

ADAMSKI PHOTOGRAPHS

Mr. George Adamski never submitted his photographs to the AirForce for official analysis. Air Force records indicate that these photographs have been in circulation since the early 1950's.

Unofficial photo analysis of two of the prints indicates that the object photographed by Mr. Adamski is a tobacco humidor with three ping-pong balls. No attempt was made to analyze ~~the third print.~~ *other photographs*  
*by Mr Adamski.*

Air Force statement regarding Captain Edward Ruppelt book, Report on Unidentified Flying Objects.

As with any free-lance author, Mr Ruppelt's theories, opinions and conclusions are his own, and not necessarily those of the Air Force. His book was reviewed and passed on by Hqs USAF from a security viewpoint only. While most of the statements in his book are factual, the inferences and implications that he attempts to leave are definitely questionable. As project officer of the UFO program, Capt Ruppelt had good knowledge and appreciation of various technical and scientific fields, was considered competent in monitoring investigations, and collecting and correlating data for analysis. However, he was not an expert in such highly specialized fields as astrophysics, meteorological optics, psychology, radar, and photography. In sightings with these aspects or implications the Air Force has relied on many scientists and specialists, whose conclusions are considered more valid.

Air Force statement regarding motion picture, Unidentified Flying Objects.

The film "U.F.O." was produced by the Green and Rouse Studios and released in May 1956 to movie theaters as a commercial venture. This film has recently been released to Television stations. The Air Force has never had any connection with the production or release of this film. Individuals employed by the Green and Rouse Studios as technical advisors were Major Dewey Fournet, Jr., Captain Edward Ruppelt and Mr. Albert M. Chop. They had no connection with the Air Force in any official capacity at the time the movie was made. Sequences purportedly showing Air Force investigations of UFO sightings were filmed privately, with the use of professional actors... not Air Force personnel.

The films of UFO's incorporated as a part of the movie were obtained from the original owners, Chief Petty Officer Delbert C. Newhouse (Tremonton, Utah case), and Mr. Nicholas Mariana (Great Falls, Montana case). The Air Force evaluations and conclusions of these films are as follows:

a) Tremonton, Utah, 2 July 1952. The original film was analyzed by an Air Force Photo Reconnaissance laboratory shortly after the sighting. The conclusion reached was that the bright spots of light appearing on the film were caused by seagulls soaring in thermal air currents.

b) Great Falls, Montana, 10 August 1950. Based on the interrogation of the witnesses and evaluation of data, the Air Force conclusion was that the objects on the film were two F-94 fighter aircraft known to be in the area at the time.

The disorientation that pilots experience during night formation flight may result from what is called the autokinetic illusion. The autokinetic illusion is a visual phenomenon in which a stationary spot of light against a dark background appears to move erratically. It is known to have been experienced by pilots when they were observing formation lights on other aircraft (8). In fact, this illusion can disorient a trained pilot to the extent that he will spin in a link trainer (8). In a recent night formation flight accident a surviving pilot reported that he "saw" the other two aircraft in the formation peel-off to the left when, actually, they had not changed course (16). On the basis of this false information he maneuvered his aircraft so as to collide with the other two with a resultant loss of one pilot and three F-86D aircraft. The "peeling-off" of these two aircraft is typical of the nature of the autokinetic illusion.

Investigations of the autokinetic illusion reveal that the apparent movement is greatest and most frequent when small (point-source), dim lights are being viewed; but it is still present in the case of large light sources (6, 7) and, although to a lesser degree, when viewing patterns of lights (8). Therefore, the use of more or larger area reference lights in formation flight should cause a reduction in the autokinetic effect. It has been demonstrated that autokinetic movement was frequent and large when only one reference light was visible during formation flight, was much reduced when two reference lights were visible, and reduced even more when three reference lights were visible (8).

\* \* \* \* \*

AVRO CAR

The program to which you refer is probably the Army-Air Force sponsored research program with AVRO Aircraft, Ltd., of Canada. This program was designed to explore the new (at that time) scientific and technical approach to vertical take-off and landing. The research vehicle was to operate within the ground cushion, riding on air. The saucer shaped resulted entirely from the desire to utilize the "ducted fan principle" of propulsion. The final phase of this contract was completed in December 1961. The AVROCAR had not been able to perform as desired. Instability above four feet was ~~so~~ so dangerous that final tests were conducted with the Avrocar in a tethered condition. It was determined there could be no military application due to the instability of the vehicle.

The idea for the design of this vehicle was dictated by the requirement ~~of~~ of a shape to accommodate the ducted fan engine. Any relationship between this vehicle and the so-called "flying saucer" is purely coincidental.

This is in reply to your recent letter regarding the AVRO-Disc. It is suggested that you write to the following address for information you are seeking.

Mr. J. E. McDonald  
DeHavilland Aircraft of Canada, Ltd  
Suite 202  
1701 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D C 20006

BARIMUM CLOUD RELEASES

Reference your unidentified observation of \_\_\_\_\_ . The description you provided is consistent with that of a barium cloud release and is similar to other reports which we received from the eastern United States on that day. We feel that you probably observed an artificial cloud release which was launched into the upper atmosphere from Wallops Island, Virginia on October 3. Inclosed is a copy of a news release from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on this experiment. Thank you for your interest and participation in the AirForce UFO program.

BARNES AERIAL ADVERTISING SIGN

Reference your unidentified flying object (UFO) observation of \_\_\_\_\_ which you reported ~~submitting~~ to the Air Force at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio.

2. The stimulus for your sighting has been identified as an aircraft that had an electrical advertising sign attached to it. The plane is a Cessna 172 that operates between 50 to 60 mph and when the sign is lighted, it can be seen as far as 15 miles away. The sign was advertising for Stueve Ford of Miamisburg and was operating in the area of Miamisburg, Franklin, West Carrollton, Kettering and Dayton, on the night of \_\_\_\_\_.

3. The attached material on electrical aerial advertisers may be of interest to you.

Thank you for reporting your observation to the Air Force.

CHAFF

Reference your letter of \_\_\_\_\_ in which you submitted an unidentified specimen. The sample that you sent to the Aerial Phenomena <sup>Branch</sup> ~~Office~~ has been identified as radar chaff. This material is dropped in military exercises to confuse radar operators as to the position of the plane. (Stevens Point Low ITA is an authorized chaff drop point for Truax Field and has been used frequently for this purpose.)

We are returning your sample and also have included a copy of Project Blue Book which you may find interesting.

COST ~~MMMMM~~ IN DUPLICATION

Due to the heavy workload and costs involved in duplicating, it is impossible to fulfill your request for copies of \_\_\_\_\_. The office at Wright-Patterson AFB is manned by five persons and much of their time is spent analyzing alleged unidentified flying object (UFO) sightings.

Rob Mercer

DISCREPANCY IN DATE OF OBSERVATION

Reference your \_\_\_\_\_ observation of an unidentified flying object. Prior to reaching our final conclusion on your sighting we need to know the exact date. The initial report indicated the sighting occurred on the night of J \_\_\_\_\_; however, the questionnaire you completed indicated that the sighting occurred on \_\_\_\_\_. We would appreciate a note from you clarifying this discrepancy.

Rob Mercer

DISCREPANCY IN REPORTING OBSERVATION (FLIGHT PATH)

Reference your recent correspondence on your unidentified observation of \_\_\_\_.

There is some question as to the exact direction from which the unidentified flying object came. We would appreciate a statement describing the actual flight path of the UFO. What direction did the UFO come from and in what direction did the UFO depart? With this information, our analysts can complete their investigation.

DR. HYNEKS COMMENTS

As for Dr. Hynek's comments, he was not speaking as a representative of the Air Force. He was not consulted by the Air Force on this sighting and his comments are those of a free agent who can and will speak his mind.

Rob Mercer

## ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION

Regarding the 1948 "Estimate of the Situation," the late Captain Ruppelt in his book, The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects, provides the answer. The Top Secret Estimation was working its way up to the higher echelons of the Air Force. It got ~~the~~ to the late General Hoyt S. Vanderberg, then Chief of Staff, before it was "batted down." The **General** wouldn't "buy" interplanetary vehicles. The report lacked proof and the Estimate died a quick death. Some months later, it was completely declassified and relegated to the incinerator. I am sorry, but we have no copies of this document.

