

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 4 March 62	2. LOCATION Sheffield, England
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION INSUFFICIENT DATA FOR EVALUATION Negatives not with prints. No request made for photo analysis. Prints not available for evaluation.
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS Multiple	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION Not Stated	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS Photos submitted with letter requesting evaluation.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	
7. COURSE N/A	
8. PHOTOS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

FORM  
FTD SEP 63 0-329 (TDE) Previous editions of this form may be used.



<b>PHOTO SERVICE REQUEST</b>				TD-D4c WORK ORDER NO. <i>3-66</i>	
TO: AFCIN-TD-D4c		DATE <i>5 Mar 64</i>	PROJECT NO. <i>G68002</i>	TASK NO.	
INITIATOR <i>Sgt. Morley</i>		EXP. DATE COMPLETION	COMPLETED DATE	QUALITY CONTROL	
ORGN CODE	EXT: <i>69216</i>	CLASSIFICATION <i>Uncl.</i>	TAB:		
DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES (Include purpose of request, time and place of requirement, and other pertinent information).					
PHOTOGRAPHIC SPECIFICATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Copy <i>Colormathe</i>	By	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Projection Prints <i>P&amp;K</i>	By
	Duplicate Negative	By		Continuous Prints	By
	Duplicate Positive	By		Other	By
	Develop	By	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gloss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single Wt
	Contact Prints	By		Matte	Double Wt
No. of Copies <i>10 sets</i>					
MATERIAL FURNISHED: <i>1 Photo</i>					
REMARKS/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:					
RECEIPT FOR PHOTOGRAPHIC WORK					
I certify that I have received <u>1</u> originals, <u>1</u> negatives and <u>10</u> prints, all to be used in the service of the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ONLY. <i>P&amp;K</i>					
				TD-D4c WORK ORDER NO. <i>3-66</i>	
NAME		RANK		DATE	





4 March 1962  
20 Sheffield, England  
insufficient data for  
evaluation

by Alex Birch  
(then 14)

12 Moor Crescent

Mossborough, Sheffield,

England

K-1



Sheffield, ENGLAND 4 Mar 62

CASE INCLUDES

ONE (1) 4½" x 7" photo  $\frac{1}{3}$

ONE (1) NEGATIVE

~~DR 75-59~~  
~~1/22/75~~



[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Sweden

March 26th 1964

Project Blue Book Information Officer  
Hq USAF - SAF- OIPB  
The Pentagon  
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Major Maston M. Jacks,

I feel very grateful for your favor of giving me a reply, dated March 23rd, to my letter of March 2nd 1964. I also acknowledge receipt of two photographic prints enclosed, one being your duplication of the photo I sent.

Regarding your point 1: I did not want to burden you with the full story of the Sheffield sighting, but it is on record that the boy, [REDACTED], was held for questioning by the Air Ministry, London. It was the Yorkshire Post that arranged the trip to London for the boy and his father in order to show the photograph and tell the story to the Air Ministry. What happened there was told by the Yorkshire Post, the Sheffield Telegraph and some London paper, from which a brief account was transmitted to a Swedish Daily. There is also a magazine, "The Flying Saucer Review", London, which tells the story.

Of course, there is also the comments to be had from the Air Ministry itself and its Mr P.H. White. According to the Yorkshire Post (Nov 1, 1962) "a letter from the Air Ministry describes unidentified flying objects seen over Sheffield last March as probably reflected ice particles". March 4 was overcast, with snow and some sun and ice particles in the atmosphere, it is pointed out. "In the Sheffield area smoke and haze were present and, generally, cloud formations at various altitudes were many and varied. Pockets of warm air rising from the city would have caused temperature inversions. Under these conditions, reflected and refracted light can cause peculiar effects in the sky. It is possible that this attracted the attention of [REDACTED] and his friends and that the photograph is of effects of this kind. It is also a possibility that the photograph of the flying objects is the result of an imperfect exposure. To sum up, the photograph can be explained in mundane terms and does not mean that so-called unidentified objects must have been over Sheffield at the time it was taken".

