

## OLIVER'S CASTLE VIDEOTAPE

*(We apologize for possible errors in the translation)*

At dawn of August 11, 1996, John Wheyleigh films with his videocamera two unbend bright (said even Foo Fighters or "BOLs") that in a few moments gave life to a spectacular crop circle compound from 7 circles in hexagonal symmetry. From that moment begin a diatribe on the authenticity of the film, that sees detractive and supporting contrasts. It seemed then, that it could be put a stings on the alien origin of the crops circles, but the lapels of this history yet owed to be eviscerated. The tape ended soon in the hands of the media, and in Italy was published in enclosure to the first number of January 1998 of the magazine "UFO CONTACT." Once spread, the tape was taken in examination and studied by various researchers and technical, to the search of possible falsifications. The first ones to lift consistent doubts on the authenticity of the tape were Paul Vigay and Peter Sorenson, experienced in computer graphics and techniques video. The two analysts underline as the television camera of the operator stay immovable, also when the BOLs go out of the visual field, while the crop that is "borning" - almost that the cameraman had exactly foreseen the demanded coordinates in which it would be formed - perfectly enters the shot. Besides, keeping in mind of the solar light that was in that place and to that date, the shades to the ground they don't correspond. Busty Taylor (pilot and accredited researcher of crop circles) confirm that the shades to the ground are wrong to be dawn morning, and considering that the operator camera was oriented toward west.

Vigay and Sorenson recognized however that it dealt with a forgery made by very expert hands (not jokers), realizable only from person that have some good instrumentations and knowledges of computer-graphics. Sir. Wheyleigh didn't seem to have the requisite to create a false of the kind. Here it enters the scene Sir Lee Winterson. He discovered, trought a simple investigation by telephone number left by Wheyleigh, that dealt with person under false name. The true name was John Wabe. It began then the searches to individualize who Wabe is, and the discovery was interesting: experienced in computer-graphics of the studies of the post-production and animation of the "First Cut" in Bristol, England. Wabe had the competences and the tools to realize a false tape.

Lee and Sorenson, together with seven operators of the Nippon Television, did "break-in" in the studies of the First Cut and succeeded in interviewing Lomas, partner of Wabe, to which they succeeded making him say that indeed Wabe had involved in the "matter of Oliver's Castle". Lee asked to Lomas to directly talk to Wabe, and Lomas went to his partner to tell him. At that point Wabe hastily left the Studios, running away the television cameras. Sorenson, that was waiting hide out of the building with one videocamera, filmed his escape. Then was asked to Lomas to convince his partner to to talk to them, since by now the truth had emerged, and to nothing would have helped running away.

Next days they succeed in talking to him, but only by telephone. Wabe admitted to be involved, but he didn't want to say nothing more, because -he specified- he had an exclusive with the production "Discovery Channel Usa."

It was immediately thought that the Discovery Channel had paid Wabe to realize a forgery, that would have been then presented in TV as a sensational discover. Now however this was no more possible, and is a fact that the transmission Discovery Channel was broadcasted with a different style: "discovered the fraud of Oliver's Castle!"

Could it be, therefore, that the Discovery Channel had paid Wabe subsequently, after he had shown them the tape, and the tape had been judged "sufficiently" authentic? Without deepening the investigations (which is not the purpose of these pages), we limit to say that after such stories, on the authenticity of the film anybody would have no more betted one cent.

Nevertheless the truth, in our opinion, has to rest in the object in matter (in the tape) more than in the stories -even if sincere- of the subjects involved to discredit it. Then the best argument in favour of the forgery remains that of Paul Vigay, related to the immovable television camera and to the wrong shades. However something still doesn't fit. For instance the same Vigay realized again that tape with the computer, correcting the imperfections of the tape of Wabe, and he said he did it in only 3 hours, to realize a forgery better than the one of Wabe. Then Wabe, that had available the same instruments of Vigay but very more time, and even - according to some- a millionaire contract that attended him to ended job, should be considered a true amateur?

There is more.

Jim Dilettoso, American investigator, experienced in systems of analysis computerized video-photographic, and advisor of the Nasa, has analyzed the video, reaching the conclusion that "very probably" it is authentic. He has declared that *"don't exist evidences of falsifications [...] and there is no any test that the images have been digitalized."* He said that the circles were there really, therefore someone necessarily had to go there to position the camera and to film the circle. Subsequently he would have had to reverse the process, making raise again the wheat; therefore - eventually- he should have undo the crop circle not yet done. To falsify this video they would have had to reverse the trial in comparison to this spiral scheme, that we have identified analyzing the image. But if they had perfectly reversed the process and make the wheatraise again, there would have been some proof of it, some traces of this action; instead they are not. I find very difficult that there has been an animator so skilled to falsify this video. Dilettoso also reproaches various analysts that defended the theory of the forgery not to have made available the results and the methodologies used in their tests.