( THE ABOVE WAS TAKEN FROM A LETTER PREPARED BY LT COL GEO FREEMAN  
MARCH 29, 1967)

## FACTORS INFLUENCING THE NUMBER OF UFO REPORTS RECEIVED

The number of UFO reports varies from year to year because of a number of reasons. Some of the factors that influence the number of reports that the Air Force receives are specific technological developments, prevailing weather conditions, news coverage, and public interest. For instance, there was a significant increase in UFO reports in 1957 after the Soviets launched the first Sputnik satellite. During the period of 31 Aug - 3 Sep 65 several hundred UFO reports were submitted from the Mid-West states primarily because of a temperature inversion which existed over this region during this time period. News coverage and public interest are directly related and were responsible for the large number of sightings in 1952. Publicity often stimulates public interest which in turn stimulates increased news coverage of the subject.

## FUNDS

Funds are not appropriated specifically for the investigation of UFO reports submitted to the Air force for evaluation. Funds for this purpose come from the total allocation to the Defense effort. Consequently, no information can be supplied as to the total amount of funds used in the investigation of UFO reports.

Rob Mercer

## HOT AIR BALLOONS

The description, that you provided on your observation, is consistent with other reports that we have received of plastic garment bag hot air balloons. These balloons usually appear as a luminescent object that is red, orange, yellow or white in color, and usually uses birthday candles for a heat source. After the candles burn down, the stage or platform on which the ~~main~~ candles are mounted on sometimes catches fire and sparks can be seen falling from the object. Shortly after the fiery pieces fall the light dims and disappears.

The insufficient data category includes all sightings where essential or pertinent items of information are missing, making it impossible to form a valid conclusion. These include corroboration of the sighting by an additional witness; description of the size, shape or color of the object; direction and altitude; exact time and location; wind weather conditions etc. This category is not used as a convenient way to get rid of what might be referred to as "unidentified objects." However, if there is not an additional witness or if the data received is insufficient or unrelated, the analysts must then place that particular report in this category. The Air Force needs complete information to reach a valid conclusion. Air Force officials stressed the fact that an observer should send a complete report of a bona fide sighting to the nearest Air Force activity. There the report will be promptly forwarded to the proper office for analysis and evaluation.

Taken from FACT Sheet, No 98-60, News Release, Jan 29, 1960, by DOD

LACK OF DATA ON SIGHTING (VAGUE)

It would be extremely difficult to perform a comprehensive investigation based on your observation; you neglected to mention the time, date and location of your sighting.

If you had reported ~~your sighting~~ to the Air Force (or your nearest military installation) at the time, our analysts and evaluators would have attempted to determine what you had observed. If we had been unable to find a logical answer, then your case would have been categorized as UNIDENTIFIED.

With the information submitted, it would be extremely difficult to offer much of an explanation. Essential data such as flight characteristics, maneuvers, and duration of sighting are quite important in a comprehensive evaluation. If you had reported your observation to ~~the Air Force~~ (or your nearest military installation), at the time, an evaluation would have been possible.

~~your nearest military installation~~, <sup>the local</sup> investigator is in a far better position to conduct an on-the-spot investigation. Your information will be added to our present data.

## LARGE AMOUNT OF 1952 CASES

All files, with the exception of 1952, have been screened and consolidated. This , plus the fact that there was a large amount of publicity in 1952 are the reasons why the figures for the year 1952 are much higher than preceding years.

Consolidation of the case files is necessary since at one time personnel considered ten observations of the same meteor as ten different observations. Whereas now, it is considered as one sighting with multiple observers.

The project office hopes to be able to screen the 1952 files in the near future.

LARGE AMOUNT OF CASES

~~Immature~~ (TAKEN FROM NEWS RELEASE, DOD, JAN 29, 1960, No 98-60)

It appears that some specific incident is usually responsible for touching off a rash of reported sightings and this is particularly true of the two high report years of 1952 and 1957.

In 1952 the Washington, D C sightings with extensive national press coverage resulted in 1501 sightings reported that year.

