

model or models). They gave great emphasis to the fact that only twelve out of the 434 were described "with sufficient detail," with the implication that perhaps twelve could have been reduced to zero with further investigation. On the other hand, they could have emphasized that if even only one report were sufficiently detailed to positively rule out known phenomena, then they would have "discovered" a flying saucer.

Of the twelve good unknowns, eight were reported by technically oriented people, including four reports by pilots; ten of the objects were observed for greater than ten seconds, and six of these were seen for over one minute; six were seen at sufficiently close ranges so that structure details were perceived; and seven were disc-like or oval. One case is particularly interesting (case 10 of the good unknowns) since it involved aeronautical engineers who observed a disc-like object through binoculars for over two minutes.¹⁰

By pointing out differences rather than similarities between the various objects that were described, the SR 14 investigators were able to state, "It is not possible, therefore, to derive a verified model of a 'flying saucer' from the data that have been gathered to date." They further stated, "On the basis of this evidence, therefore, there is a low probability that any of the unknowns represent observations of a class of 'flying saucers.'" They didn't point out that other analysts looking at the same data might decide that definite similarities between several of the objects would suggest that a "model flying saucer" could be constructed.

In the conclusion to the report, the investigators emphasized the fact that "there was a complete lack of any valid evidence consisting of any physical matter" and they thus concluded that

the probability that any of the unknowns considered in this study are "flying saucers" is . . . extremely small, since the most complete and reliable reports from the present data, when isolated and studied,