Dan D. (a photographer with 35 years of experience especially in the cinema and in special effects and in computer graphics has remained impressed by the "elegant quality of movement shown by the spheres, that go rhythmic and not mechanic way,

the same as dolphins that play”, and has noticed that “the process of formation was continuous and progressive, without obstacles and discontinuity, with an unbelievable fluidity and sweetness of action” (info: [www.cropcircleconnector.com](http://www.cropcircleconnector.com)). Enigma Channel transmits then a tv show ("The Crop Circle Update - 1999") in which speaks of an analysis of the tape. Besides the fact that many accredited researchers have held authentic the Oliver's Castle crop, the real results of the analysis of the video are the followings:

1. the “frames” magnified are in conformity with the photographic quality of an amateur camera.
2. There is no trace of realized three-dimensional animation or adds with computer.
3. the flying object cannot be seen on a standard TV.
4. The BOLs are big around as a volley Ball, and they move to the speed of around 100 feet per second.

Not only therefore the tape would be authentic, but there are further curiosities and details that emerge in a second moment. The Australian Mike Farrell transcribes the transmission (published also on [www.caus.org](http://www.caus.org)). Emerges that it needs to observe well the first seconds of the tape, while and before the two spheres of light enter the scene from the right. To an examination effected to the computer (planning a thirtieth of second per frame) analysis underlines what it seems to be a great brightness (around 800 feet from the videocamera) that it goes down from the sky and it turns itself into a classical “flying disk” that it immediately disappears behind the trees to the left extremity of the dividing hedge, aloft in the screen. This UFO is not visible on ours televisions, but analyzing the tape with frame to 1/30th and advancing frame by frame, is noticed also in television a bright flash in that point. Analyzing to the computer is seen even that the UFO is a solid body, or at least it produces a shade, and you can see that after the flash of light it starts to expel a gaseous substance, and then another sphere of light appears. Moreover, the bright spheres, after having danced on the field to realize the crop, seem to return in the point in which the big trees seem to hide the UFO.

Shortly, Farrell sustains that the analysis of the tape suggests a hypothesis according to which an UFO has gone down in that area hiding itself behind the trees, freeing two spheres of light (that are well visible in the tape), and then freeing a third sphere of light that followed the others two and that, to the second passage above to the crop, divided itself in two parts.

So the question: if the video of Oliver Castle is a forgery, why add these details, that are invisible on a standard television? These details however have remained rather in shade, and we don't have any official news confirming or denying these analyses of the tape. The general propensity is not to consider them as real proofs, also

considering that the same Colin Andrews (pioneer researcher and author of some books in crop circles theme) has declared that the video of Oliver Castle, from himself purchased, studied, and sent around for the world, is a forgery. Not the crop circle created by the BOLs is false, and not even the BOLs, but the tape! Here is what he precisely tells Colin Andrews in a mail sent by him spread out and published on some magazines and on the site caus.org:

*“I am convinced that the video of Oliver Castle has been manually created”* but the BOLs, seen in other authentic tapes and in a lot of photos, they are very real. There are about ten BOLs in some photos taken in the same crop of Oliver Castle.<BR>Same Colin Andrews has declared that “three people have been involved in the creation of this tape, so that we could made it known to the public, for then later accuse us to be "untrustable", and to damage and to discredit both the phenomenon and ourselves”. Then he adds a very illuminating sentence: “The material [he is speaking about the video of Oliver Castle] could also be real, but has been used in very ambiguous way”. (source “UFO CONTACT). In short it would be said that Colin Andrews in his mind believes that the tape is (or could be) authentic, but not to expose himself, he preferred to declare that it deals with a forgery. In reality there is not the certainty that the not even crop itself is genuine, If Michael Glickman believes that the formation of Oliver Castle is authentic, and the video is amazing, on the contrary the infrared photos of Freddy Silva seem to disprove this hypothesis: while other crop, photographed within the 24 hours from their creation, showed thermal changes to the ground, the crop of Oliver Castle not. The analysis of Dr Levengood results inconclusive, since the champions received from him were not quantitatively neither qualitatively able to satisfy the demands of a complete analysis.

**Notes for the consumer:** all the images, photos, sketches, articles or quotations, are of exclusive ownership of the author or the quoted site. The use of such material is therefore subordinate to the explicit consent of the same one, in lack of which is made prohibition to spread the aforesaid material.

**Notes for the authors:** I have tried to directly contact all the sources from which I have retrieved photo, images, sketches, quotations etc quoted in this article. Nevertheless for reasons not dependent from my wish, in some (rare) cases it has not been possible to track down the legitimate owners. If therefore in the present publication there are images or other of your ownership, it will be enough to immediately communicate it by e-mail and i'll remove.

