

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE <u>19</u> <u>27</u> July 1956		2. LOCATION San Bernadino, California		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☒ Other <u>Hoax</u> ☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local <u>noon</u> GMT <u>19/2000</u>		4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☒ Ground-Visual ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Intercept Radar			
5. PHOTOS ☒ Yes ☐ No		6. SOURCE Civilian			
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 15-30 seconds		8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS one		9. COURSE north	
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Observer reported he was lying on grass taking pictures with new camera. Saucer shaped object passed in view only one picture taken for he "over-shot" his film advance knob. Object disappeared to the north. Silver gray or metallic in color. No sound. First observed approximately 600 yards (1800feet) away. Reference: AIIR-01-56 27 Air Division 8 August 1956				11. COMMENTS Analysis of negative and numerous "blow-ups" of photo of various densities disclosed 4 slender shadows across diameter of saucer with 1/2 of the object in shadows. This unusual for object almost 1/4 of a mile away and in mid air. Also, all objects in picture clear, sharp and in focus except object which is very blurred and apparently very near camera lens.	

ROUTING	COORDINATION
	AFOIN-4
	AFOIN-4X2b
	AFOIN-4X2c
	AFOIN-4X3
	AFOIN-4X4
	AFOIN-4A
	AFOIN-4B
	AFOIN-4C
	AFOIN-4D
	AFOIN-4E
	AFOIN-4F
	OTHERS

FILE CLASS: _____
OFFICIAL FILE COPY

OFFICE OF RECORD

20 DEC 1956

Mr. [REDACTED]
San Bernardino, California

Dear [REDACTED]

We are returning a negative and four prints of an unidentified flying object which you photographed on the 19th of July 1956. Your photograph and a report of the circumstances surrounding the observation was referred to this Center for analysis by Air Force personnel who investigated the matter.

Some of our comments, based on a photo analysis of the photography and review of the information given by you to investigators, is outlined below for your information:

1. With a negative size of 2 9/16 by 1 11/16 inches, the focal length of the lens are assumed to be approximately 3 inches (75 MM). This is based on the general rule that the focal length is usually equal or larger than the diagonal of the negative size.
2. The image size of the object on the negative is 5/16 inch, over-all size.
3. The distance of the object as given by the source in the report is estimated at 600 yards i.e. 1800 feet. On the basis of the focal length, the object would then be approximately two-thirds the size of a football field, or over 200 feet in diameter.
4. An object of such size appearing over a populated city or area of California would certainly have been noticed, and reported, by a large number of persons. No reports on UFOs were received for this particular day or area.
5. A study of the photograph shows that the foliage in the foreground, the leaves on the tree in the background, and the two slender wire lines between these two points are all clear and in sharp focus, in contrast to the object which is somewhat fuzzy and indistinct in outline.

6. Photo analysis strongly suggests that the out-of-focus, indistinct appearance of the object is not caused by any apparent motion through space, but because of its very close proximity to the

PERM	
TEMP	
90 DAYS	
INITIAL	

ROUTING

COORDINATION

FILE CLASS: _____
OFFICIAL FILE COPY

OFFICE OF RECORD

AFOIN-4

camera. As any optical experiment will show, an object will appear lighter in color as it recedes into the distance. The object here, alleged to be approximately 2000 feet or over one-third of a mile away, is as dark or darker than any object in the field of view.

AFOIN-4X2

7. The direction of the light and shadows on the object does not appear to be consistent with that of the surrounding objects. A study of all the photographs attached indicate.

AFOIN-4X2C

AFOIN-4X3

8. A magnification of the image into three different densities reveals an object just inside the left edge of the print and on the object which resembles a thumb or some odd protrudance.

AFOIN-4X4

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

AFOIN-4A

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. O'CONNOR
Captain, USAF
Assistant Adjutant

AFOIN-4B

1 Incl.
3 Prints w/neg

AFOIN-4C

AFOIN-4D

AFOIN-4E

AFOIN-4F

OTHERS

PERM	
TEMP	
90 DAYS	
INITIAL	

ADVISOR
To RT 700
Witness

IN
-9 JUL 1956 07 00

174E4
23
4-4X 2a
JC

NNNN WPA038 YDB002 TYB035 TMA026NYA010

PP RJEDEN RJEDWP RJEPHQ RJEPNB

DE RJEPNY 12

P 090553Z

FM HQ 26TH ADIV ROSLYN AFS NY

TO RJEDEN/COMDR ADC ENT AFB COLORADO

RJEDWP/COMDR AIR TECH INTEL CEN WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OHIO

RJEPHQ/DIR OF INTEL HQ USAF WASH 25 DC

RJEPNB/COMDR DET 3 4602ND AISS STEWART AFB NY

RJEPNB/COMDR FLT 3 4602ND AISS STEWART AFB NY

INFO RJEPNB/COMDR EADF STEWART AFB NY

BT

/UNCLASSIFIED/CITE NBR 4698. ATTN: CIC EADF. SUBJ: UFAOB.

