

plausible explanations for reports not otherwise explainable." Review of Dr. Pitt's report reveals that this conclusion is unwarranted, despite its presumptuous sound. Dr. Pitt provided plausible explanations in six specific reports, one agreed with IAD, four agreed with Dr. Lynch, and one Dr. Lynch could not explain and IAD did not mention.

5. C. S. Description of Corrosive Weather Events (Appendix "B")

The Weather Bureau provided such information on the phenomenon of ball lightning and lightning in general. These phenomena cannot be ruled out entirely. However, none of the reported incidents appear to have been lightning.

6. Summary of Results of Experiments

It can be stated with certainty that unidentified objects are very different types of objects and not multiple sightings of the same object of the same type object.

It is realized that none of the explanations given constitute positive scientific proof. Such proof might be possible were fragments recovered or wire damage to property or injury to personnel sustained in any instance. In the other hand, almost every incident has less than legal proof that an object was seen, or that an object appeared or performed as described. Even in those cases where more than one witness reported, all witnesses seldom agreed on details.

In view of the foregoing, the explanations provided by consulting agencies are accepted as solutions to the respective incidents.

Of the 230 incidents under consideration in this report, 50 must be disregarded for lack of suitable evidence. Eight were extracted from press and radio accounts and saw barely more than rumors. In the investigation of five others, the observers were found to have possessed too vivid imaginations, were of low intelligence, or were merely questionable. It is reasonable to assume that if these thirty incidents had provided sufficient information a proportionate number could be explained as were the 174 incidents that have been explained.

With 18 incidents thus eliminated, there remain thirty-four which contain some evidence but have no agreed-upon ready explanation. This statement is true only under the assumption that the evidence is accepted as reliable and accurate. When psychological and psycho-physical factors are taken into consideration, all of these incidents can be explained rationally, as pointed out by Hans Conradsen and Dr. Pitts of Air Materiel Command Aero-Medical Laboratory (see Appendixes "C" and "D").

7. Summary of U.S. Explanations of Unexplained Reports

The remaining unexplained incidents (see Appendix "E") exhibited few common characteristics. Two of them, by statements of the reporters, would not have been made had the witnesses not read of the Ft. Belvoir

T
H
I
S

F
A
C
E

I
S

U
N
C
L
A
S
S
I
F
I
E
D