This was purported to be the explanations of the Air Ministry, which, if interest subsists, undoubtedly could give you their views in this matter.

Sincerely  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



HEADQUARTERS  
FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION  
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO



REPLY TO  
ATTN OF:

SUBJECT: Proposed Reply

TO:

[REDACTED]  
Bromma 12 Sweden

1. A delay in replying to your letter of 2 March 1964 was due to the reproduction of the photograph you submitted. We can assure you that there is no evidence whatsoever of interplanetary space vehicles visiting our planet. It is because of your scientific attitude that Doctors Hynek and Menzel, as well as other agencies communicate with you on the subject of unidentified flying objects.

2. If these objects are to be studied scientifically then only cold HARD facts, such as photographs, material fragments and so on can be accepted as evidence. All personal interpretations and opinions are just that, and as such are not acceptable as fact. SPADATS and other space surveillance agencies are quite capable of picking up meteors and do so frequently. Is it not strange that if flying saucers were in existence that they would not also be detected by this electronic equipment? Also, astronomers and astrophysicists for years have been scanning and photographing the skies, and magnifying portions that they wish to study many times over. At no time has any evidence been detected which would show any evidence of life in any form visiting earth from outside our own planet.

3. In regard to paragraph 2 of your letter. Sightings from close range, such as you mentioned, are interesting and undoubtedly the witness or witnesses are reporting what they believe has happened. Many reports of close range sightings are in the AF files and the Air Force cannot explain these reports. Again, these are reports of what people thought they saw. They are the opinions and interpretations of the observers.

a. As to whether a sighting is a CLOSE RANGE sighting or not is questionable. There are many many cases of Star/Planet observations reported as close range sightings. This point is made clear in the [REDACTED] case. This case is undoubtedly considered a close range sighting since he reported the object as attacking his

AFSA # 2



automobile and besieging the farmhouse with such hostility that the local Sheriff was called in, and yet investigation showed that without doubt the object was the planet Jupiter.

b. Your point of inference as to the reality of an unknown object is well taken. The Air Force has never denied that these objects are real and indeed they are real objects or phenomenon that the observers have been unable to identify or understand.

c. May I remind you that the burden of proof does not lie with the Air Force or a serious investigator, such as yourself, to prove that "Flying Saucers" do not exist. Proof that they do exist lies with those who WISH them to exist. Until such time as someone has proof that they do exist, flying saucers are and should be considered only as some phenomenon which we do not understand or cannot explain on the data presented. Until such a time as proof exists interplanetary space vehicles under intelligent control cannot be accepted as a fact.

d. Again the point of distance and sizes, etc is relative and the question of close range, unless specifically measured, is an opinion of the witness and may or may not be accurate.

e. The report from Fritch, Texas is an illustration for the cause of marks on the ground other than a so called flying saucer. May I restate here that in no case has any physical evidence of a landing ever been established.

4. Considering the "common characteristics" of cases which are unidentified and thus assuming a qualitative proof of the reality of an unknown flying object, would certainly not result in a conclusion of validity or reliability. Many of these "common characteristics" of the so called flying saucers are present in cases with firm evaluations of aircraft, balloons and Stars or Planets.

5. No positive evaluation of the photograph you sent to us can be made without the negative.

a. It is possible that the images are real, however, the spots on the print are similar to those on other prints which have been attributed to either flaws in the negative, a flaw in the film itself, emulsion spots on the negative or poor photo processing.



b. In reading the reported situation during which the photograph was taken several questionable points were raised.

(1) We do not wish to question the integrity of the boy that took the picture. However, it is not probable that the Air Ministry would hold a youth of 14 for questioning. If he were questioned regarding the photograph, it would more likely have occurred at the location where the photograph was taken.

(2) The statement by Mr P H White that there was no fault or tampering with the negative in no way offers an explanation as to the cause of the printed images.

(3) Certainly neither the Air Ministry nor any photographic expert would offer ice particles as an explanation for the cause of the images.

