

CONCLUSIONS

It can never be absolutely proven that "flying saucers" do not exist. This would be true if the data obtained were to include complete scientific measurements of the attributes of each sighting, as well as complete and detailed descriptions of the objects sighted. It might be possible to demonstrate the existence of "flying saucers" with data of this type, IF they were to exist.

Although the reports considered in this study usually did not contain scientific measurements of the attributes of each sighting, it was possible to establish certain valid conclusions by the application of statistical methods in the treatment of the data. Scientifically evaluated and arranged, the data as a whole did not show any marked patterns or trends. The inaccuracies inherent in this type of data, in addition to the incompleteness of a large proportion of the reports, may have obscured any patterns or trends that otherwise would have been evident. This absence of indicative relationships necessitated an exhaustive study of selected facets of the data in order to draw any valid conclusions.

A critical examination of the distributions of the important characteristics of sightings, plus an intensive study of the sightings evaluated as UNKNOWN, led to the conclusion that a combination of factors, principally the reported maneuvers of the objects and the unavailability of supplemental data such as aircraft flight plans or balloon-launching records, resulted in the failure to identify as KNOWN most of the reports of objects classified as UNKNOWN.

An intensive study, aimed at finding a verified example of a "flying saucer" or at deriving a verified model or models of "flying saucers" (as defined on Page 1), led to the conclusion that neither goal could be attained using the present data.

It is emphasized that there was a complete lack of any valid evidence consisting of physical matter in any case of a reported unidentified aerial object.

Thus, the probability that any of the UNKNOWNs considered in this study are "flying saucers" is concluded to be extremely small, since the most complete and reliable reports from the present data, when isolated and studied, conclusively failed to reveal even a rough model, and since the data as a whole failed to reveal any marked patterns or trends.

Therefore, on the basis of this evaluation of the information, it is considered to be highly improbable that any of the reports of unidentified aerial objects examined in this study represent observations of technological developments outside the range of present-day scientific knowledge.

APPENDIX A
TABULATIONS OF FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTIONS BY CHARACTERISTICS
INDEX OF TABLES

	Page
Table A1. Evaluation of All Sightings by Years	107
Table A2. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Years	107
Table A3. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Years	108
Table A4. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, All Years	109
Table A5. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1947	110
Table A6. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1948	111
Table A7. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1949	112
Table A8. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1950	113
Table A9. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1951	114
Table A10. Evaluation of All Sightings by Month of Year, 1952	115
Table A11. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, All Years	116
Table A12. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1947	117
Table A13. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1948	118
Table A14. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1949	119
Table A15. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1950	120
Table A16. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1951	121
Table A17. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Month of Year, 1952	122
Table A18. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, All Years	123
Table A19. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1947	124
Table A20. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1948	125
Table A21. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1949	126
Table A22. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1950	127
Table A23. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1951	128
Table A24. Evaluation of Object Sightings by Month of Year, 1952	129
Table A25. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, All Years	130
Table A26. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1947	130
Table A27. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1948	130
Table A28. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1949	130
Table A29. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1950	131
Table A30. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1951	131
Table A31. Evaluation of All Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1952	131
Table A32. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, All Years	132
Table A33. Evaluation of Unit Sightings by Sighting Reliability Groups, 1947	132