PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 24 Jun 47	2. LOCATION Portland, Oregon
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION UNIDENTIFIED
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS Five or Six	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 45-60 seconds	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS Round object with tail, about 30 ft in diameter. About five or six objects banking in the sun, had no particular formation. Source stated that the needle on a compass wavered from side to side while the objects were in sight. No sound.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	
7. COURSE SE	
8. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐ Yes ☒ No	

FORM
FTD SEP 63 0-329 (TDE) Previous editions of this form may be used.

Incident No. 68 — 24 June 1947, Daytime, Cascade Mountains, Washington. A prospector reported sighting five or six round objects with tails, 1000 ft overhead, heading S.E., and banking in the sun. The objects were in sight 45-60 seconds, and alleged to be thirty feet in diameter. They made no noise. While the objects were within sight, the observers compass fluctuated wildly. He states that he read of a former sighting (incident No. 17) also occurring on 24 June 1947, and submitted this report solely to add credence to the person who provided that story. While there appears to be an attempt on the part of the observer to infer that these objects were possibly the same as those reported in (incident No. 17), there are several major differences, notably as Dr. Hynek points out (app.B), that these objects had tails, and that the inferred size, as determined from the estimated distance, is quite different. Dr. Valley (App D) has pointed out and Dr. Hynek concurred that it is difficult to take seriously the peculiar action of the compass for this would imply fantastically large magnetic fields.

AIC Opinion: From the limited evidence submitted, it is impossible to reach a definite conclusion. However, two possible psychological factors are readily apparent; one, the observer stated he submitted this report solely because he had read several days following his observation of another sighting. Therefore, he very likely either consciously or inadvertently may have attempted to conform his report to that recounted in the newspaper; and two, he colored his report with inference of huge magnetic fields, as to the implications of which he was obviously uninformed.

UNE 24, 1947 CASCADE MOUNTAINS, WASHINGTON (KEYHOE-1950 P 24) 1 WITNESS 00
A PORTLAND PROSPECTOR NAMED [redacted]ON, WHO WAS WORKING UP IN THE CASCADE 01
OUNTAINS, REPORTED FIVE OR SIX DISK-SHAPED OBJECTS BANKING IN THE SUN. HE 02
ATCHED THEM THROUGH HIS TELESCOPE SEVERAL SECONDS. THEN HE SUDDENLY NOTICED 03
HAT THE COMPASS HAND ON HIS SPECIAL WATCH WAS WEAVING WILDLY FROM SIDE TO 04
IDE. (JOHNSON INSISTED HE HAD NOT HEARD OF THE FAMOUS REPORT ON THIS SAME 05
AY, BY [redacted] (Q.V.), WHICH WAS NOT BROADCAST UNTIL EARLY EVENING.) 06
********** 07

Incident #68 -- Portland, Oregon -- 24 June 1947

There is no astronomical explanation for this incident, which should be considered together with the Kenneth Arnold case (#17), which occurred on the same day, and in which similar discoid objects were observed. (The present objects appeared to have tails, however; another major difference between this and the Arnold incident is the inferred size of the objects, as determined from the estimated distance.)

It is difficult to take seriously the peculiar action of the compass, for this would imply fantastically large magnetic fields.

[redacted]

METHOD II. Direct use of Earth's Magnetic Field.

One observ (incident 68) noticed a viole motion of a hand-held compass. If we assume from this that the objects produced a magnetic field, comparable with the Earth's field, namely 0.1 gauss, and that the observer found that the object subtended an angle θ at his position, then the ampereturns of the required electromagnet is given by

$ni = \frac{30\ R}{\theta^2}$ where R is the range of the object.

For instance, if R is one kilometer and the object is 10 meters in diameter, then ni = 1 billion ampere-turns.

Now if the object were actually only 10 meters away and were correspondingly smaller, namely 10 cm in diameter, it would still require 10 million ampere-turns.

These figures are a little in excess of what can be conveniently done on the ground. They make it seem unlikely that the effect was actually observed.

Now the Earth's magnetic field would react on such a magnet to produce not only a torque but also a force. This force depends not directly on the Earth's field intensity but on its irregularity or gradient. This force is obviously minute since the change in field over a distance of 10 meters (assumed diameter of the object) is scarcely measurable - moreover the gradient is not predictable but changes due to local ore deposits. Thus even if the effect were large enough to use it would still be unreliable and unpredictable.

