in front of us as saying no.

THE PRESS: Haven't he admitted that the two have been a ground light that he was looking at?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I don't recall. I --

THE PRESS: Well, have you found any conclusion as a result of interrogating this pilot?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: None other than that this is another one of the thousand or two thousand sightings.

THE PRESS: General, this fellow that almost flew into the ground, did he go around a corner or if on a bent return? What were the circumstances of that flight?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Did I get the information of the ground look-out from you, James?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Yes, sir; you did.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Would you answer the question?

CAPTAIN JAMES: I'm sorry. I didn't hear it.

THE PRESS: Did he look on a reflected image, go around the corner, and go down to the ground? Was that the pattern?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Yes; that's true. That was the pattern, and he did that three times and each time it led him to the same point on the ground.

THE PRESS: Captain, what about the man who saw four lights, Saturday night?

CAPTAIN JAMES: Well, I'll have to ask Captain Ruppelt to explain the lights.

THE PRESS: General --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: There's this difficulty. May I make this statement? I was trying to -- let's take any one of these reports and pull it out and say, "Well, what is the meaning of that one report?" None of those things in the period of our entire experience with them has had any validity on its own. The only thing that we hope for is to find enough similarity in sequence of these things so that you can begin to pull something out. There is no validity in them as individual sightings to mean any particular thing.

THE PRESS: General, did you notice in all of your, say, twenty per cent of the inexplainable reports a consistency as to solar, site, or speed, estimated speed?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: None whatsoever.

THE PRESS: None whatsoever?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: No.

THE PRESS: Have you ever tracked the speed by radar of any particular object that you can explain?
MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: There have been many radar reports giving speed.

THE PRESS: What did they range from, sir?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: They run from zero to fantastic speeds.

THE PRESS: General, how do you explain this case, now? The CAA, as I understand the story, after picking up these objects on the radar, also got this Capital Airlines pilot named Ploemen on their radar as he was going out west and, as the Senior Controller told me, he said whenever a blip, one of the unidentified blips, appeared anywhere near Ploemen's plane, he would call Ploemen on the radio and say, "You have traffic at two o'clock about three miles," and Ploemen, in return, would look to the given range and bearing and say, "I see it. I see the light."

THE PRESS: Happy New Year! (Laughter)

THE PRESS: Ploemen described it as a light that was zooming and all such things and this was done not once but Barnes told me he instructed him on that target three times and then, Saturday night, this past Saturday night, when they all saw all these blips, Barnes vectored at least a half dozen airline pilots and planes into those things and they all reported seeing lights.

THE PRESS: Many of them didn't see them, according to Barnes.

THE PRESS: Yes. Many of them didn't see them, but some did.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I can't explain that.

THE PRESS: Well, how do you explain this directing? Is that autosuggestion or --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I can't explain it at all. I think maybe --

THE PRESS: Have you investigated that phase of this thing, this vectering the planes into that?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: You can investigate, but the technique of investigating a process of mind-reading,
for example; or the technique of investigating the process of 
memories. You can any Will you investigate those things? I 
think probably we know no more about mind-reading than the 
technique of investigating that or the technique of investi-
gating evidence of spiritualism than we do about those fields 
but for many years the field of spiritualism had those same 
things in it in which completely competent creditable observers 
reported incredible things. I don’t mean to say that this is 
that sort of thing, but it’s an explanation of an inability to 
explain and that is with us.

THE PRESS: General, I understand that the wavelength 
of the radar has something to do with what it can pick up in the 
way of phenomena. Were those relatively low or relatively high 
wavelength radar?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I couldn’t say and I don’t 
know whether Captain Jones can or not, but I’d like to have him 
have the opportunity.

CAPTAIN JONES: Those were relatively high frequency 
or short wavelength. However, the same effect can be observed 
with long wavelength equipment with different degrees.

THE PRESS: You say very short wavelength?

CAPTAIN JONES: In this case, yes.

THE PRESS: They were designed for different purposes?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: General, why has the Air Force refused 
to disclose the substance of Captain Montell’s air-ground 
conversations before he died? Do you remember that case?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I don’t know enough 
about it to say what was said or what some reason was.

