PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 11 Dec 63	2. LOCATION McMinnville, Oregon	12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☐ Other UNIDENTIFIED ☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☒ Unknown
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local GMT 11/1500Z	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☒ Ground-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar	
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No	6. SOURCE civilian	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION ONE MIN	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS ONE	9. COURSE E AST
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING See Case File.	11. COMMENTS UNIDENTIFIED.	

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

2 December 1964

Dear [redacted]

Your recent letter to Doctor J. Allen Hynek has been forwarded to the Air Force as part of the case file on your sighting of 11 December 1963 at McMinnville, Oregon.

Since you expressed a desire to know of the final evaluation and/or disposition of the sighting, we regret to say that we are unable to provide you with an evaluation. Dr. Hynek considered the possibility of a light aircraft; however, the circumstances would not support this evaluation. Balloons do carry lights and are usually battery operated however, the motion of the object was not consistent with the evaluation of a balloon. Also, the absence of an astronomical object in that particular area rules out this as a possible evaluation.

Sincerely,

MASTON M. JACKS
Major, USAF
Chief, Pictorial Branch
Public Information Division
Office of Information

[redacted]
Linfield College
McMinnville, Oregon

HEADQUARTERS
FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

REPLY TO ATTN OF: TDEW

SUBJECT: UFO Sighting, McMinnville, Oregon, 11 Dec 63 — 25 Nov 64

TO: Hq USAF SAFOI PB
Wash D C 20330

This office has a UFO report from [redacted], Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon. As [redacted] has requested that he be informed of our evaluation the following is a suggested reply:

Dear Dean [redacted]

Your recent letter dated 12 Nov 64 to Doctor J Allen Hynek has been forwarded to the Air Force as part of the case file on your sighting of 11 Dec 63 [redacted].

Since you expressed a desire to know of the final evaluation and/or dispostion of the sighting we regret to say that we are unable to provide you with an evaluation. Doctor Hynek considered the possibility of a light aircraft, however, the circumstances would not support this evaluation. Balloons do carry lights and are usually battery operated, however, the motion of the object was not consistant with the evaluation of a balloon. Also, the absence of an astronomical object in that particular area rules out this as a possibly evaluation.

Your case has been filed as one of the few cases for which the Air Force cannot find a logical explanation. The attached statistics for 1963 indicate the small residue of those sightings which are indeed puzzling to us as well as men of science, such as yourself. The attached brochure depicts a more comprehensive picture of our project to date.

FOR THE COMMANDER

ERIC T de JONCKHEERE
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Technology
and Subsystems

YOU - THE NUCLEUS OF SECURITY!

AREA CODE 303
TEL: 635-8911
EXT: 3524

HEADQUARTERS
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
ENT AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO, 80912

SHIELD OF FREEDOM

23 Jan 64

REPLY TO ATTN OF: ADOIN

SUBJECT: UFO

TO: Foreign Technology Division
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio

The attached letter, received through the Air Force Academy, is forwarded for your information.

FOR THE COMMANDER

Ernest C. Parsonson

ERNEST C. PARSONSON
Lt Colonel, USAF
Deputy Director of Intelligence

1 Atch
Ltr fr Linfield College
dtd 6 Jan 64

Linfield College
McMINNVILLE, OREGON

January 6, 1964

UFO Investigation Office,
U. S. Air Force,
Colorado Springs, Colo.

Dear sirs:

This address has been given me as appropriate for the present report; please forward if so indicated.

As a college professor of math and astronomy I have been a skeptic regarding mysterious objects in the sky, supposing them to be optical illusions or familiar items not recognized by the observers. The attached notes of a month ago have left me without any good theory of what I saw. Perhaps they will interest someone else.

Very truly yours,

[redacted]

Dean of Faculty

Observation of December 11, 1963, 7:00 am, McMinnville, Oregon

I glanced out the bathroom window on the north side of the house and saw what appeared to be a bright star, due north, just above the horizon -- below the tallest trees and nearly central in a break among lower trees. It appeared about as bright as Jupiter. No bright star can be seen in that position from here, though Capella is visible there in summer evenings from a few degrees farther north. I guessed that it might be a nova, which could be checked by looking nearly overhead in early evening. I stepped in the next room to get my spectacles, and when I came back I thought the star might have moved slightly. While I watched it, it began to move perceptibly to the right, parallel to the horizon, just above the lower trees. It went dim, then flashed very brightly as if a window had reflected the sun. It picked up speed, moving certainly faster than the familiar visible satellites, but getting dimmer and dimmer. I could barely see it when it disappeared behind a taller tree after perhaps ten or fifteen seconds of motion, and I never saw it beyond the tree. The period of apparent motionless position was perhaps 30 to 60 seconds, the period of motion 15 seconds, the length of motion 5 to 10 degrees along the horizon.

The time of sunrise this day, locally, was about 7:40. The estimated angle of the sun below the horizon at 7:00 would be 7 to 8 degrees. For an object to reflect sunlight it would have to be about 30-40 miles above the earth. This, as well as the apparent speed, would rule out aircraft; so would the hovering effect during the first period of time. No earth satellite could display the same combination of apparent motionlessness followed by rapid lateral movement.

