

PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 1 Apr 67 130430Z	2. LOCATION South Wellington, Texas
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION Other (PHYSICAL)
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 20 minutes	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS Observer stated that the object was cylindrical with round nose. Color: light aluminum and grey. Object had a light 20 inches in diameter which was located at the nose of this object and emitted a soft fluorescent type beam.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground Visual	
7. COURSE South	
8. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Despite "probable" report - 3 report in a short time is also probably to meat - report is strongly suspect as psychological MM
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

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

4 June 1968

it occurred at a small airport and the duration was one and one-half minutes. Followup should have been made to determine whether there were other potential witnesses. Since it occurred at midnight on December 28, it is possible that there were no other witnesses available. Must be carried as unidentified, single witness.

15. 12 August 1965, Ramona, California.

One witness, duration of sighting only 15 seconds. Witness was a 67 year old lady. Sighting occurred at 9p.m. daylight saving time in the middle of August, and thus the sky should still have been reasonably bright. Witness said sighting occurred at night and sky very blue. Perhaps she thinks that anything after 6 p.m. is night. Must be listed as unknown (meager data, single witness, very short duration).

16. 26 February 1966, Bartlett, New Hampshire

I have in my files for 26 February 1966, Manchester, New Hampshire. I do not seem to find a Bartlett, New Hampshire case. See attached supplemental sheet A.

17. 17 July 1966, Centerville, Ohio.

Temporarily not in file. Will study this case when I visit Dayton.

18. 9 February 1967, Odessa, Delaware.

Since by an admitted breakdown in communications the Dover Air Force Base delayed some five months in investigating this case, all I have is the NICAP report. Evaluation pending my getting a copy of the Air Force investigation of same. Based on NICAP report, the sighting is obviously unidentified.

19. 12 February 1967, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

I have only the card on this case, but judging from it there seems to be a possibility that this one-witness case was caused by low-flying birds reflecting light. The sighting lasted 4 to 10 seconds, and witness mentions a high-pitched chirping noise.

20. 1 April 1967, Wellington or Loco, Texas.

I had a great personal involvement in this case, much of it

4 June

independent of official Project Blue Book business. The case was very involved and I feel must be classified as psychological and hoax unless other data turns up to change this, which I think is unlikely.

In synopsis form: because of my interest in any purported photograph, I called ██████████ of Wellington, Texas, and had a long taped interview with him. He sounded simple and straightforward, in fact so simple that I feel a complicated contrived hoax would be beyond his capabilities. The pictures were sent up and examined by Mr. ██████████ and me. There was nothing on the picture to suggest that it was not a hoax, and we did not spend too much time in any detailed analysis. There were no reference marks, for instance, which made it impossible to judge distances, etc., and the object photographed could very well have been a small object at very close range.

I had also taken the precaution of calling the sheriff in Wellington and getting a rundown on ██████████. The sheriff described him as living, with his wife, in an isolated, ██████████ section of Texas, as a cotton farmer, and as a man that had no knowledge of photography whatever. The sheriff volunteered the information that - to make a long story short - the man was not too bright, and from his standpoint alone a photographic hoax seemed unlikely. He volunteered, however, that if a hoax were involved, Mrs. ██████████ would be the more likely engineer of such a hoax.

Shortly thereafter two reporters from Amarillo called. Apparently the story had leaked and ██████████ had told them that he would have no story for them until he had confirmation of the pictures from me. This, of course, he never got. I told the reporters how I felt, but that they might have a good story of the perpetration of a hoax if they looked into it. This they did, and following my suggestion, had a lie detector test administered to Mr. ██████████. This he flunked and he was generally discredited in the papers, as is well known. I then had a phone call from a commercial artist from his ranch some distance from both Amarillo and Wellington, to tell me that he had earlier become interested in this case, and himself had hypnotised Mr. ██████████ in order, as he put it, to get more information, and to see whether the information given under hypnosis was the same as given consciously by Mr. ██████████. This unsolicited phone call surprised me but I considered it just another one of the oddball things in this oddball case.

4 June 1966

Shortly thereafter, I learned that Mr. [REDACTED] had stated that the whole thing was a hoax, that he had been put up [REDACTED] under hypnosis by this very artist-hypnotist who had called me up some days earlier. The story then went something like this.

The hypnotist had appeared out of a clear sky (maybe I shouldn't use that expression in this context!), had given [REDACTED] the set of pictures, one of which included the head (one of the purported occupants of the craft), and under hypnosis had given Mr. [REDACTED] the story he was to tell later. By this time, I wanted nothing further to do with the case, but I wasn't off the hook yet. One of the original reporters called up, quite incensed, and asked whether I couldn't get the Air Force to prosecute this hypnotist for unethical practices, etc., for having made a dupe of [REDACTED] and subjected him to public ridicule. I told him that first of all the Air Force did not prosecute in such cases, and that furthermore in such lawsuits it is the injured party who brings suit and that I hardly felt that the Air Force or I had been injured by the purported hypnotist's actions.

This would seemingly have ended it, except that I remembered that the hypnotist when he had first called me, had mentioned just in passing that he had done some work with the physics department at the University of Colorado (no connection whatever with the Condon Committee), and had mentioned a [REDACTED]. Now it so happens that [REDACTED] took his Master's Degree with me a good many years ago at Ohio State University. I thought a phone call to him might be in order. This I did and was surprised to learn that the hypnotist (whose name I do not recall at the moment, but the entire story is on tapes which I can have my secretary transcribe if needed) has a daughter that had worked for [REDACTED] in his laboratory for the past year or so, and that he himself had visited the studio and home of the artist and only part-time hypnotist. He had found him a thoroughly honorable and upstanding citizen. He could not conceive that this man could have perpetrated such a hoax and made such a dupe of Mr. [REDACTED]. In fact, he considered it improbable in the extreme.

I relayed this information to the reporters, largely out of a sense of duty, since they were rapidly losing interest in the case. But the sequel to this was that [REDACTED] then changed his story once again. He now stated that he had flunked the lie detector test on purpose, but on his way to take the lie detector test, his car had been accosted by two men who scuffed him up and warned him that if he passed the lie detector test, he would never make it home alive. I do not know whether it is possible to deliberately flunk a lie detector test, but the fact remains that he did.

4 June 1968

The puzzling thing about the entire case is how Mr. [REDACTED] came into possession of the rather remarkable color polaroid photographs. What were the circumstances under which the photographs were taken, and how were they contrived? Somebody went to a fair amount of trouble, but why? I questioned both the sheriff and asked the reporters to find out also, whether Mr. [REDACTED] was ever known to have bought photographic supplies in the local stores, and whether he knew anything about photography himself. The reply to this as far as could be determined, was negative. If one had the time, this would make a very interesting, but not terribly significant detective story. I would suggest it as a psychology master's degree thesis!

It should be pointed out that the [REDACTED] sighting was by no means the only case reported in that area. There followed quite a spate of reports, apparently all through the year, and even as late as November 3, 1967, when a [REDACTED] made a typical close encounter, luminous body sighting. "It was big enough to drive a car in", [REDACTED] said, "it was shaped like a cigar - one end was round."

I believe there is a moral to be drawn from the Wellington case. Had the Altus Air Force Base reacted promptly and done a good investigation on this case, very early in the game, and in particular, had found out how Mr. [REDACTED] had come into possession of said pictures, a lot of later trouble could have been saved. We still don't know how the pictures came into being.

21. 2 April 1967, Shively, Kentucky.

The evaluation "possible aircraft" seems okay. The sighting fits a pattern of the unusual, but we do not know how much the young boys "read into" what might have been a perfectly ordinary sighting. They are familiar with UFO literature and could have given a highly preferential interpretation to their sighting. The sighting was of short duration and the telescopic sighting was 20 seconds or less, hardly enough time to make a cold appraisal at a time of high excitement. Proper investigation at the local level could have easily determined how much of this was interpretation and how much was fact.

22. 3 April 1967, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The evaluation "aircraft" on this is ludicrous, if any credence whatever is given to the sanity and reliability of the observer. If it was an aircraft, then it created in the mind of the observer an entire fantasy, because as the observer stated, "there is no object I've ever seen similar to this object I saw. Or could even compare to it."

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 50846 (6 Apr 67) A/wkt

Pg 1 of 5

ACTION : RDC-4 INFO : XOP-1, XOPX-2, SAFOS-3, NIN-7, DIA-1 (19) ADV CY RDC & DIA

SMB B28RTTU JAW RUWTBIA 0166 0960102-UUUU-R LED HQA.

ZNR UUUUU

R 060030Z APR 67

FM 11 SAW ALTUS AFB OKLA

TO RUWTFVA/ADC

RUWTEBA/31ST AIR DEFENCE DIV OKLAHOMA CITY AFS OKLA

RUEDF1F/FTD WPAFB OHIO

RUEDHQA/CSAF

RUEDHQA/OSAF

BT

UNCLAS DS 002544, APR 67. FTD FOR TDETR, CSAF FOR AFRDC, OSAF
FOR SAF-01, SUBJECT: UFO. REPORTED IAW AFR 80-17 AND FORMAT THERE-
TO. A DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT: (1) SHAPE WAS CYLINDRICAL WITH
ROUND NOSE. (2) SIZE APPROXIMATELY 100 FEET IN LENGTH, 8-10 FT HIGH
AND TEN (10) FT WIDE. (3) LIGHT ALUMINUM OR GREY COLOR THAT DID NOT
REFLECT LIGHT (4) ONE (5) N/A (6) ESTIMATED TO BE APPROXIMATELY ONE
FOOT OFF THE GROUND. (7) NO TAIL, TRAIL OR EXHAUST OBSERVED (8) NO
SOUND (9) A LIGHT TWENTY INCHES IN DIAMETER WAS LOCATED ON THE NOSE
OF THIS OBJECT AND EMITTED A SOFT FLUORESCENT TYPE BEAM. B. DESCRIP-
TION OF COURSE OF OBJECT: (1) BEAM OF LIGHT WAS OBSERVED ABOUT ONE-

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 50846

Pg 2 of 5

FOURTH OF A MILE OFF THE ROAD ON A SMALL SIDE ROAD. (2) ON SIDE ROAD.

(3) OBJECT REMAINED IN HIS SIGHT UNTIL OBSERVER DEPARTED FOR HIS
PAGE 2 RUMTBIA 0166 UNCLAS

HOME. (4) REMAINED NEAR THE GROUND AND MOVED APPROXIMATELY ONE-HALF
TO ONE MILE SOUTH. (5) DID NOT DISAPPEAR. (6) APPROXIMATELY TWENTY
MINUTES. C. MANNER OF OBSERVATION: (1) GROUND, VISUAL. (2) N/A (3)

N/A. D. TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTING: (1) APPROXIMATELY 0430Z, 1 APR

67 (1030 CST) (2) NIGHT. E. LOCATION OF OBSERVER, 34 DEGREES 42 MINUTES
NORTH, ONE HUNDRED DEGREES ELEVEN MINUTES WEST. 10N 42W. SOUTH WELLING-

TON, TEXAS. F. (1) [REDACTED] AGE 28, FARMER, HIGH
SCHOOL EDUCATION, APPEARED RELIABLE AND STABLE. PEOPLE CONTACTED IN

WELLINGTON, TEXAS VERIFIED HIS RELIABILITY. G. WEATHER AND WINDS

ALOFT. (1) GOOD, (2) SURFACE 180/10, 6M FT 250/23, 10M FT 230/33,

10M FT 230/53, 20M FT 260/68, 30M FT 220/92, 50M FT 250/55, (3)

CHILDRESS, TEXAS WEATHER CLEAR, VISIBILITY 10, (5) N/A, (6) N/A, (7)

VERTICAL TEMPERATURE GRADIENT - SURFACE 4M FT 3 DEG/M FT, 4-13 FT

3 DEG/M FT, 13-28M FT 2 DEG/M FT, 28-38M FT 2.2 DEG/M FT, 38-45M

FT 0.5 DEG/M FT. H. NONE THAT IS KNOWN I. NONE J. N/A. NARRATIVE

DESCRIPTION AT APPROXIMATELY 10:30 P.M., [REDACTED] LEFT

HIS FATHERS HOME AND TRAVELED SOUTH IN THE DIRECTION OF HIS HOME,

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 50846

Pg 3 of 5

ONE MILE AWAY. HE NOTICED A LIGHT NEAR AN ABANDONED FARM HOUSE EN-
ROUTE. SINCE THE LAND BELONGED TO HIS UNCLE AND [REDACTED] SUSPECTED
PROMLERS, HE LEFT THE ROAD TO EXPLORE IT. THE LIGHT WAS SHINING WEST

PAGE 3 RUMTBIA0166 UNCLAS

SO AS TO ILLUMINATE THE SIDE OF THE HOUSE. AS HE NEARED THE OBJECT
HE COULD DISTINGUISH THE ABOVE - DESCRIBED FORM. AFTER PARKING
200 FEET EAST OF THE OBJECT, [REDACTED] APPROACHED IT ON FOOT AND WALKED
AROUND IT. HE NOTED THAT THE HULL LOOKED LIKE IT WAS MADE OF ALUM-
INUM, BUT DID NOT REFLECT LIGHT. THE OBJECT WAS ELEVATED ONE FOOT
ABOVE GROUND WITH NO VISIBLE MEANS OF SUPPORT. AT THIS POINT [REDACTED]
THOUGHT THE OBJECT WAS AN EXPERIMENTAL USAF AIRCRAFT. HE NOTICED
THE OUTLINE OF A HATCH AND KNOCKED SHARPLY SEVERAL TIMES. WHEN THE
U-SHAPED DOOR WAS LOWERED FROM THE HULL, HE HEARD THE WHIR OF A MOTOR.
THE DOOR WAS 5 FEET LONG AND 3 FEET WIDE AND CURVED AT THE TOP. STEPS
4 INCHES APART WERE BUILT INTO THE INSIDE OF THE DOOR. [REDACTED] COULD
THEN SEE INSIDE THE OBJECT ALTHOUGH HE COULD NOT DETERMINE THE SOURCE
OF ILLUMINATION. HE OBSERVED WHAT HE TOOK TO BE A MAP ON THE OPPOSITE
WALL ONE FOOT ABOVE THE FLOOR. IT WAS A YARD SQUARE, HORIZONTALLY
AND VERTICALLY LINED AND CONTAINED ONLY SIX OR SEVEN CROOKED LINES
WHICH WATTS THINKS REPRESENTED RIVERS. TO THE LEFT OF THE MAP WAS

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 50846

Pg 4 of 5

A CONSOLE PANEL THAT REACHED FROM THE FLOOR TO NEARLY THE CEILING WHICH CONTAINED ONE KNOB AND ONE TOGGLE SWITCH. ABOVE THIS PANEL WERE FOUR GAUGES WHICH SEEMED TO BE LIGHTED. THE FLOOR WAS FLAT. AFTER THE DOOR OPENED, [REDACTED] HEARD A VOICE BUT SAW NO ONE. HE DESCRIBED

PAGE 4 RUMTBIA 0166 UNCLAS

THE VOICE QUANTITY AS MECHANICAL AND LACKING ANY INFLECTION. HE WAS ASKED TO BOARD THE CRAFT TO SUBMIT TO A QUOTE STRENUOUS PHYSICAL UNQUOTE. HE ASKED WHY THE PHYSICAL WAS NECESSARY AND WAS INFORMED THAT IT WAS A PREREQUISITE TO A FLIGHT IN THE OBJECT. HE WAS TOLD THAT ONLY THE MOST HEALTHY MEN COULD PASS THE PHYSICAL AND THAT OTHER MEN HAD PREVIOUSLY FLOWN ABOARD THE OBJECT. [REDACTED] REPORTED THAT HE WAS REPEATEDLY ASKED TO BOARD THE OBJECT FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAKING A PHYSICAL. HE WAS ALSO INFORMED THAT THE CRAFT HOUSED A MACHINE WHICH, WHEN WITHIN 300 YARDS OF A HOUSE, COULD DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS AND THEIR AGES. WHEN THE VOICE AGAIN ASKED [REDACTED] TO BOARD THE CRAFT FOR A PHYSICAL, HE REPORTS THAT HE BECAME FRIGHTENED AND LEFT TO RETURN TO HIS TRUCK. HE THEN DROVE TOWARD THE OBJECT, PASSED IT AND TURNED SOUTH. AFTER PASSING THE OBJECT HE OBSERVED IN HIS REARVIEW MIRROR THAT IT LIFTED ABOUT THREE OR FOUR FEET, TURNED SOUTH AND FLEW CLOSE TO THE GROUND. THE LIGHT IN THE FRONT OF THE

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 50846

Pg 5 of 5

OBJECT WAS ABOUT FOUR FEET FROM THE GROUND AND TWENTY INCHES IN DIAMETER. WHILE PARKED THE LIGHT WAS WHITE WITH A FLUORESCENT QUALITY. AS THE OBJECT BEGAN TO MOVE, THE LIGHT TURNED TO A REDDISH COLOR. DRAWINGS OF THE OBJECT AND THE INTERIOR COMPARTMENT WERE OBTAINED FROM ██████████ AND ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST. K. LT COL KENNETH H. HALLMARK

PAGE 5 RUMTBIA#166 UNCLAS

CHIEF, SAFETY DIVISION, AREA CODE 405, OFFICE PHONE 418, HOME 482-7774. ASSISTED BY LT ROBERT W. NICHOLSON JR, FV 3175934 CHIEF, INFORMATION DIVISION. BOTH 11SAW ALT US AFB OKLA. PERSONNEL IN WELLINGTON, TEXAS STATED THAT MR ██████████ WAS A RELIABLE AND STABLE INDIVIDUAL. HE HAS RESIDED IN THIS VICINITY FOR ALL OF HIS LIFE WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ONE YEAR. CONCLUSIVE FINDINGS AND CAUSE ARE UNDETERMINED.

BT

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 2089 (18 Apr 67) R/bw

Pg 1 of 3

ACTION: RDC-4 INFO : XOP-1, XOPX-2, SAFOS-3, NIN-7, DIA/JCS-1 (19)

SMB A260RTTU JAW R UWTB1A0542 108194 1=UUUU=R UED HQA. ADV CY DIA
ZNR UUUUU

R 181845Z APR 67

FM 11 SAW ALTUS AFB OKLA

TO RUWMFVA/AD C

R UWTEBA/31ST AIR DEFENSE DIV OKLAHOMA CITY AFS OKLA

R UED F1F/FTD WPAFB OHIO

R UED HQA/CSAF

R UED HQA/OSAF

BT

UNCLAS DS 02545, APR 67. FTD FOR TOETR, CSAF FOR AFRODC, OSAF
FOR SAF=01, SUBJECT: UFO. REPORTED IAW AFR 80-17 AND FORMAT THERE-
TO. A. DESCRIPTION OF OBJECT: (1) EGG SHAPED BUT SLIGHTLY FLATTER
ON THE BOTTOM. (2) APPROXIMATELY 30 FEET LONG (3) GRAY ALUMINUM
COLOR (4) ONE IN NUMBER (5) WHILE IN FLIGHT WAS JOINED AND BECAME
ATTACHED TO ANOTHER VEHICLE. (6) THE INTERIOR OF THE ATTACHED VEH-
ICLE LOOKED FAMILIAR TO MR WATTS AND WAS APPARENTLY THE SAME
OBJECT AS DESCRIBED IN ALTUS AFB MESSAGE DS 02544, APRIL 67. (7)
NO TAIL, TRAIL OR EXHAUST. (8) NO DISCERNIBLE SOUND. (9) A TAPE
RECORDING OF THE COMPLETE EVENT AS NARRATED BY MR [REDACTED] WILL BE

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 2089

Pg 2 of 3

FORWARDED TO FTD (TDET/UFO) WPAFB, OHIO. B. DESCRIPTION OF COURSE
OF OBJECT: (1) A LIGHT WAS SEEN IN THE REAR VIEW MIRROR OF HIS
PAGE 2 RUWTBIA0542 UNCLAS

VEHICLE. (2) GROUND LEVEL (3) MR WATTS DROVE FROM THE OBJECT TO
HIS HOME (4) MR [REDACTED] BOARDED THE OBJECT AND FLIGHT PATH IS UNKNOWN. (5)

UNKNOWN (6) ESTIMATED THAT FLIGHT DURATION WAS ONE AND ONE HALF HOURS

C. MANNER OF OBSERVATION (1) GROUND VISUAL (2) AND (3) N/A D. TIME
AND DATE OF SIGHTING: (1) 0333Z 12 APRIL 1967, 2130CST. (2) NIGHT

E. LOCATION OF OBSERVER: THIRTY FOUR DEGREES FORTY THREE AND ONE
HALF MINUTES NORTH, ONE HUNDRED DEGREES AND NINE MINUTES WEST, 8
MILES SOUTHWEST OF DODSON, TEXAS. F. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION ON

OBSERVER: (1) CIVILIAN - [REDACTED] AGE 28, FARMER,
[REDACTED] WELLINGTON, TEXAS, HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE, APPEARS RELIABLE

AND SINCERE. G. WEATHER AND WINDS ALOFT AT TIME AND PLACE OF SIGHT-

ING (1) THUNDERSTORMS IN VICINITY AND RAINING INTERMITTENTLY. (2)

SURFACE EAST 110/10 GUSTS 15, 6M FT 220/29, 10M FT 240/33, 16M FT
230/48, 20M FT GARBED/41, 30M FT 210/GARBED, 40M FT 180/68, 50M

FT 210/GARBED. (3) CHILDRESS, TEXAS WEATHER ESTIMATED 3M FT BROKEN,

10M FT OVERCAST (4) VISIBILITY 15. (5) SEE (3). (6) THUNDERSTORMS

THROUGH NORTH MOVING NORTHEAST. LIGHTNING IN CLOUDS, CLOUD TO CLOUD

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH
INCOMING MESSAGE

AF IN : 2089

Pg 3 of 3

AND CLOUD TO GROUND. (7) VERTICAL TEMPERATURE GRADIENT - SURFACE 4M
FT PLUS 1 DEGREE/1M FT, 4M = 13.5M FT MINUS 1.9 DEGREES/1M FT, 13.5M
-14M FT MINUS 10 DEGREES/1M FT, 14 M-17M FT MINUS 1 DEGREE/1M FT,

PAGE 3 RUWTBIA0542 UNCLAS

17M-18M FT MINUS 3 DEGREES/1M FT, 18M-23M FT MINUS 1.9 DEGREES/1M FT,
23M-42M FT MINUS 2.4 DEGREES/1M FT. H. NONE THAT IS KNOWN. I. N/A.

J. NONE THAT IS KNOWN. K. LT COL KENNETH H. HALLMARK, CHIEF
SAFETY DIVISION, 11 SAW ALTUS AFB OKLA. 73521, AREA CODE 405, OFFICE
PHONE EXT 418, HOME PHONE 482-7774. THIS IS THE THIRD REPORT FROM
THIS INDIVIDUAL. THE FIRST WAS A VISUAL SIGHTING, THE SECOND WAS
AN ACTUAL CONTACT WITH AN OBJECT AS REPORTED BY 11SAW MESSAGE DS
02544 APR 11 1967 AND THIS REPORT IN WHICH HE DESCRIBES TAKING AN
ACTUAL FLIGHT AND SUBMITTING TO A PHYSICAL EXAMINATION. CONCLUSIVE
FINDINGS AND CAUSE ARE UNDETERMINED.

BT

NNNN