1. DATE - TIME GROUP	2. LOCATION
8,9 June 65 - 08/2145Z	Turkey
3. SOURCE	**10. CONCLUSION**
Military	ELECTRONIC SIGNALS (RADAR) Insufficient Data (Visual)
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS	
One Each Time	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION	**11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS**
Not Reported	See Case: Eight returns at about one hour intervals of blips coming directly toward the radar station and disappearing as they reached the site. Visual observations reported but data not clear as to the time of the sightings. May or may not have occured in the same direction at the same time.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION	
Visual Ground-& Grnd-Radar	
7. COURSE	
SW	COMMENTS: Radar analysists regard the radar returns as most likely being caused by transmitting signals, NOT regarded as a solid object. Visual portions not clear in message. Insufficient Data.
8. PHOTOS	
XX Yes Radar Overlays ☐ No (Not Rec'd)	ADD MESSAGE: Visual observations similar to Satellite ECHO I and passed North of location. Not consistant with the radar tracks.
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE	
☐ Yes XX No	-motion westerly.

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

UNCLASSIFIED

[redacted]

L CITE DCCOT [illegible] JUNE 1965.

MSG TO ACS/I IN USAF,

[redacted]

ON 9 JUNE 1965, CHARLES W. KINNEY WAS INFORMED BY GENERAL EDILSP, CHIEF AIR DEFENSE, TAFC, THAT THE ANLATLICEL RADAR SITE NEAR ANKARA HAD OBSERVED SOME RADAR RETURNS WITH UNUSUAL CHARACTERISTICS DURING THE NIGHT OF 8-9 JUNE 65. HE STATED THAT THE TRACKS WERE OF EXTREMELY HIGH SPEED AND THAT SOME OF THE PERSONNEL AT THE RADAR SITE HAD VISUALLY SEEN THE OBJECT AS IT PASSED OVER ANKARA. CHARLES W. KINNEY VISITED THE RADAR SITE DURING THE AFTERNOON OF 9 JUNE 65 AND DISCUSSED THESE TRACKS WITH THE CONTROLLER WHO WAS ON DUTY DURING MOST

Classification Cancelled
~~(or changed to~~
Auth Director
By
Date 15 May 69
KR 205-1 Para 2-17(b)
Jan 68

[redacted]

DOWNGRADED AT 3 YEAR INTER
DECLASSIFIED AFTER 12 YEA
DOD DIR 5200.10

PAGE 2 RUQNDA 61 [redacted]

OF THE OBSERVATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL AT THE RADAR SITE. THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE INFORMATION WHICH WAS RECEIVED:

A. TYPE OF RADAR: FPS-6B

B. OPERATING FREQUENCY: 1295.7MC

[redacted]

C. TRACKS ORIGINATED AT SCOPE LIMIT WHICH IS APPROXIMATELY [illegible] NM AT INTERVALS OF APPROXIMATELY 1 HOUR, HEADING APPROXIMATELY 238 DEGREES AT SPEEDS UP TO 3000 MPH. ON THE SCOPE THE TRACKS APPEARED TO ORIGINATE BETWEEN [illegible] DEGREES - [illegible] DEGREES HEADING DIRECTLY IN TOWARD THE STATION. VISUAL SIGHTINGS PASSED NORTH OF ANKARA.

D. THE TRACKS WERE NEVER TRACKED WEST OF THE RADAR SITE ALTHOUGH VISUAL OBSERVATION SHOWED THAT IT CONTINUED IN A WESTERLY DIRECTION.

E. VISUAL DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT CAN BE SUMMARIZED AS HAVING THE SAME CHARACTERISTICS AS A VISUAL SIGHTING [illegible] OF "SCOG-1".

F. THE ORIGINAL VISUAL SIGHTING WAS REPORTED BY A GUARD WHO HAD NO KNOWLEDGE THAT THE OBJECT WAS BEING TRACKED ON RADAR.

G. A CHIEF CONTROLLER REQUESTED OTHER RADAR SITES IN TURKEY TO

Classification Can
~~(or~~
Auth
By
Date 15 May 69
AR 205-1
Para 2-17(b)
3 Jan 68

UNCLASSIFIED

MENZIFON PAPER REPORTED THAT THEY SAW THE TRACK ONE TIME.

4. ALTHOUGH THE CONTROLLER STATED THAT THE TRACK HAD BEEN OBSERVED 5 TIMES HE HAD OVERLAYS FOR THE FOLLOWING FOUR OBSERVATIONS

UNCLASSIFIED

[redacted]

PAGE 3 RUQNDH 01 [redacted]

ONLY:

8 JUNE 2141 2145Z

8 JUNE 2238 2242Z

8 JUNE 2339 2342Z

9 JUNE 0655 0758Z

2. REQUEST YOU CORRELATE THESE OBSERVATIONS WITH KNOWN ORBITING OBJECTS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT VISUAL SIGHTINGS WERE LEGITIMATE AND IN AN EFFORT TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE RADAR WAS TRACKING AN OBJECT, RECEIVING A TRANSMITTED SIGNAL OR JUST MALFUNCTIONING. ANY INFORMATION RELEASABLE TO TAF WHICH MIGHT EXPLAIN THIS PHENOMENON WILL BE APPRECIATED.

BT

UNCLASSIFIED

[redacted]

DOWNGRADED AT 12 YEARS
INDEFINITELY NOT AUTOMATICALLY
DECLASSIFIED DOD DIR 5200.10

[redacted]

M-NNWFZ51KCSRC167ZCPYA265

UNCLASSIFIED

CCN-19

RR RUCDSQ

DE RUQNDH 01 11/1255Z

R 111125Z JUN 65

FM DCCOT ANKARA TURKEY

TO RUEAHQ/HQ USAF WASHINGTON DC

1-2C

M/R: Maj Groening contacted Sgt Moody stating that FTD had been directed to reply on this message. Wanted to know if this was the proper office. Agreed that it was. Sgt Moody contacted Mr Bryant (TDEED) regarding the radar portion. He says it could not be a/c, report indicates that returns could be caused by the transmitting ~~sing~~ signal as indicated in paragraph two of the message. Did not think it was a malfunction due to the fact that eight returns were received. If a device would have triggered the information on such a device, if known to exist, would be obtainable from Mr Gould, ext 72131. Mr Bryant feels that a solid object is not the cause of the returns.

The visual portion of the sighting - No conclusions can be reached as to whether the visual observations coincide with radar returns. Sattlites are ruled out if the visual objects are consistant with the radar returns, that is if the heading is towards 230° (Southwesterly) Aircraft are also ruled out if the reported speeds are correct. In order for an evaluation of the visual sightings, additional data would be required.

Mr. Zabetakis TDCAM

MR ZABETAKIS HAS REQUESTED MORE INFORMATION, 16 JUN 65