

The role of the CIA in the flying saucer field is becoming increasingly well known, as the following references show: Stringfield, "Inside Saucer Post 3-0 Blue", page 42; SAUCER NEWS, February-March 1958, pages 7-14; Palmer, "Flying Saucers", Feb. 1959, editorial; "Fate", Feb. 1959, page 57; NICAP, "The UFO Investigator", No. 4, June 1958, page 4.

Meaning of the Equation ECM + CIA = UFO: I contend that the CIA, since 1951, has caused or sponsored saucer sightings for its own purposes. By shrewd psychological manipulation, a series of "normal" events has been served up so as to appear as quite convincing evidence of extraterrestrial UFO's. Some of this "normal" activity includes military use of ECM on a classified basis, unknown to the radar observers who were involved, leading to the radar reports discussed in this article.

By examining the references given, the reader will see that these three cases are treated as good sightings by competent reliable observers. The general attitude of saucer researchers toward these cases is somewhat as follows: These cases show that saucers are real solid objects, giving genuine radar returns (Michel, pp. 85-89), traveling at speeds up to 9,000 mph (FSCOS, pp. 161-165). These objects can maneuver remarkably well (FSCOS, p. 217) and perform beyond the capability of present Earthmade devices (FSCOS, p. 166). These radar blips are not due to temperature inversions (FSCOS, pp. 101-105, and Michel, p. 87). In some cases there are simultaneous radar and visual sightings, so the objects cannot be merely radar tricks (FSCOS, p. 64).

I will now endeavor to show that the attitude expressed above is unfounded, if the existence of ECM equipment can be postulated.

The "Invisible" Saucers: The "classic" radar sighting, in its purest form, is the case of the "Invisible" Saucers, given in Chapter 15 of Keyhoe's "Flying Saucer Conspiracy" (FSCOS, pp. 217-221). A brief abstract follows: "In late September (1952) as UFO sightings were increasing all over Europe... a strange U-formation had appeared on a civilian radarscope (in England). The formation... of 40 to 50 UFO's... changed with a precise movement from a U-formation to two parallel lines... and (then) reformed in a perfect Z... Cloudy skies had hidden them... but the third appearance came on a bright clear day... at noon... But this time... the UFO formation was invisible to the human eye (just as on the two previous days)... Four more times the mystery formation returned at noon... For over a month this story was kept from the public... The War Office spokesman said he had been given top-level orders to 'maintain the utmost secrecy'..."

Keyhoe's Washington contact, "Paul Redell", says of this case (see p. 219, FSCOS): "Yes, I know about it, and I'm pretty sure it happened here too... I believe that the answer is tied in with some highly classified research I've heard about... There's one I can give you... The Mansel-Shoto thing is exactly the same as what happened over England. Some day when the lid is lifted, I'll explain it." (The Mansel-Shoto affair is discussed on pages 221-224 of FSCOS and is also mentioned in the following section of this article.)

Note that there is no claim of visual confirmation in this English case, as reported by Keyhoe. A test or demonstration, by military authorities, of ECM in England, could have accounted for this case and for Redell's remarks.

The Washington Airport Sightings and the Official Explanations: An important and well known case is the Washington National Airport radar sightings of July 19th and July 26th, 1952. I have no space to quote the case here, but it is well written up in Ruppelt (pp. 209-226), Michel (pp. 84-89), and Keyhoe (FSCOS, pp. 62-70).

At a press conference at the Pentagon, July 29th, 1952, General Samford, Director of Air Force Intelligence, answered questions about these radar sightings. The New York Times front page story of July 30th, 1952, in quoting from Samford's statements, contains the following "official" viewpoints: "We are learning more and more about radar... Radar is capable of playing tricks for which it was not designed... These instances were good observations of something, but not good observations of what radar was designed to observe! (Naturally, the General did not mention ECM because this was a classified subject at the time, but it seems obvious that this is what he was guardedly referring to.)

The General also said that an experienced radar operator, assigned to define saucers on the radar screen, was subject to curiosity stimuli that would result in overemphasis. He said that he was satisfied that none of the saucer "sightings" represented the flight of any material object. The New York Times news summary for that day also stated: "The pickup of the aerial objects on radar screens was of 'radar ghosts' and not actual things."

Along this line, a Washington Post article by John O. Norris, July 29th, 1952, stated: "A high Navy officer suggested that they were a revisitation of the 'ghosts of Mansel-Shoto'. He referred to the rash of spots which appeared on radar screens... in 1945... never fully explained... believed generally to have been caused by... 'electronic noise' from the many radar sets in the area! (It may be surmised that the Mansel-Shoto affair was an accident, due to the proximity of many Naval radar sets, which led to the realization of the possibility of ECM.)

The Gulf of Mexico Sightings: Space permits only a brief discussion of the Gulf of Mexico case of December 6th, 1952, one of the mainstays of Keyhoe's theories. (FSCOS, pp. 161-166) The case involved a radar training plane, returning from a night's practice. Suddenly radar blips apparently going 5,000 to 9,000 mph were seen. Although this case is supposed to contain visual confirmation, I quote from p. 165: "The closest the objects came was approximately 20 miles... Flashes of light were noted... I saw a blue-white streak travel from front to rear... since almost anything seen from a plane will seem to travel from front to rear, even wisps of clouds or particles from the exhaust, this is not conclusive visual confirmation of a flying saucer."

Unknown to the airmen on the plane, this incident could have been due to ECM operations, either for the purposes of training the crew, or for demonstrating ECM's capabilities to those high officials who would later get to see the "eyewitness" reports made out by the crew. In any case, it also provided a good radar