In 1957, the Russian Sattellite Sputnik I was launched in October and particularly significant is the fact that 701 of the total of 1178 sightings reported, were made in the last three months of that year.

LETTER TO POLICE DEPARTMENTS

1. The Aerial Phenomena Office is in receipt of an unidentified flying object (UFO) report from New Orleans, Louisiana which occurred on April 1, 1967 at approximately 4:30 pm.
2. The witness stated that he observed a dark disc shaped object that disappeared to the north. He also managed to photograph the object.
3. Did you receive any reports of unusual objects for this date? We would appreciate your comments as to a possible cause for this sighting.
4. Thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Light beams from Aristarchus on the moon.

These light beams have never been reported to the Air Force as an unidentified flying object; therefore, we have not attempted to find an explanation.

I would suggest you refer your question to the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

The following is an extract from ltr fm Dr. Hynek, 5 Jan 67 to Maj Quintanilla  
"Mr Cox does not give specific page references to the statements by Frank Edwards concerning "light beams" seen coming from the crater Aristarchus, but I believe I know what is being referred to. I'm afraid ~~that~~ this is just another example of loose reporting by Mr. Edwards and of his many attempts to make a big story to suit his own purposes.

It is true that in 1965 the astronomer, Greenacre, at the Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff, did report seeing a reddish glow near the crater Aristarchus which lasted about 20 minutes. There were no "light beams" ever reported, to the best of my knowledge. Similar activity near the crater Aristarchus has been reported occasionally in the past and presumably arises from escaping gases from this ancient crater. Of course, we cannot be sure, but the glow reported did not seem to suggested a "man made" origin, as seems to be implied by Mr. Edwards. But it is correct to say that the reported glow, if real, remains unexplained."

LTR FOR SIGHTING ACCIDENTALLY NOT INVESTIGATED

1. This replies to your letter concerning your observation of an unidentified flying object.
2. Whiel reviewing our correspondence files we found your letter in which you reported seeing an unidentified object on \_\_\_\_\_. Because of an error, your sighting was not investigated at that time. We handle over 10,000 letters and investigate approximately 1,000 UFO sightings a year; once in a while an error is made. We regret that this has kept us from investigating your observation. However, if you would complete the inclosed AF Form 117 we will investigate your sighting in an attempt to determine the stimulus for your observation.
3. Thank you for reporting your observation to the Air Force, once again, please excuse us for not responding to your correspondence earlier.

MAJOR QUINTANILLA's OPINION ON UFOs

UFOS exist in reports only and we have never been able to recover any hardware from an alleged flying saucer. There is absolutely no evidence which would indicate that these alleged saucers were vehicles from another planet or that they were under the guidance of some alien being.

Scientifically, the closest star that could sustain life as you and I know it, is  $4\frac{1}{2}$  light years away. That is to say, that if this vehicle left his star and traveled at the speed of light which is 186,000 miles per second, then it would take him nine years to make a round trip. Now thinking a little bit further, we know that anything which has mass/~~w~~eight cannot travel at the speed of light, so we have to add a few more years to his travel time. There are many, many more problems which have to be taken into consideration, but unfortunately my other duties do not permit the time to explain them fully.

I believe that astronomers in their observatories and the tracking stations throughout the world, will detect the presence of a so-called interstellar space vehicle long before it reaches our earth's envelope. If such an event ever occurs, then these gentlemen would have notified the world long before you and I could detect them with the naked eye. I honestly don't believe that these learned gentlemen of science would keep such an event to themselves and not reveal it to the general public. After all, fame and fortune await the discoverer of such an event.

METEOR AND OR SATELLITE DECAY OBSERVATIONS:

Your sighting has been evaluated as a meteor. This evaluation is based on the duration and the description as well as the direction of flight. The speed of the object as indicated by the duration is well within the limits of meteor capability. The duration of decay sightings is much greater. Sputnik IV decay on September 5, 1962, lasted in excess of two minutes and Discoverer VIII decay on March 7, 1960 lasted over four minutes.

The object which you have described is similar to ~~t~~ either a meteor or satellite decay. Several essential bits of information were omitted precluding a firm evaluation. The duration was omitted as well as the direction of travel for the arc distance through which the object passed.

23 Nov 67 Mansfield Ohio

" Dayton Ohio  
Dayton, Ohio

20 Nov 67 Superior Wisconsin

24 Nov 67 Dayton Ohio (2)

26 Nov 67 Boston, Mass

26 Nov 67 Dayton, Ohio

Bob Mercer

22 Oct 67 76 McKinney, Ohio  
15 Oct 67 Tripoli Iowa  
18 Oct 67 Delwein Iowa  
24 Oct 67 Kentucky, Covington  
18+19 Oct 67 Corpus Christi Texas  
22 Oct 67 Bellrose NY  
25 Oct 67 Authaen, Miss  
28+29 Oct 67 Dayton Ohio  
29 Oct 67 Farmersville Ohio  
28 Oct 67 Dayton Ohio  
27 Oct 67 Kewanee, Georgia  
1 Nov 67 Menaul, Colorado  
30 Oct 67 Canwood, N Jersey  
5 Nov 67 Farmersville Ohio  
4 Nov 67 Myrtle Beach, S Carolina  
6 Nov 67 Dayton Ohio  
18 Oct 67 Corpus Christi, Texas

25 Oct 67 Jasper Alaba  
21 Oct 67 Blytheville, Ark  
25 Oct 67 " "  
3 Nov 67 Ft Walton, Fla  
9 Nov 67 Minister, Ohio  
8 Nov 67 Cincinnati Ohio  
8 Nov 67 Lake Isabelle, Calif  
14 Nov 67 Petersburg, Miss  
10 Nov 67 Collingdale, Pa  
15 Nov 67 Kettering, Ohio  
~~9 Oct 67 B~~  
8 Nov 67 Blytheville Ark  
4 Nov 67 Tallahassee, Fla  
20 Nov 67 Athens, Ohio  
19 Nov 67 Duluth, Minn  
21 Nov 67 San Angelo, Texas  
17 Nov 67 Walcott, Iowa

5 October 1967 Duluth AFB, Minnesota  
10 October 67 Lakewood, Colorado  
10 October 67 Denver, Colorado  
4 October 67 Turkey  
8 October 67 Omaha, Nebraska  
26 Sep 67 Alaska  
6 Oct 67 California  
3 Oct 67 Queens, New York  
12 Oct 67 Juliet, Lebanon  
2 Oct 67 Bay Shore, N York  
4 Oct 67 Windsor, Conn  
10 Oct 67 Columbus, Ohio  
12 Aug 67 Broadmoor, Colo  
12 Oct 67 OKALOOSA, FLA  
10 Oct 67 Delwein, Iowa  
17 Oct 67 Escambia County, Fla  
19+20 Oct 67 Marblehead, Ohio  
19 or 20 Oct 67 Fairborn, Ohio

# Photographs

*Reference*

~~This replies to~~ your recent correspondence of ----- in which you

*reported*

mention your unidentified observation of ----- and subsequent

photographs. Additional information on your sighting and your

original negative are needed to perform a scientific investigation.

Request you complete the attached photographic data sheet and ~~FTD Form 164~~ *AF Form 117*

and return them with your original negative. Upon completion of analysis

we will return your negative along with our findings.

## PHOTOGRAPHS

Photographs that have been submitted for evaluation on conjunction with UFO reports have been determined to be a misinterpretation of natural or conventional objects. There has never been any photographic evidence which would indicate that an extra-terrestrial object has been observed.

Photographs submitted ~~to~~ to the Air Force for evaluation in conjunction with UFO reports have been determined to be a misinterpretation of natural of conventional objects. These photographs have been identified as unusual cloud formations, astronomical bodies, emulsion flaws, reflections, lens flares, double exposures, and other processing defects. Only a small percentage of th~~e~~ photographs submitted ~~were~~ are hoaxes

I am glad that you enjoy space science and mathematics, for this type of background is quite necessary in evaluating UFO cases. As you can see by reading the above, that we use all types of personnel with scientific backgrounds. Therefore, I would suggest that you continue to study the field of science and mathematics. If you have an opportunity to take a course in astronomy, this would be most helpful. However, we cannot guarantee that you would be able to work directly in the Project Blue Book office. Their present office staff is manned by \_\_\_\_\_.

It is possible that you may come into indirect contact with the Blue Book office in the future, since each Air Force installation has a UFO investigator.

PROJECT OFFICERS ON UFO PROGRAM

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DATES</u>
Capt. Robert R. Sneider	Oct 1948 - Mar 1951
Capt. Edward J. Ruppelt	Mar 1951 - Sept 1953
Lt. Robert M. Olsson	Sept 1953 - Mar 1954
Capt. Charles A. Hardin	Mar 1954 - Apr 1956
Capt. George T. Gregory	Apr 1956 - Oct 1958
Maj. Robert J. Friend	Oct 1958 - Aug 1963
Maj. Hector Quintanilla, Jr.	Aug 1963 - Present

This will reply to your letter of March 5, 1968, in which you described an unidentified flying object (UFO) that you and your family observed on \_\_\_\_\_.

Without additional information, we cannot offer an explanation of the object you saw. However, if you will complete the attached questionnaire and mail it in the inclosed envelope, our technical people at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base will be able to investigate further and make an evaluation.

Should you ever sight another UFO, please report it as ~~as~~ soon as possible to the nearest Air Force base. Each base has an UFO investigator, who is in a better position to make an on-the-spot investigation which usually results in a more accurate analysis.

In the meantime, we are sending you some literature that ~~you~~ may help you identify the sighting. Thank you for reporting it to the Air Force.

## RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AIR FORCE

Within the Department of Defense the Air Force has the responsibility for investigating reports on UFOs and evaluating any possible threat to our national security that such objects might pose. In carrying out this responsibility, the Air Force is both objective and thorough in its treatment of all reports of unusual aerial phenomena over the United States. Under the designation "Project Blue Book," the program is carried out in three phases: (1) an initial investigation of each report received; (2) a detailed analysis of unidentified sightings; and (3) dissemination of information on sightings, findings, and statistics.

## SATELLITES

To naked-eye observers, the motion of a bright artificial satellite frequently consists of tiny zig-zags rather than a smooth curve across the sky. This familiar illusion has been ascribed to the fact that we do not move our eyes continuously, but in little jerks. Fluctuations in light akin to the twinkling of stars can also cause the illusion of zig-zag motion. Observations show that the fluctuations are closely related to meteorological conditions.

SIGHTINGS OVER 90 DAYS OLD

We appreciated learning of your unusual experience and will file ~~the~~  
your letter for information purposes. At this late date it would be  
~~impractical~~ <sup>impossible</sup> to undertake a detailed investigation. <sup>It is not for</sup> It is important  
that a witness report his ~~or her~~ observation as soon as possible, ~~This~~ <sup>this</sup>  
enables <sup>ing</sup> Air Force analysts to perform a comprehensive investigation.

## SPEAKERS ON UFOS

This is in reply to your recent request for a speaker on the subject of unidentified flying objects.

Public interest generated by recent sightings has precipitated a flood of requests such as yours. Unfortunately, Project Blue Book, the Air Force UFO program, is not staffed to provide speakers for programs such as yours. Personnel assigned to the project are responsible for investigating UFO reports and maintaining records. The tremendous workload in that office precludes participation in private club and industry programs.

Your interest in the unidentified flying object program is appreciated; I regret that I cannot give you a more favorable reply.

SPENCER WHEDON'S STATEMENT W/REGARDS TO COST OF AN INVESTIGATION

In the basic letter, Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ makes reference to a statement by a Lt. Colonel Whedon that it costs \$10,000 to investigate each major UFO case. Whedon was ~~was~~ a reserve officer on a two-week active duty tour at the time he made the statement on the Armstrong Circle Theater TV show of January 22, 1958. In the course of the show entitled "UFO -- The Enigma of the Skies," Whedon actually said "A single UFO investigation may well cost the Government \$10,000." Whedon now says, "This sounded like a good round number." He had no basis of fact for making such a statement.

