

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 5 April 1956		2. LOCATION Casablanca, Morocco		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft	
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local 2015 GMT 05/2015Z		4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☒ Ground-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar		12. CONCLUSIONS ☒ Was Astronomical Meteor ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical	
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No		6. SOURCE Civilian		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Other _____ ☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 2 RPTS 1. not rptd/few seconds 2. 2-3 minutes		8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS one	9. COURSE West		
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Two reports of firey object, one by employee of meteorological station at Casablanca Airport. Described as round firey ball orange in color bluish on edge. East-West flight. Witness took for granted that object was a meteor. Additional report including maneuvers of circling city, low speed, 2-3 minute obsrvation and disappearance behind clouds.			11. COMMENTS Meteor report. Additional rpt probable exaggeration of meteor, which initiated the report.		

5/20157

METEOR

ANA 76-56

6 April 1956

11 April 1956

Assistant Naval Attache
Tangier (Resident Casablanca)

Press; local contacts

C3

MOROCCO - REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT AT CASABLANCA

4506.

Ref: (a) OPNAVINST 3820.9

1. GENERAL. On 6 April 1956 the local press carried an article stating that a mysterious flying object had flown over the city of Casablanca. The press article further stated that the object was luminous with a fiery yellow color, appeared in the east and appeared to cross over the city at a low altitude, turning at the same time, and disappeared a few seconds later in a southeasterly direction.

2. OBSERVER NO. 1. The object was reported by M. Tahiri, an employee at the local newspaper LA VIEILLE, who describes the object as follows (enclosure (1) to reference (a)):

Description of object:

- a. Round or slightly oval shape.
- b. Size unknown.
- c. Yellow, fiery color.
- d. One in number.
- e. Not applicable.
- f. There may have been something below the bright object that was part of it.
- g. There was no tail or trail.
- h. There was no sound.

Description of course of object:

- a. The observer first noticed the object because of its brightness.
- b. Object was first observed in the east and observer states it had an altitude of 2,000 - 3,000 meters.
- c. Object maintained its altitude throughout sighting.
- d. Object had a straight flight at a very low speed; however, observer further states object circled the city and disappeared toward the southeast (approximately Casablanca Airport direction).
- e. Object disappeared behind a cloud.
- f. Object was in view during 2 or 3 minutes.

7493rd Investigation Wing, Detachment 62,
PICELM; COMSIXTHFLT; ALUSNA TANGIER; Nouasseur Air Depot, Morocco

3

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

R7C

UNCLASSIFIED

Assistant Naval Attache
Tangier (Resident Casablanca) AHA 75-56

11 April 1956

Manner of observation - ground-visual.

Time and date of sighting - 2015, 5 April 1956 (light condition - dusk)

Location of observer - Across from Admiralty in front of the Jardin Public,
Casablanca, Morocco.

Identification of observer - M. Tahir, n/a LA VIGIE MAROCAINE Newspaper,
83, bd des Zoukour 5^{me}
Casablanca, Morocco

Weather at time of sighting - Ceiling was 7/8 cloudy at 400 meters.
Wind from the southwest, 10 knots.

1. OBJECT NO. 2. The object was viewed by another observer, Mr. Paul Hillion, who is employed at the Meteorological Station, Casablanca Airport, Casablanca. He made the following statement:

"I left Casablanca Airport to go home at about 2000 on 5 April 1956. I live across from the Italian Consulate (rue Margu). As I was about to open the gate to the house, I looked at the sky and saw something like a round fiery ball, an orange color, bluish on the edge. This lasted for only a few seconds. It was travelling east-west (on a perpendicular with rue Margu) and in a trajectory that seemed to take it toward the sea. I took it for granted that this was a meteorite."

COMMENT: The locations of the two observers was separated by a distance of approximately one mile. Observer No. 1 (M. Tahir) would have had more opportunity to keep the object in unobstructed view for a longer period of time than observer No. 2. It appears likely the sighting was of a meteorite; however, this sighting is reported to make it a matter of record. USAF notified in accordance with reference (a).

Prepared:

THOMAS E. DONAHUE
LCDR, U.S. NAVY

Forwarded:

H. K. HARRIS
CAPT, USN