

D-6

"Vertical-rising aircraft capable of transition to supersonic horizontal flight will be a new phenomenon in our skies, and under certain conditions could give the illusion of the so-called flying saucer. The Department of Defense will make every effort within bounds of security to keep the public informed of these developments so they can be recognized for what they are."

Mr. Quarles added: "I think we must recognize that other countries also have the capability of developing vertical-rising aircraft, perhaps of unconventional shapes. However we are satisfied at this time that none of the sightings of so-called 'flying saucers' reported in this country were in fact aircraft of foreign origin."

E N D

Attachment

-2-

Since the Summary gives figures of 9% for the Unknown cases in 1953-1954, and only 3% for the Unknown cases in 1955 (up to May 5), it is evident that persons not having the full report available would not know that 20% to 30% of the cases had been left as Unknown in the main study. The Summary absolutely fails to quote any numerical results for 1947-1952. One may surmise that the Air Force did not want the public to know that such a high percentage of the reports remained Unknown, and that this was one reason for making the full report unavailable, for all practical purposes, to the public.

[2] What is the meaning and purpose of the Chi Square test (pages 60--76 of the original edition)?

The paragraph at the bottom of page 60 and top of page 61 (orig. ed.) explains the purpose of the "Chi Square" test, and the statistical theory involved is described on page 61. The reason for making this test was simply this: The author(s) of the report felt that it might be possible to show by this test that the Unknown cases were really just like the Known cases, after all. If this could be shown, it would then have been simple to say that the Unknowns had been essentially the same objects as the Knowns, and there would have been no residual "unknown" type of object ("flying saucer") to talk about.

As it turned out, the author(s) had to admit, at top of p. 68 (orig.) that there was very little probability that the Unknowns were the same as the Knowns. But they refused to admit that this meant that "saucers" could be a real type of novel object. Notice how they carry on the struggle to prove that the Unknowns are the same as the Knowns, until at the end of the "Chi Square Test" section, they admit that the results are inconclusive.

[3] What is the definition of "Flying Saucer" used in the Blue Book Report?

On p. 1 of the original text, third paragraph, a definition is given which is used by the author(s) of the report. It implies that some "secret military weapon" may be involved, by use of the words "Free World" and "intruder aircraft". There is no mention of "interplanetary vehicles" either from terrestrial or extra-terrestrial sources.

Also on page 1, in the second paragraph, is a facetious definition of "flying saucer" which, if adopted, would prevent any identification or explanation of flying saucers, by its very wording.

Unfortunately, the author(s) of the report, when referring to the definition of "flying saucer", (as for instance in their Conclusions, orig. p. 94, fourth paragraph), merely refer to "flying saucers" (as defined on Page 1)". This leaves somewhat confused the question of which of the two definitions on page 1 they are referring to.