1. (A) RED CHANGING TO WHITE BACK TO RED

(B) N/A

(C) RED AND WHITE

(D) 1

(E) N/A

(F) N/A

(G) N/A

(H) N/A

(I) LATER BECAME TWO SEPERATE LIGHTS ONE RED ONE WHITE

AIR INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION REPORT

FROM (Agency)	REPORT NO.	PAGE	OF	PAGES
By 27th Air Division (Defense)	IR-41-56	2	5	

PART ONE

I. SOURCE:

Address: [REDACTED] San Bernardino, California
Age: 15 years
Occupation: Student
Education: 9th Grade
Qualifications: None

II. RELIABILITY: Good. In a personal interview, [REDACTED], appeared to be sincere and positive in all his statements. He was calm and completely relaxed and rational in his thinking of the object.

III. SOURCE'S DESCRIPTION OF SIGHTING: Source was lying on the grass in the backyard of his home taking pictures with a new camera when a movement was observed to the left. The single disk-shaped object was receding rapidly from approximately 600 yards to the North of position of source. Source took a picture (Refer Incl 1, PART ONE this report) immediately and tried to get another shot but turned film advance control beyond the next frame in the attempt to watch object and set camera. The object seemed to dwindle or disappear directly away from source upward in a due North direction (at approximately a 60 degree angle). Object was observed for 15 to 30 seconds and did not move behind any other object during the entire sighting. The object was not brighter than the background of the sky and its edges were fuzzy or blurred. There was no sound heard and object was silvery-gray or metallic in color. Object appeared to be the size of a nickel held in the hand at arm's length and source estimated its size to be 30 feet in its longest dimension. Source described its shape as a third of an orange placed on top of another third of an orange.

Source's description of weather conditions at the time of sighting was hazy, hot, dry and a slight breeze was blowing. Source had no explanation of what object might have been except he did not believe it to be a balloon and believed it was made of metal.

Incl #1 Negative and 2 prints
of UFOB. (NOTE: To be
returned to Source at address
given in this report).

AIR INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION REPORT

FROM (Agency)	REPORT NO.	PAGE	OF	PAGES
By 27th Air Division (Defense)	12-01-56	3	5	

PART TWO

SUPPLEMENTARY INVESTIGATIVE EFFORTS:

1. [REDACTED] was interviewed on 27 July 1956 and photograph negative of object was obtained on 29 July 1956. (See Incl #1, PART ONE of this report).
Note: Source requests the return of this negative upon completion of analysis.

2. Capt B. Beattie, Operations Plans, Air Force Flight Test Center, Edwards Air Force Base, California was questioned as to the possibility of test aircraft in the vicinity at the time of sighting with negative results of experimental aircraft from that base in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

3. Detachment 7, 6th Weather Group, Norton Air Force Base was contacted and the following information was obtained:

a. Two (2) temperature inversions were recorded on the 19th of July 1956 at the Los Angeles Weather Office.

(1) Inversion at 191500Z Jul 56 was between 1,000 feet at 14.5°C and 3,200 feet at 22°C. Winds aloft during that inversion follows:

Altitude (In ft)	Wind Direction (In degrees)	Wind Speed (In knots)
2,000	140	10
3,000	130	10
4,000	120	13
5,000	130	10
6,000	170	10
7,000	170	10
8,000	170	10
9,000	160	10
10,000	130	10
15,000	130	13
20,000	120	15
25,000	170	10
30,000	170	10
35,000	180	15
40,000	190	30

(2) A double inversion existed at 192100Z July 1956. The first between 500 feet at 17°C and 1300 feet at 24.5°C and the second between 8,000 feet at 33°C and 9,000 feet at 14°C. Winds aloft during these inversions follows:

Altitude (In ft)	Wind Direction (In degrees)	Wind Speed (In knots)
1,000	190	10
2,000	190	10
3,000	200	13
4,000	190	5
5,000	200	5

AIR INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION REPORT

FROM (Agency)	REPORT NO.	DATE	BY	FOR
27th Air Division (Defense)	11-01-56			

Part III. Cont'd

9,000	090	10
10,000	120	10
15,000	120	10
20,000	110	10
25,000	070	5
30,000	110	10
35,000	110	10
40,000	140	15

b. Surface winds recorded at Norton Air Force Base were as follows:

Time (Z)	Wind Direction (In degrees)	Wind Speed (In knots)
192128 Jul 56	250	10
192229 Jul 56	225	10
192328 Jul 56	225	12
200029 Jul 56	250	8
200127 Jul 56	250	6
200228 Jul 56	250	8

AIR INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION REPORT

FROM (Agency)	REPORT NO.	PAGE	OF	PAGES
37th Air Division (Defense)	IP-01-56	5	5	

PART THREE

CORRECTIONS OF THE PREPARING OFFICER:

1. It is the opinion of the preparing officer that the temperature inversion which was recorded at Los Angeles (Refer to par 3b, PART TWO of this report) could have moved to the area of sighting for a possible optical phenomena solution to this sighting.

