

## PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 14 June 1961	2. LOCATION Bedford, Massachusetts	12. CONCLUSIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Was Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Balloon  <input type="checkbox"/> Was Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Aircraft  <input type="checkbox"/> Was Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Astronomical  <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Data for Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local 0300 GMT 0700Z	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Ground-Radar  <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Intercept Radar	
5. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	6. SOURCE Civilian	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 30 Sec.	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	9. COURSE SE
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING  Object viewed as flashing light with flashes of 1 sec each observed for 30 sec while traveling through 45 deg arc. Object appeared to be going away from observer. Viewed first at 360 deg az, disappeared at 045 deg az. Elevation during flight about 25 deg. Object faded due to distance.		11. COMMENTS  Flash rate of anticolision light is 60-100 per minute. This compares with the 1 sec interval of the flashing. This conclusion is supported by the angular velocity reported. At the reported 18° in 30 sec, an a/c at a distance of 10 nautical miles would have a speed of 384 knots. Since the witness reported that the elevation angle remained fairly constant it is fair to assume that flight path of a/c was normal.

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

Smithsonian Institution  
Astrophysical Observatory  
60 Garden St.  
Cambridge, Mass.

June 22, 1961

Dr. [REDACTED]

Bedford, Mass.

Dear Dr. [REDACTED]

We have not been able to determine the nature of your recent observation, and are therefore forwarding your report to:

Aerospace Technical Intelligence Center  
United States Air Force  
(AFCIN-4E2x)  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Any further correspondence regarding this matter should be sent to them.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Respectfully,

Barbara Kidder  
Public Information

BK:k

June 16, 1961.

Report of Unidentified Object.

Observed and Reported by: Dr. [REDACTED] Bedford, Mass.

Site: Bedford, Mass. (presumably at above address).

Visibility: Excellent; stars bright.

Time: 1961 June 14, 07 02 U.T.  $\pm$  3 minutes.

Azimuth: Travelled arc from about  $360^\circ$  to about  $045^\circ$ .

Altitude: About  $25^\circ$ .

Time Visible: About 30 seconds.

Size: About 1 cm. diameter at arm's length.

Brightness: ) Similar to full moon at  $20^\circ$  to  $25^\circ$  altitude.  
Color:      )

Variability: Regular period of  $\pm$  1 second; still visible at minima.

*copy attached*  
Original letter from which above information was obtained is on file at Moonwatch Headquarters, SAO.

A.B.G.

COPY

[REDACTED]  
Bedford, Mass.  
June 14, 1961

Mr. Alex Geddes

SAO

60 Garden Street  
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Mr. Geddes:

As you requested in our telephone conversation this date I am forwarding the following information concerning a sighting of a lighted object in the sky this morning:

Time: Between 3:00 and 3:05 A.M.

Place: Bedford, Mass.

Direction: Low in the northwest sky, passing from north toward east; at maximum height in its arc it appeared to be about the height of two fingers held out at arms length; above a high horizon (tall trees 200-300 feet distant.)

Intensity: Roughly as bright (at its most intense) as a full moon when it has risen  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the distance

between horizon and zenith under ② conditions of good visibility. Color was roughly of the same quality. The brilliance was variable and appeared to have a regular period of  $\pm 1$  second. Light was still visible at the low point of intensity length of observation: about 30 seconds, during which time it traversed the aperture of a 30 inch wide window placed 8 feet from the observer's eye.

Conditions at the time of sighting: visibility excellent; stars brightly visible.

I would not consider myself an experienced observer of aircraft, but rather an experienced observer. I have seen a number of artificial satellites in transit, including Sputnik I & II. The variability in brilliance of the carrier rocket associated with the second of these satellites resembled that seen.

this morning. I have also seen  
Echo on two occasions, when it  
was overhead, last fall. The  
brilliance of this current object  
less, but its apparent  
diameter greater (about 1 cm.  
at arms length.)

If I can furnish further  
information I shall be glad  
to cooperate.