If an object were 30-40 miles aloft and visible just over the horizon from here, it would have to be at least a hundred miles away. At that distance the lateral speed of 5 degrees in 15 seconds would work out at about 2400 mph. This would rule out free-floating objects such as weather balloons. Greater distance, hight and speed combinations would also be consistent with the observation, but I don't know of any object that would offer a reasonable explanation.

If the object were self-illuminated instead of reflecting, it could have been much nearer and slower. One might think of a helicopter, but the very bright star-like quality of the staticnary period is improbable.

Evergreen Helicopter Service reports no copters were out at that time from the McMinnville airport.

[redacted]
Linfield College

11 Dec 1963

FTD (TDEW)
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
2 Mar 64

Dr J Allen Hynek
[redacted]
Evanston, Illinois

Dear Allen,

Reference the attached sighting of [redacted], Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon. It seems as though a reply is in order to [redacted]. Could you help us with this matter.

We have received the weather data from the Rome, Italy sighting of 20 - 22 August 1963. This was one of the four cases carried as pending. Our initial evaluation was a mirage or refraction of some sort. However, in the additional information, the observer indicates that the object passed over his car. I am enclosing a translation of the additional information. Also, a reply to Mr [redacted] is in order. We are attaching the initial report for your convenience.

Sincerely,

DAVID N MOODY
TSgt, USAF

5 November 1964

[redacted]
Linfield College
McMinnville, Oregon

Dear [redacted]:

This letter may come as a surprise to you, and indeed a belated surprise. It is actually an answer to your letter of January 6 to the "UFO Investigation Office" of the U. S. Air Force. Although the letter was transmitted to me much earlier this year, extensive travels and an inevitable misplacing of correspondence has caused this delay.

For a number of years, I have acted as consultant to the Air Force on unidentified aerial sightings. The continued flow of reports (and I stress the word reports) continues to puzzle me, especially those reports such as you made. Particularly interesting to me is the stature of many of those who make reports of unexplained sightings. It is indeed an interesting selection factor: the poorer reports and the reports of misinterpreted objects come more frequently from untrained and less critical people than the "good" reports. That is, highly trained people can generally solve the "easy" cases themselves and hence do not report them.

Be that all as it may, I have been unable to come up with any solution to your sightings of December 11, 1963, at 7:00 A. M., and I wonder whether, after all this passage of time, you may have had some afterthoughts or clues to the nature of the original stimulus.

One is tempted to suggest that you saw the landing light of an aircraft, its stationary phase occasioned by its coming directly toward you, and its lateral motion along the horizon by its making a turn. However, in that case, the light should have dimmed appreciably. You do mention that it did get dimmer and dimmer. Did the dimness correspond to the start of its lateral motion? Or, was there any chance that a brightly lighted weather balloon had been launched from the local airport and came toward you for a while and then caught a change of wind and proceeded laterally? One standard candle at one mile appears as bright as Polaris, and to be as bright as Jupiter all that would be required would be to have a light less than one hundred candle power.

I would appreciate your thoughts on this matter even though the incident occurred nearly a year ago. The Air Force still lists it as an unidentified sighting, but if you feel that there is no compelling reason to believe that it could not have been an aircraft landing light or a lighted balloon, we might be able to list it as possibly belonging to that category and take it out of the vexing unidentified column. Is the McMinnville Airport to the north of you? Better yet, is it to the northeast of you? In that case, the plane might have been in its landing pattern, coming towards you directly for a bit and then turning toward the landing strip.

In any event, I do hope to hear from you at your convenience. I am all of the reports we got at Wright Field were as factual as yours was.

Sincerely yours,

J. Allen Hynek

JAH:krf

Linfield College

McMINNVILLE, OREGON

November 12, 1964

Mr. J. Allen Hynek,
Dearborn Observatory,
Northwestern University,
Evanston, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Hynek:

Your letter of 5 November is much appreciated and the more so since I had concluded that my report had probably gone into the same bin with all the other odd-ball sightings! Time is no object, but it occurs to me that if you write as carefully to everyone as you have to me there is little wonder you run several months behind.

I have had to refer to my original notes to renew my impressions of last December in order to answer your inquiry about a possible airplane with landing lights. The local airport has no regularly scheduled service; it does have a moderate amount of activity in private planes and irregular visitors, but the [illegible] Air. When I called the office to ask about helicopter [illegible] didn't ask directly about aircraft of any other kind. [illegible] such information was [illegible]ered. As for position, [illegible] is about two miles east of my house. The object [illegible] hardly have been [illegible] directly for it at the [illegible] the sighting, but might have been too far removed.

The features that made me rule out conventional aircraft at the time (so that I didn't even ask the airport people) were these: (1) the length of the apparent stay period was long enough to require an extraordinary degree of alignment, and I noticed no change in brightness that would suggest its continuous approach; (2) there was no signal colored running lights or a flashing light such as one usually sees; (3) if it made a right-angled turn the landing lights would hardly be visible at [illegible]; (4) the bright flash I saw is hardly to be explained [illegible] manner.

I think it [illegible] that this is the most [illegible] source among obvious possibilities, but I could not make it fit what I saw. As for a balloon, I never heard of one at the local airport, and the wind is almost never from the east. [illegible] the problem of reflection too, as described in my memo. [illegible] balloons ever self-lighted? I didn't know it, but in any case the motion rules out a local source. -- Just for my own curiosity, I hope you'll let me know how you finally file the thing!

Cordially yours,

[redacted]