

the sightings matched each other identically, the probability that any sighting was valid "is concluded to be extremely small." However, only two of the Twelve Good Unknowns were considered unreliable (a non-technically oriented witness and a "self-conflicting" report).

Thus we must assume that even the Battelle investigators believed that each of the other sightings was valid. This would explain why they did not attempt to explain each one, but rather to explain them away by "conglomeration": in combination, the cases do not point to a single model "flying saucer"; therefore, each one by itself must be invalid. This sort of reasoning avoids the sticky problem of explaining how a Reserve Air Force captain and an airline captain could be fooled into thinking that they saw an apparently circular craft with a flashing light on top and steady lights on the bottom pass in front of the airliner they were flying. The object was in view for about half a minute (Case XI).

Another case they avoided explaining concerned the daytime sighting of a circular object (identical in shape to the object in the case just described, but which performed maneuvers which were "unique both among the Unknowns and among the Good Unknowns" and therefore was not used as part of a model) reported by a flight sergeant and "another man" at an AF base in Korea (Case VII).

Still another case they avoided explaining may be one of the most credible on record. The summary in SR 14 does not do the case justice (as is typical with the summaries). Case X describes a sighting by two aeronautical engineers who worked at the Ames Research Laboratory and three other people. Each engineer had the opportunity to observe a "flying saucer" through binoculars for a period exceeding 60 seconds. The drawings produced by these witnesses were extremely detailed. The intelligence information on this case is missing from the Project Blue Book section of the microfilm record at the National Archives. However, Maccabee¹⁰ has found the original