

- (3) Case III does not satisfy Condition 1. It also does not satisfy Condition 4 when Case II is eliminated as a good UNKNOWN.

- (4) Case IV does not satisfy Conditions 1 or 2. There are few cigar-shaped or rocket-shaped objects reported in the literature. In addition, this observer is not considered to be well-qualified technically.

- (5) Case V does not satisfy Condition 1. It also does not satisfy Condition 4 when Case IV is eliminated as a good UNKNOWN.

It might be argued here that many of the UNKNOWNS might actually have shapes similar to these good UNKNOWNS. It will be noted, however, that each of these five cases does not satisfy one of the other three conditions.

- (6) Case VI does not satisfy Condition 2. In the description of the object, it was stated that at certain times there was no light seen from the object. Apparently, the "band of no light", as diagrammed by the observer, was an attempt to explain this. However, if the object were constructed as shown in the diagram, light should have been seen at all times. Because of this conflict the drawing is not considered reliable, and without the drawing, there is not enough detail in the description to make it useful for this study.
- (7) Case VII violates Conditions 1 and 4. Although the shape is disc-like, the maneuvers performed by the object are unique both among the UNKNOWNS and among the good UNKNOWNS.

Cases VIII to XII satisfy Conditions 1 through 3, but they do not satisfy Condition 4. The features which make them different from each other are as follows:

- (8) Case VIII. The object is smooth, with no protrusions or other details.
- (9) Case IX. The object had rocket or jet pods on each side that were shooting out flames.
- (10) Case X. The object had a fin or rudder.
- (11) Case XI. The object had a series of portholes, or windows, on its under side.

- (12) Case XII. The object had windows in its top and front and its top midsection. It also had a set of propellers around its waist.

It is not possible, therefore, to derive a verified model of a "flying saucer" from the data that have been gathered to date. This point is important enough to emphasize. Out of about 4,000 people who said they saw a "flying saucer", sufficiently detailed descriptions were given in only 12 cases. Having culled the cream of the crop, it is still impossible to develop a picture of what a "flying saucer" is.

In addition to this study of the good UNKNOWNS, an attempt was made to find groups of UNKNOWNS for which the observed characteristics were the same. No such groups were found.

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". It may be that some reports represent observations of not one but several classes of objects that might have been "flying saucers"; however, the lack of evidence to confirm even one class would seem to make this possibility remote. It is pointed out that some of the cases of KNOWNS, before identification, appeared fully as bizarre as any of the 12 cases of good UNKNOWNS, and, in fact, would have been placed in the class of good UNKNOWNS had it not been possible to establish their identity.

This is, of course, contrary to the bulk of the publicity that has been given to this problem. The reason for the nature of this publicity was clearly brought out during the re-evaluation study. It is a definite fact that upon reading a few reports, the reader becomes convinced that "flying saucers" are real and are some form of sinister contrivance. This reaction is independent of the training of the reader or of his attitude toward the problem prior to the initial contact. It is unfortunate that practically all of the articles, books, and news stories dealing with the phenomenon of the "flying saucer" were written by men who were in this category, that is, men who had read only a few selected reports. This is accentuated by the fact that, as a rule, only the more lurid-sounding reports are cited in these publications. Were it not for this common psychological tendency to be captivated by the mysterious, it is possible that no problem of this nature would exist.

The reaction, mentioned above, that after reading a few reports, the reader is convinced that "flying saucers" are real and are some form of sinister contrivance, is very misleading. As more and more of the reports are read, the feeling that "saucers" are real fades, and is replaced by a feeling of skepticism regarding their existence. The reader eventually reaches a point of saturation, after which the reports contain no new information at all and are no longer of any interest. This feeling of surfeit was universal among the personnel who worked on this project, and continually necessitated a conscious effort on their part to remain objective.