PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 27 June [illegible]	2. LOCATION 19[illegible] 172[illegible] 1 mi[illegible]
3. SOURCE Civil[illegible]n	10. CONCLUSION Unidentified
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS one	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION several minutes	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS Observer watched a cloud grow to about the size of a golf ball held at arm's length. The strange thing about the cloud was the flashing light at its center. The cloud continued to expand with the white flashing light located within the cloud. After several minutes the flashing light moved southward from the cloud and was lost from view shortly afterwards. A study of the submitted information did not reveal a logical explanation. The case is being carried as unidentified by the AirForce.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground Visual	
7. COURSE basically Stationary	
8. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐ Yes ☒ No	

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

27 June 66

Proposed reply to letter from [redacted], 11 November 1966

Dear Mr. [redacted]

Reference your recent letter regarding your 27 June 1966 observation. As you most certainly implied in your letter it was a most extraordinary sighting. To date, we have been unable to reach a definite explanation.

Dr. Hynek, Air Force consultant to Project Blue Book, has studied the case and can offer no conclusive explanation. It was a quite interesting observation and the case is being carried as unidentified since no definite explanation is apparent.

In Safe 19 Jan 67

[redacted]
Seminole Florida 33540
11 Nov 66

FTD (TDETR)
Project Blue Book
Wright-Patterson AFB

Dear Sirs:

During the months following my UFO sighting of this past summer (S/S Mount Vernon Victory, 19N 172E, 27 June 66) I have waded through some thousands of pages of UFO-lore. As a result of this digging I have come to realize that the Mount Vernon Victory sighting was rather extraordinary - or at least unusual - as to type.

Enclosing a self-addressed card. Would you reveal to me the category (in terms of reliability) under which this report was filed following evaluation?

Many thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540

US AIR MAIL

6¢

[redacted]
Seminole Florida 33540

BB 11 Nov 66
SELF ADDRESSED REPLY CARD

[redacted]
SEMINOLE FLORIDA 33540

- - - -

S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY
AT SEA, 19 NORTH 172 EAST
27 JUNE 66

MICAP
WASHDC

DEAR SIRS:

AT ABOUT 0400 THIS MORNING I WAS AWAKENED BY WATCH OFFICER DONALD ROMINGER, ALERTING ME TO A UFO SIGHTING. MR ROMINGER HAD PREVIOUSLY NOTICED A COPY OF THE UFO INVESTIGATOR IN THE RADIOROOM AND HAD INFERRED FROM THAT MY INTEREST IN UFO'S.

ABOUT FIVE HOURS EARLIER I HAD COMPLETED RE-READING THE LAST THREE ISSUES OF THE UFO INVESTIGATOR, INCLUDING THE ACCOUNT OF THE 16 DEC 65 SIGHTING BY THE BRITISH S/S CARL SCHMEDEMAN. HAVING THUS GONE TO SLEEP WITH THE SCHMEDEMAN INCIDENT REFRESHED IN MY MIND AND HAVING BEEN AWAKENED TO WITNESS A SIMILAR SIGHTING A SHORT TIME LATER, I BELIEVE I MAY FOR THAT REASON HAVE NOTICED A CERTAIN CHARACTERISTIC OF THE "SCHMEDEMAN CLOUD" WHICH I MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE HAVE NOTICED IN THE EXCITEMENT OF THIS FIRST SIGHTING.

BY THE TIME OF MY ARRIVAL ON THE BRIDGE, THE CLOUD HAD GROWN TO THE APPARENT SIZE OF A GOLF BALL HELD AT ARM'S LENGTH AND WAS MOVING EITHER UPWARD OR TOWARD THE SHIP OR BOTH. ITS POSITION AT THAT TIME WAS APPROXIMATELY DEAD AHEAD (SHIP HEADED ABOUT DUE EAST) WITH AN ELEVATION OF PERHAPS TEN DEGREES. FROM THAT TIME UNTIL THE CLOUD BECAME TEMPORARILY OBSCURED BY A "REAL" CLOUD SOME FEW MINUTES LATER, BY WHICH TIME IT HAD REACHED AN ELEVATION OF PERHAPS 40 DEGREES AND WAS ABOUT 20 DEGREES TO STARBOARD, I DID NOT NOTICE ANY OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS BEYOND ITS LUMINESCENCE, GROWTH, AND MOVEMENT, AND OF COUESE THE FLASHING LIGHT AT ITS CENTER. ON COMING BACK INTO VIEW TWO OR THREE MINUTES LATER, IT HAD BY THAT TIME ASSUMED THE RELATIVE SIZE OF A SIX-INCH BALL AT ARM'S LENGTH, HAD THINNED OUT AND PERMITTED STARS TO BE SEEN THROUGH IT. THE WHITE FLASHING LIGHT WAS AT THIS TIME STILL LOCATED WITHIN THE EXPANDING CLOUD.

IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT AN INTERESTING FACT BECAME APPARENT. MOST OF THE PERIMETER OF THE LOWER RIGHT-HAND QUADRANT OF THE CLOUD WAS VISIBLE. VIEWING THROUGH EX3[illegible] CLASSES, I WAS STRUCK BY THE PERFECT ROUNDNESS OF THIS SHARPLY DEFINED LINE, AND THOUGHT IMMEDIATELY HOW THIS MIGHT RESEMBLE A SHOCK WAVE RADIATING FROM A POINT SOURCE. (THIS IS BY NO MEANS A SPECULATION ON THE NATURE OF THE BEAST: I AM SIMPLY GROPING FOR A WAY OF MOST ACCURATELY CONVEYING WHAT I SAW). RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS IMPRESSION WAS THE FACT OF ROUNDNESS, THE FACT OF HIGH CONTRAST ALONG THE LEADING EDGE OF THE EXPANDING CLOUD, AND THE FACT OF VERY RAPIDLY DIMINISHING INTENSITY FROM THE BACK EDGE TOWARD THE EPICENTER.

I BELIEVE AN X-RAY PROJECTION OF A 6-INCH HOLLOW SHERE WITH AN 1/8-INCH SURFACE THICKNESS WOULD REPRODUCE A PICTURE OF WHAT I AM TRYING TO DESCRIBE. THIS WOULD BE QUITE DIFFERENT FROM AN X-RAY OF A SOLID HOMOGENEOUS BALL, WHOSE PROJECTION WOULD SHOW INCREASING DENSITY TOWARD THE CENTER, AND IT IS THIS DIFFERENCE WHICH I WISH TO CONVEY.

I WISH I COULD SAY THAT ALL QUADRANTS NEATLY FITTED THIS DESCRIPTION, BUT THIS IS NOT SO. MOST OF THE UPPER SEMICIRCLE WAS UNOBSCURED AT THIS TIME, AND SEEMED FREELY TO BLEND GRADUALLY INTO THE DARK BACKGROUND. AT ABOUT THIS TIME THE FLASHING LIGHT, WHICH I SAW ONLY AS A FLASHING LIGHT AND WITHOUT FORM, ACCELERATED SOUTHWARD FROM ITS CLOUD AND WAS LOST FROM MY VIEW SHORTLY AFTERWARD.

I HAVE AVOIDED DISCUSSING THIS SIGHTING WITH ANYONE UNTIL AFTER WRITING THIS LETTER IN ORDER THAT MY ORIGINAL IMPRESSIONS WOULD NOT BE CHANGED, BEING AWARE THAT IMPRESSIONS CAN BE ALTERED RETROACTIVELY, UNCONSCIOUSLY, WITHOUT EFFORT OR INTENT.

I THINK MR ROMINGER WILL WANT TO WRITE YOU. IF NOT, I WILL URGE HIM TO DO SO AS THIS LETTER HAS HAD TO DO MAINLY WITH ONLY ONE ASPECT OF THE SIGHTING.

YOURS TRULY,

[redacted]
RADIO OFFICER,
S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY,
U.S. REG. #284178

S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY
AT SEA, 28 JUNE 66

NICAP
WASHDC

SIRS:

WITH REFERENCE TO MY ENCLOSED SIGHTING REPORT AND ALSO THE 16 NOV 65 S/S SCHNEIDERMAN REPORT (VOL III, NO 6):

I FEEL SOMEWHAT FOOLISH OFFERING THE FOLLOWING TO NICAP IN VIEW OF THE EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE YOU MUST HAVE IN THIS FIELD, BUT YOUR SCHNEIDERMAN ACCOUNT DOES HINT OF YOUR NEGLECT TO CONSIDER SOME OF WHAT FOLLOWS.

IF A BODY ENTERS THE ATMOSPHERE AT A SUFFICIENTLY SHALLOW ANGLE, AND

IF IT CONTINUES LOSING ALTITUDE, AND

IF THE OBSERVER IS AT A SUFFICIENTLY LOW ALTITUDE, AND

IF THE SIGHTING IS DISCONTINUED PRIOR TO THE ARRIVAL OF THE BODY AT AN OVERHEAD POSITION, AND

IF THE TRAJECTORY, WHEN EXTENDED, FALLS BEHIND THE OBSERVER,

THEN THIS CONTINUALLY FALLING BODY WILL APPEAR TO THE OBSERVER AS A CONTINUALLY RISING BODY.

YOU STATE (REF S/S SCHNEIDERMAN) "POSSIBLY THE INITIAL 'CLOUD' EFFECT WAS INCIDENTAL TO THE LAUNCHING, BUT THE EXPANSION INTO A LARGER, GLOWING MASS IS A PUZZLING FACTOR." I OFFER THIS: THAT THE S/S SCHNEIDERMAN AND S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY CLOUDS WERE NOT THE EXPANDING CLOUDS THEY APPEARED TO BE, BUT RATHER INCREASED IN APPARENT SIZE WITH INCREASING PROXIMITY. AT FIRST SIGHTING THE 6/27 UFO WAS ON THE HORIZON AND, I SPECULATE, MANY MILES HIGH AND MANY MILES BEHIND THE FLIGHT-PATH HORIZON, WHILE AT TERMINATION THE CLOUD WAS PERHAPS A VERY FEW MILES AWAY AT MOST. THIS IS A CONSIDERABLE RANGE RATIO, AND THE APPARENT EXPANSION WOULD NECESSARILY FOLLOW THE SAME RATIO. RATHER THAN VIEW THE CLOUD AS ~~AS~~ EXPANDING AND "INCIDENTAL TO THE LAUNCHING", THE FOREGOING WOULD PERMIT IT TO BE CONSIDERED IN STRAIGHTFORWARD FASHION AS A SHOCK FRONT, LUMINOUS THROUGH IONIZATION.

BEARING IN MIND THAT THE MID-AIR TERMINATION OF THE 6/27 TRAJECTORY WAS SEEN AT AN ANGLE CONSIDERABLY REMOVED FROM THAT OF THE TRAJECTORY ITSELF, THE SHOCK-WAVE VIEW WOULD THEN ALSO SERVE TO EXPLAIN THE LACK OF SYMMETRY NOTED IN MY REPORT." I SHOULD NOTE HERE THAT THE HIGH CONTRAST LINE SEEN AT THIS TIME WAS NOT SEEN AT ANY POINT WITH RESPECT TO THE UFO (UNTIL AFTER "SEPARATION") THAT SUGGESTED IT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A SHOCK LINE.

DR ROHTAKER HAS OFFERED TWO SUGGESTIONS: THAT THE VERTICAL PORTION OF THE DISSYMMETRY MIGHT BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE HIGHER MOISTURE OR OTHER CONTENT OF THE LOWER AIR (AS A CONSIDERABLE VERTICAL SPAN SEEMED LIKELY) AND THAT A CLUE TO THE SPACING BETWEEN THE UFO AND THE SHOCK FRONT MIGHT BE FOUND IN A RECENT RELEASE IN THE SCIENCE JOURNAL (LONDON), MAY '66, P. 9, "MAGNETIC CONTROL FOR RE-ENTRY". NOT TOO MUCH IMAGINATION WOULD SUGGEST THAT T WITH HIGH FIELDS (EVEN ENORMOUSLY GREATER THAN THE 540 KILOGAUSS MOMENTARY FIELDS DESCRIBED ELSEWHERE IN THE SAME ISSUE) MIGHT PROVIDE A MEANS FOR KEEPING A SHOCK WAVE A VERY CONSIDERABLE DISTANCE AHEAD OF THE BODY PRODUCING IT. THIS, IF APPLIED TO THE 6/27 SIGHTING, WOULD PERMIT THE ROUNDED LINE TO BE SEEN AS THE EXPECTED PHENOMENON RATHER THAN, IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH INFLUENCE, A V WITH ITS APEX IN CONTACT T WITH THE GENERATING BODY.

THIS LEAVES DE QUESTION OF THE LINGERING AND DRIFTING LUMINESCENT CLOUD FOLLOWING "SEPARATION". IN THIS CONNECTION IT MIGHT BE NOTED THAT UPPER-ATMOSPHERE IONIZATION, AS TAKES PLACE DAILY THROUGH SOLAR RADIATION, IS NOT EXTINGUISHED IMMEDIATELY AT SUNDOWN BUT TENDS TO LINGER, DIMINISHING GRADUALLY OVER A PERIOD OF HOURS.

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THESE VARIOUS THINGS, A UFO EMERGING FROM A GLOWING, EXPANDING CLOUD SEEMS VERY MUCH LESS THAN ABSURD.

YOURS TRULY,

[redacted]

Send To May-R.?

14 December 1966

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540

Dear Mr. [redacted]

Major Quintanilla has forwarded the correspondence concerning your sighting to the Dearborn Observatory, asking us to see what ideas we may be able to come up with.

I cannot give any positive identification of what you saw, but there are some possibilities that you may wish to consider. Since this was not a solid object seen at close range from several different angles by many witnesses, as is the case in our most puzzling sightings, we would not be able to say with any certainty that what you say was an unknown object (that is, something definitely different from a human or natural phenomenon); the closest we might come to that would be to say that you saw something very striking, but which bears enough resemblance to known phenomena that we cannot call it a "grade A UFO".

Last summer and fall, I had occasion to investigate a large number of sightings in the Midwest. The observers reported a rapidly expanding ball of light (about a thrid of the witnesses interpreted the expansion as an approach) which grew in size until it was some four times larger than the apparent size of the full moon. Its edges were sharp nearly all the way around except for one sector where the light faded away gradually. At one point in the event, swirling blue and green lights were seen within the object. After an initial expansion lasting perhaps fifteen seconds, the object turned silvery and persisted for another half hour, during which it faded and became progressively more indistinct. It also moved slowly to the west. Finally it became very dim and assumed the shape of a column or streak, like the beam of a searchlight, and stars could be seen through it.

Before the final fading away, a bright spark was seen at the approximate center of the object, which moved rapidly to the east for perhaps ten degrees of arc, and then blossomed into an exactly similar display. All todd, something was visible for two hours.

Five of the people who interpreted the rapid expansion as an approach were commercial or military pilots, in the air at the time. They felt

that the object rushed at them, and then turned and followed their airplanes, pacing them for between five and twenty minutes, and then veered off, as the change of shape began. One of these pilots contacted an approach-control radar station, without telling why he was asking for information, and was told that there was indeed traffic moving toward him some 12 miles away, and which had turned to a parallel course.

All of the pilots were mistaken, without any possibility of doubt. The same phenomenon was seen at precisely the same time (within a few minutes) by observers scattered between Rockford, Illinois, and northern North Dakota. I have letters and interviews from over 60 people who watched the display, and all of their descriptions match those of the pilots in every respect (size, expansion, color, form) except for the interpretation of approach. Lines of sight drawn on a map from the position of each observer converge to an area in north central Canada, some 500 to 1000 miles away from the various observers.

We have now found out that at exactly the median time given by the witnesses, the first of two consecutive releases of clouds of barium took place, 250 miles above Ft. Churchill on Hudson's bay. Two releases took place a few minutes apart. The results were photographed, and the photographs match perfectly the pictures drawn by several witnesses, including one of the pilots. We contacted the radar station involved in the one sighting, and found that nothing unusual was seen on radar that night - the operator who had been on duty didn't even recall the specific pilot's request. There is so much air traffic in that area (near Milwaukee, Wisconsin) that we cannot doubt that the supposed radar observation was a coincidence. One would have to reach very far to say that one pilot happened to see a spectacular UFO which just happened to match the description of the barium cloud released by the rockets, at the same moment, and in the same direction.

I presume that you have watched launchings from Cape Kennedy, on television or live: have you ever noticed what happens to the exhaust from the rocket when the booster gets well out of the denser atmosphere? Instead of producing a long tail, the exhaust gases spread into a wider and wider cone, and when a near-vacuum is reached, the cone flattens to a disc which then actually curls forward and forms a ball around the whole body of the rocket, moving, of course, with it. This ball is luminous, and expands with altitude. The rocket motor, still firing, is seen as a brilliant light at the center of the ball, when the point of view is behind the direction of acceleration.

The area of the Pacific where your sighting took place is known to be used for rocket experiments, both from this country and from others. There was, as you note, a rocket launched near the right time, only 110 degrees of longitude from your position, but I don't know anything about its trajectory. You were well within range of launching facilities all over the Pacific, including Vandenburg AFB in California.

I can't account for the flashing white light in the center of the object, although I can guess what it might have been (a marker for optical acquisition of the center of the explosion). Departure of the white object suggests a most interesting type of experiment, and also suggests that one would have a very bad time getting any information about it from the military!

I think that there is convincing, if indirect, evidence that what you saw was an explosion, or at least a shock-wave-limited expansion, of gas, in outer space. The symmetry rules out motion through the atmosphere, as does the long duration of the gas cloud. Since the object was moving (relative to the ship's 20 mph speed, at any rate) it must have been moving in a vacuum, in order to retain its shape.

As I said, we can't positively identify what you saw, but I think you will agree that what you saw could be reproduced by several known phenomena, and so we would be unjustified in concluding that a space ship from somewhere else was involved (or a poltergeist at high altitude).

Concerning your other remarks, I don't know where you get your information about gravitic research, but it isn't correct. Inertial mass exists regardless of gravitational fields - think what would happen to orbital calculations if it didn't! And how could we so accurately predict the paths of comets, which travel at aphelion in regions where the sun's gravitational field is down to a billionth of its value at perihelion, if the equations using inertial mass as constant were wrong? Nobody has ever succeeded in producing even the slightest artificial gravitational effect, the slightest shielding effect, or in fact any influence whatsoever on gravitation: newspaper, magazine, and UFO journal articles which have hinted at this having been done in some "secret laboratory" are just making noises - they don't know what they are talking about.

The Gallup Poll revealed that five million people have seen something in the sky which they would call a UFO (the wording of the question). I take that more as an indication of the appalling level of ignorance that prevails in this country, which I have seen first hand on many occasions. I have had dozens of witnesses go outdoors with me and point out their UFO, which was a twinkling star, or a planet, or even a lousy airplane. I mean ordinary, solid citizens, too, not imbeciles or psychotics. Judging from experience and knowledge of UFO reports in the Air Force files and in other hands (such as Jacques Vallee's far more impressive files), I would guess that perhaps 100,000 people in the <u>whole world</u> have seen something which would make an educated man even look twice; of these, there are certainly no more than 2000 to 3000 which merit any serious attention. I would place yours, incidentally, in this last category, since it was definitely a striking and unusual phenomenon, not something ordinary misinterpreted out of ignorance.

FTD (TDETR) hl
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433
24 August 1966

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540

Dear Mr. [redacted]

I appreciated learning of your most exciting experience. It must have been a truly fantastic observation.

I depict disbelief on your behalf concerning the validity of information released on UFO investigations by the Air Force. Speaking as Chief of Project Blue Book, I know of no reluctance on my part to share what knowledge I possess with the general public.

NICAP is in no way associated with the USAF or any agency of the U. S. Government. NICAP is a privately owned UFO investigating group and has no relationship with Project Blue Book.

Again, I want to thank you for reporting to the Air Force your most unusual observation. The information you furnished has been forwarded to meteorological experts for their evaluation. If these gentlemen cannot determine the cause of your observation, then we will submit your case file to some upper air research physicist for their evaluation.

Sincerely,

HECTOR QUINTANILLA, Jr, Major, USAF
Chief, Project Blue Book

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
IDEA
Office of Record

we are dealing with, and that some day we will solve it. I don't care how it comes out, just as long as we don't make fools of each other by making a lot of wild guesses before anybody knows anything worth talking about.

Yours truly,

[redacted]

WTP:lh

I happen to agree with you that the Air Force could have done a better job in the past; I have disagreed even with the present Blue Book people (who are doing a better job than most of their predecessors) and I expect to disagree in the future, since they don't tell me what to say or not to say and since I wouldn't dream of working for them as a very occasional consultant if they did. The Blue Book people and I are just ordinary people, working on a puzzling problem, and trying not to be subjected to snow jobs by the many people who would like to try doing just that. Major Quintanilla doesn't happen to think that there is any mystery behind the UFO phenomenon, while I think that there is probably something of scientific interest, even, just possibly, spaceships. That doesn't mean that he's wrong and I'm right - it just means that as in most of the affairs of life people don't agree on every aspect of every problem. I have no intention of trying to bully Quintanilla into taking my point of view, and he would never make an attempt to do the same to me. What he does expect of me is that whatever I have to say on the problem be constructive and rational, and that if I have any criticisms, I come up with recommendations that are reasonable, possible, and well-thought-out.

Where on earth did you get the idea that 50 million dollars was ever spent to investigate UFO's? Blue Book consists of four (count'em, four) people: the Major, Lt. Marley, a secretary, and an airman. Maybe like many others you have an imaginary picture of something like NORAD headquarters, with rows of teletypes and computers, and a big plotting board down at one end, and dim blue lights. It ain't so, and never has been. Blue Book is a very tiny operation, as operations in the Air Force go. Once you understand that, you will see the importance of the fact that the Pentagon has given $3000,000 to the University of Colorado to conduct an independent study of the whole problem, with no strings attached. That much money would run Blue Book for five years. In other words, the Air Force has been convinced, through the efforts of many people including their own scientists, that it is time to look at the whole phenomenon and see what if anything needs to be done. It couldn't have been done before now - give or take a couple of years. We just haven't known enough about the phenomenon even to guess how to approach it, until a few people out of the thousands of clamoring enthusiasts actually did some hard work, and made some statistical studies of reports from all over the world, and showed how one might go about studying this phenomenon in a meaningful way. People are always eager to demand to know why "somebody" doesn't do something: it rarely occurs to them to do it themselves, since a lot of effort and time is involved.

This has been a long letter - I hope that somewhere in it you find what you were looking for. I have no solutions to the UFO problem, but I am quite confident that inside of a few years we will know what

27 June 66

FTD (TDETR)
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433
1 August 1966

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540

Dear Mr. [redacted]

Thank you for the information which you have submitted to Project Blue Book on your observation. Indeed your observation is interesting and unique. I would appreciate it if you would fill out the attached FTD Form 164 and return to me for further evaluation.

I intend to turn your information over to the meteorological experts for their study.

Sincerely,

HECTOR QUINTANILLA, Jr, Major, USAF
Chief, Project Blue Book

[redacted]
Seminole Fla. 33540

1.05

FTD (TD- ETR)
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO 45433

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

FTD (TDETR)
Project Blue Book
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

FTD FORM JUL 61 383 This form supersedes ATIC Form Nr. 383, dated Dec 60, which is obsolete.

REGISTERED
NO. 0161

RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540



VIA AIR MAIL

Project Blue Book
U S AIR FORCE
Washington
D C

ORIGINAL

U.S. AIR FORCE TECHNICAL INFORMATION

This questionnaire has been prepared so that you can give the U.S. Air Force as much information as possible concerning the unidentified aerial phenomenon that you have observed. Please try to answer as many questions as you possibly can. The information that you give will be used for research purposes. Your name will not be used in connection with any statements, conclusions, or publications without your permission. We request this personal information so that if it is deemed necessary, we may contact you for further details.

1. When did you see the object?

27 June 66

Day / Month / Year

2. Time of day: 4 AM

Hour / Minutes

(Circle One): A.M. or P.M.

3. Time Zone:

(Circle One): a. Eastern
b. Central
c. Mountain
d. Pacific
e. Other Just West of intl dateline

(Circle One): a. Daylight Saving
b. Standard

4. Where were you when you saw the object?

Aboard S/S Mount Vernon Victory (U S Reg 284178), great circle Guam-Hawaii, roughly 19N 172E.

Nearest Postal Address / City or Town / State or County

5. How long was object in sight? (Total Duration) 20 Minutes

Hours / Minutes / Seconds

a. Certain
*b. Fairly certain
c. Not very sure
d. Just a guess

5.1 How was time in sight determined? *Exact time may be obtained from Navigation Officer, Mr Rominger.

5.2 Was object in sight continuously? Yes **Yes, either "object" or related phenom. No ____

6. What was the condition of the sky?

DAY
a. Bright
b. Cloudy

NIGHT
a. Bright
***b. Cloudy

***Scattered clouds, but stars beautifully clear.

7. IF you saw the object during DAYLIGHT, where was the SUN located as you looked at the object?

(Circle One): a. In front of you
b. In back of you
c. To your right
d. To your left
e. Overhead
f. Don't remember

FORM
FTD OCT 62 164 This form supersedes FTD 164, Jul 61, which is obsolete.

8. IF you saw the object at NIGHT, what did you notice concerning the STARS and MOON?

8.1 STARS (*Circle One*):

a. None
b. A few
X c. Many
d. Don't remember

8.2 MOON (*Circle One*):

a. Bright moonlight
X b. Dull moonlight
c. No moonlight – pitch dark
d. Don't remember

9. What were the weather conditions at the time you saw the object?

CLOUDS (*Circle One*):

a. Clear sky
b. Hazy
X c. Scattered clouds
d. Thick or heavy clouds

WEATHER (*Circle One*):

* a. Dry
b. Fog, mist, or light rain
c. Moderate or heavy rain
d. Snow
e. Don't remember

*Dry, recent rain having ended.

10. The object appeared: (*Circle One*):

a. Solid
b. Transparent
c. Vapor
** d. As a light
e. Don't remember

**With exceptions as noted.

11. If it appeared as a light, was it brighter than the brightest stars? (*Circle One*):

a. Brighter
b. Dimmer
c. About the same
d. Don't know

***At first thought to be Venus (due to arrive about then), though brilliance thought to be unusual.

11.1 Compare brightness to some common object:

Difficult. Perhaps as a carbon arc lamp might appear at a distance.

12. The edges of the object were:

(*Circle One*): a. Fuzzy or blurred
b. Like a bright star
c. Sharply outlined
d. Don't remember
e. Other

****Pinpoint light surrounded by sharply defined and expanding "cloud".

13. Did the object:

(Circle One for each question)

a. Appear to stand still at any time?	Yes	No X	Don't know	*5 - See p 18, last Para.
b. Suddenly speed up and rush away at any time?	Yes *5	No *5	Don't know	
c. Break up into parts or explode?	Yes	No X	Don't know	*6 - See p 19, 4th Para.
d. Give off smoke?	Yes	No X	Don't know	
e. Change brightness?	Yes *8	No *8	Don't know	
f. Change shape?	Yes X	No	Don't know	*7 - See p 10.
g. Flash or flicker?	Yes	No	Don't know	
h. Disappear and reappear?	Yes *7	No	Don't know	

14. Did the object disappear while you were watching it? If so, how?

Unaccountably lost sight of it ##### shortly after its "departure" from the peculiar "cloud" described on pages 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16.

15. Did the object move behind something at any time, particularly a cloud?

(Circle One): *Yes No Don't Know. IF you answered YES, then tell what it moved behind: *Behind a cloud for 2 or 3 minutes toward the end of the sighting. See page 16

16. Did the object move in front of something at any time, particularly a cloud?

(Circle One): Yes XNo Don't Know. IF you answered YES, then tell what in front of: _____

17. Tell in a few words the following things about the object:

a. Sound No sound heard.

b. Color Para 11.1

18. We wish to know the angular size. Hold a match stick at arm's length in line with a known object and note how much of the object is covered by the head of the match. If you had performed this experiment at the time of the sighting, how much of the object would have been covered by the match head?

While sizes given for the 10-minute and 20-minute points, page , were compared to a golf ball and a 6-inch ball, I recall that during the minutes following the sighting I had considered a tennis ball and a basketball - but had revised this downward, perhaps as a

19. Draw a picture that will show the shape of the object or objects. Label and include in your sketch any details of the object that you saw such as wings, protrusions, etc., and especially exhaust trails or vapor trails. Place an arrow beside the drawing to show the direction the object was moving.

18. cont.:

strained attempt not to exaggerate. After writing my NICAP report, a conversation with Mr Rominger revealed his estimate to approximate my original (larger) impression.

19. See pages 15, 16. Also notes on pages 18, 19.

20. Do you think you can estimate the speed of the object?

(Circle One) Yes X No

IF you answered YES, then what speed would you estimate? _____

21. Do you think you can estimate how far away from you the object was?

(Circle One) Yes X No

IF you answered YES, then how far away would you say it was? _____

22. Where were you located when you saw the object? (Circle One):

a. Inside a building
b. In a car
c. Outdoors
d. In an airplane (type)
X e. At sea
f. Other _____

23. Were you (Circle One)

a. In the business section of a city?
b. In the residential section of a city?
c. In open countryside?
d. Near an airfield?
e. Flying over a city?
f. Flying over open country?
g. Other Mid-Pacific, about 19N 172E

24. IF you were MOVING IN AN AUTOMOBILE or other vehicle at the time, then complete the following questions:

24.1 What direction were you moving? (Circle One)

a. North c. East e. South g. West
b. Northeast d. Southeast f. Southwest h. Northwest

24.2 How fast were you moving? abt 18 kts miles per hour. *Approx. See Mr R's NICAP report.

24.3 Did you stop at any time while you were looking at the object?

(Circle One) Yes X No


25. Did you observe the object through any of the following?


a. Eyeglasses	Yes	No	e. Binoculars	*X Yes	No
b. Sun glasses	Yes	No	f. Telescope	Yes	No
c. Windshield	Yes	No	g. Theodolite	Yes	No
d. Window glass	Yes	No	h. Other *8 X 30		

26. In order that you can give as clear a picture as possible of what you saw, describe in your own words a common object or objects which, when placed up in the sky, would give the same appearance as the object which you saw.

See page 7, under para 35.

27. In the following sketch, imagine that you are at the point shown. Place an "A" on the curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you *first* saw it. Place a "B" on the same curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you *last* saw it. Place an "A" on the compass when you *first* saw it. Place a "B" on the compass where you *last* saw the object.





See pages ... etc.

28. Draw a picture that will show the motion that the object or objects made. Place an "A" at the beginning of the path, a "B" at the end of the path, and show any changes in direction during the course.

See pages 10, 16

29. IF there was MORE THAN ONE object, then how many were there? _____
Draw a picture of how they were arranged, and put an arrow to show the direction that they were traveling.

Clearly ONE object during first 18 minutes or so of sighting. The possibility of a second object may account for a very considerable discrepancy, during the final 1 or 2 minutes, between Mr Rominger's report and my own. See page 18, last para.

30. Have you ever seen this, or a similar object before. If so give date or dates and location.

No.

31. Was anyone else with you at the time you saw the object? (Circle One) X Yes No

31.1 IF you answered YES, did they see the object too? (Circle One) X Yes No

31.2 Please list their names and addresses:

[redacted]
Poland, Ohio, 44514

*Mr [redacted] who was the navigation officer on board the S/S Mount Vernon ####### Victory, and who was present (on bridge watch) during the entire period of sighting, can identify several others who were present .

32. Please give the following information about yourself:

NAME [redacted] (Last Name) _____ (First Name) _____ (Middle Name)

ADDRESS [redacted] (Street) Seminole, (City) Florida, (Zone) 33540 (State)

TELEPHONE NUMBER Unlisted AGE 43 SEX M

Indicate any additional information about yourself, including any special experience, which might be pertinent.

At time of sighting, serving as radio officer aboard S/S Mount Vernon Victory.

No special qualifications beyond any which may be inferred from an unhurried reading of this report.

33. When and to whom did you report that you had seen the object?

On arrival USA 7/1/66, pages 10, 11, 12, 13 mailed to NICAP with cc (Day) (Month) (Year)

Blue Book. On 7/14/66 duplicates were mailed to both addressees as no acknowledgements had been received.

34. Date you completed this questionnaire: Pages 10 & 11, 6/27/66. Pages 12 & 13, 6/28/66. Pages 15 & 16, 6/28/66 or 6/29/66. All other pages, 8/10/66. (Day / Month / Year)

35. Information which you feel pertinent and which is not adequately covered in the specific points of the questionnaire or a narrative explanation of your sighting. (see page 8)

Cont. from page 4, para 26:

Your question seems to presuppose the sighting of a common object. Neglecting the fact ## of the UFO having indeed become a very common object, I would say that if the phenomenon had appeared to be anything less common than a UFO I wouldn't be spending time on this report. I would instead be putting up shelves out in the garage.

The USAF Pretended Skepticism is infuriating. The supreme irony of this: that even today, after a generation of sharply increased UFO activity, countless capable, fertile, ingenious and productive minds are wastefully diverted from any attention to UFO phenomena through naive faith that our military would be the first to declare UFO possibility if it were indeed a fact. It should not be thought that this naivete is an efficient automatic weeding-out process, and if this is your assumption then it can be an error of enormously grave consequences. Political or social or worldly naivete can not be correlated properly with special scientific talents. Is is an incontestable fact that those major developments in science which were not arrived at by evolutionary or brute-force or accidental means were born through momentary inspiration - and that a necessary condition for the inspiration was, obviously, freedom from conviction beforehand that a solution was either impossible or unneeded.

Your apparent notion that you already have the best heads in the country working on this (albeit for twenty unispired years) and that you can well do without any suggestions from those dunderhead nuisances who would otherwise plague you but for their being weeded out through this idiotic process is as fine an example as can be found of "tossing the baby out with the bath water". I call this your "apparent" notion, though certainly you have never given any hint, publicly, that it is so. But, perhaps through having a need or preference or desire to believe that we are not all held in control by Brass Children, I choose the notion I hold on the basis of its being the least idiotic of all conceivable idiocies. As an article of faith in the USAF this is a peculiar compliment, but surely a compliment in view of my disbelieving your publicized opinions: I do in a sense believe you know what you are doing, but charge you with the indefensible arrogance of presuming that your clique of workmen, who have been laboring now for twenty long years, have been chosen by yourselves and therefore must be the # best possible choice.

Allowing for an avalanche of invalid ideas and some $50 million a year to consider and reject them, but in view of the enormous implications of the solved problems and the tremendously increased possibility of their being solved by some of our many millions who may not be in your present coterie, reason does not permit your exclusion of those people through your maintaining their faith that no problems of a UFO nature exist.

CONTINUED on page 17

PAGE 8 - Blank

Page 9

[redacted],
Seminole, Florida 33540
10 Aug 66

FTD (TDER)
Project Blue Book
Wright-Patterson AFB
Ohio 45433

Dear Sirs:

Enclosed herewith is information solicited by you in your letter of 8/1/66 (see page 14).

This reply, complete in 19 pages, is presented in Thermofax.

Yours truly,

[redacted]

Registered mail;
Seminole, Fla, 8/11/66

[redacted]
SEMINOLE FLORIDA 33540

- - - -

S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY
AT SEA, 19 NORTH 172 EAST
27 JUNE 66

NICAP
WASHDC

DEAR SIRS:

AT ABOUT 0400 THIS MORNING I WAS AWAKENED BY WATCH OFFICER DONALD ROMINGER, ALERTING ME TO A UFO SIGHTING. MR ROMINGER HAD PREVIOUSLY NOTICED A COPY OF THE UFO INVESTIGATOR IN THE RADIOROOM AND HAD INFERRED FROM THAT MY INTEREST IN UFO'S.

ABOUT FIVE HOURS EARLIER I HAD COMPLETED RE-READING THE LAST THREE ISSUES OF THE UFO INVESTIGATOR, INCLUDING THE ACCOUNT OF THE 16 DEC 65 SIGHTING BY THE BRITISH S/S CARL SCHMEDEMAN. HAVING THUS GONE TO SLEEP WITH THE SCHMEDEMAN INCIDENT REFRESHED IN MY MIND AND HAVING BEEN AWAKENED TO WITNESS A SIMILAR SIGHTING A SHORT TIME LATER, I BELIEVE I MAY FOR THAT REASON HAVE NOTICED A CERTAIN CHARACTERISTIC OF THE "SCHMEDELMAN CLOUD" WHICH I MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE HAVE NOTICED IN THE EXCITEMENT OF THIS FIRST SIGHTING.

BY THE TIME OF MY ARRIVAL ON THE BRIDGE, THE CLOUD HAD GROWN TO THE APPARENT SIZE OF A GOLF BALL HELD AT ARM'S LENGTH AND WAS MOVING EITHER UPWARD OR TOWARD THE SHIP OR BOTH. ITS POSITION AT THAT TIME WAS APPROXIMATELY DEAD AHEAD (SHIP HEADED ABOUT DUE EAST) WITH AN ELEVATION OF PERHAPS TEN DEGREES. FROM THAT TIME UNTIL THE CLOUD BECAME TEMPORARILY OBSCURED BY A "REAL" CLOUD SOME FEW MINUTES LATER, BY WHICH TIME IT HAD REACHED AN ELEVATION OF PERHAPS 40 DEGREES AND WAS ABOUT 20 DEGREES TO STARBOARD, I DID NOT NOTICE ANY OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS BEYOND ITS LUMINESCENCE, GROWTH, AND MOVEMENT, AND OF COURSE THE FLASHING LIGHT AT ITS CENTER. ON COMING BACK INTO VIEW TWO OR THREE MINUTES LATER, IT HAD BY THAT TIME ASSUMED THE RELATIVE SIZE OF A SIX-INCH BALL AT ARM'S LENGTH, HAD THINNED OUT AND PERMITTED STARS TO BE SEEN THROUGH IT. THE WHITE FLASHING LIGHT WAS AT THIS TIME STILL LOCATED WITHIN THE EXPANDING CLOUD.

IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT AN INTERESTING FACT BECAME APPARENT. MOST OF THE PERIMETER OF THE LOWER RIGHT-HAND QUADRANT OF THE CLOUD WAS VISIBLE. VIEWING THROUGH 8X30 GLASSES, I WAS STRUCK BY THE PERFECT ROUNDNESS OF THIS SHARPLY DEFINED LINE, AND THOUGHT IMMEDIATELY HOW THIS MIGHT RESEMBLE A SHOCK WAVE RADIATING FROM A POINT SOURCE. (THIS IS BY NO MEANS A SPECULATION ON THE NATURE OF THE BEAST: I AM SIMPLY GROPING FOR A WAY OF MOST ACCURATELY CONVEYING WHAT I SAW). RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS IMPRESSION WAS THE FACT OF ROUNDNESS, THE FACT OF HIGH CONTRAST ALONG THE LEADING EDGE OF THE EXPANDING CLOUD, AND THE FACT OF VERY RAPIDLY DIMINISHING INTENSITY FROM THE BACK EDGE TOWARD THE EPICENTER.

I BELIEVE AN X-RAY PROJECTION OF A 6-INCH HOLLOW SHERE WITH AN 1/8-INCH SURFACE THICKNESS WOULD REPRODUCE A PICTURE OF WHAT I AM TRYING TO DESCRIBE. THIS WOULD BE QUITE DIFFERENT FROM AN X-RAY OF A SOLID HOMOGENEOUS BALL, WHOSE PROJECTION WOULD SHOW INCREASING DENSITY TOWARD THE CENTER, AND IT IS THIS DIFFERENCE WHICH I WISH TO CONVEY.

I WISH I COULD SAY THAT ALL QUADRANTS NEATLY FITTED THIS DESCRIPTION, BUT THIS IS NOT SO. MOST OF THE UPPER SEMICIRCLE WAS UNOBSCURED AT THIS TIME, AND SEEMED MERELY TO BLEND GRADUALLY INTO THE DARK BACKGROUND. AT ABOUT THIS TIME THE FLASHING LIGHT, WHICH I SAW ONLY AS A FLASHING LIGHT AND WITHOUT FORM, ACCELERATED SOUTHWARD FROM ITS CLOUD AND WAS LOST FROM MY VIEW SHORTLY AFTERWARD.

I HAVE AVOIDED DISCUSSING THIS SIGHTING WITH ANYONE UNTIL AFTER WRITING THIS LETTER IN ORDER THAT MY ORIGINAL IMPRESSIONS WOULD NOT BE CHANGED, BEING AWARE THAT IMPRESSIONS CAN BE ALTERED RETROACTIVELY, UNCONSCIOUSLY, WITHOUT EFFORT OR INTENT.

I THINK MR ROMINGER WILL WANT TO WRITE YOU. IF NOT, I WILL URGE HIM TO DO SO AS THIS LETTER HAS HAD TO DO MAINLY WITH ONLY ONE ASPECT OF THE SIGHTING.

YOURS TRULY,

[redacted]
RADIO OFFICER,
S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY,
U.S. REG. #234176

S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY
AT SEA, 28 JUNE 66

NICAP
WASH DC

SIRS:

WITH REFERENCE TO MY ENCLOSED SIGHTING REPORT AND ALSO THE 16 DEC 65 S/S SCHMEDEMAN REPORT (VOL III, NO 6):

I FEEL SOMEWHAT FOOLISH OFFERING THE FOLLOWING TO NICAP IN VIEW OF THE EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE YOU MUST HAVE IN THIS FIELD, BUT YOUR SCHMEDEMAN ACCOUNT DOES HINT OF YOUR NEGLECT TO CONSIDER SOME OF WHAT FOLLOWS.

IF A BODY ENTERS THE ATMOSPHERE AT A SUFFFICIENTLY SHALLOW ANGLE, AND

IF IT CONTINUES LOSING ALTITUDE, AND

IF THE OBSERVER IS AT A SUFFICIENTLY LOW ALTITUDE, AND

IF THE SIGHTING IS DISCONTINUED PRIOR TO THE ARRIVAL OF THE BODY AT AN OVERHEAD POSITION, AND

IF THE TRAJECTORY, WHEN EXTENDED, FALLS BEHIND THE OBSERVER,

THEN THIS CONTINUALLY FALLING BODY WILL APPEAR TO THE OBSERVER AS A CONTINUALLY RISING BODY.

YOU STATE (REF S/S SCHMEDEMAN) "POSSIBLY THE INITIAL 'CLOUD' EFFECT WAS INCIDENTAL TO THE LAUNCHING, BUT THE EXPANSION INTO A LARGER, GLOWING MASS IS A PUZZLING FACTOR." I OFFER THIS: THAT THE S/S SCHMEDEMAN AND S/S MOUNT VERNON VICTORY CLOUDS WERE NOT THE EXPANDING CLOUDS THEY APPEARED TO BE, BUT RATHER INCREASED IN APPARENT SIZE WITH INCREASING PROXIMITY. AT FIRST SIGHTING THE 6/27 UFO WAS ON THE HORIZON AND, I SPECULATE, MANY MILES HIGH AND MANY MILES BEHIND THE EIGHT-MILE HORIZON, WHILE AT TERMINATION THE CLOUD WAS PERHAPS A VERY FEW MILES AWAY AT MOST. THIS IS A CONSIDERABLE RANGE RATIO, AND THE APPARENT EXPANSION WOULD NECESSARILY FOLLOW THE SAME RATIO. RATHER THAN VIEW THE CLOUD AS AN EXPANDING AND "INCIDENTAL TO THE LAUNCHING", THE FOREGOING WOULD PERMIT IT TO BE CONSIDERED IN STRAIGHTFORWARD FASHION AS A SHOCK FRONT, LUMINOUS THROUGH IONIZATION.

BEARING IN MIND THAT THE MID-AIR TERMINATION OF THE 6/27 TRAJECTORY WAS SEEN AT AN ANGLE CONSIDERABLY REMOVED FROM THAT OF THE TRAJECTORY ITSELF, THE SHOCK-WAVE VIEW WOULD THEN ALSO SERVE TO EXPLAIN THE LACK OF SYMMETRY NOTED IN MY REPORT. I SHOULD NOTE HERE THAT THE HIGH CONTRAST LINE SEEN AT THIS TIME WAS NOT SEEN AT ANY POINT WITH RESPECT TO THE UFO (UNTIL AFTER "SEPARATION") THAT SUGGESTED IT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A SHOCK LINE.

MR ROMINGER HAS OFFERED TWO SUGGESTIONS: THAT THE VERTICAL PORTION OF THE DISSYMMETRY MIGHT BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE HIGHER MOISTURE OR OTHER CONTENT OF THE LOWER AIR (AS A CONSIDERABLE VERTICAL SPAN SEEMED LIKELY) AND THAT A CLUE TO THE SPACING BETWEEN THE UFO AND THE SHOCK FRONT MIGHT BE FOUND IN A RECENT RELEASE IN THE SCIENCE JOURNAL (LONDON), MAY '66, P. 9, "MAGNETIC CONTROL FOR RE-ENTRY". NOT TOO MUCH IMAGINATION WOULD SUGGEST THAT # WITH HIGH FIELDS (EVEN ENORMOUSLY GREATER THAN THE 500 KILOGAUSS MOMENTARY FIELDS DESCRIBED ELSEWHERE IN THE SAME ISSUE) MIGHT PROVIDE A MEANS FOR KEEPING A SHOCK WAVE A VERY CONSIDERABLE DISTANCE AHEAD OF THE BODY PRODUCING IT. THIS, IF APPLIED TO THE 6/27 SIGHTING, WOULD PERMIT THE ROUNDED LINE TO BE SEEN AS THE EXPECTED PHENOMENON RATHER THAN, IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH INFLUENCE, A V WITH ITS APEX IN CONTACT # WITH THE GENERATING BODY.

THIS LEAVES THE QUESTION OF THE LINGERING AND DRIFTING LUMINESCENT CLOUD FOLLOWING "SEPARATION". IN THIS CONNECTION IT MIGHT BE NOTED THAT UPPER-ATMOSPHERE IONIZATION, AS TAKES PLACE DAILY THROUGH SOLAR RADIATION, IS NOT EXTINGUISHED IMMEDIATELY AT SUNDOWN BUT TENDS TO LINGER, DIMINISHING GRADUALLY OVER A PERIOD OF HOURS.

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THESE VARIOUS THINGS, A UFO EMERGING FROM A GLOWING, EXPANDING CLOUD SEEMS VERY MUCH LESS THAN ABSURD.

YOURS TRULY,

[redacted]

FTD (TDETR)
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433
1 August 1966

[redacted]
Seminole, Florida 33540


Dear Mr[redacted]

Thank you for the information which you have submitted to Project Blue Book on your observation. Indeed your observation is interesting and unique. I would appreciate it if you would fill out the attached FTD Form 164 and return to me for further evaluation.


I intend to turn your information over to the meteorological experts for their study.

Sincerely,


HECTOR QUINTANILLA, Jr, Major, USAF
Chief, Project Blue Book




(1)




(2)




(3)



(4)





Continued from p. 7:

There is extremely little public knowledge of the interest and work being conducted in gravity and anti-gravity research, and that laboratory demonstrations have shown considerable manipulation of gravity possible by a number of methods. Even less is is know publicly that mass ### inertia exists soley within its gravitic reference zone - a fact which when not recognized makes it very easy for the most capable and ingenious minds to be mislead by USAF pronouncements that UFOs are other than what they truly are.

I predict that unless the truth of USAF interest in UFOs is made public, we will be faced in the not distant future not #### only with increasing popular preoccupation with UFOs but with the rediculous spectacle of its becoming a prime political consideration. I would suggest you consider the implications of this, and the unlikelyhood of such a movement not gaining momentum once started - in view of five million Americans now having seen UFOs (by Gallup poll) and about half the US adult population (Gallup) no longer subscribing to the hallucination or hoax explanations. These five million first-hand witnesses and rapidly increasing number of people who do not consider a UFO to be a planet (usually Venus) surrounded by a cloud of marsh gass while refuelling operations are taking place in an area of unusually intense weather balcon activity, etc., - these are the people who would give the necessary support to those who would declare intent to end the secrecy through elementary political means.

Rediculous or irrational? Not when viewed from the other side of the Brass Curtain, and that is where most of us are, and there is little in history to support the irrational notion that Human beings are Rational beings.

RANDOM COMMENTS, pertinent to preceding pages:

On perhaps the day following the sighting - or on the second day - I sketched out a few pictorial graphs (Page 15) showing relative object size plotted against time. Afterwards, presenting the completed sheet to Mr R, he indicated within seconds that #2 represented what he had seen.

At bottom of same sheet (p 15) we discussed the nature of the brilliantly flashing light and agreed that it could best be described as a symmetrical square wave with some rounding-off of the corners.

Page 16 (Thermofax of original scratch paper, as is p 15): During the first ten minutes of sighting, immediately prior to Mr R's having called me, the UFO had a much different characteristic than was ###### observed later.

1. When first sighted, was thought to be Venus, though exceptionally bright.

2. At point "F", p 15, the on-off flashing was noted to have begun, and it was no longer thought likely that this might be Venus.

3. At this time it was noted that the light had grown very considerably in apparent size, and that the flashing light was surrounded by a bright halo.

4. This halo is shown in a negative sense - light being dark and dark being light - at the top of page 16. All lines were sharply outstanding, crisp, contrasty, with the lower semicircle of the halo being at all times much wider than the upper semicircle. While the uppermost figure in Mr R's sketch would not seem to agree, perhaps through carelessness in drawing, he did tell me that the flashing light was at all times at the center of the outer halo edge rather than at the center of the inner one.

5. Center of the page (16) shows a disagreement Mr R and I had concerning the direction taken by the flashing light following its "separation" from the halo. Ref para 29, p 5. My contention: acceleration and sharp change of course to southward. Mr R: Continuation on same course, and with apparent acceleration due to change in viewing angle with UFO approach, with illusion of acceleration increased through the UFO having spent perhaps as long as two minutes behind a dark cloud toward the end of the sighting.

Cont., p 19

As Mr R has had a 20-year history of earning his livelyhood with a sextant, plus the even more important fact of his enjoying his work, I hesitate to say that he was wrong and I was right (ref again para 29), can only say that at the moment this apparent course change became apparent to me I put down my glasses for a few moments in order to orient myself properly with the foremast and starboard beam.

6. After about ten minutes of sighting, the halo, previously having been very sharp along both inner and outer perimeters, diffused ## along its inner edge until, at about the ten minute point, the halo was then for several minutes # seen simply as a glowing ball - with sharp outer edge - having at its center a brilliant, flashing white light.

7. This condition existed, with the ball expanding, until changes were noted as covered in the NICAP report (pages 10 thru 13).

My impression now, after several weeks, is that the flashing light may have been considerably less intense during the last minute or two of sighting than earlier, based on the memory of ## the difficulty of locating it (after it had begun leaving its glowing cloud) amid the brilliant stars in the background. (This is answer to your para 13 e.)

Two days ago I received a letter from an organization which heroically pretends to be an independent agency saying, in part, "..., a prominent scientist, checked on some facts for us and discovered that there was a rocket fired from Bikini Atoll within minutes of your sighting. Could you tell us whether you were anywhere near this island at the time or whether this is what you may have seen. I realize that some of your descriptions may not fit in with the rocket launching, but we would still like to know if it is possible that this is what you saw..." As your own organization may have been the source of this weatherbalooning technique, I quote to you my answer that "At the time of the 27 June sighting, Bikini Atoll was roughly 110 degrees removed from the point at which the UFO first appeared on the horizon." This fact could have been established by means of a two minute expenditure of energy over a chart plot - yet my opinion of the fact was solicited by mail.

With reference to your 8/1/66 letter (page 14), I am pleased that you regard this sighting as being interesting and unique, but question your wisdom in engaging meteorologists to study a phenomena which you know not to be primarily of a meteorological interest.

1. DATE - GROUP 30 Ju 03/0045Z	2. LOCATION ARBOIS, FRANCE
3. SOURCE Civil	10. CONCLUSION INSUFFICIENT DATA FOR EVALUATION
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS ONe	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION Not Reported	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS SEE CASE
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	
7. COURSE South	
8. PHOTOS ☐ Yes (Classified) XXNo	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐ Yes XXNo	

FORM
FTD [illegible] 63 0-329 (TDE) Previous editions of this form may be used

Du Bois, Pa 30 June 66

FTD (TDETR)/Hr
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433
12 August 1966

Mr. and Mrs. [redacted]
Du Bois, Pennsylvania 15801

Dear Mr. and Mrs. [redacted]

Reference your unidentified observation of 30 June 1966. The information in your letter was not sufficient for evaluation. Request you complete the attached FTD Form 164 and return it in the envelope provided.

We wish to thank you for reporting your observation to the Air Force.

Sincerely,

HECTOR QUINTANILLA, Jr, Major, USAF
Chief, Project Blue Book

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
TDETR
Office of Record

[redacted]
Du Bois, Pa. 15801
June 30, 1966

Project Blue Book
The Pentagon Bldg.
Washington, D. C.


Dear Sirs:

On this date about 2:45 P.M. we were traveling west on route 322 south of Du Bois, Pa. near the State Police Barracks when we noticed in the sky a star like light object above us 4 engine delta-winged aircraft, we believe was a B-52 Stratofortress bomber. We stopped the car and got out to see better. We saw the object overhead and it was traveling faster than the Jet.

We are enclosing a sketch of the ~~[illegible]~~ object as it appeared to us.

Yours truly,
Mr. & Mrs. [redacted]
Du Bois, Pa. 15801

Send 164



shape of object we saw through the jet.