(4) Photographic experts viewed the negatives and could find no fault or deception. Here again they offer no explanation for these images merely stating that there is no fault or tampering with the negative. How photographic "experts" would fail to offer one or more the possible causes of images on this print is not understandable, unless of course their statements are being quoted out of context, with the possible/probable causes being omitted and stating only that the negative showed no indication of "tampering".

6. We appreciate your opinions and your interest in the United States Air Force position regarding unidentified flying objects. We are returning your photograph and three duplicate copies.

Sincerely,



[REDACTED]  
Bromma 12 Sweden

March 2, 1964

Project Blue Book Information Officer  
Hq USAF (SAF-OIPB)  
The Pentagon  
Washington 25, DC

UFO- information

Dear Sir:

I thank you very much for sending me your latest information sheets on UFOs. Upon reading them and upon reading prof. Menzels latest UFO-book I feel that I have wasted lot of time in trying to "prove" the case for the UFOs, their reality and their interplanetary origin. I credit myself with a scientific attitude in my long studies of the saucer events. I do not indulge in wishful thinking. I do not want to be deluded. Therefore, I feel very much shaken in my former belief in the saucers and I am ready to give it up altogether, were it not for some lingering doubts as to the non-existence of the saucers

1. You rate as evidence <sup>only</sup> the hard, cold scientific facts that the astronomers and the physicists want, quantitative evidence, measurements, photos showing details, material fragments etc. Spectroscopic analysis of the lights, of "the eggshaped balls of fire", may be revealing, it may solve the whole problem. The SPADAT could perhaps help to get additional data, very much needed?

2. But there is also qualitative evidence to be considered. Take the close-range cases, objects hovering near the ground or landed on it with or without little creatures around it. Here I make a sharp distinction between mere sighting reports and the superstitious tales about talks and rides in a saucer. There is an agreement in details concerning reported shape, manoeuvres, the tilting and fluttering of the object when making the sharp turn, the radiations, the soundlessness, the draught, the whining sound when taking off from the ground, the acrid smell from a landed saucer and even the measures of the dwarfs. People in different countries, unknown to each other, unfamiliar with saucer lore, have reported such details in different years. (ca 1,20 m) \*

This would lead one to make an inference as to the reality of the unknown object. The question of their origin may be subject to a hypothesis. If the sightings of the "little men" cannot be disproven, they may strengthen the hypothesis.

Another point is that the close-range cases offer very little of refuting arguments to the scientists or technicians. The marginal error in estimates of size, positions etc., dwindles into insignificance just because of the short distances involved.

Menzel writes (p.6): "A biologist trying to identify a group of unusual animals which are said to represent a new species, begins by collecting all possible information about their appearance and behavior". He compares the characteristics and classifies. This is precisely what I have done in the past and arrived at my conclusions by logical induction. But dr Menzel as well the Air Force do not find any striking agreements as to characteristics. Menzel comments on the "varying shapes". While he repeatedly shows how the atmosphere distorts the shape of a common object, which leads to misinterpretations, it stands to reason that the same kind of distortions may

\* Also physical evidence of a landed UFO. flattened grass, broken twigs etc







FLYING SAUCER REVIEW-Mar-April 1963.....  
ENGLAND Sheffield has been the scene of numerous reports in 1962-63. On Mar. 4, 1962, Alex Burch, 14, photographed five objects in the sky about 500-1000' up. They were stationary, never changed position, and then disappeared. With him at the time were David Brownlow, 12, and 16-year-old Stuart Dixon. Under questioning the three boys' stories showed no discrepancies.

The Air Ministry opined that these "effects" were the result of atmospheric conditions. Temperature Inversions caused the reflection and bending of light to produce the peculiar effects. The Nov.-Dec. edition of Flying Saucer carried another picture taken in the Sheffield area. Both pictures have been under study by the British Air Ministry.

Note: The first information as to Alex Burch does not tally in all particulars with the latest reports-All in Flying Saucer Review.