APPENDIX D

Dr. G. E. Valley

Some Considerations Affecting the Interpretation of Reports of Unidentified Flying Objects

UNCLASSIFIED

CHECK-LIST — UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Date 24 June 47
2. Time afternoon
3. Location Pendleton, Ore. Portland, Oregon
4. Name of observer [redacted]
5. Occupation of observer Prospector
6. Address of observer [redacted] Portland
7. Place of observation Pendleton, Ore.
8. Number of objects 5 or 6
9. Distance of object from observer approximately at 1,000 ft.
10. Time in sight 45 - 60 seconds
11. Altitude 6,000 ft above sea level
12. Speed N/S
13. Direction of flight N/S
14. Tactics Weaving
15. Sound None
16. Size about 30' dia.
17. Color N/S
18. Shape Crescent with tail
19. Odor detected N/S
20. Apparent construction N/S
21. Exhaust trails N/S
22. Weather conditions Clear
23. Effect on clouds N/S
24. Sketches or photographs None
25. Manner of disappearance N/S
26. Remarks (over)

UNCLASSIFIED

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

With 194 incidents thus eliminated, there remain thirty-four which contain some evidence but have no apparent ready explanation. This statement is true only under the assumption that the evidence is accepted as reliable and accurate. When psychological and physiological factors are taken into consideration, all of these incidents can be explained rationally, as pointed out by Rand Corporation and Air Plots of Air Material Command Aero-Medical Laboratory (see Appendix "H").

Air Material Command Aero-Medical Laboratory (Dr. Paul M.

212 Incidents considered)

There are sufficient psychological explanations for the reporting of unidentified flying objects to provide plausible explanations for reports not otherwise explainable. These errors in identifying real stimuli result chiefly from inability to estimate speed, distance, and size.

All of the remaining 34 incidents are treated in detail in this report. These incidents form no pattern in regard to area of sighting, type of object, or manner of performance. There are indications, however, that some sightings were influenced by earlier reports, and probably would not have been considered unusual or reported had there been no publicity.

APPENDIX I

Project Grudge

Summary of ATIC Evaluation of Remaining Reports

VII. Summary of ATIC Evaluation of Remaining Reports

The remaining unexplained incidents (see Appendix "I") exhibited four common characteristics. Two of them, by statements of the reporters, would not have been made had the witnesses not read of the Mt. Rainier incident (Incident No. 17). Most were distributed without pattern throughout the United States. A few were outside the U. S. No two descriptions of appearance or performance were exactly alike. The reported sightings occurred at various times of day and year.

APPENDIX I

In the following sections of this report, each remaining unexplained incident is considered separately. It is not the intent to generally discredit the character of observers, but each case has undesirable elements, and these cannot be disregarded. The numerical designation is merely the categorical order of the incident in the project files.

1, 10, 17, 21, 29, 35, 37, 40, 51, 58, 62, 64, 68, 71, 75, 76, 77, 79, 84,

111, 122, 134, 135, 151, 152, 154, 162, 168, 176, 183, 186, 193, 207, 215, 235.

[redacted]

Incident #74 -- cancelled -- see #68

[redacted]

Dr HYNEK'S EVALUATIONS EXTRACTED FROM PROJECT GRUDGE REPORT.

INCIDENT INDEX

1. Astronomical

a. High probability:
#26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 48, 49, 59, 60, 66, 69, 70, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116, 119, 132, 136, 140, 147, 148, 158, 174, 184, 185, 187, 197, 203, 204, 208, 216, 219, 238.

b. Fair or low probability:
#19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 35, 36, 46, 50, 63, 67, 80, 82, 93, 100, 112, 120, 121, 129, 130, 144, 153, 165, 166, 167, 175, 192, 199, 202, 205, 220, 230, 240.

2. Non-astronomical but suggestive of other explanations

a. Balloons or ordinary aircraft:
#3, 11, 22, 41, 42, 53, 54, 73, 81, 83, 91, 92, 113, 114, 115, 126, 131, 138, 141, 145, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 163, 169, 171, 173, 178, 180, 182, 188, 190, 194, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 209, 210, 217, 222, 235, 237, 239.

b. Rockets, flares or falling bodies:
#4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25, 56, 65, 78, 106, 107, 108, 109, 133, 170, 211, 218.

c. Miscellaneous (reflections, auroral streamers, birds, etc.):
#39, 89, 123, 124, 128, 146, 164, 181, 189, 214, 221, 231, 234.

3. Non-astronomical, with no explanation evident

a. Lack of evidence precludes explanation:
#38, 44, 45, 47, 55, 57, 72, 86, 87, 88, 90, 99, 110, 117, 118, 125, 127, 137, 139, 149, 150, 177, 179, 191, 206, 212, 213, 229, 232, 233.

b. Evidence offered suggests no explanation:
#1, 2, 10, 17, 21, 29, 37, 40, 51, 52, 58, 61, 62, 64, 68, 71, 75, 76, 77, 79, 84, 105, 111, 122, 135, 151, 152, 154, 162, 168, 172, 176, 183, 186, 193, 207, 215, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 236, 241, 242, 243, 244, 134.