

## "REVIEW OF THE 1966 CONISBOROUGH PICTURE"

By  
John R. English  
Research Associate, NARCAP

In response to a request by Mr. Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos, I have performed an independent review of this classic case by using present state-of-the-art analysis.

To this purpose I was provided with both contemporary and background documentation on the case, including a digital copy of the photograph and the filmstrip which includes the target negative, kindly provided to Mr. Ballester Olmos by Mr. John Hanson.



Source: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos  
By email to: John R. English 04/05/2012

Background: John R. English,

I am a past Director of the "International Aerospace Hall of Fame" (IAHF), San Diego Air & Space Historical center. During this time I was involved in the research, selection, and installation of several US and foreign Astronauts, as well as other significant aviation related candidates and events.

I am a Licensed pilot S.E.L. and a "Diamond" level Soaring pilot (28 years), with approx. 400 flight hours logged, 350 in high performance Sailplanes in multiple flight envelopes and conditions.

Certified to level three Industrial Non Destructive Testing - Ultrasonic, Infrared, Films & Coatings, Metals.

Certified material damage appraiser - Heavy equipment, Light aircraft, Motor vehicles.

Certified material damage site and artifact digital and film photo documentation.

Research Associate (15 years), NARCAP (National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena).



2012 Google Earth  
Street view

Of Approx location the photo  
at the right was taken





#### Digital review of Frame # 5 of alleged original film negative strip

- Frame #5 selected, cut & enlarged
- Frame #5 digitally enhanced
- Frame #5 infrared filtered
- Moiré pattern is revealed throughout picture
- Finger or thumb print is revealed at top left of picture
- Review of the remaining three negatives No. 6,7,8 on this strip show no indication of the Moire effect
- Conclusion: An additional layer was mechanically added to the original exposure to achieve a contrived special effect. (additional imagery not part of the original photo).

Note!  
Moiré pattern is seen wherever a repetitive structure is overlaid with another structure and the line elements are nearly superimposed





Digital review of Frame # 6 of alleged original film negative strip

- Frame #6 selected, cut & enlarged
- Frame #6 digitally enhanced
- Frame #6 infrared filtered
- Frame #6 shows no indication of a Moire effect



Digital review of Frame # 6 of alleged original film negative strip

- Frame #7 selected, cut & enlarged
- Frame #7 digitally enhanced
- Frame #7 infrared filtered
- Frame #7 shows no indication of a Moire effect



Digital review of Frame # 6 of alleged original film negative strip

- Frame #8 selected, cut & enlarged
- Frame #8 digitally enhanced
- Frame #8 infrared filtered
- Frame #8 shows no indication of a Moire effect



### **Conclusions, April, 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Digital enhancement of the alleged original negative #5 revealed a Moire effect throughout the negative. (Moiré pattern is seen wherever a repetitive structure is overlaid with another structure and the line elements are nearly superimposed)

Indications are that an additional layer was mechanically added to negative #5. This layering can be achieved using a glass plate with additional imagery (anything affixed to the glass surface, such as a cut out) then placed over the original exposure to achieve a contrived special effect.

The remaining negatives # 6,7,8 show no indication of Moire or layering.

Indications are there is a high probability this is a hoaxed photo.

J.R. English  
RA, NARCAP

### **In addition:**

A note from Dr. Richard Haines, Chief Scientist NARCAP. While looking at the photo I recalled that I had included it in my book Project Delta: A Study of Multiple UFO. (Pp. 129-131, see Figure 13). For various reasons other than yours I also came to the same conclusion that it was a hoax.

My opinion on the 1966 English photos is when all the alleged facts are examined what is left is only one hard feature.

The negative in frame #5 has been altered, The remaining frames show no indication of tampering.

Moiré effect?, not Moiré, effect?, Capillary dispersion of a liquid used to secure an inclusion? Collusion with family and chemist to arrange tampering? Chemist tampering unknown to family? family or associates tampering after development? all are at best conjecture!

In my opinion the only hard feature available at this time emerged from frame #5 with very little adjustment to lighting and contrast..



- The alleged “Saucers” were not seen when the original photo was taken?
- Alleged “Single bright light” was the original subject of the photographer?  
(no coronal image from a bright light source, no “bright light” image)
- Sodium light fixture affixed to the pole in the frame gives no indication of being on as reported in the original account of the alleged sighting.
- No amount of lighting or contrast when applied to the remaining frames revealed any artifact other than what was contained in the original exposure.
- Mr. Cade’s opinion “The negative appears to be untouched” , when in fact the negative contains substantive evidence that is has been modified.

Very high probability frame #5 is a hoaxed picture.