MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Special Activities

SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Object

REFERENCE: Attachments, 1 Feb 55

1. Detailed analysis of the
   At 19 November 1954 and review of associated correspondence indicates that there was
in fact, no high altitude ultra-high-speed UFO north of
   during the period. There were, however,
   apparently valid tracks and/or observations of unidentified aircraft
   in the vicinity of that
   on 16, 17, 18, 19,
   and 21 November 1954.

2. Relative to the incident during the evening of 19 November,
   the US Navy F-4C pilot was able to distinguish the object as a delta
   shape - in the size of a jet fighter, reported it as having much
   higher performance, and estimated object speed to be in excess of
   Mach 3. The
   reported a radar track in excess of 3000 knots.

   a. During this incident

   were
   taken of the
   presentation. Analysis of
   trace photographs show a good track in excess of 300 n.m.
   of the object in question. The object was flying a course
   of about 165° relative to the
   at a relative speed of
   about 405 knots.
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At the time, the \[\ldots\] was undergoing an evaluation test program -- hence, the use of a recording camera.

In view of the \[\ldots\] and pilot observation, it is concluded that the so-called UFO on 15 November was probably a delta-wing fighter of a type having a significantly higher climb performance than the F-8C at the 50,000 feet altitude regime. Based on the limited information provided in the associated correspondence, other objects reported during the period of 15 to 21 November would appear to be unidentified aircraft.

Apparently, missile test firings were scheduled during this time period, and it is conceivable that the area in question could have been an attractive target for reconnaissance. The target was located 325 n.m. from the eastern edge of the area during the 19 November incident, well within MiG-21 range. The USSR has a MiG-21 reconnaissance configuration.

There is no evidence at hand to suggest or deny any MiG-21 reconnaissance activity at this time.

[Signature]

DONALD S. CHAMBERLAIN
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence

Attachment:
Three attachments to!
1. Your referred interesting memorandum has been reviewed thoroughly within this office. Although my Applied Science Division assume responsibility for UFO's, I considered it appropriate to refer this case to the Air Force wherein primary community responsibility lies. Referral was accomplished by forwarding a copy of your memorandum to AFOSI.

2. Your third paragraph poses an interesting question to which I am not at all certain I have the solution. Nevertheless, for you to procure Dr. Fine's photographs and determine more about his experiments, my suggestions are:

   a. That you approach him perhaps as one interested in photograph research.

   b. That you seek advice from the AD/0 relative to other avenues of approach with which he may well be familiar.

GREGG SCOWTICE, JR.
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence