

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 11 Sep 61	2. LOCATION San Diego, Calif		12. CONCLUSIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Was Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Balloon
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local <u>9 PM</u> GMT <u>12/0500Z</u>	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		<input type="checkbox"/> Was Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Aircraft
5. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	6. SOURCE Civilian		<input type="checkbox"/> Was Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Astronomical
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS 1	9. COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Data for Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Large UFO passed over Dan Diego. km Lady saw it. Not imagination. Larger than 6 jets and faster than anything U.S. can make. Creseent shaped with. Flashing and rotating light.		11. COMMENTS Info received in ltr. Feb 62. No investigation made km due to time lag. Case listed as insufficient data.	

No answer required
(AD)

February 20, 1962

San Diego 3, California

Chief of Information
Department of the Air Force
Washington 25, D. C.

REFERENCE: DOD Release No. 179-62, February 6, 1962
Air Force UFO Report

Gentlemen:

This letter is in reply to the above mentioned news release issued by the Department of Defense on February 6, 1962, regarding Air Force Unidentified Flying Object Report No. 179-62 and in answer to my letter of February 7, 1962.

I appreciate your reply but cannot agree with you. News releases will not convince the public that flying saucers do not exist.

Since you think flying saucers are so unimportant, why do you bother issuing a five-page news release on the subject? Obviously, it shouldn't be worth the paper or time. Since you did bother with a five-page release, apparently there is something to be concerned about. You contradict yourself throughout the release. First, you assume that all civilian sightings are mirages, reflections, lights, balloons, etc., and then you state that all UFOs should be reported to the nearest military base as soon as possible! Why? You are mistaken in claiming that valid sightings of UFOs always concern the defense of the United States. Why not give your real reasons?

Why confuse people? You call your office the "Office of Aerial Phenomena." This way, people get confused with the "National Investigating Committee on Aerial Phenomena." However, we are not confused. Perhaps if you called your office the "National Investigating Congress on Aerial Phenomena," people would be even more confused.

On Page 2 you give a UFO Report Evaluation by Category and Percentage Breakdown. I notice that 175 of the sightings were considered "astronomical." Of course, since you call most UFOs reflections of Venus or meteors, this is understandable. As for the 99 with "insufficient data", that leaves quite a wide margin, doesn't it?

Since these so-called objects do not give any indication of threat to the national security (your statement), why is the Department of Defense issuing news releases on the subject? Why are photographs and other data confiscated from people who have evidence of flying saucers? Something is not quite right here.

Why insult expert civilian pilots, radar operators, and corroborating expert witnesses by stating they are "startled by the appearance of weather balloons"? You know as well as I do of night flying training, instrument flight, and of the physico-psychological effects of "staring at fixed lights." Furthermore, pilots do not gaze at distant lights for long periods of time. What about the times that the pilots AND passengers have seen "round, metallic objects with lights" circling the planes and performing unusual feats of which we are incapable? I suppose this is "mass hallucination." However, it's ridiculous to state that pilots and passengers "see" exactly the same hallucination.

I myself have noted many times Navy jet fighters circling at high altitudes, and never yet mistook them for UFOs. They don't look round no matter how high they fly.

Paragraph 2 on Page 5 gives "firework displays and flares" also as being called UFOs.-----This needs no comment!

On September 11, 1961, at 9:00 p.m. a large UFO passed over San Diego. I saw it! It was not imagination, "sun or moon dogs, a kite, a blimp, a cloud, searchlight, bird, reflection, spurious radar indication, hoax, fireworks display, flare, ice crystal, plane headlights, weather balloon, hallucination, drunkenness, airplane, satellite, or any of the planets or stars." What other explanation do you have??? It was larger than six jets and traveled faster than anything we can produce. It was crescent-shaped and had flashing and rotating lights. I have a record of direction, angle of sighting, and other corroborating data. So does NICAP.

Another curious thing----on Page 3 you list UFOs sighted since 1947. Why do you start with that date? Wasn't that when Mantell saw the UFO? Why didn't you start with 1945 or 1940? It's strange that the two dates coincide!

You can't keep this up too much longer. I, for one, will help to spread the word. And many others are helping, also. As for that news release, everyone I've showed it to has chuckled at your transparent fabrications! Will you forever assume that all the public are idiotic children? Remember Lincoln's words? You would have been better off with no news release at all.

Sincerely,

Mrs.
Mrs.

cc: NICAP
AFSCA