I would be most interested  
in your opinion of the identity  
of this object.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
M.D.

AEROSPACE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE  
OHIO

REPLY TO:  
ATTN OF: AFCIN-4E/Major Friend

SUBJECT: UFO Sighting (Dr. [REDACTED])

28 JUN 1961

TO: HQ USAF  
SACOI-3c (Major Coleman)  
Washington 25, D. C.

1. Reference the attached copy of a letter to the Aerospace Technical Intelligence Center from the Smithsonian Institute's Moonwatch Headquarters regarding the sighting of an unidentified flying object by Dr. [REDACTED] of Bedford, Massachusetts. A copy of Dr. [REDACTED] letter to the Smithsonian Institute is also attached.

2. The object sighted by Dr. [REDACTED] was probably the anti-collision light on an aircraft. By specification the flash rate on the present U. S. Air Force anticolision light is 60-100 flashes per minute. This flash rate compares favorably with the one-second period reported by the witness. Dr. [REDACTED] indicated that the object was still visible while at minima in its varying cycle. With as close a rate as one second and the indicated intensity the witness would not be able to tell if the light disappeared or not due to retinal image retention.

3. The conclusion that Dr. [REDACTED] probably saw an aircraft is supported by the angular velocity reported by him. At the reported rate of  $10^{\circ}$  in 30 seconds, an aircraft at a distance of 10 nautical miles would have a speed of approximately 384 knots. This speed was arrived at by assuming the flight path of the aircraft was at right angles to the angle bisector of its reported angular path. At a mean distance of 10 miles the angle could deviate as much as  $45^{\circ}$  without exceeding the normal operating speed of jet aircraft. Since the witness indicated in his report that the elevation angle remained fairly constant, it is fair to assume that the flight path of the aircraft was normal to his line of sight.

4. For your information the specification for the anticolision light presently in operational use by the U. S. Air Force is MIL-L-21652.

5. It is suggested that Dr. [REDACTED] of Bedford, Massachusetts, and the Smithsonian Institute be advised of our findings.

*Philip G. Evans*  
PHILIP G. EVANS  
Colonel, USAF  
Deputy for Science  
and Components

2 Atchs

1. Cy ltr fm Smithsonian  
Institute dtd 22 Jun 61.
2. Cy ltr fm Dr. [REDACTED]  
dtd 14 Jun 61.

6 July 1961

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]

Your letter of June 14th addressed to the Smithsonian Institution's Moonwatch Headquarters was forwarded to the Aerospace Technical Intelligence Center and thence to this office.

The sighting reported by you was probably the anti-collision beacon on an aircraft. By the specification the flash rate on the present Air Force anti-collision beacon is 60-100 flashes per minute. This flash rate compares favorably with the one-second period reported by you. With a rate as close as one second and the indicated intensity, it would be difficult to tell if the light disappeared or not due to retinal image retention.

The conclusion we broach is also supported by the angular velocity reported. At the reported rate of  $15^\circ$  in 30 seconds, an aircraft at a distance of 10 nautical miles would have a speed of approximately 384 knots. This speed was arrived at by assuming the flight path of the aircraft was at right angle to the angle bisector of its reported angular path. At a mean distance of 10 miles the angle would deviate as much as  $45^\circ$  without exceeding the normal operating speed of jet aircraft. Since you reported that the elevation angle remained fairly constant, it is fair to assume that the flight path of the aircraft was normal to your line of sight.

I might mention here, too, that the Federal Aviation Agency through its divisions has authorized some jet airliners to "fly-test" an experimental anti-collision beacon consisting of two white lights of strobe intensity, mounted one above the other and flashing alternately. This light has been observed from over 50 miles distance, and at slant range visibility it is quite an awesome sight appearing in various colors and size (prismatic effect through relatively dense atmosphere).

I hope this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR.  
Major, USAF  
UFO Project Officer  
Public Information Division  
Office of Information

Dr. [REDACTED]

Bedford, Massachusetts

CC: Smithsonian Institution