

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

EXHIBITION SHEET

REF ID: A66103

IDENTIFICATION

1. Symbols to IDENTIFY: do not change to identify an office record used for reference.
2. Do not use IDENTIFY codes before to suggest additional markings and suggestions are to make on existing file.
3. Forward IDENTIFY to originator of reports (if you are not originator) of report.

PART A. (To be completed by Originator Only)

IDENTIFY CODE	SYMBOL TO IDENTIFY	SYMBOL TO IDENTIFY	SYMBOL TO IDENTIFY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	IF IDENTIFIED FILE

NOTE: Symbols to be used to identify files should be used in the case of the same file to identify different editions, including the original and subsequent editions. Symbols to be used to identify files should be used to identify files to be used as a reference to a specific edition by reference.

On 3/25/52, in May 1952, a report was received from the Mr. Blanche, Brazil on an alleged sighting of a "flying saucer" near Rio de Janeiro. The photographs of the saucer, a "O Cruzeiro" had five photographs negatives allegedly taken of the saucer. The incident was stated to have occurred at a remote beach southeast of Rio, near da Tijara, at 11:30 hours on 7 May 1952. It will be noted that this beach lies roughly on a line between Rio and Sao Paulo. The newspaper asked \$25,000 for world-wide publication of the photographs.

The negatives were examined by LIFE photo experts, another outstanding US photo lab, and by the Headquarters. A common evaluation was received independently by all three, viz, it was an attempt at a colored hoax. This was based primarily on the facts that (1) the shadow on the "saucer" in one photograph did not match those of the terrain and (2) the selling price was too close to \$25,000, then to more (understanding of money instead, after no customers were found for the original offer).

These events lead to a preliminary evaluation of the attached report as follows:

- (1) If Mr. Santoniello supplied this information prior to 7 May 52 (it is impossible to determine the date from the report), it is possible that he was a part of the scheme.

PART B. (To be completed by Distribution, Production and Identification)

CHECK (X) APPROPRIATE IDENTIFY CODE

<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE	IDENTIFY CODE

NOTE:

CHECK (X) THE APPROPRIATE IDENTIFY CODE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SYMBOLS IN PART A. OF THIS FORM.

 SECRET CONFIDENTIAL UNCLASSIFIED