Charles R. Hartman 2/5/57
for JOHN H. AHLSTROM
Major, USAF
Dir of Intelligence

AFOIN-4E4

SUBJECT: Analysis of UFO Report, IR-01-56

TO: Commander
4602d Air Intelligence Service Squadron (ADC)
Ent Air Force Base
Colorado Springs, Colorado

1. Reference 4602d AISS UFOB Report Nr. 469, originally submitted under AF Form 112, IR-01-56, from Headquarters, 27th Air Division, 8 August 1956.

2. Attached hereto is a negative and photograph of an unidentified flying object photographed by source, [REDACTED], over San Bernardino, California on 19 July 1956. Also appended are three "contrast" print enlargements of varying densities used in the analysis of the object photographed.

3. Comments of this Center, on the basis of a review of the information submitted and a photo analysis of the photo material submitted, are as follows:

a. With a negative size of $2 \frac{9}{16}$ by $1 \frac{11}{16}$ inches, the focal length of the lens are assumed to be approximately 3 inches (75 mm). This is based on the general rule that the focal length is usually equal or larger than the diagonal of the negative size.

b. The image size of the object on the negative is $\frac{5}{16}$ inch, over-all size.

c. The distance of the object as given by the source in the report is estimated at 600 yards i.e. 1800 feet. On the basis of the focal length, the object would then be approximately two-thirds the size of a football field, or over 200 feet in diameter.

d. An object of such size appearing over a populated city or area of California would certainly have been noticed, and reported, by a large number of persons. No reports on UFOs were received for this particular day or area.

e. A study of the photograph shows that the foliage in the foreground, the leaves on the tree in the background, and the two

Ltr, ATIC, Subj: Analysis of UFO Report, IR-01-56

slender wire lines between these two points are all clear and in sharp focus, in contrast to the object which is somewhat fuzzy and indistinct in outline.

f. Photo analysis strongly suggests that the out-of-focus, indistinct appearance of the object is not caused by any apparent motion through space, but because of its very close proximity to the camera. As any optical experiment will show, an object will appear lighter in color as it recedes into the distance. The object here, alleged to be approximately 2000 feet or over one-third of a mile away, is as dark or darker than any object in the field of view.

g. The direction of the light and shadows on the object does not appear to be consistent with that of the surrounding objects, as a study of all the photographs attached indicate.

h. A magnification of the image into three different densities reveals an object just inside the left edge of the print and on the object which resembles a thumb or some odd protrudance.

i. The opinion submitted in the IR that the sighting may have been caused by a "temperature inversion" cannot be remotely considered as creating the optical phenomena i.e. the object. While such inversions can create spurious objects or blips on radar scopes, the object shown here is a dark, solid, tangible one and against a fairly clear sky. Optical phenomena created by unusual weather or temperature conditions and inversions usually tend to blend in, or have the general coloration or hue of, the sky or cloud formation which they are a part of.

4. In view of the foregoing, the opinion of this Center is that the photographs strongly suggest a hoax; and typical of the many it receives, resulting in a considerable waste of government time, money, and man-power in the investigations and analysis required.

5. In accordance with established policies for providing field units and related agencies with guidance and assistance on UFO matters, suggest the following be considered in the investigation of sightings of this type involving UFO photographs:

a. Investigative and interviewing personnel "mentally" frame or study the immediate area and surroundings shown within the UFO photograph.

4E4/Capt G.T.Gregory/ltc
69216

Ltr. ATIC, Subj: Analysis of UFO Report, IR-01-56

b. Exact time of the exposure, if possible. This will assist in determining the sun's position at that time and whether the sun was out among other factors, statements of the source to the contrary notwithstanding, as our case files often disclose.

c. The direction and angle of elevation which the camera was facing. Not given in AF 112.

d. The type, make, lens size of the camera, shutter speed, and exposure settings used. In all cases, where the source states he does not know what "f" stop or speed used, the minimum and maximum scale of these camera gradients should be obtained, and given in the AF 112.

e. Type of film used.

f. Where an object is not shown in mid air, as in this case, determine whether any object or means just outside the picture area could have been used to support the supposedly "flying saucer," such as overhanging tree limb, post, rod inserted in the ground, etc.

