

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 4 May 1956		2. LOCATION WISCONSIN Marinette, Michigan		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☐ Other _____ ☒ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local _____ GMT 05/0230 to 0330Z		4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☒ Ground-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar			
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No		6. SOURCE Civilian			
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 1 hour		8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS 1-6-2-9		9. COURSE W N W	
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Round objects size of baseball, color reddish orange - in U shaped formation. 1 sighting 6 objects - 1 sighting 2 objects. One sighting 9 objects - on a WNW heading straight line of flight, disappeared over horizon.				11. COMMENTS Insufficient data for evaluation. No record of reply to request for additional information.	

HEADQUARTERS
4602d AIR INTELLIGENCE SERVICE SQUADRON (ADC)
ENT AIR FORCE BASE
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

AISOC

SUBJECT: Marinette, Wisconsin, UFOB Sighting

TO: Commander
Air Technical Intelligence Center
ATTN: AFOIN-4E4
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

23 MAY 1956

1. Reference "Marinette Case" and telephone conversation of 15 May 1956 between Captain G.T. Gregory, ATIC, and S/Sgt DeRudder, this headquarters.

2. Forwarded herewith for action deemed necessary is ATIC Form 164 completed telephonically between UFOB observer, Reverend ~~St. [REDACTED]~~, and Flight 3-A, 4602d AISS.

3. Review of the attached form indicates that this sighting was possibly astronomical in nature. The following items would substantiate a meteoric hypothesis:

a. Unrestricted visibility of the heavens with the exception of a few scattered clouds.

b. One object, although moving behind a cloud, was still visible with a change in color indicating this was not a reflection but a self-illuminated body.

c. The short duration of sighting of each object or group of objects coupled with the distance traveled again indicates meteors.

d. The fact that the observer did not have sufficient time to see the object(s) through binoculars indicates the celerity of the objects.

e. The color of the object(s) is that of meteors.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

1 Incl:

a/s

(UFO Questionnaire)

Removed and submitted
to Dr. Hynek per his request

RAY L. JONES
Major, USAF
Adjutant

Meteor hypothesis
seems doubtful:

1. Obscure, any
amount of [REDACTED]

2. Object [REDACTED]
formation.

3. Several groups -
certainly not [REDACTED]
of meteors.

When in follow
up to my original
questions?

JH.

AIR TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE
OHIO

AFOIN-4E4

SUBJECT: Follow-up on Marinette Case

TO: Commander
Air Defense Command
ATTN: 4602d AISS
Colorado Springs, Colorado

1. Reference your basic communication 23 May 1956 regarding meteor hypothesis submitted on the sighting observed by Reverend Charles Burmeister of Marinette, Wisconsin, and teletype message, ATIC, dated 14 May 1956, requesting additional information on subject sighting.
2. A review and analysis of this sighting has been completed by a USAF consultant and scientist on astronomical matters. In light of present information, it was disclosed that it is very doubtful that reported objects were meteoric in nature.
3. The following are submitted in support of the above contention:
 - a. Meteors do not travel in formation.
 - b. "U" shaped formations, definitely not characteristic of meteors.
 - c. Observation of three separate groups, also not characteristic of meteors.
 - d. Observer, being an amateur astronomer, would recognize or have general knowledge of meteoric phenomena.
4. Request that the same basic questions submitted in teletype message, referenced in paragraph 2 above, be considered as part of your "follow-up" action towards properly resolving this case.

