

A3

21 February 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ATTENTION:

THROUGH:

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Speed Letter
dated 30 January 1967

1. Analysis of the UFO target on the provided photographs was performed to the limited extent permitted by the copy prints. It must be remembered that the conclusions presented are based on the reproduction of copies rather than the originals. The copying process will not only the grain and focus characteristics of the original image, but also may distort the accuracy of reproduction even when the exact enlargement parameters are known. In this case, these parameters are unknown.

2. The following are assumed for the basis of this analysis. The accuracy of these assumptions, however, is questionable.

a. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is the same.

b. The total enlargement factor of prints two and five is the same.

c. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is approximately two times that of prints two and five.

3. Findings:

a. The pattern of apparent grain clustering is similar on prints one and three and on prints two and five.

b. The edges of the UFO target are more sharply defined in print one than in those of the helicopter target in print three.

T-13
Approved for Release

2/2010

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Speed Letter
dated 30 January 1967

c. Contrast and density analysis of the images
was not considered valid due to the inherent distortions
caused by the copying process.

d. The edge sharpness of the UFO image in print two
appears quite similar to the edge sharpness of the pipe in
the same print.

e. It is assumed that the difference in image size
between prints two and five was caused by a change in
camera-to-UFO distance. This distance was less in print
five than in print two. The following two conditions are
offered:

(1) Considering a large UFO at a distance of
approximately 1,000 feet (1,000 feet) and a sta-
tionary camera location, the UFO would have had to
travel a considerable distance (200 feet) in a flight
line almost directly toward the camera position to
produce such a change in image size.

(2) Considering a small, stationary UFO at a
distance of approximately six feet and a slightly
variable (1/2 sec) in camera location, a change
in image size of this magnitude would have resulted
from a change in camera location of less than the
above variable.

f. has reviewed the quantitative results
obtained by and has found no discrepancies in what
has been done. Unfortunately, with the material avail-
able very little objective information can be obtained
except building upon tables of object size versus dis-
tance from the camera station. Feel that the
original prints would enable further quantitative study
by providing the total geometric image work and frequency
of the exposures. It is anticipated that this study would
concentrate on three areas:

(1) Main image construction including shape,
distance, and angle.

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Secret Letter
dated 30 January 1967

(2) Stereoscopic analysis of the UFO and its relationship with the surrounding branches, pole, and camera station.

(3) Dynamic analysis of the relative movement of the system including camera station and UFO.

4. Conclusion:

None definite. To decide the authenticity of the image as being a UFO is not possible from the furnished prints. It is probable that an analysis of the original photograph would provide added information which would enable a definite conclusion. Associated facts such as the facilities, reluctance to discuss or show the original photographs, the convenient location of the wire frame through which the photographs were taken and the difference in scale of the UFO image between prints two and five which is most easily explained with a model tends to substantiate the model theory. It is difficult to conclude as to whether the object is either a model or a genuine UFO can be offered at this time.