THE PRESS: Well, a popular book made quite a point 
of that, that the Air Force was holding back on that because 
it took the true nature of the answer, that he had approached 
it, and "

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Well, I wish that that were 
true, that he did say something that had enough substance in 
it for use. I haven’t the slightest idea what he said.
THE PRESS: Are you withholding any information about these so-called --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Are we now?

THE PRESS: Yes. In anything --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: There is one thing that we have asked that our -- some of our informers have asked -- I don't like the word "informer" either -- reporters had asked --

THE PRESS: We don't like that word either.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I like the word. Reporter is all right. But many people are reticent about reporting those things if their names are mentioned because they are frequently looked on by others as being publicity seekers or maybe people will avoid them and go on the other side of the street for while (laughter), so they ask us to not say who made this report and sometime information is received that deals with the credibility of a reporter saying he's drunk all the time or he never did do anything but lie. (Laughter). Well, those things we get are not revealed, but it is far as the statement of what they saw, when and where they saw it, the measurements that they took, such as they were, we are not withholding any of that data.

THE PRESS: How about your interpretation of what they reported?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: Well, we're trying to say as much as we can on that today and admit that the barrier of understanding on all of this is not one that we break.

THE PRESS: General, have you ever said flatly that these are not machines that the United States has made or is developing?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: What was that?

THE PRESS: Have you said this afternoon that these are not machines or weapons that the United States is developing?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMPSON: I would say that these that we have been speaking about in this locality are definitely not. However, many reports that we have received and we've been able to correlate and put in their place we have been able to do so
through association with an activity we had somewhere, a jet aircraft line, a missile, certain balloons. We could say, well, the report probably was associated with this thing which we've done, but in so far as what you are thinking about in this locality --

THE PRESS: These are not missiles or rockets?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: -- there is nothing.

THE PRESS: Well, General, could you turn that over a little bit? A lot of people keep saying that all this talk is a cover-up and that saucers are really the result of some experiments the United States, either the Air Force or Atomic Energy, is carrying on. Can you make a flat statement and say that those unexplained flying saucer manifestations are not the result of any American weapon or other experimentation or test?

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: I'd say that those that we categorize as unexplained or unidentified have gone through the process of trying to associate them with something we were doing and when we fail to associate them with something we're doing, we say that is one other clue that runs to nothing. Now, to say that sightings everywhere are -- none of them could possibly be associated with what the United States is doing, isn't quite true because we know that a particular jet fighter has been flying in a certain area; somebody has reported thus and thus and thus, and we get those two things together and we say something that we were doing caused that report. As General Pency said a minute ago, there is a fair degree of probability that two fighters locked on each other and saw and received senses. That was certainly something we were doing that caused those two reports.

THE PRESS: What I was aiming at was this popular feeling --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: Of mystery?

THE PRESS: -- of mystery, of something, that it's some very highly secret new weapon that we're working on that's causing all this.

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: We have nothing that has no mass and unlimited power! (Laughter)
THE PRESS: General, somebody asked you before how much money you'd spent on this investigation since the start. How much have you spent on it?

MAJOR GENERAL CAMPO: It's very slight. I don't know.

THE PRESS: General, in connection with withholding information, I'd like to ask General Ramsey a question. That is, how many times have fighter planes been brought down over the Washington area in the last couple of weeks to investigate reports of flying objects?

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: That's a matter of record -- three, I believe. I think two flights one night and one flight Saturday night. I don't remember the night the other two were up. I think there have been six sorties.

THE PRESS: One flight the first Saturday night and two flights --

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: In this immediate area, yes. We have airplanes that investigate various reports all over the country or places where we have these fighters, but --

THE PRESS: I thought the Air Force had said that it couldn't send any fighters up because it didn't have them.

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: No. I don't believe it said that.

THE PRESS: The first night.

THE PRESS: How about last night, General?

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: No; there were no fighters up last night.

THE PRESS: Were there fighters sent in here from New Castle on both those Saturday nights in question?

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: That's right; yes.

THE PRESS: Last night, was that because of lack of a track?

MAJOR GENERAL RAMSEY: Lack of a track.
THE PRESS: General, are sightings from military personnel made public generally, or are they --

MAJOR GENERAL SAMFORD: There's no reason why they shouldn't be.

THE PRESS: Thank you, General. Thank you.

... The conference was concluded at 5:20 p.m. ...
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