

was definitely dark, sur-
like the corona of the Sun
ing meteors, about half the
nt; they seemed to revolve
ght darkening toward their
back exploding sparks and
twice as many, of half the
exploding sparks; . . . 20
arks across the heavens." A
ers that it may have been
the meteors. This fantastic
lory, was seen directly on
han expected.

Mr. George Lee, who re-
h a long tail, low on the
nutes, from the glassworks
hwest of the Chant trace;
but the time was 2:30 AM.
on the same trajectory is
ta, p. 215: observer A. W.
meteors at 2:20 AM, appar-
at 9 PM, but visible some-
about 20 minutes, and the
the Earth in the distance.
n like a rocket." This im-
ed previously, because Mr.
ed his directions; compari-
cinity leaves no doubt that
great procession," or one of

ssion have been mentioned
ations obtained in the last
ferred for the repetition of
ter the Earth had turned
this connection, that, on
of dark objects passed from
ted the obvious, tho inex-
nothing of a meteoric na-
re on precisely the same

CLUSIONS

t observation leaves much
bt that over much of the

Chant trace in the United States, the characteristic processional
character was certainly seen. Two of the hypotheses that have been
proposed appear to be unacceptable in view of the new data. The
first is Fort's supposition that the procession consisted of spaceships
(flying saucers). This view is able to account for the otherwise
enigmatic repetition, and seems to accord with the peculiar struc-
tures of the procession described by Mrs. Williams and Mr. Keller,
but it is ruled out by the fact that none of those who saw the proces-
sion at close range described it as other than meteoric in character.
The only definite assertions that vessels were seen were made by the
observers at Marshall, Michigan, and at North Bay, Ontario—in
both cases at the extreme distance of 200 miles. More favorably
placed observers unanimously recognized the lights as incandescent
meteorites. The appearance of "chains" connecting the fireballs is
characteristic of processional (slow-speed) bolides, and should not,
of course, be interpreted as an actual structure.

The other hypothesis that may be discarded is that the display was
due simply to a "meteor shower," unless the group of meteors pro-
duced by the atmospheric ablation of a slow fireball may be classi-
fied as a "meteor shower." (Many of the observers used the term in
this way, but they were hardly authorities on meteoritical termi-
nology!) It is clear that the meteors seen were not the ordinary,
small, unconnected individuals emanating in all directions from a
meteor radiant, but were rather members of clusters of closely related
fragments originating from the partial or complete disruption of
larger bodies. Wylie's reading of the Ontario observations is defi-
nitely contradicted both by the prior observations in Michigan and
by the later observations in New York.

On the other hand, it seems probable that the original Chant
picture of complete continuity also is untenable. The well-developed
procession seen in Hibbing, Minnesota, is surely not identical with
the body seen at Houghton, Michigan, which did not break up until
near the zenith; and this in turn, tho probably identical with the
swarm of sparks seen at Escanaba, can hardly be identical with the
2 large fireballs observed across lower Michigan. The single-file pro-
cession across Alpena must be distinguished from the less regular
procession (the 2 large fireballs?) that passed to the south of Alpena;
and since both of these evidently crossed the lake to Ontario, it must
be suspected that Chant erred in fitting all of his observations to a
single line. On the other hand, it seems possible that all of the New
York observations from Buffalo to Elmira refer to a single group of
fireballs, whereas the New Jersey observation at Watchung must
relate to a different group, since no sound was heard.

The question of sound in itself shows that the data cannot be
accommodated in the original framework of horizontally-moving