g. Consider the source's age (15, in this case); his opinion or interest regarding "flying saucers"; whether any motion pictures having this subject as their theme were recently shown in his location; and whether he has done any extensive reading on "flying saucer" books. This information can only be determined at the source location, and is pertinent as supplementary data for formulating sound conclusions. There are at the present time 10 to 15 science-fiction motion pictures, and almost 20 books dealing with "flying saucers." Investigators must consider the impressionable characteristics, and the influence of such media on one of source's age.

h. Refer to AFR 200-2, "Intelligence Photography," for guidance on collection involving photography, with specific reference to paragraph 137 and Appendix C. This manual is also used by investigative units of the Army, Navy and FBI.

1 Incl

4 prints w/neg.

Copy furnished:
Cmdr Hq, 27th Air Div. (Def)
Norton AF Base, California



HEADQUARTERS
4602D AIR INTELLIGENCE SERVICE SQUADRON (ADC)
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
ENT AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO

11 December 1956

AISOC

SUBJECT: Negative of UFOB


TO: Commander
Air Technical Intelligence Center
ATTN: AFOIN 4EL4
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Ohio

1. Inclosed is a letter from Commander, 27th Air Division (DEF), Norton AFB, California, forwarded for your information and appropriate action.

2. The subject negative was recently forwarded to your organization attached to the UFOB Index Card for AISS-UFOB-469-56.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

1 Incl
Ltr fr Comdr 27th AD
w/1 Incl


CHARLES W. GODSEY
Captain, USAF
Assistant Adjutant

DD
1
Second A.S.S.

HEADQUARTERS
27TH AIR DIVISION (DEFENSE)
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Norton Air Force Base, California

270I

SUBJECT: Negative of UFOB

TO: Commander
Air Defense Command
Ent Air Force Base
Colorado

1. Reference is made to Air Intelligence Information Report (Form 112) No. IR-01-56, dated 8 August 1956, with source: [REDACTED] San Bernardino, California. A photographic negative of the Unidentified Flying Object was attached to this report. A specific request was made in the report to the effect that this negative should be returned to the source at the address given in the report. At the time of the initial investigation, the observer was reluctant to give up the negative and did so only upon the express assurances of the reporting officer that subject negative would be returned as soon as possible. As of this date, subject negative has not been returned as requested; the source is now concerned about the possibility of never receiving this negative.

2. On 14 October 1956, an article appeared in the "Aviation News" column of the Los Angeles Examiner newspaper based upon the possible significance of the Air Force's retention of this UFOB negative belonging to [REDACTED]. This article has been clipped from the newspaper and is attached to this letter.

3. It is possible that considerable publicity adverse to the best interests of the Air Force could result from this situation if subject negative is not returned to the "source" as soon as practicable.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

1 Incl
Newspaper Clipping

Pholey M. Young
W. C. M. YOUNG
CWO 73 USAF
1st Lt. Col.

4E4/Sgt O.D. Hill/wm
69216

AFOIN-4E4

SUBJECT: (U) Negative of UFOB

TO: Commander
27th Air Division (Defense)
ATTN: Major J.M. Ahlstrom
Norton AFB, California

1. Reference is made to your letter dated 5 December 1956, concerning the return of UFOB negative to source.


2. Inclosed herewith are copies of reply to source and to the 27th Air Division (Defense) with regard to subject UFOB negative. This action was completed by the Air Technical Intelligence Center as of 10 December 1956.

3. In regards to paragraphs 2 and 3 of your letter, you are quite right in that this type of publicity could very well be adverse to the Air Force. Thank you for the clipping. You may be assured that this incident will be brought to the attention of the D/I.

2 Incls

1. Cy of ltr to 27th AD
2. Cy of ltr to Mr. Savage

File - San Bernardino File

COVER SHEET										SUSPENSE				
ORIGIN OF BASIC 4602d AISS, Ent Air Force Base, Colorado										DATE ASSIGNED BY				
DATE 11 December 56					TYPE Letter					NO.				
SUBJECT Negative of UFOB														
ROUTING														
<i>Initial "IN" column to denote review prior to action. Initial "OUT" column to denote review of completed action. (X for action; ✓ for coordination.)</i>														
IN	OFFICE	OUT	IN	OFFICE	OUT	IN	OFFICE	OUT	IN	OFFICE	OUT	IN	OFFICE	OUT
	OIN-1			OIN-2			OIN-3			OIN-4			AFOIN	
	OIN-1X			OIN-2X			OIN-3X			OIN-4X			✓ AFOIN-X	
													✓ AFOIN-X	
													AFOIN-X1	
													AFOIN-X2	
													AFOIN-X3	
													AFOIN-X4	
													AFOIN-X5	
													AFOIN-Z	
													CABLES	
													FILE	
													DISPATCH	
TO: AFOIN-X, Lt Col Green										DATE 27 December 56				
FROM: AFOIN-4E4										COMMENT NO. 1				
COMMENTS (Use reverse, if necessary)														
1. Inclosed herewith is complete case file on subject UFO sighting for your information and necessary action. 2. Regarding the statement purported to have been made by PRO, this office was not contacted at anytime in relation to report on action taken. 3. Accordingly, it is requested that positive action be taken to bring to the attention of Mr. Tom Towers, that the negative, and prints therefrom, were processed, analyzed, and the results made known to source, Mr. ██████████ on 10 Dec 56. For your information, it should be pointed out that Mr. Towers, was the individual cast in the leading role of the controversial documentary film produced by Green Rouse Studios "UFO". The implications in not informing Mr. Towers are therefore obvious. 4. Request case file be returned to AFOIN-4E4 for retention in our files.														
2 Incls 1. Ltr fr 4602d AISS w/Incl 2. Case file  ROBERT E. O'CONNOR Captain, USAF AFOIN-4X2a														

4E4/Capt G.T.Gregory
ltc/69216

AFOIN-4E4

SUBJECT: Copy, Analysis of UFO Sighting. IR-01-56.

TO: Commander
27th Air Division (Defense)
Headquarters (ADC)
ATTN: Maj J. M. Ahlstrom
Norton Air Force Base, California

1. Attached herewith for your information and guidance is a copy of the analysis made of a photograph of an unidentified flying object, reported by your organization per Air Intelligence Information Report, IR-01-56, dated 8 August 1956. Also attached are three copies of the original prints.

2. In accordance with instructions submitted in subject IR, the negatives and prints, together with pertinent, discreet portions of the attached analysis and comments, were forwarded to source of subject sighting.

2 Incls

1. Cy, ltr to 4604d AISS,
subj: Analysis of UFO Rpt
2. 3 prints

Note!!!
Concur

Case 174, San Bernardino, Cal., July 19, '36—In San Bernardino readers of the *Daily Sun* got an eyeful: in four columns was the story and a large photo of a saucer. AP carried a wirephoto which was printed in the Los Angeles *Daily Mirror* and *The Times*. Briefly, the story is centered around one [REDACTED] 15-year old son of a doctor. According to the *Daily Sun*, Michael's story ran like this: "... I was lying on the grass in my back-~~yard about to take a picture when a movement caught~~ my eye. I turned to see it and saw a disk-shaped object not far away which was receding rapidly. Immediately on seeing it, I turned my camera and took a quick shot at it because of its strange shape. After taking the picture I tried to watch the object and crank my film at the same time. The result was that I overcranked the film and the next shot turned out to be a blank. The object did not disappear over the horizon, but seemed to shrink or dwindle as it disappeared. It was gone within 30 seconds after I spotted it."

Ed: Officers at George AFB expressed interest in the photo and wanted to see negatives. Of interest also is the fact that the photo was taken on the same date as sightings over Kansas. (See Case 168, Orono, August, 1936.)

Aviation News: *12.1.1*

Stir in Hawthorne Over Airport Deal

By TOM TOWERS
Aviation Editor

Reports that the city-owned Hawthorne Airport might be sold to the Northrop Aircraft Company for use as a parking lot have caused some concern among private pilots and business firms now using and leasing space on the premises.

If the deal goes through, it will reduce the active and available airports in metropolitan Los Angeles (Los Angeles and Orange Counties) to 13. In 1940 there were 60 airports in operation in the metropolitan area.

According to Hawthorne City Manager M. L. Wilhelm, sale of the airport "probably" will not take place before this time next year.

He said that many local problems would first have to be solved before a sale could be arranged. One such hurdle is how the CAA would react to such a proposal at this agency of the Government has promised some aid in solving aviation problems.

PROFIT RAIDS—

In recent years the Government has increased WPA funds in the Los Angeles area and the city of Hawthorne has been one of the beneficiaries of the program. The city has been able to keep the airport in good shape.

Wilhelm said that the airport is now operating at a "break even" point and that it is not sufficient to enable the city government to make any worthwhile improvements on the property.

The city manager said that the private pilots are not willing to pay increased landing and rental fees in order to maintain the airport properly. The city of Hawthorne is not in the business of operating a landing strip for private pilots, Wilhelm declared. Forty firms lease space at the airport.

When Northrop established its plant in Hawthorne in 1939, the city agreed to build an airport for the company. In 1948, the airport was opened as a municipal terminal.

INTENSIFIED—


Northrop's need for additional parking space for its employees is

being intensified. The consensus went something like this: We like to take the "champagne" flight because we get a good meal (steak) en route to San Francisco. By doing this, we save some two or three hours that normally would be spent in a San Francisco restaurant at mealtime. Having dinner on the plane enables us to prepare our daily reports and get set for the next day's work.

AIR FORCE REPORT—Air Force headquarters in the Pentagon reports that there is no record of the receipt of a "CHINA BANG" message from the San Bernardino County Jail. According to the Air Force, the message was received by the Air Force in the Pentagon and was forwarded to the Air Force in the Pentagon. The message was received by the Air Force in the Pentagon and was forwarded to the Air Force in the Pentagon.

The message was received by the Air Force in the Pentagon and was forwarded to the Air Force in the Pentagon. The message was received by the Air Force in the Pentagon and was forwarded to the Air Force in the Pentagon. The message was received by the Air Force in the Pentagon and was forwarded to the Air Force in the Pentagon.

FLIGHT LINE BRIGHTEN—Los Angeles-area reservists, who did a tour of active duty at March AFB last month in hopes of coming in close contact with jet flying, are still talking about how they had to help stage the base's "Olympic Days" athletic events... One reservist told this corner that it was time and money wasted, and that the events assumed fiasco status from the outset... Richard R. Miller, Northrop's vice president-general manager, has been named to the firm's board of directors... TWA's annual European holiday discount fare plan is now in effect... The Douglas A4D Skyhawk "bantam bomber"



19 July 1956

San Bernardino,

California

evaluated

as a leaf

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED~~

No Case (Information Only)

1 or 2 July 1956
Bromley, Kentucky

Case 163, Bromley, Ky., July 1 or 2, 1956—The sighters, Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] are not sure of the date, but they are certain they saw a huge glowing object about a quarter the size of the moon shining through their bedroom window about 3 a.m. Both were awakened at the same instant by the intense yellow glow and Mr. [REDACTED] estimated that it was about 30 degrees above the horizon. To him it appeared round and self-luminous. Reassuring himself that he was not being deceived by Mars or a bright star [REDACTED] watched again, same time, the following night, but saw nothing.

No Case (Information Only)

8 July 1956
Little Rock, Arkansas

1956, July 8-Little Rock, Arkansas-Great "Balls-of-Fire" attack the 12--
room home of the Prather Family. Said to be Lightning, but
it lasted for three whole minutes. Neighbors said the house
appeared to be "A sheet of flame- with balls of fire pop-
ping out the windows." "It looked like someone was shoot-
ing big Roman-Candles right over our heads," said one of
the Family who was inside at the time... (Well...???)

No Case (Information Only)

10 July 1956
Washington, Indiana

Case 172, Washington, Indiana, July 10, 1956—Frank Edwards of WTTV, Indianapolis sent CRIFO the following item which appeared in the Washington Daily Times. The observers have withheld their identity for "obvious reasons". We quote thus: "It all started at 3:40 a.m. when I sneezed and awoke from a deep slumber. As I opened my eyes and looked out of the window I saw this bright, star-like object moving in a due east direction. Suddenly it stopped dead still. I awakened my wife. I pointed it out to her by aligning it directly above a neighbor's chimney. The object had a bluish cast and appeared to pulsate—it was brighter than most stars. . . . I focused binoculars on the object and made it out quite clearly. It consisted of eight lights. One bright light in the hub with two smaller one on each side of the hub in all four directions of the compass. Then there were two smaller lights, one spaced to the northeast of the hub and one to the southwest. The center light was brighter than the rest and emitted a pulsating light that would change from red to blue and blue to red. All the lights would pulsate in unison, causing a twinkling effect although all of the other lights except the hub remained bluish. Finally it started moving again toward the east, made a semi-circle and stopped motionless again. The sky was getting brighter and the stars disappeared, but the object remained as clear as before. At 5:15 a.m. the object began to climb higher and higher and moved off in a southeasterly direction."

U. F. O. Seen Early This Morning Over Washington

(Editors Note: This is an incident that happened locally early this morning. It is related in exact detail although the observers wish that their true identity be withheld because of obvious reasons. We present it to our readers as a true happening but they, naturally are entitled to draw their own conclusions.)

"Today I will have to admit I have been converted to the rapidly growing number of people who have seen U.F.O.'s (Unidentified Flying Objects.) On two other occasions I have seen this same type of "light", resembling a star, moving across the sky at lower altitudes, but early this morning, one stopped and hovered for 1 hour and 35 minutes — long enough to observe it carefully:


"It all started at 3:40 a.m. when I sneezed and awoke myself from deep slumber. As I opened my eyes and looked out of the window I saw this "bright, star-like object" at a great height, moving in a due east direction. It moved much slower than a comet and faster than an airplane. I got out of bed and stood watching it. Then it stopped, dead still. I awakened my wife and she sleepily, peered into the star studded sky. "Where?" she asked, "I don't see anything."

"I pointed it out to her by aligning it directly above a neighbor's chimney. Then she saw it too.

"The U.F.O. looked so much like a bright star that it was quite difficult to make out unless one had seen it moving across the sky before it stopped. It had a blueish cast and appeared to pulsate or twinkle like a true star. The only difference between its appearance and that of a star was that it was brighter than most stars.

"I told my wife to keep watching the object and I searched for my binoculars. They are quite powerful and with them I have often observed the mountains and craters on the moon.

"I focused my binoculars on the object and was successful in making it out quite clearly. It consisted of eleven lights. One bright light in the hub with two smaller ones on each side of the hub in all four directions of the compass. Then there were two smaller lights, one spaced to the northeast of the hub and one to the southwest of the hub. The center light was brighter than the rest and emitted a pulsating light that would change from red to blue and blue to red. All of the lights would pulsate in unison,



(This is an artist's conception of the way the U.F.O. appeared against dark sky.)

✦ ✦

causing a twinkling effect although all of the other lights except the hub remained blueish.

"Finally it started moving again toward the east, made a semi-circle and stopped motionless again, changing its relation to the stars where it had been seen previous. All the while I observed the object through the binoculars and wondered who in the world I could telephone about the U.F.O. My wife finally gave up and went back to bed only after observing it through the binoculars and witnessing its movement.

"I continued to observe the object. The sky was getting lighter and finally all of the stars disappeared — but the bright object remained as clear as before. It was not light enough to make out any sort of outline — only the formation of the lights. At fifteen minutes past five a.m. the object began to climb higher and higher. It was getting light and the birds were chirping. Traffic was moving on a nearby highway and the roar of cars and trucks were quite audible. All the while the object climbed sky and moved off in a southeasterly direction.

"I went back to bed to catch a few winks wondering if anyone else had been watching this same object.

"I personally believe that this is some sort of secret flying object of the U.S.A., so maneuverable that it can fly in any direction or hover in a stationary position and yet be so well camouflaged that to the casual observer, it is only a star.

"Others wonder if it could be a secret flying object from another country or even another planet. Your guess is as good as mine!"

No Case (Information Only)

10 July 1956
Cincinnati & Northern Ky.

Case 164, Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky, July 10, 1956—Two Cincinnatians witnessed a circular object "lit up like a lantern" pacing an air transport plane heading for Boone County Airport, Kentucky. They said the object was bigger and brighter than the landing lights shown by the aircraft, and when the plane landed the object continued its course, then swerved and blinked out. Both sighters had been skeptical of saucers, but were changing their minds.

14 July 1956
Gary, Indiana

Case 173, Gary, Indiana, July 14, 1956—Said the Gary *Post Tribune* in part: "... The brilliant stranger appeared high in the southeastern sky, was visible for more than an hour and then moved into 'the infinity' of the south. ... Five substantial citizens of Gary saw it and were 'enthralled and amazed.' According to the *Post Tribune* one of the sighters, August Barnett said it was like a beautiful jewel. He described it as big as a full moon and that it seemed to have a bright white light in its center. He added, "the outer edges could have been dotted with rubies it was so brilliant." At 12:45 a.m. (Saturday) Barnett called the civil defense director, Bud Bardowski, and told him to look. According to the *Post Tribune*, Bardowski saw it too and reported it to the Air Defense Command at Truax Field.¹

Ed: The *Post Tribune* depicted an artist's conception of the "jewel" over Gary and there is striking similarity to object witnessed in Case 172, which was also sketched and presented in the *Washington Daily Times*. Both Barnett and Bardowski used binoculars.

¹ Frank Edwards, WFTV, Indianapolis.

Saucer or Jewel? Sky Visitor A Mystery

Bright Light Seen On Gary Horizon

By EDWIN BLAY

Gary had a mysterious celestial visitor early Saturday morning and, whether you saw it or not, don't argue with those who did.

The brilliant stranger appeared high in the southeastern sky, was visible for more than an hour and then moved into "the infinity" of the south, leaving behind conquered doubts and new converts to the possibilities of flying saucers.

Its passage through Gary's star-filled heavens also proved the old adage that there is no truer believer than a convert. Whether it be in religion or in matters from outer space.

Five persons saw it. Five substantial citizens of Gary, and they were in their own words "enthralled and amazed."

It was like a beautiful jewel," according to Aug. J. (Gus) Barnett of 3508 Buchanan St.

"I know how how these other people felt who were kidded about seeing flying saucers. I'll never again laugh at one of them. I watched that thing, whatever it was, for over an hour and it was marvelous," he declared.

"I called Bud Barlowe, the civil defense director, that was about 12:45 a.m. Saturday, and told him about it. He saw it too, just ask him," he insisted.



JEWEL IN THE SKY—This is an artist's conception of the celestial visitor reported Saturday morning by residents of Buchanan St. who watched two strange objects swing the brightly colored way across the darkened Gary skies. "It had a white light in its center with what seemed like rubies against a purple background," according to the witnesses.

So Barlowe was called. And he had seen it. In fact, he had reported its presence to the Air Division of the Defense Command at Travis Field in Madison, Wis., mentioning the call from his home at 444 Maryland St.

They told him they would check and, "If it isn't something of ours, we'll call you back."

Stays for Hour, Moves to South

They didn't call. "My binoculars weren't as strong as those being used by Mr. Barnett, but I saw it plainly enough," the civil defense chief said.

"It was big as a full moon to me," new convert Barnett said. "It seemed to have a bright white light in its center and the outer edges could have been dotted with rubies. It was so brilliant."

He said he was on his way home at 12:30 a.m. when his attention was called to the phenomenon by Mr. and Mrs. Karl M. Jensen of 3540 Buchanan St.

"They were on the porch watching it. I wouldn't have seen it if they hadn't pointed it out to me and asked me to look. They can tell you the same thing if you ask them," Barnett insisted.

But neither Mr. nor Mrs. Jensen was available for comment.

"All right then, ask my son Keith. He came along about 12:45 and watched it with us for over a half hour," the Gary druggist said.

Keith too proved unavailable. He had left home for his job at Miller Beach where he is a lifeguard.

A call to the civil defense filter center in Chicago showed no report of the "jewel."

See SAUCERS—Page 2

NO CASE (INFORMATION ONLY)

19 July 1956
Wichita, Kansas

Source: Fawcett

On July 19, 1956 the same aerial phenomena appeared on film over San Bernardino, California and over Wichita, Kansas.

20 - 31 JULY 1956 SIGHTINGS

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>OBSERVER</u>	<u>EVALUATION</u>
20	Terre Haute, Indiana (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Balloon
20-22	Guatemala	Civ Press Rpts	Astro (METEOR)
21	Auburn, California		Aircraft
22	Challenge, California		Insufficient Data
22	400 mi W of Monterey, Calif (Pacific)	PAA Airlines	Astro (METEOR)
22	Lake Port, California		Astro (METEOR)
22	Seattle, Washington		Balloon
23	Hollywood, California		Astro (METEOR)
23	Alpena, Michigan		Balloon
23	England, Arkansas		Astro (SPICA)
23	Pensacola, Florida (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Aircraft
23	San Antonio, Texas (CASE MISSING)	Civ & Mil	Aircraft
24	Pretoria, South Africa	Press (PHOTO/NR)	Other (HOAX)
26	Bernalillo, New Mexico (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Astro (VENUS)
26	Atlantic 43.12N 49.30W	Civil Airlines	Astro (METEOR)
26	Macon, Georgia (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Astro (METEOR)
27	Mechanicsburg, Ohio		Balloon
27	Dayton, Ohio		Balloon
27	Brooklyn, New York		Aircraft
28	Chilton, Wisconsin		Astro (VENUS)
	Cadillac, Michigan	Multi (Vis & RADAR)	Astro (VENUS)
28	Ocala, Florida		Balloon
28	Columbus, Ohio (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Insufficient Data
28	Meriden, Connecticut		Insufficient Data
28	Commerce, Michigan		Balloon
29	Vancouver, B. C. Bellingham, Wash. (CASE MISSING)	Civilian	Balloon
30	Breeque Isle, Maine		Astro (VENUS)
30	Utica, New York		Balloon
30	Annapolis, Maryland		Astro (MARS)
30	Jacksonville, Florida		Insufficient Data
30	Rialto, California		Other (GROUND LIGHT)
31	Temple, Texas		Aircraft
31	St Augustine, Florida		Balloon
31	Smyrna, Georgia		Aircraft
31	Carrollton, Ohio		Other (HOAX)
31	Amarillo, Texas	(PHOTO/NR)	Other (ARTILLERY FIRING)

ADDITIONAL REPORTED SIGHTINGS (NOT CASES)

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>EVALUATION</u>
Jul	SE Kansas	Newsclipping	
22	Pixley, California	Newsclipping	
22	San Joaquin Valley, California	Newsclipping	
22	Sierra, California	Newsclipping	
24	Guychosa Falls, Ohio	Newsclipping	
25	Provo, Utah	Newsclipping	
26	Plymouth, Massachusetts	Newsclipping	
28	Brantwood, California	Newsclipping	
30	Port Austin & Bad Ave, Michigan	Newsclipping	