## STAFF OF PROJECT BLUE BOOK

There is only a minimal, permanent, full time staff on Project Blue Book. Only a minimal permanent staff is necessary to provide direction and administration to the program. All other personnel are used only on an "as needed" basis. Operating in this manner permits us to utilize the best scientific brains available in the laboratories of all governmental agencies. This also permits the utilization of any one or all of the scientific disciplines according to the requirements of any particular investigation. Further, it gives us access to and use of the latest equipments and techniques used by the finest laboratories in the world. A list of all the personnel involved at one time or another during investigation and analysis of a sighting would be far too lengthy for your purposes.

Major Hector Quintanilla, Jr, a physicist by training, is primarily the administrator that screens the incoming reports of sightings and decides the specific investigative and analytical requirements of each. He then directs the action to be taken, monitors the results and determines what, if any, further action need be taken. On rare occasions, time permitting, he personally conducts some phase of an investigation. The conclusions reached are a product of the sum total of answers that flow back in from all facets of any specific investigation.

An operation conducted in a manner such as that of Project Blue Book, has a capability and flexibility that far exceeds anything that would be possible with a permanent staff which would be necessarily limited by the amount of money available for salaries and facilities. Also, such a mode of operation eliminates the possibility of a permanent staff member becoming narrow or un-scientific in his approach to the problem before him. It permits progress toward a solution without a preconceived idea of what the solution "should" be.

The Aerial Phenomena BRANCH

Our ~~office~~ is in receipt of a reported unidentified/object observation flying over the \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ area. A check of our ~~File~~ Low Altitude High Speed Training Route Chart indicates that your group is engaged in training flights over the area in question. Request information on participation by \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_, low altitude, high speed route at approximately \_\_\_\_\_.

Rob Mercier

## UNIDENTIFIED SIGHTING

The only data that the Air Force has on which to make a scientific study is that of an observer's own experience or interpretation of an experience. In no case has there been an instance where sightings categorized as UNIDENTIFIED have furnished scientific and technological data that could be channeled to Research and Development for their study and utilization. Unidentified flying objects exist in reports only; there has been no conclusive evidence submitted to or discovered by the Air Force that our planet is being visited by extraterrestrial vehicles. There is no evidence available that suggests that UFOs caused the New York blackout.

It is the opinion of the Air Force that if more detailed objective data had been available, all UFO reports could have been explained. However, because of the fact that analyses of UFO sightings depend primarily on the ~~xxxxxx~~ personal impressions and interpretations of the observer rather than on accurate scientific data or facts obtained under controlled conditions, the elimination of all unidentifieds is ~~improbable~~ improbable.

## VILLA PHOTOGRAPHS

Photographs allegedly taken by Mr. A. A. "Paul" Villa, on June 16, 1963, near Albuquerque, New Mexico, were determined to be a hoax. The sighting which led to the photographing of the object has never been officially reported to the Air Force.

The Blue Book office analyzed a set of photos and determined that the object photographed is estimated to be twenty inches in diameter and seven inches high. If humanoids were inside of this so-called "flying saucer," they would have to be less than seven inches tall. Newspapers claimed that the UFO was estimated to be 70 feet in diameter.

WRECKAGE OF FLYING SAUCER AT ~~S~~FITZBERGAN

The alleged wreckage of a flying saucer at ~~S~~Fitzbergan has been denied by the Royal Norwegian Air Force. The Royal Norwegian Air Force stated to the USAIRA in Oslo, that the information regarding the flying saucer was definitely a farce. It should be emphasized that the story of this alleged incident was the product of the German newspaper "Berling Volksblatt" July 9, 1952.

Rob Mercer

WRITERS - AUTHORS

There is no law that requires writers to adhere strictly to the truth; such a law would make any speculative writing illegal.

The Air Force UFO program, Project Blue Book, is completely unclassified. Our files at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are open to bona fide newsmen and scientists, many of whom have taken advantage of our offer to examine the reports on file with the Air Force. The more sensation-prone writers, however, have not done so. Reports are classified only when they involve national security, such as the performance of military equipment (aircraft, radar, mission and location of certain installations). For example, if a UFO report had been made by the pilot of the YF12A before its existence was revealed to the public, any part of that report which might have revealed the existence of the YF12A would have been classified, but the rest (pertaining to the UFO) would be unclassified and released.