

*Discussion of  
investigators  
...  
...  
...*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 23 1966

TO: Investigating Group  
FROM: Robert J. Low  
SUBJECT: Suggested Agenda for Dec. 27th Meeting

At our discussion we might consider some of the following points:

1. Give further thought to the Wertheimer hypothesis ( I personally do not question the basic conclusion that it is impossible, for the "residual" cases, to determine whether they are ETI's or conventional terrestrial phenomena. I further agree that the use of ~~the~~ probability theory would be of limited, or perhaps of no, relevance to the question. It is another matter, however, whether, as Mike argues, improved data would also be non-relevant. He maintains that what improved data would do is reduce the number of residual cases. That is, it would enable us to explain more of them but would not help us further along the road to answering the question that everybody wants answered: are the residuals ETI's or conventional terrestrial phenomena?
2. Closely connected with this point is the question of what it would take to convince us that a given sighting, any sighting, was an ETI. What evidence would we accept as conclusive? I think this is a key problem and ought to be considered at length. Would we accept a photograph? What sort of a relic would do? Would any pattern of repeated sightings serve as convincing evidence?
3. Once we have defined the problem in (2), <sup>we</sup> can then turn to a consideration of whether in fact we have any such evidence yet or not and whether we might be able, after suitable investigation, to say something about what the present situation is with respect to ETI's.
4. If it turns out, considering all the <sup>data</sup> ~~evidence~~ we have, that we do not have any that satisfies the criteria of convincing evidence of ETI's, then we can address ourselves to what one might do to get such evidence, from the available data or from new improved data. This also leads to a consideration of recommendations we might make as to how to assemble and acquire improved data. One possible conclusion, following the Wertheimer hypothesis, is that, while improved data would be nice, they wouldn't help solve the problem. Then we might recommend that the Air Force just get out of the business and quit studying the matter. One could not justify spending taxpayers' money for continuing the effort. The country would then wait for conclusive evidence, as we have defined it, to emerge ( or not to emerge) on its own - without trying, through a big data program, to dig it out. ( The emergence of conclusive evidence <sup>if</sup> it ever emerges, might come about just as fast whether or not we mount an elaborate observing effort ).
5. Specific things that we need to do are: Prepare an interview form, discuss the manual that Franklin Roach has been working on, discuss the question of instrumentation, and review the problem of the "conspiracy" hypothesis. I have been spending some time on the latter myself and would be prepared to speak to that subject for a few moments.
6. These are the points that occur to me. There may, and undoubtedly are, others.