PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE (LaCrosse, Wisco	onsin (U Was Balloon D Probably Balloo	n
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local 1235 CST GMT 1 1835	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATIO	D Air-Intercept Radar	D Was Aircraft D Probably Aircraft D Possibly Aircraft	
S. PHOTOS O Yes No	6. SOURCE airline pilot		D Probably Astronomical D Possibly Astronomical	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS Beveral	9. COURSE	Other Insufficient Dat Unknown	a for Evaluation
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING		11. COMMENTS		
Light colored. Straight and level maneuvers.		Objects traveling at high speed and changing positions in V-formation.		
		* .		

the glas file to present 14 /2 3-NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201 DEPARTMENT OF ASTRONOMY LINDHEIMER ASTRONA AL RESEARCH CENTER 4 June 1968 FTD (TDETR) Research and Aerial Phenomena Division Wright Patterson Air Force Base Ohio 45433 TDPT (UFO) Attn: Subj: UFO Investigation Lt. Col. Hector Quintanilla, Jr. I. Your letter 22 May 1968, subject, UFO Transactions, I have the following comments on all the you have listed, in the order they were listed. 7 January 1952, Palmer, Alaska. I have rated this case $\Sigma 3$ C7, meaning that as far as strangeness was concerned, the stimulus giving rise to this report could have been something quite ordinary or it could have fallen into the category of "cigar-shaped Ufos" reported from many countries and which have no ready explanation. In this instance, there is not sufficient information to go on. The report we have states, "Alaska Air Command informed and will take further investigative action," and, "additional data will be forwarded when available". To the best of my knowledge the further data were never transmitted. This plus the fact that it was reported by one woman out of 4 or 5 (not 45 as the original report stated) and the fact that it was observed at the time of the setting sun, leads me to think that the sighting might have had a meteorlogical origin. Thus, "possibly meteorological, but data insufficient for firm evaluation" in my recommendation for this classification. 2. 14 April 1952, LaCrosse, Wisconsin. I originally asked to review this case in the hopes that unknown to me some additional followup had been made. I found that despite the fact that a captain of commercial airliner and others -1had witnessed this, no followup whatever was made. It is that sort of thing in this case, and in a great many others, that he ded to the facetious, but somewhat deadly remark by someone that droject Blue Book might be called, not the "Society for the Investigation of Unexplained", (Ivan Sanerson's organization) but rather, "Society for the Explanation of the Uninvestigated". Since 1947, because of lack of funds and adequate personnel, a formidable number of cases were not adequately followed up. I had often pointed out, both to officials in Dayton and in Washington, that a day of reckoning might some day come when the Air Force might be asked to show cause why proper investigations were not made. In this case, for instance, no attempt apparently was made even to find out ""the others" were who had made this sighting. How many? Were passengers? Were they members of the crew? No attempt made to find out the duration of the sighting. In view it is patently impossible to form any sort of a valid je as to what the stimulus that gave rise to this report might and been. To list it as "insufficient information" is incorrect, but it should really be listed as "insufficient information because of lack of followup". A store of information may have been available, but this store was never tapped. Incidentally, how is the case presently carried, unidentified, or insufficient information? The latter would certainly be more appropriate.

3. 4 June 1952, Stuttgart, Germany.

I have rated this a 23 C6 meaning puzzling but possibly explanable case of credibility 6, since there were two witnesses technically trained. One witness was a Lieutenant Colonel who was shortly thereafter assigned to the Directorate of Intelligence, Headquarters, United States Air Force. It seems unlikely that they would have been mislead into a misidentification of an F84, and reported instead a very bright light that crossed in front of their aircraft, made fairly tight turns, and then have turned their own aircraft to follow it. Of course, it is entirely possible that it was a gross misidentification on the part of these two experienced pilots and therefore the evaluation of possible aircraft is justified. It is unjustified, however, in the statistics for the year to call it an unquestioned aircraft. To be fair, one might also have designated it "possibly unidentified" and at the end of the year have listed it as "unidentified". I have long inveighed against the unacceptable (and this is to any good statistician) statistics employed by Blue Book over the years in transforming possibles and "probables into firm actualities.

SIN 0136

DUL GOE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE STAFF MESSAGE DIVISION

HINGERY JINCOMING CLEAR MESSAGE

DE JEPFF 106.

0 1422552

EDITELIGIE

RPT LAST LINE

. FIT OLISTED FLT SV CET OLISTED AFD PA

TO SEC DEFENSE WASHDO

CIRVIS SIGNTED FROM GROUND AT LA CROSSE VISC AT 1235 CENTRAL

APR 14 SEVERAL LIGHT COLORED OBJ HI V FORMATION EST 15 TO 20

THOUSAND FEET ALT HEADED IN UN DIRECTION SIZE OF OBJ UNDETERMINED

CHANGED FORMATION UTTH TREMEMBOUS SPEED DESAPPEARED TO IN SUMYING

NOTION NOTICED SIGNTED BY WAY CAPT VISC CENTRAL AIRLINES

ACFT AND OTHERS SGD SCHRODER STN MANAGER

NOTE : ADVANCE COPY SENT TO OIN

ACTION: OIN

IMPO : SEC DEF, ARMY, NAVY, CIA, JCS, AFSA

AF IN: 16527 (14 Apr 52)

HER/lgb

S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

see AF.I.N: 16555 (150752)

111155034

EXTRACT FROM STATUS REPORT # 7

DATE: 14 Apr 52

TIME (Local): Not Reported

LOCATION: LaCrosse, Wisc. .

LENGTH OF TIME OBSERVED: Not Reported

SOUND: Unknown

SPEED: Fast

ALTITUDE: 12-20,000'

HEADING: NA

SOURCE: Airline Pilot

ACTION OR COMMENTS: No conclusions

DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT: Several light colored objects in "V" formation. (Unclas.)