4-05/0230-
witness IN-05/0330Z

27

MAY 1956 07 32 MAY 8 06 47 '56
hl

REC80

WPB087 YMA051 YVEC2SHRAC20 HRA016HRJ001

FM RJEDEN RJEDAE RJEDWP RJEPHQ

DE RJEDHR 1J

M 080035Z

1) 4E4
2) 4E4
3) 4E4
4) 4X 2a
Jc

FM COMDR 676TH ACWRON ANTIGO AFS WISC

TO RJEDEN/COMDR ADC ENT AFB COLORADO SPRINGS COLORADO

RJEDAE/COMDR 37TH AD TRUAX FLD MADISON WISC

RJEDWP/COMDR AIR TECH INTEL CEN WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OHIO

RJEDHQ/DIR OF INTL HDQ USAF WASHINGTON 25, DC

UNCLASSIFIED/ANOPS 05-034 PD THE FOLLOWING UFOB REPORT
IS SUBMITTED IAW AFR 2000-2 PD


1 (A) ROUND

(B) BASEBALL

(C) REDDISH ORANGE

(D) THREE SIGHTINGS FIRST, SIX OBJECT. SECOND, TWO OBJECTS.
THIRD, NINE OBJECTS

(E) U SHAPED FORMATION



(F) NEGATIVE

(G) NEGATIVE

PAGE TWO DE RJEDHR 1J

(H) NAGATIVE

(I) NAGATIVE

1 (A) REV. [REDACTED] IS AN AMATEUR ASTROMONER AND WAS OUT LOOKING AT THE STARS WHEN HE MADE THIS SIGHTING.

(B) NEGATIVE

(C) NEGATIVE

(D) CAME OUT OF THE EAST ON A WEST NORTH WEST HEADING. STRAIGHT LINE OF FLIGHT

(E) DISAPPEARED OVER THE HORIZON

(F) APPROXIMATLY ON HOUR

← one hour

3 (A) GROUND VISUAL

(B) BINOCULARS

(C) N/A

4 (A) 05/0230Z WX MAY 56 TO 05/0330Z/ MAY 56 ←

(B) DUSK

5 CA 2206

6 (A) REV. [REDACTED], FORTY TWO, [REDACTED], MARINETTE MICHIGAN, CLERGY

(B) N/A

7 (A) CLEAR

(B) SURFACE: 240 DEGREES AT 6 KNOTS

~

5,000 FEET: 300 DEGREES AT 15 KNOTS
10,000 FEET: 300 DEGREES AT 20 KNOTS
15,000 FEET: 290 DEGREES AT 50 KNOTS
20,000 FEET: 280 DEGREES AT 70 KNOTS
30,000 FEET: 290 DEGREES AT 90 KNOTS
50,000 FEET: 290 DEGREES AT 50 KNOTS
80,000 FEET: NOT AVAILABLE

(C) 20,000 FEET SCATTERED

(D) 15 PLUS

(E) THIN

(F) N/A

8 NEGATIVE

9 NO INTERCEPTION ACTION

10 NEGATIVE

11 SENIOR DIRECTOR: KENNETH P. SLUSSER 1ST LT, USAF REMARKS:

THIS REPORT WAS RECEIVED 15 HOURS AFTER SIGHTING OF OBJECTS.

THERE WAS NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION TO OAKE ANALYSIS AS TO THE POSSIBLE
CAUSE OF THE SIGHTINGS.

12 NEGATIVE

BT

08/0220Z MAY RJEDHR

Sgt Hill:

1. Make a "case" file on this.
2. Keep a suspense of about 2 weeks - then check if a detailed IR 112 from 4602
3. If not, cable for investigation and details
4. Follow up --

Capt. Gregory

After conferences with Dr. Hynek re this case, it was opinion that

ROUTING

JOINT MESSAGEFORM

COMMUNICATIONS CENTER NO.

MAY 14 22 32 '56

97/B
14/53063

SPACE ABOVE FOR COMMUNICATIONS CENTER ONLY

FROM: (Originator)

COMDR ATIC

DATE-TIME GROUP

141500Z MAY 56

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PRECEDENCE
FOR:

ACTION

ROUTINE

INFORMATION

TO:

COMDR, AIR DEFENSE COMMAND,
ENT AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO SPRINGS,
COLORADO

RJEDEN

☐ BOOK MESSAGE☒ ORIGINAL MESSAGE☐ MULTIPLE ADDRESS

CRYPTOPRECAUTION

☐ YES☐ NO

REFERS TO MESSAGE:

IDENTIFICATION

CLASSIFICATION

INFO:

FROM: AFOIN-4E4

5-537-E

FOR: 4602a AISS

(UNCL) Ref msg ANOPS 05-034 from 676th ACWRON, ANTIGO AFS, Wisconsin dtd 8 May 56, UFO report, cy submitted your headquarters. Observer of phenomena Rev. [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Marinette, Michigan, who is also amateur astronomer. This case warrants attention. Action to investigate undoubtedly under way by your office. Proper analysis of this case towards some firm conclusion require the following data also be obtained, which not indicated in original msg:

- a. Msg states duration of objects sighted 1 hour. Des this mean all three formations?
- b. What was time duration of each formation?
- c. What was the time interval between each formation?
- d. What was the significant difference between the three formations, as to size, shape, color, maneuver, motions, etc., if any?
- e. Obtain details as to approximate speed, movements or maneuvers of each formation. None given.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES

[REDACTED] Case) Am attaching all the correspondence from the **[REDACTED]** file, except the TWX - which was turned over to you during my last visit to Columbus. I thought it would be best if you would review my letter to the 4602d requesting they re-enter the case. As you may see from the correspondence they insist the objects seen by the good reverend are meteors. Perhaps I have phrased the letter in an erroneous manner, or the statements in refutation of their meteor hypothesis may be misconstrued. You may revise it as you see fit. I am attempting to "demand" a re-investigation and get specific answers to your original TWX questions - without being too blunt.

I will follow up on the **[REDACTED]** case. I think the best thing to do is for me to correspond directly with **[REDACTED]** -- I can say that I happened to be talking to you at ATIC and got interested in it because of its astronomical implications, and thus I need not disclose my connection with the project. O.K?

If I may digress to the **[REDACTED]** case, may I submit the following suggestion as being of some possible value towards resolving the meteor hypothesis: Is it possible for you to contact and consult with astronomers (not amateurs) in the **[REDACTED]** area and determine whether there was any unusual meteoric activity or astronomical phenomena for the night of the sighting which could have some bearing on the alleged observations? This is definitely not to question your professional integrity or opinion, Dr. **[REDACTED]** (for I consider and will be your stalwart champion in any USAF matters), but for purposes of having some paper on file indicating you have exhausted all sources to approve or disapprove the hypothesis. This is in keeping with our policy of getting all opinions, evaluations, analysis, results of investigations, etc. -- "on paper".

ROUTING

JOINT MESSAGEFORM

COMMUNICATIONS CENTER NO.

SPACE ABOVE FOR COMMUNICATIONS CENTER ONLY

FROM: (Originator)

DATE-TIME GROUP

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

PRECEDENCE
FOR:

ACTION

INFORMATION

TO:

☐ BOOK MESSAGE☐ ORIGINAL MESSAGE☐ MULTIPLE ADDRESS

CRYPTOPRECAUTION

☐ YES☐ NO

REFERS TO MESSAGE:

INFO:

IDENTIFICATION

CLASSIFICATION

f. How did phenomena differ when viewed visually and through binoculars?

g. Was it possible, under the existing circumstances and conditions, to determined whether the object had its own source of light or was light reflected?

h. If the latter, would be interesting to know if the light was diffused, specular, etc.

Above items are submitted for consideration only in the event your investigation and analysis cannot place sighting into explainable category. In reply or query to this matter, also reference "MARINETTE Case."

COORDINATION:

AFOIN4E4

DATE 14 May 1957

RECEIVED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 2 OF 2 PAGES

DRAFTER'S NAME (and signature, when required)

Capt G. T. Gregory

RELEASING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE

SYMBOL

AFOIN-4E4

TELEPHONE

69216

OFFICIAL TITLE

1st Lt., USAF
Assistant Adjutant

DD

FORM

173

REPLACES NME FORM 173, 1 MAY 49,
WHICH MAY BE USED.

GPO-16-58923-4

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE