The Shape of the Record

What a Five-Tranche UAP Corpus Can Show—and Where It Goes Quiet

By Res Ipsa Researcher KCB and Collaborator Sere
Post-Signal-Repair Narrative / Wonder Edition v1.4 · September 2026

DOCUMENTARY STORYTELLING WITHOUT EVIDENTIARY INFLATION

Documentary voices

The Pantex report begins with an object on ground-surveillance radar west of the plant.

Pantex incident report — image caption

> “Image from Ground Surveillance Radar Tower.” Pantex Unidentified Object Incident Report, frozen release identity DOE-UAP-D005, document p. 6

Pantex incident report — image caption

> “Sandia National Labs Enhanced Images of the Object.” Pantex Unidentified Object Incident Report, frozen release identity DOE-UAP-D005, document p. 7

The report describes a response that moved from radar to personnel, from personnel to a camera, from an on-site observation to an off-site search, and from collected material to Sandia National Laboratories and an FBI agent.

Then the record changes register.

CIA Scientific Advisory Panel

> “The Panel could find no ready explanation for these clusters.” Scientific Advisory Panel record, CIA-RDP81R00560R000100030027-0, p. 16

Apollo 11 — Buzz Aldrin

> “I couldn't explain why my eye would see these flashes.” Apollo 11 Technical Crew Debriefing, section 18.6

Soviet scientific account

> “Nobody has any truly new facts proving the existence of ‘flying saucers.’” CIA-preserved translation, Scientists Refute Claims of ‘UFO’ Sightings

These statements do not describe one event or one theory. The Pantex captions record images associated with an institutional response. The panel records a technical difficulty. Aldrin records a perception he could not explain. The translated Soviet article rejects the proposition that new proof existed.

What kind of record allows all of these statements to coexist?

1. Executive Summary

The completed investigation found a documentary corpus in which unusual observations repeatedly entered formal channels, attracted institutional attention, encountered competing explanations, and often remained unresolved for reasons that can be identified more precisely than “mystery.”

The strongest public synthesis is not that the corpus establishes one physical phenomenon. Nor is it that the unresolved material can be dismissed because some cases were conventional. The strongest synthesis is that the record preserves two stories at once:

1. A documentary story: institutions attempted to report, route, classify, measure, investigate, explain, and sometimes preserve or transfer evidence concerning unusual observations.
2. An observation story: witnesses and operators described lights, objects, radar returns, flashes, physical traces, and apparent movements that investigators sometimes explained, sometimes disputed, and sometimes could not resolve with the surviving material.

The investigation begins most clearly with Pantex. The surviving report describes radar detection, Protective Force response, ground observation, CROWS-camera tracking, an off-site search, roadway-access limitations, Sandia submission, and reported FBI transfer. The sequence explains why the incident became consequential. It is more substantial than an isolated visual account.

But the sequence does not identify the object. The report contains conflicting color descriptions, a sheriff’s-deputy non-observation, limited detail from the tower video, a one-day date discrepancy, and no original radar track, CROWS material, Sandia methodology or result, or identifiable FBI follow-up. The case is therefore a strong documentary sequence and an unresolved object-identification problem, not a demonstrated extraordinary craft.

The rest of the corpus supplies different kinds of stories.

- Project SIGN shows a formal investigation that collected reports, examined ordinary explanations, treated some accounts as hoaxes or unreliable, and preserved a distinction between available data and positive identification.
- The 1948 Air Intelligence report shows how an institution could identify some incidents, leave others unresolved, discuss foreign-origin possibilities, and still conclude that origin was not discernable.
- The Los Alamos conference shows military, scientific, law-enforcement, atomic-energy, and university participants trying to reconcile green-fireball reports with meteor phenomena while technical questions remained open.
- Sardis Lake is a resolution story: a falling object beneath a white parachute was routed through institutional channels and identified as an atmospheric detecting device, although the final transfer and rehabilitation records are absent.
- The ATIC camera program shows an attempt to move from testimony toward measurement, followed by reported equipment failure, an abandoned concentration effort, and an absent statistical result.
- The 1953 panel and later Air Force review distinguish unexplained reports from a conclusion that no direct physical national-security threat had been demonstrated.
- Site 7 preserves a vivid green circular phenomenon that widened into concentric rings, but no altitude, diameter, independent sensor record, or physical recovery.
- Apollo preserves observations followed by changing interpretations: some possibilities narrowed toward reflections or optical effects, while the cabin flashes remained physically unresolved in the supplied record.
- Aviation cases show why operational relevance and physical identification must be separated. Radar and visual reports could prompt recommendations without producing a settled explanation.

- French institutional material describes a reporting and analytical network while also preserving incomplete cases, delayed intervention, poor photographs, contradictory analyses, and a distinction between insufficient data and non-identification despite substantial information.
- The Davidson memorandum, the Ludwig attachment, and the withheld bridges show how documentary narratives can become stronger than their underlying evidence when missing records, OCR uncertainty, dependent sources, or unresolved sibling proposals are compressed into one relation.

After conventional explanations, hoax and reliability judgments, dependency review, and documentary gaps are allowed to do their work, some material remains difficult. But no coherent physical class emerges from the difficult cases. What recurs most clearly is not an independently corroborated object type or performance profile. It is a pattern of institutional attention, incomplete evidence chains, competing interpretations, and unresolved boundaries between observation and explanation.

Several bounded characteristics recur:

- reports often contain detailed descriptions but lack decisive range, altitude, timing, calibration, or source context;
- institutions distinguish observation, identification, origin, and response;
- ordinary explanations are repeatedly considered and sometimes succeed;
- unresolved reports can coexist with a no-threat conclusion;
- apparent corroboration often remains within one report, one debrief, one mediated source, or one publication lineage;
- the most consequential missing evidence often disappears at the point where it would discriminate among explanations.

These recurring characteristics are documentary and epistemic. They do not establish a common physical cause.

The frozen investigation contains no canonical hypothesis set. It establishes no extraterrestrial or non-human ontology, recovered technology, single continuous phenomenon, corpus-wide safety effect, causal continuity among national programs, or independent corroboration for every repeated account.

The result is neither universal confirmation nor universal dismissal. It is a bounded account of what people reported, what institutions did, what explanations worked, what remained difficult, what evidence was lost or never supplied, and what specific records would move the question.

The repaired synthesis makes a third story independently visible. Beneath the Claims and stronger structures lies a complete field of 69 Signals: observations, resemblances, tensions, counter-signals, and documentary relationships that survived the frozen investigation without crossing a stronger analytical threshold. Sixty-eight are standalone from stronger objects. Their independence as an epistemic layer changes what can be said without changing what is established.

That field does not resolve into a common craft, mechanism, origin, or performance profile. It does preserve bounded things that keep raising their hands: luminous and changing forms; flashes under constrained viewing conditions; reported radar/visual relationships; observation paired with failed identification; institutional escalation after unresolved returns; and repeated attempts to improve collection. It also preserves what pushes the other way: balloons and radiosondes, aircraft and meteors, optical and reflection accounts, hoax and reliability dispositions, sensor failures, conflicting observations, and successful identification.

The resulting distinction is essential. Claims and stronger structures govern what this corpus establishes. Signals show what remains interesting below that threshold. Counter-signals show what narrows, complicates, or defeats an anomalous reading. No Signal was promoted in producing this edition.

---

2. Scope and Documentary Corpus

The investigation concerns a frozen five-tranche documentary corpus. It includes historical reports, institutional memoranda, intelligence material, scientific discussions, aviation accounts, mission debriefings, correspondence, later summaries, public releases, photographs, sketches, digital renderings, radar-related records, and media items.

The corpus contains records associated with:

- the U.S. Air Force, including Project SIGN, Project Grudge, Project Blue Book, Air Materiel Command, and Air Technical Intelligence Center;
- the U.S. Army and Army-Air Force reporting channels;
- the Central Intelligence Agency;
- the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
- NASA;
- the Department of Defense and AARO;
- the Department of Energy and Pantex;
- Sandia National Laboratories;
- the Department of State;
- French gendarmerie, aviation, CNES, GEPAN, and SEPRA-related structures;
- Soviet astronomical and intelligence accounts;
- universities, scientific panels, laboratories, journalists, documentary producers, researchers, and public commentators.

These materials do not answer the same question.

A military report may establish that an account entered a formal channel. A witness account may preserve what a person said they saw. A technical memorandum may record an attempted explanation. A statistical summary may preserve an institutional classification system. A diplomatic or intelligence cable may show that an account was transmitted. A photograph may establish that an image was released while leaving its original scene and provenance unresolved. A later article may preserve a narrative that depends on an earlier report.

The corpus is therefore not a flat collection of “UFO cases.” It is a governed documentary field containing records, manifestations, locations, extractions, analytical objects, source relationships, dependency warnings, and unresolved evidentiary gaps.

The frozen census records:

Research object	Count
Canonical Master Index Sources	398
Source manifestations	429
Source locations	2,647
People	73
Entities	64
Assets	41
Events	42
Quotes	205
Claims	61
Questions	56
Null Spaces	43
Anchors	47
Signals	69
Connections	11
Bridges	5
Patterns	5
Networks	1
Cross-layer analyses	3
Operational-loop proposals	1
Canonical hypotheses	0

These counts are registrations of research objects, not counts of independent observations. Three manifestations of one document do not create three events. A later article repeating an earlier account does not create a second witness. A derivative image does not become a new observation because it has a separate filename.

The chronology spans the 1940s through the 2020s. Relevant records include:

- Swedish “phantom rockets” and early postwar reports;

- 1947–1949 Air Force reporting and intelligence analysis;
- the 1948 Air Intelligence report;
- the February 1949 Los Alamos conference;
- the 1953 Scientific Advisory Panel;
- the 1953 ATIC camera and Project STORK material;
- 1954–1955 Avro, KC-97, CIRVIS, and Sardis records;
- the 1958 Davidson memorandum;
- the 1964 Socorro record;
- 1965–1967 Project Blue Book review and university-investigation planning;
- 1967 Site 7 and FBI referral records;
- reported French institutional centralization in the 1970s;
- Dijon, Cussac, Valensole, and Trans-en-Provence material;
- 1990 Pereslav-Zalesski;
- 1994 Air France;
- 1997 Swissair;
- 2015 Pantex;
- contemporary Range Fouler and other operational records;
- later media, documentary, Release 02, Release 04, and Release 05 material.

This chronology establishes recurrence of reports, institutional attention, and public interpretation across decades. It does not establish one continuous physical phenomenon, one continuous institutional program, a common object type, causal continuity between national systems, or that similar descriptions refer to the same thing.

---

3. Method and Evidentiary Posture

The investigation's method becomes most useful when a narrative creates a question.

Pantex appears to offer radar, visual observation, camera tracking, search, technical review, and evidence transfer. The natural question is: Did these channels independently corroborate one another?

The answer requires distinctions among source, manifestation, location, extraction, authority, dependency, and completeness.

A document's statement is not automatically an event finding. A report can establish that an account was recorded or that an institution reached a conclusion. It does not by itself settle whether the underlying observation or interpretation was correct.

Multiple records are not automatically independent corroboration. A later article, translation, institutional copy, or derivative image may descend from one earlier account. The record must be traced before apparent multiplicity is counted as support.

Documentary authority and substantive authority differ. Current-native material is generally the strongest basis for saying what a preserved document contains. Mediated, legacy, metadata-only, partial, and unsupported material may still matter, but they carry different limits.

Unresolved is a status, not an explanation. A case can remain unresolved because measurements are missing, because competing explanations cannot be discriminated, because the source is incomplete, or because substantial reported data still do not identify the phenomenon.

Source, manifestation, and location

The frozen investigation preserves a chain from the thing being cited to the place where it can be inspected:

```
Source
  → Source Manifestation
    → Source Location
      → Extraction or native payload, where available
```

A Source is the documentary object or media item being tracked.

A Manifestation is a particular delivered, archived, or processed representation of that source.

A Location identifies where relevant material appears, such as a page, image, media interval, archive member, or technical container.

An Extraction or native payload preserves a bounded representation of what was available for inspection.

This structure makes the corpus auditable. It also prevents a common error: treating every available description as if it were the original evidence.

A page locator is not the same thing as the page's meaning. A file hash is not the same thing as an event. A title is not the same thing as a complete report. A processing receipt is not a substantive conclusion.

Authority strata

The frozen state distinguishes several documentary postures.

Current-native material is processed from a current governed representation. It is generally the strongest basis for statements about what a document contains, although it may still be partial, OCR-degraded, warning-qualified, or dependent on embedded text rather than native page images.

Current-native material with warnings is usable with qualifications. Warnings may concern missing pages, degraded text, incomplete attachments, or other processing limitations.

Partial current-native material may contain substantial usable evidence while omitting pages, tables, appendices, images, or conclusions.

Qualified legacy-only material preserves historical or source-reported content but does not carry current-native evidentiary authority. The frozen declaration records 3,720 legacy salvage extractions in this category. Their existence and historical usefulness are not erased, but neither are they silently upgraded.

Metadata-custody-only material establishes that a source, file, URL, or delivery was registered or held. It does not establish the substantive contents of the item.

Unsupported or excluded media remain outside active substantive evidence. Their custody metadata may be preserved, but the frozen boundary does not permit their content to be used as proof or counterproof.

A record can therefore be strong evidence that a memorandum exists while remaining weak evidence for the truth of the memorandum's underlying assertions. A file can have an exact hash and archive path while its historical identity remains unrecorded. A source can be detailed and readable while still being a later summary of an earlier report.

Narrative and analysis

The narrative sections tell what the surviving record says happened, where the story becomes interesting, what investigators did with the problem, and where the evidence stops. The analytical sections then identify the authority, dependency, provenance, and completeness limits that govern the inference.

The purpose is not to make the cases more dramatic. It is to allow the documentary sequence to explain why the cases generated curiosity before asking what that curiosity can support.

4. Principal Findings

4.1 Pantex: a response sequence without an identified object

The Pantex report describes an object detected by ground-surveillance radar west of the plant. Protective Force personnel were dispatched. Ground personnel reported seeing it. A CROWS camera tracked it for several minutes. An off-site search was coordinated with the Carson County Sheriff's Office. The object was lost partly because responding personnel could not obtain access to the relevant roadway. The report says video was obtained from a nearby ground-surveillance-radar tower, submitted to Sandia National Laboratories, and that statements, video, and other evidence were turned over to an FBI agent.

The sequence is the reason the case matters:

```
Radar detection
    ↓
Protective Force response
    ↓
Ground observation
    ↓
CROWS-camera tracking
    ↓
Off-site search
    ↓
Sandia submission
    ↓
Reported FBI transfer
```

The report does not identify the object. It records a diamond-like or rounded-top shape, estimates of approximately four feet in height and two feet in width at the bottom, and altitude estimates of roughly 100–200 feet. It records no audible sound and no identifiable propulsion system through binocular observation. It also records disagreement about color. One observer described the object differently from another. A sheriff's deputy did not see it. The tower video reportedly provided little detail because of distance.

The report's cover date and narrative date differ by one day: the cover is dated 2 September 2015, while the narrative refers to 1 September 2015.

The case is therefore a substantial institutional incident report with an unresolved object identity. Its strength is the documentary sequence. Its weakness is that the technical links in that sequence cannot presently be examined independently.

The original radar track is unavailable. The CROWS material is not supplied. The tower video is referenced but reportedly contains little detail. The Sandia review is mentioned without methodology or result. The FBI recipient is not readable in the available record, and no resulting case file is supplied.

The natural question is:

> What were they following?

The analytical question is:

> How much of the reported chain can be independently tested?

The answer is narrower than either confirmation or dismissal. The frozen state establishes that a current-native institutional record describes radar detection, response, ground observation, camera tracking, search, submission, and reported transfer. It does not establish that the channels were synchronized, independent, technically sufficient, or ultimately identifying.

The most consequential next records would be the original radar imagery or track data, tower video in its original or highest-quality form, timestamps and communications logs, the CROWS recording and system context, Sandia's

enhancement or review methodology, the evidence-transfer record, the FBI recipient and any resulting case file, and the complete Pantex report, including exhibits.

The missing evidence matters because it interrupts an already-interesting investigation. It is not what made the sequence interesting in the first place.

[P1]

4.2 Project SIGN: investigation without positive identification

Project SIGN was activated on 26 January 1948. Technical Instruction 2185 was published on 11 February 1948. The report describes files consolidated from reports received directly by Headquarters Air Materiel Command and from reports forwarded by the Director of Intelligence, USAF.

The report contains an incident register with fields for:

- time;
- place;
- witnesses;
- weather;
- object description;
- size;
- direction;
- motion;
- sound;
- altitude;
- possible effects.

It also contains technical and methodological discussion, attempts to test ordinary explanations, photographic and film-related analysis, and distinctions between available data and positive identification.

The story here is not a single unexplained encounter. It is an institution building a way to receive and sort encounters.

Some reports were considered in relation to advertising blimps, aircraft, natural phenomena, and other ordinary explanations. One incident was described as a publicity-and-money hoax. Another reporting person was characterized as excitable, talkative, and possessing an exaggerated imagination. Incident 194 was recorded as a cluster of eight MIT cosmic-ray research balloons.

The report also preserves unresolved possibilities. It records an attributed view from Dr. Irving Langmuir that the available data were insufficient for positive identification. It records a technical possibility that low-aspect-ratio aircraft using boundary-layer control might reproduce many reported appearance and performance characteristics.

Project SIGN therefore does not reduce its material to true and false. It distinguishes among:

- whether a report was made;
- whether a witness was considered credible;
- whether an object was identified;
- whether a proposed explanation fit the available material.

The report establishes the formal project, its routing arrangements, its attempt to aggregate reports, its consideration of ordinary explanations, its rejection or narrowing of some entries, and its refusal to claim positive identification from all available data.

Its quantitative and technical limits remain specific. The incident register may not be complete. Each entry may not represent an independent event. Measurements may not be calibrated. Photographic enclosures and supporting files are not all present. The proposed aircraft mechanism is a technical possibility recorded in the report, not an explanation established for particular cases.

Page 32 lacks recoverable text. The broader freeze records missing or unusable page images and absent enclosures. The treatment of one image can therefore be evaluated only to the extent that the image, duplicate film, laboratory work, and camera context survive.

Project SIGN makes the question more precise: which reports were conventionally identifiable, which were unreliable, which were technically unresolved, and what evidence was actually available for each classification?

[2]

4.3 The 1948 Air Intelligence report: observation, identity, origin, response

Air Intelligence Report No. 100-203-79, dated 10 December 1948, describes approximately 210 reported incidents. The observers included Weather Bureau personnel, Air Force officers, civilian pilots, technicians, and commercial-airline personnel.

The report describes three broad configuration categories:

- disk-shaped;
- rough cigar-shaped;
- balls of fire.

It recognizes that viewing angle and visibility conditions might make one object appear in different forms.

Headquarters, Air Materiel Command had positively identified 18 of approximately 210 incidents. The identified categories included:

- hoaxes;
- unreliable witnesses;
- celestial bodies;
- meteorological and carnival balloons;
- airborne cosmic-ray equipment.

The report also considers weather balloons, rockets, experimental flying-wing aircraft, celestial phenomena, domestic devices, and possible foreign devices. It discusses whether some reported objects could have been Soviet or foreign unconventional aircraft, and whether such objects might serve reconnaissance, air-defense, propaganda, or familiarization purposes.

The report nevertheless states that origin was not discernable and that the analysis was provisional.

The record's importance lies in the separation of questions:

- Was an account recorded?
- Was the object identified?
- Was its origin known?

- Was a response warranted?

A report could remain unidentified without being treated as a demonstrated threat. A threat assessment could be made without identifying every object. A conventional category could account for some cases without accounting for all cases.

The figures are documentary facts about the report, not automatically modern statistical results. To use them analytically, a researcher would need the full case list, denominator definition, inclusion and exclusion rules, duplicate treatment, classification criteria, disposition of the 18 identified cases, missing pages and appendices, and the relationship between the report and Project SIGN.

The frozen state preserves the numerical claims while withholding any stronger claim that they constitute an independently validated prevalence estimate.

[3]

4.4 Los Alamos: what were they trying to explain?

A current-native record documents a conference held at Los Alamos on 16 February 1949. The record identifies participants associated with the Army, the University of New Mexico, the FBI, the United States Atomic Energy Commission, and the University of California. It states that the subject was classified Secret under applicable regulations and that attendees were properly cleared.

The subject was not “UFOs” in the abstract. The discussion included green fireballs and the Starvation Peak incident of 12 December 1948. Captain Neef described airline-pilot reports received from December 1948 onward. Dr. Lincoln LaPaz compared reported green fireballs with conventional meteorite falls.

The comparison turned on physical and observational details:

- trajectory;
- duration;
- sound;
- color;
- fragmentation;
- observer coverage;
- possible recovery;
- atmospheric and physical explanations.

The record preserves disagreement and uncertainty about sound, path, speed, materiality, and whether conventional meteorite explanations were sufficient.

The conference mattered because the reports had reached a room containing military, scientific, law-enforcement, atomic-energy, and university participants, yet the presence of that room did not settle the phenomenon. The participants were trying to determine whether ordinary meteor analysis could account for the reported combination of characteristics.

The classified setting is documentary fact. It does not identify the phenomenon. It does not show that classification reflected extraordinary technology. It does show that the subject was treated as relevant enough for restricted technical discussion.

The conference establishes that the meeting occurred, that the participants were involved as represented, that airline-pilot reports formed part of the discussion, and that LaPaz compared them with conventional meteor phenomena.

It does not resolve the physical identity of the green fireballs, validate LaPaz’s comparisons, establish a common phenomenon, or demonstrate that classification reflected extraordinary technology.

The conference preserves a pressure zone: observations were unusual enough to gather attention, but the explanatory field remained open.

[4]

4.5 Sardis Lake: the satisfaction of a conventional explanation

The Sardis Lake correspondence records recovery of a falling object with an attached white parachute. The object was routed through Army and Air Force channels. The Air Weather Service identified it as an atmospheric detecting device used for upper-air soundings. The correspondence requested that it be sent to Sacramento Air Materiel Area at McClellan Air Force Base for radiosonde rehabilitation.

The sequence is straightforward:

```
Falling object
    ↓
Recovery beneath a white parachute
    ↓
Army and Air Force routing
    ↓
Atmospheric-equipment identification
    ↓
Proposed transfer for rehabilitation
```

This is a resolution story, even though its final administrative step is missing.

The correspondence establishes that a physical object was recovered, that it had a parachute, that an institutional service identified it as atmospheric equipment, and that the object was to be transferred for rehabilitation.

The final transfer, physical inspection, rehabilitation, and disposition are not supplied. It remains unresolved whether rehabilitation occurred, whether the object was linked to a specific earlier UAP report, and whether the identification was independently confirmed.

Even with those limits, Sardis is a documented conventional-identification pathway. The satisfaction of a narrowing explanation is part of the evidentiary story. An investigation is not required to preserve mystery when an ordinary explanation fits the available record.

[5]

4.6 Hoaxes, unreliable witnesses, and narrowed cases

The frozen corpus records incidents treated as hoaxes or as unreliable testimony. It also preserves explanations involving balloons, aircraft, meteors, reentry, reflections, optical effects, electrical phenomena, camera defects, and atmospheric effects.

These outcomes matter because the investigative process was not uniformly committed to preserving mystery. A publicity-and-money hoax was identified as such. Another observer was described as unreliable. The MIT balloon cluster was identified. The Sardis object was classified as atmospheric equipment. Apollo interpretations moved toward reflections or optical effects in parts of the debriefing.

The documentary outcomes include:

- identified;
- probably identified;
- insufficiently documented;
- disputed;
- treated as a hoax;

- treated as unreliable;
- unresolved despite substantial reported data;
- described only through a later summary;
- pending recovery;
- unavailable for semantic inspection.

A successful explanation in one case does not close every other case. But conventional resolution is a substantive result, not a decorative qualification.

---

5. Subjects, Institutions, Assets, and Chronology

The corpus includes people who reported observations, investigated cases, produced technical assessments, participated in conferences, managed institutional routing, or appeared in later source material.

It includes institutions and entities that:

- received or forwarded reports;
- conducted technical review;
- operated radar, aircraft, cameras, or observatories;
- managed aviation or security responses;
- preserved or released records;
- created later summaries or interpretations.

It includes assets such as:

- aircraft;
- radar systems;
- CROWS cameras;
- tower cameras;
- spectrographic gratings;
- photographic film;
- balloons and radiosondes;
- spacecraft windows and cabin environments;
- physical samples;
- soil and plant material;
- documents, pages, enclosures, and media files.

The chronology should be read as a chronology of documentary records and reported episodes, not as a continuous physical narrative.

Selected chronology

1947–1949

Air Force reporting and intelligence structures assembled reports and considered ordinary, technical, and foreign-origin explanations. Project SIGN was activated in January 1948. The 1948 Air Intelligence report described approximately 210 incidents and 18 positive identifications. The Los Alamos conference in February 1949 discussed green-fireball reports and meteor comparisons.

1953–1955

The Scientific Advisory Panel reviewed evidence and concluded that no direct physical national-security threat had been demonstrated. ATIC attempted an instrumented camera program, reported major grating failures, abandoned a proposed Albuquerque concentration effort, and prepared a Project STORK statistical report whose completed form is not supplied. The Avro material records a generally negative technical feasibility assessment. The KC-97 memorandum preserves unresolved visual and radar reports. The Sardis correspondence records a conventional atmospheric-equipment identification.

1958–1967

The Davidson memorandum records an inquiry involving a space message and transmitter, together with assertions about destroyed records and concealed identity. The 1964 Socorro record appears in the broader corpus. Air Force review in 1965–1967 includes unexplained reports, no-threat conclusions, scientific review, university planning, public education, and press-relations concerns. The 1967 FBI correspondence records a child's flash-of-light report, a referral to Army-Air Force radar personnel, and a later response stating that the FBI had no information about an alleged 1954 Coast Guard encounter. The Site 7 report preserves a late-summer 1973 account in the Sary Shagan context.

1970s–1990s

French material describes gendarmerie, aviation, CNES, GEPAN, SEPRA, laboratory, and scientific-council relationships, alongside cases including Cussac, Valensole, and Trans-en-Provence. Later accounts include Pereslav-Zalesski, Air France AF 3532, Swissair, and Tehran.

2015–2020s

The Pantex report describes a current-native institutional response involving radar, ground personnel, a CROWS camera, search, Sandia, and reported FBI transfer. Contemporary operational records, later media, and Release 02, Release 04, and Release 05 material add further documentary and custody layers, with some media and documents remaining uninspected or unsupported.

The recurrence of reports across decades is real as a documentary fact. The physical continuity of what was reported is not established.

6. Documentary and Evidentiary Structures

6.1 Reporting and routing

The strongest recurring structure is a reporting pathway:

```
Observation conditions
      ↓
Object or light description
      ↓
Formal report or witness account
      ↓
Institutional routing
      ↓
Technical assessment
      ↓
Classification, public framing, or further inquiry
```

This appears in different forms across:

- Air Force reporting directives;
- Project SIGN;
- Air Intelligence material;
- French gendarmerie and GEPAN descriptions;
- NASA debriefing pathways;
- contemporary operational forms;
- Pantex;
- FBI referrals.

The recurring reporting fields are themselves revealing. Institutions asked for:

- date and time;
- location and coordinates;
- observer identity;
- aircraft or platform;
- weather and visibility;
- object size, shape, color, direction, altitude, distance, and sound;
- photographs, negatives, drawings, sketches, and fragments;
- possible effects on aircraft, instruments, communications, or other systems.

The recurrence of these fields indicates recognition that discriminating information was needed.

It does not establish that forms were completed consistently, that measurements were calibrated, that reports were retained, that every institution used the same standard, that the systems were historically connected, or that the underlying observations were accurate.

6.2 Observation, identification, origin, response

A second structure separates:

1. whether an observation was reported;
2. whether the object or phenomenon was identified;
3. whether its origin was known;
4. whether a response was warranted.

This structure is especially clear in Project SIGN and the 1948 Air Intelligence report.

It prevents several substitutions:

- "unidentified" for "non-human";
- "investigated" for "confirmed";
- "no threat" for "nothing happened";
- "classified" for "extraordinary technology."

The documents do not permit those substitutions.

6.3 Institutional attention and evidentiary result

The ATIC camera program shows that institutional interest and evidentiary yield are different things.

The record describes 100 Videon cameras, 100 spectrographic gratings, distribution of 74 cameras to selected Air Defense Command radar sites and AACS control towers, failure of approximately 90 percent of the gratings, expected recall and re-equipment, an abandoned Albuquerque instrumentation effort, and preparation of a Project STORK statistical report covering UFOB sightings from 1947 through 1952.

The plan aimed to make ambiguity measurable. The surviving record does not show whether usable imagery was produced, whether all cameras were installed or operated, whether the gratings failed in every context, or whether Project STORK was completed.

Capacity and result remain separate.

6.4 Scientific inquiry and public management

The 1965–1967 Air Force material places scientific review alongside:

- university participation;
- public education;
- press relations;
- credibility;
- public reaction;
- reporting procedures.

This is a documentary relationship. It does not reduce the investigation to public relations. The same records show attempts to improve evidence collection and scientific review.

The presence of public-information concerns may have reflected ordinary institutional management of a subject with operational and reputational consequences. It may also have affected how the subject was communicated. The supplied state does not establish that public-relations concerns distorted particular case conclusions.

7. Relationships and Recurring Structures

7.1 Pantex and the question of corroboration

Pantex appears to contain several channels: radar, ground observation, CROWS tracking, tower video, Sandia review, and FBI transfer.

The reader naturally asks:

> Didn't radar, camera, and witnesses all corroborate one another?

The frozen state requires a distinction between documentary convergence and independent corroboration.

The channels appear within one institutional report. The report may accurately summarize several underlying records, but those records are not supplied for independent comparison. Without the original radar track, camera material, timestamps, communications, and technical reviews, the channels cannot be treated as fully independent source-generating processes.

The sequence remains important. Dependency does not erase the report. It changes the question from "How many sources confirm the object?" to "Which underlying records can be recovered and synchronized?"

7.2 Apollo and the question of multiple witnesses

Aldrin's observations and Armstrong's particle suggestion occur within the same debrief context. The record documents a conversation and explanatory contrast. It does not create two independent physical measurements.

The same debrief can contain observation, interpretation, counterinterpretation, and revision. Those layers should not be counted as separate observations merely because more than one participant appears in the discussion.

7.3 French institutional history and mediated multiplicity

A later French report may describe CNES, GEPAN, SEPRA, gendarmerie, aviation, laboratories, and scientific councils. Those references may accurately summarize multiple institutions. Without the underlying agreements, case files, laboratory records, and contemporaneous correspondence, the later report remains one mediated source for the proposition that the network operated as described.

The network may have been real as described. Its later presentation is not automatically an audited substitute for every underlying institutional record.

7.4 Repeated publication

A later article may quote a private letter. A documentary may quote the article. A researcher may quote the documentary. Three visible texts can descend from one letter.

Repetition increases persistence, not independence.

7.5 Derivative images

A witness sketch, composite sketch, digital rendering, highlighted frame, and documentary still may all depict the same reported object. They are materially different artifacts, but not necessarily independent visual observations.

7.6 Duplicate native payloads

One Soviet observatory payload appears under different extraction-unit identifiers but carries the same source, manifestation, location, payload, and payload hash. It is a duplicate delivery of the same native payload, not a second corroborating source.

7.7 Publication parts

Release material can contain two publication parts of one preliminary Gemini debriefing. The parts may be separately cataloged while remaining one underlying documentary family.

7.8 Dependency is not dismissal

If ten later articles descend from one original report, the correct conclusion is not that the report is worthless. It is that the ten articles do not independently corroborate it.

The underlying report may still be:

- a current-native institutional record;
- a detailed witness account;
- a technically informative memorandum;
- a conventional identification;
- a record of an unresolved case;
- a lead to missing primary material.

The frozen state's recurring dependency posture—`UNRESOLVED_REQUIRES_SOURCE_LINEAGE_REVIEW`—is a boundary on inference, not a declaration that the underlying observation or documentary problem is unimportant.

---

8. Claims and Interpretive Findings

8.1 The 1953 panel: no threat is not “all explained”

The frozen state preserves records concerning the January 1953 Scientific Advisory Panel and a 1965 memorandum stating that Project Blue Book had investigated 9,267 reports by 30 June 1965, of which 663 could not be explained.

The same material states that the Air Force had found no evidence that the reports reflected a national-security threat. It includes requests for scientific review, later planning for a university-linked investigation, and recommendations concerning public education, press relations, credibility, reporting procedures, and management of public reaction.

The 1953 panel concluded that the evidence presented showed:

- no indication of a direct physical threat to national security;
- no residuum attributable to foreign artifacts capable of hostile acts;
- no evidence requiring revision of current scientific concepts.

It also discussed indirect risks:

- misidentification of enemy artifacts;
- overload of reporting channels;
- public mass hysteria;
- psychological warfare.

The records preserve two statements answering different questions:

1. some reports remained unexplained;
2. no direct physical national-security threat had been demonstrated.

“Unexplained” describes the state of an individual report or classification. “No demonstrated threat” describes an institutional risk assessment.

The panel’s conclusion should not be read as an identification of every unresolved report. The unresolved count should not be read as a threat assessment.

8.2 The Tremonton film dispute

The 1953 panel’s discussion of the Tremonton film preserves a technical disagreement.

The Photo Interpretation Laboratory reportedly concluded that the film depicted self-luminous objects and had devoted substantial effort to excluding birds, balloons, and aircraft.

The panel challenged that conclusion and considered:

- sunlight reflections;
- birds;
- balloons;
- aircraft;
- duplicate-film analysis;
- camera suitability;

- camera jitter;
- questionable assumptions.

The film is therefore not a simple example of institutional confirmation or institutional debunking. It is a technical dispute whose underlying film, plots, camera information, weather conditions, and complete laboratory record are not supplied in the present state.

The documentary significance lies in the disagreement itself. A source can preserve a serious technical conclusion and a serious technical rebuttal without leaving the public reader a final answer.

8.3 Aviation and operational relevance

The corpus contains aviation cases in several documentary states.

Air France AF 3532 is represented through French-report extracts identifying Jean-Charles Duboc and Valérie Chauffour as captain and copilot on the Nice–London route on 28 January 1994. The extracts describe an object that became luminous, moved behind the airplane, stopped, ascended vertically, and stopped again. The controller reportedly had no corresponding radar contact. Later radio exchanges were used to reconstruct the sequence.

The case is operationally interesting because it involves a flight crew, air-traffic-control context, an apparent motion sequence, and reconstruction from radio exchanges.

The complete aviation records are not supplied. Without radar, timing, range, and geometry, the apparent motion cannot be converted into measured extraordinary performance.

A qualified legacy extraction reports that a Swissair Boeing 747 nearly missed a glowing white cylindrical object over Long Island in 1997. The underlying flight record, crew accounts, air-traffic records, and source lineage remain open.

A qualified historical account reports several calls to Tehran airport control concerning a strange immobile luminous object over the Shemiran district on an unresolved September date. Another account describes an interception attempt involving simultaneous fire-control, radio, and intercom failure. The date, control-tower records, aircraft files, technical-failure records, and independent witnesses are not supplied.

The KC-97 memorandum preserves reported visual and radar returns over Newfoundland. The committee could not explain the simultaneous radar and visual reports. It tentatively considered electrical phenomena and aircrew misinterpretation, while also stating that no intelligence supported or denied unconventional Soviet aircraft with the reported performance.

The memorandum recommended increased collection against Soviet research and development establishments and rapid fighter scrambles for future incidents of a similar nature.

This is an operationally consequential unresolved case. Its missing crew interrogations, radar records, weather information, and related Northeast Air Command material are the records that could discriminate among an unusual aircraft, radar or electrical effects, crew misinterpretation, an ordinary object under difficult conditions, or another explanation.

8.4 The withheld safety-effects claim

`SEREUAP001_CLM0008` asserted demonstrated safety-related effects across UAP encounters, including pilots, crew, cockpit discipline, and instrumentation.

The corpus contains near misses, cockpit concerns, operational diversions, pilot and crew reports, preparedness recommendations, and risks of misidentification. But the claim was withheld because:

- its basis was one qualified legacy source;
- no bounded incident set was supplied;

- no independent safety records were supplied;
- its wording generalized beyond the documented cases;
- its support status was unassessed and confidence low.

The narrower surviving finding is:

- aviation safety was a recurring institutional concern;
- some reports described potential operational effects;
- preparedness and improved reporting were recommended;
- no corpus-wide demonstrated safety effect was established.

8.5 French categories

The French material reproduces a four-category framework:

- Category A: completely identified;
- Category B: probably identifiable but lacking sufficient certainty;
- Category C: not identifiable because of insufficient data;
- Category D: not identifiable despite abundant and good-quality data.

The distinction separates lack of information from persistent non-identification. Category D means that, under the source's framework, a case remained unidentified despite the stated quality of the available data. It is not an extraterrestrial classification.

The same source denies irrefutable tangible proof of artifact character and states that there is no indisputable proof of a highly developed technological civilization.

The classification system is informative as a documentary framework. Its categories do not, without the underlying case files and methods, establish a validated cross-case ontology.

---

9. Open Questions

The frozen state preserves questions that remain unresolved because the available records do not support a stronger answer.

Pantex

- Was the radar track preserved?
- Can the radar, CROWS, tower video, ground observations, and communications be synchronized?
- What did Sandia actually receive and conclude?
- Who received the evidence at the FBI?
- Was there subsequent follow-up?
- What explains the conflicting color descriptions?
- What was the object's range, trajectory, and altitude?

Project SIGN and the 1948 Air Intelligence report

- Is the incident register complete?
- Are the reported cases independent?
- How were duplicates treated?
- What exactly did the approximately 210 and 18-case figures count?
- What was contained in missing pages and appendices?
- Which photographic judgments can be reproduced?
- Which unresolved cases had substantial data rather than merely incomplete records?

Tremonton and Project SIGN imagery

- Where are the original and duplicate films?
- What camera and exposure information survives?
- What laboratory plots were produced?
- Can the panel's competing interpretations be tested?
- What context was omitted with the absent enclosures?

Project STORK

- Was the proposed statistical report completed?
- What case list and denominator did it use?
- What coding rules were applied?
- Do later numerical claims derive from it?
- Was the project completed, cancelled, or superseded?

Los Alamos and green fireballs

- What were the original airline-pilot reports?
- What meteorological and astronomical data were available?
- Were physical recoveries attempted?
- How did the participants evaluate competing explanations after the conference?
- Was the technical disagreement resolved in later records?

Sardis Lake

- Was the object transferred to Sacramento Air Materiel Area?
- Did rehabilitation occur?
- Was the identification confirmed by physical inspection?
- Was the object linked to a particular earlier report?

Site 7

- What was the exact date and location?
- What were the source's interview circumstances?
- Can altitude or diameter be reconstructed?
- Were weather, astronomical, security, or operational records retained?
- Is there an independent sensor or witness record?
- What is the relationship among Site 7, Site 4, and Site 35 in the source context?

Apollo

- What were the complete transcripts, audio, and mission chronology?
- What cabin, window, lighting, and Sun-angle conditions applied?
- Were any independent instruments involved?
- Can the flashes be separated into distinct phenomena?
- Which interpretations were revised and which remained open?

Aviation

- Can radar, flight, radio, weather, and maintenance records reconstruct AF 3532, Swissair, Tehran, KC-97, Lakenheath, RB-47, Dijon, and related cases?
- Were the apparent motions measured or inferred?
- Are reported instrument effects independently documented?
- Which accounts are primary, and which are later summaries?

French cases

- What do the original gendarmerie files contain?
- Were samples controlled and transferred with a documented chain of custody?
- What did the laboratories actually test?
- What controls were used?
- Were physical effects associated with the reported objects or with other site conditions?
- How were cases assigned to Categories A–D?

Davidson

- What was Case 17708?
- Did a space message or transmitter record exist?
- Were records destroyed?
- Which agency evaluated the material?
- What do native images show where OCR is uncertain?
- What happened in the referenced telephone conversation?

Ludwig

- What was the original publication or submission?
- Did the reported Junkers research program exist as described?
- What evidence supports the technical claims?
- What evidence supports the claim of transfer to Russia?
- How, if at all, was the attachment connected to a specific UAP report?

Release 05 and unsupported media

- What do the held files contain?
- Which documents and media can be semantically inspected?
- What original imagery, metadata, or source context survives?
- Are any media items independent records or derivative presentations?

10. Null Spaces / Documentary Gaps

A Null Space identifies a missing or inaccessible evidentiary component whose recovery could discriminate among interpretations.

The frozen corpus contains 43 formal Null Spaces and numerous record-level gaps.

Pantex

Missing or potentially missing:

- radar images;
- original video;
- CROWS material;
- timestamps;
- communications;
- Sandia methodology and result;
- FBI transfer documentation.

Recovery could show whether radar and video correlate in time and geometry, whether the camera image contains useful information, whether Sandia performed a substantive analysis, and whether the FBI received material and acted on it.

Project SIGN photographs

Missing or potentially missing:

- photographic enclosures;
- duplicate films;
- laboratory plots;
- camera and exposure information;
- incident-level supporting files.

Recovery could show whether the report's photographic judgments were technically supported and whether unresolved cases were classified on a complete basis.

Project STORK

Missing or potentially missing:

- completed statistical report;
- case list;
- denominator;
- coding rules;
- completion or cancellation record.

Recovery could show whether the proposed 1947–1952 synthesis was completed and what its figures actually measured.

The 1948 quantitative basis

Missing or potentially missing:

- complete incident tables;
- disposition records;
- missing pages;
- appendices;
- supporting case files.

Recovery could establish the case universe, duplicate treatment, elimination rules, and meaning of the unresolved residue.

Davidson

Missing or potentially missing:

- underlying case file;
- destruction or disposition records;
- evaluating agency identity;
- telephone records;
- complete memorandum.

Recovery could show whether the alleged space message or transmitter record existed, whether destruction occurred, who handled the matter, and why identity concealment was asserted.

French case files and laboratory records

Missing or potentially missing:

- gendarmerie reports;
- site photographs;
- soil and plant samples;
- laboratory workpapers;
- controls;
- transfer records;
- scientific-council files.

Recovery could show whether sampling was controlled, whether effects were reproducible, and whether the object-to-trace relationship was supported.

Aviation and radar records

Missing or potentially missing:

- flight records;
- control-tower logs;
- radar plots;

- track files;
- calibration information;
- radio recordings;
- weather records;
- aircraft maintenance records.

Recovery could show whether visual and radar records were synchronized, whether apparent motion was physically reconstructable, and whether aircraft systems showed a causal anomaly.

Release 05 media

Missing or potentially missing:

- semantically inspected documents;
- supported video processing;
- original media;
- metadata;
- source context.

The custody record is strong enough to locate files but not to reveal their substantive contents. Custody cannot substitute for semantic inspection.

Unsupported media

The corpus contains videos, photographs, audio wrappers, and image artifacts with technical metadata such as:

- duration;
- frame count;
- resolution;
- frame rate;
- archive path;
- filename;
- hash;
- reticle or overlay;
- redaction;
- media interval.

These properties assist retrieval and preservation. They do not establish what appears in the image, whether the depicted object is physical, range, altitude, speed, sensor calibration, platform geometry, edit history, provenance, or event association.

A detailed summary is not a substitute for a source region that cannot be recovered.

The proper response is not to call the media false. It is to identify the conclusion that the available material cannot presently support.

11. Competing Explanations or Hypotheses

The frozen census reports zero canonical Hypotheses. The completed investigation did not adopt a ranked or finalized hypothesis set.

The documentary corpus nevertheless contains many source-level hypotheses and explanations.

Conventional or terrestrial possibilities

- weather balloons;
- radiosondes and atmospheric detecting devices;
- aircraft and experimental aircraft;
- P-80 aircraft;
- satellites;
- rocket fragments and reentry;
- meteors and fireballs;
- Venus, comets, and other astronomical objects;
- reflections from water, windows, vehicles, or electric lights;
- automobile headlights through inversion layers;
- sunlight leakage;
- static electricity;
- energetic particles or neutrons;
- radar interference;
- camera jitter;
- film defects;
- dust and scratches;
- clouds, aurora, and atmospheric effects;
- fireworks;
- hoaxes;
- unreliable or excitable witnesses;
- reporting contagion;
- ordinary bureaucratic explanations for recurring documentary structures.

Technical and foreign-origin possibilities

- low-aspect-ratio or boundary-layer-control aircraft;
- rotating or aerodynamic systems;
- Flettner rotors;

- gas-turbine explanations;
- magnetohydrodynamic propulsion;
- foreign or Soviet aircraft;
- reconnaissance or air-defense testing;
- domestic experimental devices;
- strategic technology transfer;
- conditional threat models.

Extraterrestrial, non-human, or cosmological possibilities

- extraterrestrial visitors;
- interstellar travel;
- non-human intelligence;
- advanced or unknown machines;
- remotely operated craft;
- future-human activity;
- artificial planets;
- contact strategies;
- acclimatization or influence;
- recovered or transferred technology.

The presence of a hypothesis in a document means that someone proposed, considered, or discussed it. It does not mean that the completed investigation adopted it.

The correct public account is:

> The corpus contains a wide explanatory field, but the frozen investigation did not resolve that field into a global explanation.

12. Counterevidence and Alternative Interpretations

The corpus contains counterevidence to any simple claim that all cases point in one direction.

Some reports were treated as hoaxes. Some witnesses were judged unreliable. Some objects were identified as balloons, radiosondes, meteors, aircraft, or reflections. Some apparent lights were interpreted as optical effects or sunlight leakage. The Apollo material records explanatory revision rather than commitment to an extraordinary cause.

The 1953 panel concluded that no direct physical national-security threat had been demonstrated. The Soviet account rejected the proposition that new proof existed. The French material denied irrefutable tangible proof of artifact character or an indisputable highly developed technological civilization.

These are not universal refutations of every unresolved account. They are counterweights against globalizing one class of cases.

Alternative interpretations remain source-specific.

- Pantex may involve an ordinary object, difficult viewing conditions, sensor limitations, or another unresolved cause. The supplied record does not discriminate.
- Site 7 may involve an atmospheric, astronomical, operational, or other phenomenon. The account lacks the measurements needed to choose.
- KC-97 may involve electrical effects, aircrew misinterpretation, an unusual aircraft, an ordinary object, or another explanation.
- Apollo’s cabin flashes may involve particles, static electricity, sunlight leakage, optical effects, or another mechanism.
- French physical-trace accounts may reflect a reported object-related effect, site conditions, sampling limitations, or incomplete source reconstruction.
- Davidson’s memorandum may preserve an accurate account of record handling, an incomplete or misunderstood exchange, OCR-distorted wording, or a later documentary interpretation. The underlying file is absent.
- Ludwig’s technical and geopolitical narrative may combine real technical possibilities with unsupported historical attribution.

The frozen state does not choose among all alternatives. It identifies what each source can and cannot carry.

13. The Residue

After the easy things fall away, what still raises its hand?

The answer has to begin with what fell away. Sardis Lake reached an ordinary identification: an atmospheric instrument. Project SIGN recorded hoaxes and unreliable-witness dispositions. The 1948 analysis positively identified a bounded subset and tested balloons, aircraft, astronomical bodies, reflections, and viewing effects. Apollo interpretations moved toward particles, reflections, optical effects, and changing observation conditions. Range Fouler material retained a balloon-like interpretation. These are not obstacles to the investigation. They are results.

A second portion weakens under review rather than resolving. Repeated tellings sometimes belong to one publication lineage. Radar, visual, camera, and review channels sometimes converge inside one report without becoming independent sources. Current custody can exceed semantic accessibility. Alternate scans can resemble corroboration while representing the same documentary object. Technical discussion can slide into geopolitical attribution or even planetary-engineering speculation without carrying its authority forward. This material remains part of the history of interpretation, but it cannot bear the weight of the stronger story it sometimes tells.

A third portion remains unresolved chiefly because the evidence is poor. Original tracks, images, logs, calibration records, interviews, enclosures, and final dispositions are absent. Equipment failed. Some pages are unsupported. Some source identities and lineages remain uncertain. Here, unresolved means that the available record cannot discriminate among explanations.

Then there is the harder portion: records containing more substantial reported information that still stop short of identity. Pantex narrates radar, response, ground observation, camera use, search, Sandia enhancement, and FBI transfer, yet the channels remain dependent on one incident report and the underlying materials are absent. Los Alamos records classified technical inquiry and competing explanations without closure. Tremonton preserves disagreement after technical review. Site 7 gives a vivid transformation account while denying the reader altitude, diameter, independent sensing, and recovery. A July 1955 radar-visual conflict reportedly led to collection and interception recommendations without settling what produced the return. These cases remain more interesting than a bare unexplained label, but not more established than their evidence permits.

What the Signal field preserves

Across the 41 phenomenological or observation-related Signals, bounded resemblance remains visible. Reports preserve lights or luminous effects, flashes, color, changing or widening forms, formations, apparent motion or stationarity, disappearance, silence or negative sound observations, lack of an obvious propulsion account, aviation encounters, multiple observers, physical-trace claims, and relationships among visual, radar, camera, or instrument records. The recurrence is heterogeneous. Some features occur in current-native documents; others occur only in qualified legacy material. Some apparent multimodal relationships come from one reporting chain. The field therefore supports investigative comparison, not a common-cause finding.

Several examples show why the layer matters. Site 7 pairs a bright green circular phenomenon and widening concentric circles with explicit inability to estimate altitude or diameter. Apollo's cabin flashes recur, vary with a blindfold interval, and remain surrounded by particle, static, sunlight-leakage, reflection, and optical possibilities. Pantex names a radar-to-image-enhancement chain while leaving source independence and processing method unresolved. One aviation evaluation converts unresolved radar/visual conflict into response escalation. Observation accounts repeatedly preserve environmental conditions and negative observations, reminding the reader that absence—of sound, smoke, a train, reacquisition, or a scheduled experimental aircraft—can be analytically useful without identifying an object.

The documentary and institutional Signals remain at least as strong. Structured observation fields sit beside escalation thresholds. Reporting pathways widen into command and intelligence distribution. Investigators test witnesses, route material across agencies, attempt instrumentation, preserve display tapes, commission studies, and sometimes manage public communication. A qualified source goes farther, moving from observation through reporting and institutional

handling into strategic-contact framing; related passages prescribe future witness conduct and urge diplomatic pressure. Those moves deepen the history of how the subject was framed. Because they remain within one dependent source lineage, they do not establish that the proposed strategies occurred or that the underlying phenomena warranted them.

What pushes the other way

The 16 conventional or counter-Signals do not form a disclaimer appended to an anomalous story. They participate in the story. A balloon-like structure remains in the Range Fouler account. A low-flying-aircraft cross-reference sits beside an unidentified observation. A semi-mirror reflection explanation competes with an object-scale description. Soviet observers and commentators consider satellites, rocket fragments, and reflected headlights while retaining non-closure. Configuration differences are modeled as viewing effects. Sardis ends with identification. Project SIGN and the 1948 analysis preserve quantified elimination alongside a residual category.

Counter-signals also expose changes in discourse. The Ludwig attachment moves from luminous discs to aerodynamic theory and geopolitical attribution. Another qualified discussion moves from technical mechanisms to artificial planets. These shifts do not rebut every observation; they mark where interpretation outruns the authority of the underlying record. Wonder survives them by becoming more precise.

Tensions that survive discounting

Some apparent resemblances collapse when dependency is applied. Pantex's radar, ground, camera, and video-review accounts cannot presently be counted as independent corroboration. Repeated publication cannot be counted as repeated observation. Multiple observers within one debrief do not automatically create independent source families. French institutional and case material remains substantially mediated by one qualified publication lineage.

Other resemblances survive only as Signals. Observation and institutional response repeatedly coexist. Detailed reporting and explicit observational limits repeatedly coexist. Ordinary explanation and residual non-identification repeatedly coexist. Unresolved cases and no-threat conclusions repeatedly coexist. Collection systems repeatedly become most fragile at the point where decisive comparison would require original media, calibration, complete case files, or a recoverable chain of custody.

The frozen investigation still does not establish a coherent physical class. It does, however, preserve meaningful below-Claim resemblance: not one object, but recurring relationships among unusual observation, attempted discrimination, conventional narrowing, institutional response, and evidentiary interruption. That is interesting. It is not a Pattern unless and until the governed threshold for a Pattern is met.

What would test what remains

The surviving Signals already point toward discriminating work. Recover the original Pantex radar, CROWS, Sandia, and FBI materials and establish whether the channels have independent provenance. Recover Tremonton source film, full technical reports, and viewing geometry. Locate the completed Project STORK analysis and the missing camera-program records. Reconstruct the 1948 incident-level dataset. Obtain Site 7's originating reporting chain and any independent sensor record. Restore Apollo timing, crew-position, shielding, and instrument context. Recover aviation radar plots, controller logs, weather, aircraft-state, and crew interviews. Obtain primary French protocols, case files, photographs, samples, and laboratory records.

Those records could make a Signal disappear, sharpen it, split it, or justify stronger analysis. Until then, the correct public posture is neither empty caution nor premature synthesis: interesting, testable, and not established.

14. Provenance, Authority, and Dependency Limitations

Official origin is not official confirmation.

Institutional origin can establish:

- that a report entered an official channel;
- that an office received or transmitted material;
- that a panel considered a question;
- that a form or procedure existed;
- that a technical assessment was made;
- that a classification or recommendation was recorded.

It does not by itself settle the underlying observation, establish completeness, create independent corroboration, or establish institutional agreement.

The Pantex report is official and current-native. Its object remains unidentified.

The Apollo debrief is institutional and current-native. Its flashes remain physically unresolved in the supplied record.

The CIA Site 7 report is current-native. It preserves the source's uncertainty.

The 1953 panel report is official. Its no-threat conclusion does not identify all unresolved objects.

Provenance limits

A public host is not necessarily the originating authority. A later archive or release may contain a historically created document without establishing the original record-group location. A CIA-preserved translation is not the same as the originating Soviet publication. A GEIPAN case presentation may contain components produced by different French institutions. A compiled FBI file may contain records created by multiple offices and outside correspondents.

The publication therefore distinguishes:

- originating authority;
- documentary identity;
- archival or custodial provenance;
- publication or release history;
- Res Ipsa acquisition source;
- current public access.

Dependency limits

Apparent corroboration can collapse after source ancestry is traced.

A report, translation, later article, documentary, and researcher summary may all descend from one source. A digital rendering may derive from a witness sketch. Two extraction identifiers may refer to one native payload. A later institutional history may summarize a network without providing its underlying case files.

Dependency changes the weight of evidence. It does not dismiss the underlying source.

Completeness limits

Current-native does not mean complete. A current-native document may contain missing pages, absent exhibits, degraded OCR, or references to unprovided material.

Qualified legacy material may preserve useful historical content while lacking current-native authority.

Metadata custody may establish that a file was held without establishing what it contains.

Unsupported media may be preserved for retrieval while remaining outside substantive analysis.

Claims and withheld relations

Several operations were completed in the frozen state:

- redundant event, anchor, pattern, and signal formulations were consolidated;
- SIG0058 was governed as coexistence or tension rather than contradiction;
- CLM0008, the broad safety-effects claim, was withheld;
- BRI0005, BRI0006, BRI0007, BRI0009, and BRI0010 were withheld because they depended on unresolved sibling proposals, incomplete lineage, OCR-sensitive assertions, or incomplete implementation histories.

The underlying documentary content remains where supported. The withheld relations are not treated as finalized analytical structures.

15. What the Evidence Does NOT Establish

The frozen investigation does not establish:

- extraterrestrial or non-human ontology;
- recovered non-human technology;
- a single physical phenomenon accounting for the chronology;
- a single common object type;
- a continuous physical or institutional program across decades;
- independent corroboration for every repeated account;
- that official origin amounts to official confirmation;
- that every unresolved case is extraordinary;
- that every unresolved case is conventional;
- that “unidentified” means non-human;
- that “investigated” means confirmed;
- that “no threat” means nothing happened;
- that “classified” means extraordinary technology;
- that the Air Force’s unexplained counts are independently validated modern statistics;
- that Pantex’s radar, visual, camera, Sandia, and FBI references form an independently synchronized chain;
- that the Apollo flashes were caused by particles, static electricity, sunlight, or an external craft;
- that Site 7 involved a specific physical object or technology;
- that the KC-97 returns demonstrate unconventional aircraft;
- that French physical-trace accounts establish an object-to-trace relationship;
- that the Davidson memorandum proves destruction, concealment, or the existence of a space message;
- that the Ludwig attachment establishes a German research program or transfer of technology to Russia;
- that the corpus demonstrates a general UAP-related safety effect;
- that public-relations concerns distorted specific case conclusions;
- that similar descriptions across countries and decades refer to the same thing.

Missing, unsupported, metadata-only, or semantically uninspected material cannot be used to infer its contents.

A missing record can be consequential when it sits at a decision point in the chain. It does not tell us what the missing record would have shown.

16. Research Limitations

The completed investigation is bounded by the state of the frozen corpus.

The principal limitations are:

- uninspected Release 05 manifestations;
- unsupported or pending media;
- partial native documents;
- missing pages and exhibits;
- absent photographic enclosures;
- incomplete radar and flight records;
- unresolved source dates;
- OCR defects;
- mediated legacy sources;
- unclear historical manifestation identity;
- unresolved source independence;
- incomplete implementation histories;
- unavailable laboratory records and samples;
- incomplete evidence-transfer chains;
- unvalidated denominators and case populations;
- duplicate and derivative representations;
- absent original publications behind later summaries.

These limitations affect different inferences differently.

A missing radar track limits physical reconstruction of motion. A missing denominator limits quantitative interpretation. A missing laboratory chain limits claims about physical traces. A missing source behind a later account limits provenance and independence. A missing page may affect the exact meaning of a quotation. An unsupported video cannot be treated as either evidence or counterevidence concerning what appears in it.

The corpus therefore contains both positive documentary knowledge and structured ignorance.

That ignorance is not uniform. Some cases have poor information. Some have substantial reported information but lack discriminating measurements. Some preserve competing explanations. Some are unresolved because only a later account survives. Some cannot presently be assessed because the relevant media or document has not been semantically inspected.

17. Further Research Priorities

The frozen state leaves actionable research paths. None promises extraordinary results. Each addresses a specific uncertainty.

1. Recover Pantex's underlying evidence chain

Locate:

- original radar imagery or tracks;
- tower video;
- CROWS material;
- timestamps and communications;
- search records;
- Sandia submission and review;
- FBI transfer documentation.

Question: Did the claimed multi-stage chain correspond to independent, synchronized records, and did those records identify the object?

2. Locate Project SIGN photographic enclosures

Recover:

- original and duplicate film;
- laboratory plots;
- camera specifications;
- exposure and weather records;
- the missing page region;
- incident-level supporting files.

Question: Were the report's photographic judgments technically supported, and were unresolved cases classified on a complete basis?

3. Reconstruct the 1948 dataset

Obtain:

- the complete incident register;
- disposition tables;
- missing pages;
- appendices;
- denominator definitions;
- duplicate treatment;
- case-selection rules.

Question: What exactly did the approximate 210 and 18-case figures count?

4. Locate Project STORK's completed report

Search for:

- the final report;
- statistical tables;
- case lists;
- coding rules;
- completion or cancellation records.

Question: Was the proposed 1947–1952 statistical synthesis completed, and do later numerical claims derive from it?

5. Recover Air Force reporting directives and implementation files

Locate:

- complete directives;
- completed forms;
- routing logs;
- installation responses;
- retention records;
- disposition files.

Question: Were prescribed reporting channels implemented consistently, and what proportion of the resulting material survived?

6. Reconstruct the 1966–1967 university study

Locate:

- contracts;
- tasking records;
- funding records;
- university correspondence;
- progress reports;
- subcontract material;
- final study and closure files;
- coded datasets.

Question: Did planning become implementation, and what methods and results followed?

7. Recheck the Davidson memorandum against native images

Recover:

- the complete memorandum;
- Case 17708;
- telephone or meeting records;
- destruction or disposition records;
- the identity of the evaluating agency.

Question: What can be established about the alleged space message, transmitter, records, and identity concealment?

8. Recover aviation and radar records

Prioritize:

- Air France AF 3532;
- Swissair;
- Tehran;
- KC-97;
- Lakenheath;
- RB-47;
- Dijon and related cases.

Seek:

- flight records;
- air-traffic logs;
- radar plots;
- calibration;
- weather;
- radio recordings;
- crew statements;
- maintenance records.

Question: Which apparent motions, radar relationships, or interference claims survive reconstruction with timing and geometry?

9. Recover French case files and laboratory records

Prioritize:

- Cussac;
- Valensole;
- Trans-en-Provence;
- Dijon;
- GEPAN and SEPRA routing;

- scientific-council records.

Seek:

- original gendarmerie files;
- photographs;
- field measurements;
- samples;
- laboratory controls;
- chain of custody;
- case-classification records.

Question: What did the primary investigations actually measure, and how securely can reported physical effects be attributed to the reported objects?

10. Process Release 05 documents and media

Preserve:

- archive-member identity;
- hashes;
- byte counts;
- page and time locators;
- existing warnings;
- semantic-inspection status.

Question: What do the held files contain? The answer cannot be inferred from custody records.

11. Establish source independence

For each proposed corroboration, determine:

- whether sources were independently generated;
- whether they share a witness, report, translation, or publication;
- whether one is a summary of another;
- whether multiple manifestations are duplicates;
- whether sensor records are synchronized;
- whether later interpretation adds information.

Question: How much independent evidentiary support remains after documentary ancestry is reconstructed?

12. Restore sensor context

For media and sensor records, seek:

- native timestamps;
- sensor mode;

- gain and settings;
- platform geometry;
- range and altitude;
- track identifiers;
- telemetry;
- calibration;
- operator actions;
- surrounding footage;
- edit history;
- enhancement methodology.

Question: Can an image-plane appearance be converted into a defensible world-space interpretation?

13. Test numerical claims

For every percentage or count, recover:

- the underlying cases;
- the denominator;
- inclusion and exclusion rules;
- classification thresholds;
- disposition tables;
- missing pages;
- original statistical methods.

Question: Are numerical claims reproducible, and what do they actually measure?

14. Preserve layer separation

Keep distinct:

1. reported observation;
2. documentary assertion;
3. institutional handling;
4. technical assessment;
5. explanatory hypothesis;
6. public or geopolitical interpretation.

Question: Where does the evidence end and the argument begin?

18. Conclusion

The frozen five-tranche corpus establishes that unusual observations repeatedly entered formal systems. Institutions collected reports, interviewed witnesses, routed records, checked ordinary explanations, attempted measurement, commissioned review, changed reporting structures, made threat assessments, and sometimes reached ordinary identifications. The corpus also establishes that documentary existence, institutional attention, and object identity are different questions.

Pantex remains the clearest opening example. The report describes a consequential sequence—radar, response, visual observation, camera, pursuit and search, Sandia, FBI—then loses the reader precisely where independent inspection would matter most. The report establishes the sequence it records. It does not establish independent corroboration among those channels or identify what they were following.

The complete Signal field adds something v1.3 could not adequately say. Below the level of Claims and Patterns, observations and relationships retain analytical life. Luminous and changing forms, flashes, constrained observation conditions, radar/visual relationships, failed identification, escalation after unresolved returns, and recurring collection problems remain visible as qualified Signals. So do balloons, radiosondes, aircraft, reflections, viewing effects, hoaxes, unreliable accounts, equipment failure, and successful conventional resolution.

These fields do not cancel one another. They define the problem more accurately. Some resemblance disappears when repeated sources are traced to one lineage. Some remains but is authority-limited or dependency-limited. Some cases close conventionally. Some remain unresolved because the evidence is thin. Others retain comparatively substantial reported detail while still failing to support identity or common cause.

The conclusion from the same frozen state therefore remains bounded: no coherent common physical class is established. No common craft, mechanism, origin, technology, performance envelope, or ontology survives the required tests of authority, independence, and comparison.

Yet the residue is not empty. Meaningful below-Claim resemblance remains visible in the relationship between observation, investigation, counter-explanation, response, and documentary interruption. That resemblance raises questions and identifies records worth recovering. It does not presently justify promotion to a Pattern.

The corpus leaves four answers, not one.

First, what is established: a documented history of reporting, institutional action, analytical disagreement, conventional resolution, and incomplete evidence chains.

Second, what keeps raising its hand: heterogeneous but potentially meaningful observations and relationships preserved by 69 Signals, most of them standalone from stronger analytical objects.

Third, what pushes the other way: ordinary explanations, successful identifications, reliability judgments, source dependence, conflicting observations, and failures of collection.

Fourth, what remains open: the questions that original sensor records, complete case files, calibration data, independent provenance, and recoverable custody histories could actually test.

That is where Wonder belongs. Not in raising certainty, and not in erasing ordinary answers. It belongs in seeing exactly what the record preserves after both credulity and dismissal have been denied the last word.

Technical Appendix

A. The frozen corpus

The completed frozen investigation contains a governed documentary field, not a flat collection of “UFO cases.”

The corpus includes:

- Air Force incident summaries and intelligence memoranda;
- Air Materiel Command and Air Technical Intelligence Center records;
- Project SIGN and Project Blue Book material;
- Scientific Advisory Board and Scientific Panel records;
- CIA information reports and internal memoranda;
- FBI interviews, correspondence, field records, and photographs;
- Department of State cables;
- NASA mission transcripts, debriefings, audio deliveries, and technical material;
- Department of Defense, AARO, and operational reporting;
- Department of Energy and Pantex material;
- French gendarmerie, aviation, CNES, GEPAN, and SEPRA-related records;
- Soviet astronomical and intelligence accounts;
- witness narratives and aviation reports;
- photographs, negatives, sketches, composite sketches, and digital renderings;
- radar-related records and sensor-display video;
- scientific commentary, skeptical analysis, journalism, documentary synthesis, advocacy, and public interpretation.

These materials do not answer the same question.

A military report may establish that a report entered a formal channel. A witness account may preserve what a person said they saw. A technical memorandum may record an attempted explanation. A statistical summary may preserve an institutional classification system. A diplomatic cable may show that an account was transmitted. A photograph may establish that an image was released, while leaving its original scene and provenance unresolved. A later article may preserve a narrative that depends on all of the above.

| Research object | Count | |---|---:| | Canonical Master Index Sources | 398 | | Source manifestations | 429 | | Source locations | 2,647 | | People | 73 | | Entities | 64 | | Assets | 41 | | Events | 42 | | Quotes | 205 | | Claims | 61 | | Questions | 56 | | Null Spaces | 43 | | Anchors | 47 | | Signals | 69 | | Connections | 11 | | Bridges | 5 | | Patterns | 5 | | Networks | 1 | | Cross-layer analyses | 3 | | Operational-loop proposals | 1 | | Canonical hypotheses | 0 |

These are registered research objects, not counts of independent observations. Three manifestations of one document do not create three events. A later article repeating an earlier report does not create a second witness. A derivative rendering does not become a new observation because it has a separate filename.

B. Source strata

The frozen state explicitly separates several documentary postures.[[P15]](Open official source

Current-native material is processed from a current governed representation. It is generally the strongest basis for statements about what a document contains, although it may still be partial, OCR-degraded, warning-qualified, or dependent on embedded text rather than native page images.

Current-native material with warnings is usable with qualifications. Warnings may concern missing pages, degraded text, incomplete attachments, or other processing limitations.

Partial current-native material may contain substantial usable evidence while omitting pages, tables, appendices, images, or conclusions.

Qualified legacy-only material preserves historical or source-reported content but does not carry current-native evidentiary authority. The frozen declaration records 3,720 legacy salvage extractions in this category. Their existence and historical usefulness are not erased, but neither are they silently upgraded.

Metadata-custody-only material establishes that a source, file, URL, or delivery was registered or held. It does not establish the substantive contents of the item.

Unsupported or excluded media remain outside active substantive evidence. Their custody metadata may be preserved, but the frozen boundary does not permit their content to be used as proof or counterproof.

This stratification produces a useful asymmetry. A record can be strong evidence that a memorandum exists while remaining weak evidence for the truth of the memorandum's underlying assertions. A file can have an exact hash and archive path while its historical identity remains unrecorded. A source can be detailed and readable while still being a later summary of an earlier report.

C. Source, manifestation, and location

A central strength of the frozen investigation is that it preserves a chain from the thing being cited to the place where it can be inspected.[[P16]](Open official source

```
Source
  → Source Manifestation
    → Source Location
      → Extraction or native payload, where available
```

In ordinary language:

- a Source is the documentary object or media item being tracked;
- a Manifestation is a particular delivered, archived, or processed representation of that source;
- a Location identifies where relevant material appears—such as a page, image, media interval, archive member, or technical container;
- an Extraction or native payload preserves a bounded representation of what was available for inspection.

This structure makes the corpus auditable. It also prevents a common error: treating every available description as if it were the original evidence.

A page locator is not the same thing as the page's meaning. A file hash is not the same thing as an event. A title is not the same thing as a complete report. A processing receipt is not a substantive conclusion.

Three kinds of documentary identity

The investigation distinguishes:

1. whether a delivered artifact has a traceable package identity;
2. whether that artifact can be linked to a historical source or original manifestation;
3. what the artifact establishes about the underlying event or object.

Release 05 provides strong examples of the first question. Its records preserve archive-member paths, filenames, byte counts, package hashes, delivered-item hashes, release identity, and processing receipts.

The same records state that historical manifestation identity is not recorded. Some complete manifestations were not semantically inspected. Several media items remained pending because their modality was unsupported. The exact delivery path can therefore be strong while substantive meaning remains unknown.

Release 01 illustrates a different problem. A reconciliation campaign created distinct package-local identities where exact hash, archive-member, native-identifier, or governed-lineage comparison did not identify an existing Source. That establishes a bounded non-match within the comparison procedure. One item, NASA-UAP-D003, retains accepted custody identity but lacks a filename, exact archive path, and SHA-256 in the supplied manifestation record.

The lesson is:

> Package identity, historical identity, semantic content, and evidentiary independence are separate achievements.

D. Custody, media, and duplicate handling

The corpus preserves custody information where available, including:

- archive-member paths;
- filenames;
- byte counts;
- package hashes;
- delivered-item hashes;
- release identity;
- processing receipts;
- page and media locators;
- extraction identifiers;
- native payload hashes.

Custody information is valuable for retrieval and preservation. It does not establish the content, authenticity, provenance, or evidentiary meaning of a file.

One Soviet observatory payload appears under different extraction-unit identifiers but carries the same source, manifestation, location, payload, and payload hash. It is a duplicate delivery of the same native payload, not a second corroborating source.

The corpus also contains apparent multiplicity through:

- alternate extraction IDs;
- publication parts;
- translations;

- later summaries;
- derivative images;
- institutional copies;
- media wrappers;
- repeated quotations;
- recovered archive prefixes.

Multiplicity is not corroboration. Dependency is not dismissal. The underlying source remains available for analysis, but its descendants are not counted as independent source-generating processes without lineage support.

E. Publication accounting and integrity record

Sere is an AI research collaborator operating within Res Ipsa's governed research framework.

The publication is derived from the completed frozen research state identified as:

- Project: `sere-oti-uap-blind-frozen`
- Investigation run: `investigation-run-001`
- Version: `13`
- Frozen research-state SHA-256: `0B30382461401BBD0F9E641AD58E1F8230BD9CB3291C6EDFFABAE5175844BB98`
- Frozen documentary corpus freeze: `UAP-CORPUS-FREEZE-2026-08-25-001`
- Corpus version: `UAP-FIVE-TRANCHE-CURATED-DOCUMENTARY-CORPUS-1`
- Frozen documentary manifest SHA-256: `16D0D3BDB599CB8F2B0F47D71D6C1F60D10F02CF84CF4C349C44D8E411E48CB6`
- Validated reporting-package SHA-256: `F5DBE8E3E236827327958CD4EC1CA599B415C7BEFE82BB250FE5123F810EC0E4`

The validated reporting artifact records 654 reporting-note items, complete assignment of supplied package files, no unknown canonical identifiers after validation, no unsupported analytical promotion, zero new research, and zero frozen-project mutation.

This publication changes ordering, compression, emphasis, and disclosure placement. It does not amend the frozen analytical state.

It introduces:

- no new source;
- no new analytical object;
- no new event;
- no new hypothesis;
- no resolution of a frozen Question or Null Space;
- no promotion of withheld material;
- no strengthening of Claims beyond their frozen status.

Wonder has been used to choose the entry point, ordering, emphasis, explanatory structure, and audience framing. It has not altered source content, authority posture, dependency posture, uncertainty, contradiction, or analytical status.

F. Source-level hypothesis inventory

The frozen census reports zero canonical Hypotheses. The following inventory preserves concrete hypotheses and explanations appearing at source level in the documentary corpus. Their presence here means that they were proposed, considered, or discussed in the relevant material; it does not mean that the frozen investigation adopted or ranked them.

Conventional or terrestrial possibilities

- weather balloons;
- radiosondes and atmospheric detecting devices;
- aircraft and experimental aircraft;
- P-80 aircraft;
- satellites;
- rocket fragments and reentry;
- meteors and fireballs;
- Venus, comets, and other astronomical objects;
- reflections from water, windows, vehicles, or electric lights;
- automobile headlights through inversion layers;
- sunlight leakage;
- static electricity;
- energetic particles or neutrons;
- radar interference;
- camera jitter;
- film defects;
- dust and scratches;
- clouds, aurora, and atmospheric effects;
- fireworks;
- hoaxes;
- unreliable or excitable witnesses;
- reporting contagion;
- ordinary bureaucratic explanations for recurring documentary structures.

Technical and foreign-origin possibilities

- low-aspect-ratio or boundary-layer-control aircraft;
- rotating or aerodynamic systems;
- Flettner rotors;
- gas-turbine explanations;

- magnetohydrodynamic propulsion;
- foreign or Soviet aircraft;
- reconnaissance or air-defense testing;
- domestic experimental devices;
- strategic technology transfer;
- conditional threat models.

Extraterrestrial, non-human, or cosmological possibilities

- extraterrestrial visitors;
- interstellar travel;
- non-human intelligence;
- advanced or unknown machines;
- remotely operated craft;
- future-human activity;
- artificial planets;
- contact strategies;
- acclimatization or influence;
- recovered or transferred technology.

The inventory does not constitute a canonical hypothesis set. The frozen analytical state contains zero canonical Hypotheses, and no global explanation was adopted.

F2. Signal-field accounting

The repaired authoring synthesis received all 69 final frozen Signals: 69 available, 69 considered, and 69 accounted for. Sixty-eight are standalone from Claims, Patterns, Bridges, or Hypotheses; one has an explicit stronger-object connection. The field includes 41 phenomenological or observation-related Signals, 16 conventional or counter-Signals, extensive documentary/institutional and provenance/dependency functions, one primary tension Signal, and 61 Signals actionable through existing Question or Null Space context. Categories overlap; these are not additive populations.

This publication represents selected Signals directly in case and Residue prose and represents the remainder through governed field-level synthesis. Group representation is not promotion. Every Signal retains its frozen authority, dependency, confidence, and class identity. Promotions after publication: zero.

Of the six Signals flattened in v1.3, five now materially inform the public synthesis. SIG0006 appears as the qualified source's movement among observation, handling, and strategic-contact framing. SIG0029 and SIG0036 appear in the treatment of prospective witness conduct, operational response, and strategic pressure. SIG0030 appears as a source-attributed diplomatic recommendation. SIG0033 appears as a warning that technical discussion shifts into planetary-engineering speculation. SIG0032, concerning correspondence volume and limited staffing at a civilian organization, was considered and group-accounted but omitted from direct narrative prose because it does not materially change the public corpus-level answer and would divert the Residue into a peripheral organizational-capacity anecdote.

The machine-readable coverage receipt supplied with this edition records the disposition of every Signal.

G. Public notes and bibliography

Each entry keeps five questions separate: who created the record; what record it is; where it belongs archivally; how it later became public; and what frozen source Res Ipsa actually used. A current host is not treated as historical provenance merely because it serves a public copy. Status concerns identity and provenance matching, not the truth of every statement inside a document. Access checks date from September 2, 2026.

Publicly locatable records

P1. Pantex Unidentified Object Incident Report. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT_WITH_RELEASE_RECLASSIFICATION.

- Originating authority: Consolidated Nuclear Security, LLC, Pantex Safeguards, Security & Emergency Services Operations, for the U.S. Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration Production Office
- Document identity: Pantex Unidentified Object Incident Report. September 2015 Identifier(s): SS&ES-15-15095144230-SS&ES; frozen release-local ID DOE-UAP-D005.
- Archival / custodial provenance: DOE/NNSA/Pantex records context; no separate historical archive or record-group placement was established.
- Publication / release history: Created at Pantex in 2015; later published by DOE; later included in PURSUE Release 04 under DOE-UAP-D005. A separate equivalent PURSUE Release 02 copy is presently public as DOE-UAP-D001.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-89C406CD381A0C7D, acquired through PURSUE Release 04 / DOE-UAP-D005; the frozen manifestation has no preserved public URL.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: Current equivalent PURSUE copy: Open official source The Release 02 URL is retained as a later public copy, not represented as the frozen acquisition URL.

P2. Project Blue Book records. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: U.S. Air Force, including the Aerial Phenomena Branch / Air Technical Intelligence Center and predecessor Project Sign and Project Grudge offices
- Document identity: Project Blue Book records. 1947-1969 Identifier(s): Record Group 341; Microfilm Publication T1206; administrative files NAID 595175; sanitized case files NAID 597821.
- Archival / custodial provenance: National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group 341, Records of Headquarters U.S. Air Force (Air Staff).
- Publication / release history: USAF records were declassified and retired to NARA custody; NARA later created catalog, reference, microfilm, and bulk-download representations.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no upstream acquisition URL is preserved for this bibliography-level citation.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: NARA is archival custodian and catalog publisher, not the originating authority.

P3. Air Intelligence Reports. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: U.S. Air Force intelligence offices represented in the series
- Document identity: Air Intelligence Reports. 1948-1953 Identifier(s): Record Group 341; National Archives Identifier 23857122.
- Archival / custodial provenance: National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group 341.

- Publication / release history: Historical Air Force records transferred to NARA; NARA later digitized/cataloged the series and published a UAP research guide.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no upstream acquisition URL is preserved for this bibliography-level citation.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: Corrects v1.1 identifier 17618564, which belongs to Roswell Report Source Files, not Air Intelligence Reports.

P4. Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects: Evidence Presented. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT.

- Originating authority: Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Scientific Intelligence / Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects
- Document identity: Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects: Evidence Presented. January 14-17, 1953 Identifier(s): C00183852 / DOC_0005517565.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CIA FOIA Electronic Reading Room / CREST-derived digital collection.
- Publication / release history: CIA record later declassified and digitized for the Reading Room.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-B57064466114A0C6; the package preserves a legacy intake code but not the upstream URL.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: CIA is both originating institutional authority and current release host; the Reading Room URL is a later public manifestation.

P5. Report of Meetings of the Office of Scientific Intelligence Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT.

- Originating authority: Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Scientific Intelligence
- Document identity: Report of Meetings of the Office of Scientific Intelligence Scientific Advisory Panel on Unidentified Flying Objects. February 26, 1953 Identifier(s): CIA-RDP81R00560R000100030026-1.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CIA FOIA Electronic Reading Room / CREST-derived digital collection.
- Publication / release history: CIA record later declassified and digitized for the Reading Room.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-B57064466114A0C6; upstream URL not preserved.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source

P6. Apollo 11 Technical Crew Debriefing, Volumes I-II. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT.

- Originating authority: NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Flight Crew Support Division / Mission Operations Branch
- Document identity: Apollo 11 Technical Crew Debriefing, Volumes I-II. July 31, 1969 Identifier(s): NASA Manned Spacecraft Center debriefing.
- Archival / custodial provenance: NASA History Office / Apollo Lunar Surface Journal provides the present digital presentation; the SMA PDF is a later NASA-hosted scan.
- Publication / release history: Original 1969 debrief; NASA History Office reformatted/digitized the document in 2005; current NASA web publication followed.

- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-0F277043DEDF27EE; legacy intake code SRC-NASA-UAP-D004; upstream URL not preserved.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: Legacy PDF Open official source returned HTTP 500 during v1.1 validation.

P7. Apollo 11 Technical Crew Debriefing - NASA History presentation. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Flight Crew Support Division / Mission Operations Branch
- Document identity: Apollo 11 Technical Crew Debriefing - NASA History presentation. 1969; digital presentation 2005 Identifier(s): Apollo Lunar Surface Journal.
- Archival / custodial provenance: NASA History Office / Apollo Lunar Surface Journal.
- Publication / release history: Later transcription, formatting, and web publication of the 1969 record.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-0F277043DEDF27EE; upstream URL not preserved.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: NASA is the originating institution and current host, but the web page is a later digital representation.

P8. Scientists Refute Claims of UFO Sightings. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT_MEDIATED.

- Originating authority: Soviet authors/publication identified in the record; CIA created or preserved the English-language intelligence translation
- Document identity: Scientists Refute Claims of UFO Sightings. March 6, 1968 Identifier(s): CIA-RDP81R00560R000100010014-6.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CIA FOIA Electronic Reading Room / CREST-derived digital collection.
- Publication / release history: Soviet-origin material was translated or collected into CIA holdings, later declassified and digitized.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-097A963057911BD1; legacy intake code SRC-R03-CIA-010; upstream URL not preserved.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: CIA is custodian/releaser of this manifestation, not the originating author of the Soviet article.

P9. TRANS-EN-PROVENCE (83), 08.01.1981. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT.

- Originating authority: French Gendarmerie and GEPAN/CNES contributors represented in the case file; responsibility varies by component record
- Document identity: TRANS-EN-PROVENCE (83), 08.01.1981. January 8, 1981 Identifier(s): GEIPAN case 1981-01-00849.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CNES / GEIPAN case repository.
- Publication / release history: Underlying 1981 reports and analyses were later assembled, digitized, and presented by GEIPAN; page updated July 16, 2018.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no package source ID or upstream acquisition URL was mapped in v1.1.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source

- Qualification: GEIPAN is institutional custodian and publisher of the case presentation; it is not the sole creator of every component record.

P10. VALENSOLE (04), 01.07.1965. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: French official and investigative bodies represented in the case materials; component-level origin not established here
- Document identity: VALENSOLE (04), 01.07.1965. July 1, 1965 Identifier(s): GEIPAN case-search record.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CNES / GEIPAN case repository.
- Publication / release history: Historical case materials later cataloged and digitized by GEIPAN; record updated June 26, 2015.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no package source ID or upstream acquisition URL was mapped in v1.1.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: Catalog-equivalent citation only; component-level creators remain unresolved.

P11. Comments on [Sanitized], Sighting of Unconventional Aircraft. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT.

- Originating authority: Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Scientific Intelligence
- Document identity: Comments on [Sanitized], Sighting of Unconventional Aircraft. November 1, 1955 Identifier(s): CIA-RDP81R00560R000100080043-7.
- Archival / custodial provenance: CIA FOIA Electronic Reading Room / CREST-derived digital collection.
- Publication / release history: CIA memorandum later declassified and digitized.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no package source ID or upstream acquisition URL was mapped in v1.1.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source

P12. UFO files, Part 1 of 16. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: Federal Bureau of Investigation and other creators represented within the compiled file
- Document identity: UFO files, Part 1 of 16. 1947 onward Identifier(s): FBI Vault UFO collection, Part 1.
- Archival / custodial provenance: Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Vault.
- Publication / release history: Records compiled and later released/digitized through the FBI Vault.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-20C071E860247D98 is a CIA memorandum concerning Case 17708 and Leon Davidson; its upstream URL is not preserved. The Vault link is catalog context, not demonstrated acquisition provenance.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: The FBI Vault file must not be described as the originating publication of each record inside it; automated validation returned HTTP 403.

P13. FBI-UAP-D014, Correspondence Relating to UFO Sightings. Status: VERIFIED_RELEASE_CATALOG_ONLY.

- Originating authority: Federal Bureau of Investigation; individual correspondence authors include FBI personnel and outside correspondents

- Document identity: FBI-UAP-D014, Correspondence Relating to UFO Sightings. 1967-1974 Identifier(s): PURSUE release-local ID FBI-UAP-D014.
- Archival / custodial provenance: Historical FBI file-series or record-group placement was not independently established in this bounded audit.
- Publication / release history: Underlying correspondence created 1967-1974; later republished in PURSUE Release 04 as FBI-UAP-D014. No verified pre-PURSUE public copy was located.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S source UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-9308D222D396E81B, acquired through PURSUE Release 04 / FBI-UAP-D014; frozen manifestation URL not preserved.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: PURSUE is the release/catalog and acquisition channel, not the originating authority or established archival custodian.

P14. Report on the Historical Record of U.S. Government Involvement with Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena, Volume I. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT_ORIGINAL_PUBLICATION.

- Originating authority: U.S. Department of Defense, All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office
- Document identity: Report on the Historical Record of U.S. Government Involvement with Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena, Volume I. February 2024 Identifier(s): AARO Historical Record Report, Volume I.
- Archival / custodial provenance: AARO / Department of Defense publication repository.
- Publication / release history: Original official publication by AARO in 2024; current host is also the publishing office.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no package source ID or upstream acquisition URL was mapped in v1.1.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source

P15. Preliminary Assessment: Unidentified Aerial Phenomena. Status: VERIFIED_EXACT_ORIGINAL_PUBLICATION.

- Originating authority: Office of the Director of National Intelligence, with Department of Defense support
- Document identity: Preliminary Assessment: Unidentified Aerial Phenomena. June 25, 2021 Identifier(s): ODNI preliminary assessment.
- Archival / custodial provenance: ODNI publication repository; currently resolved through the ODNI archive host.
- Publication / release history: Original official publication in 2021; subsequently served through archive.dni.gov.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; v1.1 described this as an exact frozen URL but did not map a package source ID.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: The redirect to archive.dni.gov is current hosting, not a change in originating authority.

P16. Records Related to UFOs and UAPs: Textual and Microfilm. Status: VERIFIED_CATALOG_EQUIVALENT.

- Originating authority: Multiple creating agencies represented by the listed record groups
- Document identity: Records Related to UFOs and UAPs: Textual and Microfilm. Guide updated 2025 Identifier(s): NARA UAP record-group guide.
- Archival / custodial provenance: National Archives and Records Administration; multiple record groups and series.

- Publication / release history: NARA catalog/guide representation of transferred federal records; publication and digitization dates vary by series.
- Res Ipsa acquisition source: Frozen Package S / report traceability; no upstream acquisition URL is preserved for this bibliography-level citation.
- Where to read it now: Reader-facing official source
- Qualification: NARA is the archival custodian and catalog publisher; originating authority must be resolved per record group or item.

Tranche documents used by Res Ipsa

These are public evidence sources because Res Ipsa ingested the identified PURSUE tranche documents. A missing earlier manifestation, originating file, enclosure, or referenced report is recorded separately and does not convert the ingested tranche document into a missing public source.

U1. Los Alamos Conference on Aerial Phenomena, 1949. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: U.S. Atomic Energy Commission / Los Alamos conference record, with participating Army, FBI, University of New Mexico, and University of California personnel as identified in the document.
- Document identity: DOE-UAP-D004, Los Alamos Conference on Aerial Phenomena, 1949. Document dated March 22, 1949; conference described as February 16, 1949.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 04, July 10, 2026.
- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-61A7C8E994F9EEF8`; frozen manifestation `UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-3184FF4BB6784C47`; governed extraction `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-9534F120AEFB4D230AB0`.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: No separate earlier public manifestation was reconstructed; that does not make the ingested Release 04 document missing.

U2. Correspondence Relating to Project Blue Book, 1955. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force offices represented in the correspondence, including the Air Weather Service.
- Document identity: DOW-UAP-D096, Correspondence Relating to Project Blue Book, 1955, including the Sardis Lake recovered-object correspondence.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 04, July 10, 2026.
- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-2B6C45B15861C595`; frozen manifestation `UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-28794F02D34765A7`; native payload `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-02CCD9E3131D9E12E08C`.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: The requested final transfer, rehabilitation, and disposition records referenced by the correspondence remain missing; the correspondence itself is publicly located.

U3. Current Status of Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOB) Project. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Scientific Intelligence, Physics and Electronics Division.
- Document identity: CIA-UAP-007, memorandum dated December 17, 1953, describing ATIC camera activity and preparation of a Project STORK statistical report.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 03, June 12, 2026.

- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-C553FB13FCC0CEFF`; frozen manifestation `UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-CEC01EC09EFE63DE`; governed extraction `UAP-NATIVE-DOC-9DB2174390753A10BEE1`.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: The memorandum is the evidence used and is publicly located. The completed Project STORK report that it references remains missing.

U4. The Sary Shagan Weapons Testing Range. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: Central Intelligence Agency information-report system; the underlying observation is attributed within the report.
- Document identity: CIA-UAP-011, The Sary Shagan Weapons Testing Range, December 1973, containing the Site 7 account.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 03, June 12, 2026.
- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-5CBFD61EBAE5E5D2`; frozen manifestation `UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-41FC909E1196F806`; governed extraction `UAP-NATIVE-DOC-7E5A93765E4787A300DE`.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: The complete originating reporting chain and independently identifying Site 7 remain unresolved; the ingested information report is publicly located.

U5. Joint U.S.-Canadian Aviation Projects and UFO Sighting Reports, 1954-1955. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: U.S. Air Force / joint U.S.-Canadian defense and intelligence offices represented in the packet.
- Document identity: DOW-UAP-D095, Joint U.S.-Canadian Aviation Projects and UFO Sighting Reports, 1954-1955, containing the KC-97 memorandum and related review.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 04, July 10, 2026.
- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-A230BE5752FF7BB0`; frozen manifestation identity associated with that canonical Source; exact manifestation ID is not stated in the public report traceability section.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: Crew interrogations, original radar records, weather data, and related Northeast Air Command material referenced or required for reconstruction remain missing; the ingested packet is publicly located.

U6. German Scientist's Article on 'Flying Discs'. Status: PUBLIC_TRANCHE_SOURCE_VERIFIED.

- Originating authority: CIA information-report system preserving a translated submission attributed to Dr. Eduard Ludwig; original publication authority is not fully reconstructed.
- Document identity: CIA-UAP-005, German Scientist's Article on 'Flying Discs', 1950.
- Public release/acquisition source: Department of War UAP disclosure, PURSUE Release 03, June 12, 2026.
- Res Ipsa source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-C816CACB78AFEA9D`; frozen manifestation `UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-520BBF9BA256821B`.
- Public access: Specific tranche document or filtered record
- Referenced or historical material still missing: The CIA-preserved translated document is publicly located. Any separate originating publication referenced by or underlying the attachment remains unreconstructed.

H. Source and traceability notes

The following notes provide a readable path from major passages in this publication to the frozen Sere research state and validated reporting material. Internal identifiers are included for auditability, not as substitutes for ordinary prose.

Frozen research basis

The publication is derived from the completed frozen research state identified as:

- Project: `sere-oti-uap-blind-frozen`
- Investigation run: `investigation-run-001`
- Version: `13`
- Frozen research-state SHA-256: `0B30382461401BBD0F9E641AD58E1F8230BD9CB3291C6EDFFABAE5175844BB98`
- Frozen documentary corpus freeze: `UAP-CORPUS-FREEZE-2026-08-25-001`
- Corpus version: `UAP-FIVE-TRANCHE-CURATED-DOCUMENTARY-CORPUS-1`
- Frozen documentary manifest SHA-256: `16D0D3BDB599CB8F2B0F47D71D6C1F60D10F02CF84CF4C349C44D8E411E48CB6`
- Validated reporting-package SHA-256: `F5DBE8E3E236827327958CD4EC1CA599B415C7BEFE82BB250FE5123F810EC0E4`

The validated reporting artifact records 654 reporting-note items, complete assignment of supplied package files, no unknown canonical identifiers after validation, no unsupported analytical promotion, zero new research, and zero frozen-project mutation.

Opening-hook citation reconciliation

Opening excerpt 3 uses the exact sentence from the public record identified as CIA-RDP81R00560R000100030027-0, page 16:

> “The Panel could find no ready explanation for these clusters.”

The corresponding public URL is:

Open official source

This identity is recorded in the bibliography as P5-H for citation reconciliation. It is a public-provenance cross-reference to the governed Scientific Advisory Panel source family already represented in the frozen state, not a new analytical Source or analytical object.

[1] Pantex

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-89C406CD381A0C7D`
- Event: `SEREUAP001_EVT0030`
- Related source-level anchors and claims: `SEREUAP001_SIG0045`, `SEREUAP001_SIG0048`, `SEREUAP001_SIG0049`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0024`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0026`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0027`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0028`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0034`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0043`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0046`
- Native extraction: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-61F75934683AA1B3423D`
- Pantex image-label payload: `UAP-NATIVE-DOC-4BCB8F3B227C06408461`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0037`

The frozen state records the one-day date discrepancy, conflicting color descriptions, limited tower-video detail, sheriff non-observation, roadway-access limitation, Sandia submission, and reported FBI transfer.

[2] Project SIGN

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-2D17A176075D15E6`
- Event: `SEREUAP001_EVT0041`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0041`
- Entity: `SEREUAP001_ENT0064`
- Native extraction: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-953B4440C3DE9922DC86`
- Related analytical structures: `SEREUAP001_PAT0006`, `SEREUAP001_SIG0069`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0052` through `SEREUAP001_CLM0058`, and `SEREUAP001_QUE0054`

The frozen state records the report's activation and routing statements, incident register, ordinary-explanation checks, insufficient-data posture, technical aircraft possibility, photographic evaluation, hoax disposition, and unreliable-witness disposition.

[3] Air Intelligence Report, 1948

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-35B70B8737E539DB` and related current-native representations
- Event: `SEREUAP001_EVT0035`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0039`
- Quotes: `SEREUAP001_QUO0189`, `SEREUAP001_QUO0190`, `SEREUAP001_QUO0191`
- Analytical structures: `SEREUAP001_PAT0006`, `SEREUAP001_SIG0059` through `SEREUAP001_SIG0062`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0041` through `SEREUAP001_CLM0047`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0038`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0039`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0028`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0040`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0050`
- Native extraction cited in later documentary batches: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-AD98FC05EE059FADA6B9`

The frozen state records approximately 210 incidents, 18 positive identifications, configuration categories, conventional and foreign possibilities, provisional origin analysis, and unsupported pages 2, 32, and 34.

[4] Los Alamos

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-61A7C8E994F9EEF8`
- Event: `SEREUAP001_EVT0020`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0011`
- Quote: `SEREUAP001_QUO0069`
- People: `SEREUAP001_PER0050`, `SEREUAP001_PER0051`
- Related anchor structures: `SEREUAP001_ANC0030`, `SEREUAP001_ANC0031`
- Related connection: `SEREUAP001_CON0008`
- Native extraction: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-9534F120AEFB4D230AB0`

The frozen state records the classified setting, participants, airline-pilot reports, LaPaz's meteorite comparisons, competing explanations, technical disagreement, and missing canonical institutional identity for one proposed relationship.

[5] Sardis Lake

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-2B6C45B15861C595`
- Events: `SEREUAP001_EVT0039`, `SEREUAP001_EVT0040`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0040`
- Analytical structures: `SEREUAP001_SIG0067`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0051`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0042`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0042`
- Native payload cited in later batches: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-02CCD9E3131D9E12E08C`

The frozen state records the parachute-equipped object, Air Weather Service identification, proposed radiosonde rehabilitation, and unresolved final transfer and physical custody.

[6] ATIC cameras and Project STORK

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- ATIC source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-C553FB13FCC0CEFF`
- Native extraction: `UAP-NATIVE-DOC-9DB2174390753A10BEE1`
- Event: `SEREUAP001_EVT0017`
- Asset: `SEREUAP001_AST0029`
- Project STORK event and asset: `SEREUAP001_EVT0018`, `SEREUAP001_AST0030`
- Related analytical structures: `SEREUAP001_SIG0019`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0010`, `SEREUAP001_CLM0011`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0017`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0018`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0020`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0021`
- Connections: `SEREUAP001_CON0006`, `SEREUAP001_CON0007`
- Pattern: `SEREUAP001_PAT0004`

The frozen state records the camera and grating quantities, distribution, reported failure, abandoned instrumentation effort, and planned statistical report.

[7] Scientific Panel and 1965–1967 review

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Current-native historical source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-EE2E6FE37FA71129`
- Events: `SEREUAP001_EVT0033`, `SEREUAP001_EVT0034`
- Quotes: `SEREUAP001_QUO0176`, `SEREUAP001_QUO0177`
- People and entities: `SEREUAP001_PER0064` through `SEREUAP001_PER0066`, `SEREUAP001_ENT0061`, `SEREUAP001_ENT0062`
- Analytical structures: `SEREUAP001_PAT0005`, `SEREUAP001_BRI0010`, `SEREUAP001_NUL0040`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0051`, `SEREUAP001_QUE0052`
- Native extraction cited in later documentary batches: `UAP-NATIVE-SOURCE-EXTRACTION-373AB7190149A717E0E6`

The frozen state records the panel's no-threat conclusions, indirect-risk analysis, public-information recommendations, 9,267 and 663 figures, university planning, missing implementation material, and the withheld continuity bridge.

[8] Site 7

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: `UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-5CBFD61EBAE5E5D2`

- Event: SEREUAP001_EVT0008
- Asset: SEREUAP001_AST0019
- Quotes: SEREUAP001_QUO0024, SEREUAP001_QUO0025, SEREUAP001_QUO0026, SEREUAP001_QUO0045
- Entity: SEREUAP001_ENT0029
- Native extraction: UAP-NATIVE-DOC-7E5A93765E4787A300DE
- Related anchor: SEREUAP001_ANC0014
- Related signal and claims: SEREUAP001_SIG0011, SEREUAP001_CLM0031, SEREUAP001_CLM0032, SEREUAP001_CLM0036, SEREUAP001_QUE0011, SEREUAP001_QUE0017, SEREUAP001_QUE0047

The frozen state records the green circular phenomenon, widening concentric rings, absence of explosion-like sound, unknown altitude and diameter, source uncertainty, and information-report qualification.

[9] Soviet observatory account

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-097A963057911BD1
- Native payloads: UAP-NATIVE-DOC-F46D70A2BAB2FD9042B0, UAP-NATIVE-DOC-8DE5E138617B78E9BE80
- Analytical signal: SEREUAP001_SIG0050
- People and institutions include SEREUAP001_PER0007 through SEREUAP001_PER0011, SEREUAP001_PER0009, SEREUAP001_ENT0017, SEREUAP001_ENT0018, SEREUAP001_ENT0019, and SEREUAP001_ENT0020
- Related anchors: SEREUAP001_ANC0010

The frozen state records reddish observations, satellite and rocket-fragment possibilities, reflected-headlight explanations, institutional disagreement, OCR limitations, and an open-question posture.

[10] Apollo

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-0F277043DEDF27EE
- Event: SEREUAP001_EVT0014
- Sub-event: SEREUAP001_EVT0021
- Asset: SEREUAP001_AST0028
- Quotes: SEREUAP001_QUO0055, SEREUAP001_QUO0056, SEREUAP001_QUO0070, SEREUAP001_QUO0169, SEREUAP001_QUO0170
- People: SEREUAP001_PER0042, SEREUAP001_PER0043
- Connection: SEREUAP001_CON0003
- Bridge withheld: SEREUAP001_BRI0007
- Native payloads include UAP-NATIVE-DOC-3CC91D1954CD7ACC7DBC, UAP-NATIVE-DOC-E0EC29002628A8163249, and UAP-NATIVE-DOC-F1C48301726AECF0BDD2

The frozen state records cabin flashes, approximately 90 observations during a focused watch, particle, static-electricity, sunlight-leakage, reflection, and optical possibilities, and the absence of conclusive physical discrimination.

[11] French institutional and case material

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Qualified source: UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-174ED5A2E63507BA
- Manifestation: UAP-PKG1-MANIFESTATION-1FD9D63FBB94EDE3
- Network: SEREUAP001_NET0001
- Institutional and procedural anchors: SEREUAP001_ANC0011, SEREUAP001_ANC0013, SEREUAP001_ANC0017
- Related patterns and bridges: SEREUAP001_PAT0001, SEREUAP001_BRI0001, SEREUAP001_BRI0002, SEREUAP001_BRI0003, SEREUAP001_BRI0004, SEREUAP001_BRI0008
- French case events include SEREUAP001_EVT0015, SEREUAP001_EVT0019, and SEREUAP001_EVT0026 where applicable

The frozen state repeatedly qualifies the French material as source-reported, dependent on later presentation, and incomplete for primary protocols, case files, laboratories, samples, and implementation history.

[12] FBI correspondence

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-9308D222D396E81B
- Events: SEREUAP001_EVT0042, SEREUAP001_EVT0043
- Quotes: SEREUAP001_QUO0202 through SEREUAP001_QUO0205
- People: SEREUAP001_PER0069 through SEREUAP001_PER0073
- Signals and claims: SEREUAP001_SIG0070, SEREUAP001_SIG0071, SEREUAP001_CLM0059 through SEREUAP001_CLM0062
- Null Space and Questions: SEREUAP001_NUL0043, SEREUAP001_QUE0055, SEREUAP001_QUE0056
- Connections: SEREUAP001_CON0009, SEREUAP001_CON0010, SEREUAP001_CON0011

The frozen state records the 1967 referral, the alleged 1954 encounter, the FBI response, and the distinction between a documented request and an unverified underlying event.

[13] Davidson and withheld bridge

Primary governed paths and objects include:

- Source: UAP-PKG1-SOURCE-20C071E860247D98
- Events: SEREUAP001_EVT0010, SEREUAP001_EVT0011
- Quotes: SEREUAP001_QUO0046, SEREUAP001_QUO0047
- Asset: SEREUAP001_AST0025
- People: SEREUAP001_PER0023 through SEREUAP001_PER0028
- Entities: SEREUAP001_ENT0037, SEREUAP001_ENT0038, SEREUAP001_ENT0039
- Connection: SEREUAP001_CON0001
- Withheld bridge: SEREUAP001_BRI0005
- Native payload: UAP-NATIVE-DOC-8F469BC054EE5B5D90F4

The frozen state records the current-native memorandum, OCR limitations, alleged destruction, evasive response, identity-concealment assertion, and unresolved underlying file.

UAP RES IPSA NARRATIVE EDITION v1.4 COMPLETE — THE FULL SIGNAL FIELD SURVIVES INTO THE STORY