

DISCREET

4

SECRET

Conclusions and Recommendations

15. When the only material available is a mass of purely subjective evidence, it is impossible to give anything like scientific proof that the phenomena observed are, or are not, caused by something entirely novel, such as an aircraft of extra-terrestrial origin, developed by beings unknown to us on lines more advanced than anything we have thought of. We are, however, satisfied that the bulk of the observations reported do not need such an explanation, and can be accounted for much more simply. There is a very old scientific principle, usually attributed to William of Occam, which states that the most probable hypothesis is the simplest necessary to explain the observations.

We believe that this principle should be applied to the present case, and accordingly conclude that all the observations reported were due to one or other of the following causes:—

- (1) Astronomical or meteorological phenomena of known types.
- (2) Mistaken identification of conventional aircraft, balloons, birds, or other normal or natural objects.
- (3) Optical illusions and psychological delusions.
- (4) Deliberate hoaxes.

We consider that no progress will be made by attempting further investigation of unco-ordinated and subjective evidence, and that positive results could only be obtained by organising throughout the country, or the world, continuous observation of the skies by a co-ordinated network of visual observers, equipped with photographic apparatus, and supplemented by a network of radar stations and sound locators. We should regard this, on the evidence so far available, as a singularly profitless enterprise. We accordingly recommend very strongly that no further investigation of reported mysterious aerial phenomena be undertaken, unless and until some material evidence becomes available.

Metropole Buildings, W.C. 2.

APPENDIX A

A NOTE ON AN UNUSUAL RADAR RESPONSE BY MR. G. E. G. GRAHAM, D.S.I. 1

With reference to the unusual response observed at Wartling on 1st June, 1950, it is suggested that the signal observed was received directly from another radar transmitter, possibly ship-borne, in the Portsmouth-Isle of Wight area. This will be termed the "Western" transmitter.

Assuming the modulation pulses of the "Western" transmitter to be isochronous with those of the Wartling set, and that the pulse of the former was occurring anything up to, say, 1.2 milliseconds minus the transmission time later than that of the latter, the received signal would be visible on the P.P.I. display. Moreover, unless the "Western" transmitter were very far away it is probable that the received signal would be of large amplitude and would therefore, as stated in the report, "appear very thick leaving more afterglow than a usual response behind."

It is reasonable to suppose that the repetition rates mentioned above would not remain identical for more than a few seconds. A relatively small drift in the repetition rates will produce a considerable change in the time interval between the transmitter pulse and the firing instant of the receiver time base. This would result in a large displacement of the received signal along the scan, which would be interpreted as a high speed movement of the "target" in the radial direction. It will be appreciated that if at the instant of first sighting the repetition rate of the "Western" transmitter were above but slowly approaching that of the Wartling set, the "target" would appear to close range rapidly; as the repetition rates became equal the "target" would appear stationary; and as the "Western" repetition rate fell below that of the Wartling set, the "target" would appear to open range rapidly. It may further be noted that one would expect reflections from objects (hills, &c.) relatively close to the "Western" transmitter to be of sufficient amplitude to be displayed also on the P.P.I., which would give the impression of "shadows" between successive points as described in the report.

SECRET

DISCREET