

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

LT. COL. Walter Quintanilla
Page 2

4 Jan 1961

had witnessed this, no followup whatever was made. It was a case of being in the case, and in a great many others, that I was to the fanshion, but somewhat dandy remark by someone that the Blue Book might be called, not the "Society for the Investigation of Unexplained", (Over Sanerson's organization) but rather "Society for the Explanation of the Uninvestigated". Since 1941, because of lack of funds and adequate personnel, a formidable number of cases were not adequately followed up. I had often pointed out to both CO officials in Dayton and in Washington, that a day or two later might come when the Air Force might be asked to explain cases why proper investigation were not made. In this case, for instance, no attempt apparently was made even to find out who the "others" were who had made this sighting. How many? Were they passengers? Were they members of the crew? No attempt was made to find out the duration of the sighting. In view of the fact, it is patently impossible to learn any sort of a valid basis as to what the stimulus that gave rise to this report might be. To list it as "insufficient information" is incorrect, 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 being carried, unidentified, or insufficient information? The latter would certainly be more appropriate.

3. 4 June 1953, Stuttgart, Germany.

I have rated this a D3 Ch meaning pending but possibly explainable case of unidentified 4, since there were two witnesses (one actually trained). One witness was a Lieutenant Colonel who was always known after assigned to the Directorate of Intelligence, Headquarters, United States Air Force. It seems unlikely that they would have been misled into a misidentification of a UFO. And reports showed a very bright light that seemed to flash in their aircraft. The fairly light area, and then have turned their own aircraft to follow it. Of course, it is entirely possible that it was a known misidentification on the part of these two experienced pilots and therefore the evaluation of possible aircraft is justified. It is unrefuted, however, in the situation for the year 1953, it is an unexplained aircraft. To be fair, one might also have called it "possibly unidentified" and at the end of the year have listed it as "unidentified". I have long inveighed against the use of the word "possible" (and this is no any good statisticians' statistics employed by Blue Book over the years in "translating possibilities" and "probabilities into firm actualities".

T
H
I
S

P
A
G
E

I
S

U
N
C
L
A
S
S
I
F
I
E
D