

# THE CLOTHES LINE

22 *Journal of Health Politics*

MANUSCRIPTS

102

33.310.0.050

## **KNOCK** *etc.* **etc.** *etc.*

### 2. Green and yellow

2460 J. C. 2

THE JOURNAL OF

1. *Leucosia* *leucosia* (L.) *leucosia* (L.)

2288

5 Ainslie

1. *Phragmites australis* (L.)

— 10 —

— \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* — \* —

Black-green object climbed at high speed, hovered, changed color to red and to blue. Seen by witness from San Marcos AFB.

1

UNCLASSIFIED

22 JUL 1952 14 18 Z  
1952 JUL 22 14:15 00

1. ATTACH  
2. ATTACH  
3. C. Files

ATTACH  
1952 JUL 22  
INFO

WC130

ACTION

WPC076

TYD146

PP JEDWP ZOV JEP

TDB105

VD152

WVDE330

WMX082

JWFSM 020

PP JEPHQ JEPWP JEDEN JEDST JWFGO 555

DE JWFSM 01

P 220820Z

FM CO SAN MARCOS AFB TEX

TO JEPHQ/ DIR AIR INTELLIGENCE HQ USAF WASH D C

JEPWP/ AIR TECH CENTR WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB DAYTON OHIO

INFO JEDEN/ CG ENT AFB COLORADO SPRINGS COLO

JEDST/ CG APRC SCOTT AFB ILL

JWFGO/ CG CONNALLY AFB WACO TEX

DECLASSIFIED AT 3 YEAR INTERVALS  
DOD DIR 5200.10  
DOWNGRADED AT 3 YEAR INTERVALS  
DECLASSIFIED AFTER 18 YEARS.

/ [REDACTED] / SLYOBRTT OBJECT SEEN 2240 CENTRAL STANDARD

TIME 22 JULY SKY AND VISIBILITY CLRAR. NO METEOROGICAL OBJECTS

NOTICED. SIGHTED BETWEEN MARTIN DALE AND MAXWELL TEX. FIRST

SEEN ALTITUDE 8000 FEET COLOR BLUISH GREEN. CLIMBED 14000 FEET

IN ARC VERY RAPID HOVERED THEN ~~DECLASSIFIED~~ AT ANGLE OF FORTY FIVE DEGREES

EXTREMELY FAST. COLOR WHILE DROPPING RED. HOVERED FOR ONE MINUTE

1-618-1

COLOR BLUE. FLEW SOUTH AT 5000 FEET. REPORTED BY FOUR AIR POLICE  
OF THIS BASE AND A STAFF SARGEANT FROM AIR INSPECTORS OFFICE THIS  
BASE

22/0915Z JUL JWFSM

cy/

RA000

AD783

AD782

BY SEDAL 201 202

LA0172

AB0012

20120

VOLVO

*Lt. Col. Hector Quintanilla*

*22 July 52*

**Lt. Col. Hector Quintanilla**  
**Page 5**

**4 June 1965**

**10. 25 June 1952, Japan/Korea area.**

This is not a single report but a collection of 13 radar reports which occurred in 1951 and 1952. No adequate explanation has been given by the radar expert for any of them and therefore I pass as far as any judgement as to their cause. This is one strictly for the radar experts.

**11. 22 July 1952, Maxwell, Texas.**

Evaluation as possible meteor is not tenable if object was seen to climb from 8,000 feet to 14,000 feet, then to hover, then to drop at an angle of 45 degrees, continue hovering, and fly south at 5,000 feet. It was reported by four air police and a staff sergeant. This is clearly a case which should have been followed up further. Proper classification: insufficient followup, or insufficient information.

**12. 22 July 1952, Uvalde, Texas.**

This is an interesting case, with two witnesses. Chief witness was the weather observer for Trans-Texas Airlines who was thoroughly familiar with planes, weather balloons, etc. Object covered an arc of approximately 100 degrees in 45 seconds, had no visible aerodynamic features, had a bright afterglow and a gyrating movement. No sound. Object seemed to climb higher every second and move from in front of a cumulus cloud to in back of it, thus giving some estimate of distance. Object observed in broad daylight. It is too bad that this one was not much more thoroughly investigated since there were two adult witnesses and one 14-year old witness. It must be carried as unknown. I have rated it as  $\Sigma 4$  C7.

**13. 24 July 1952, Carson Sink, Nevada.**

Sighting just three to four seconds in duration, too short a time to make any definite observations. Witnesses were two lieutenant colonels flying a B25 at 11,000 feet. In view of the fact that there were two qualified witnesses, case must be carried as unidentified (limited data).

**14. 28 December 1953, Marysville, California.**

A one-witness case. Even though observed by a fairly qualified witness it is very strange that there were no other witnesses since

MEMO FOR THE RECORD

9 July 1968

Subj: UFO Observation of 22 July 1952

I agree with Dr Hynek that the flight characteristics and duration as given certainly don't agree with those of a meteor. Possibly the evaluator had information that has since been lost. There is insufficient information now available for an analysis. To change the evaluation at this time, however, would cause an unwarranted amount of work in changing our records.

*H. C. Maynard*