

Free to be copied in any form, no restrictions.

Andrew J. Buckley was born in 1954 and educated at the Manchester Metropolitan University and University of London, UK, graduating with a First Class Honours Degree and Masters Degree in Fine Art. During this time he developed im interest in prehistory, archaeology, astronomy and human psychology.

As a former member ofBUFORA [British UFO Research Association] and the CCCS [Centre for Crop Circle Studies], he has been actively involved in researching and investigating the UFO phenomenon since 1972 and the crop-circle phenomenon since 1985. He has occasionally given lectures, contributed articles to various publications on these subjects and participated in television and video productions including the American 'Sightings' TV series.

He is the leading researcher and investigator into the 777 East Field cropcircle incident, having interviewed all the key witnesses and reviewed the forensic and video evidence.

(bollocks. Hes a fucking liar and an idiot)

Andrew is a full-time artist, graphic designer and lecturer in further education. He is currently living and working in the county of Cheshire, UK.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people, including the many authors and researchers

to whom owe an enormous debt of gratitude. Their work has provided me with essential inspiration and guidance during the transcribing of this interview; Colin Andrews, Mark Bond, Bibbi Bostrom, Andrew Collins, Stuart Dike, Glen Edwards, Mark Fussell, Rodney Hale, Eltjo H. Haselhoff, George Hoskins, Linda Moulton Howe, Bert Janssen, 'John', Miles Johnston, Paula Presdee-Jones, Winston Keech, Gary King, Jon King, Foeke Kootje, W.C Levengood, Nicolas Montigiani, Umberto Morazzoni, Paramount Pictures, Lucy Pringle, Nick Redfern, Rob Seaman, Derek Sheffield, Terje Toftenes, Jacques F. Vallee, Judy Wall, John Wilson. Very special thanks to Dr. Anthony Rackham for having the patience and openmindedness

to conduct this interview with me.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and pUblications which I have listed in the 'References and Bibliography'

[Section Fourteen], and this is gratefully acknowledged.

The views and opinions expressed in this report / interview by the author, Andrew J. Buckley do not necessarily concur with any views and opinions held by the individuals mentioned thereafter.

SECTION HEADINGS

SECTION ONE: Biographical details and overview of the crop- pages 1 - 4
circle phenomenon.

SECTION TWO: The military involvement in crop-circle and pages 4 - 7

UFO research.

SECTION THREE: Overview of the 777 East Field crop-circle pages 7 - 10 incident.

SECTION FOUR: Interviewing the key witnesses. pages 10 - 14

SECTION FIVE: Disinformation and the involvement of pages 14 - 18

Matthew Williams in the 777 incident.

SECTION SIX: Meet the 'circlemakers'. pages 19 - 24

SECTION SEVEN: The Press Conference. pages 24 - 26

SECTION EIGHT: Controversy and Deception: Reactions from pages 26 - 39 the crop-circle research community.

SECTION NINE: Winston Keech: the cameraman's story. pages 39 - 41

SECTION TEN: Military activity in the vicinity of the 777 pages 41 - 48 crop formation.

SECTION ELEVEN: Biohazards and abnormal radiation readings pages 48 - 55

in the 777 crop formation.

SECTION TWELVE: Analysis of the photographic and video evidence. pages 55 - 59

SECTION THIRTEEN: Conclusions and summary. pages 60 - 73

SECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography. pages 74 - 78

777: THE INCONVENIENT TRUTH. THE EAST FIELD CROP FORMATION.

6th

/ In JULY 2007, ALTON BARNES, WILTSHIRE.

The following interview was conducted throughout 2008 between Andrew J. Buckley [AJB]

and the UK based astronomer and scientist Dr. Anthony Rackham [AR].

SECTION ONE: BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS AND OVERVIEW OF THE CROPCIRCLE PHENOMENON

PHENOMENON

AR Andrew, could you begin by briefly describing how you first became involved

in UFO and crop-circle research?

AJB Good to talk to you, Tony. Yes, I guess my involvement with these subjects goes right back to childhood. Throughout my life, I had what could best be described as a series of unusual experiences, mostly of a UFO and paranormal nature.

AR Could you be more specific?

AJB Well, sightings of unexplained lights / objects in the sky, often seen with witnesses

mostly in the north-west of England, UK, where I lived at the time. In 1972 I met an astronomer who became a very good friend until he sadly died in 1985.

With several other enthusiasts, I formed a local astronomy group and kind of investigated UFO sightings as a sideline. Whilst investigating these incidents, some of us also witnessed various unusual phenomena including UFOs; ghosts; electronic voice phenomena and also sightings of a crypto-zoological nature. We always tried to secure a rational and scientific explanation wherever possible.

I also became a member of BUFORA [British UFO Research Association] and for a time was an active field investigator, which helped me to develop a more co-ordinated approach to interviewing witnesses. In the mid - 1970s as I began my formal art education, my research widened to include such diverse subjects as earth mysteries; astro-archaeology; Egyptology and human psychology. Importantly, my connection to Wiltshire began in the 1970s when I first visited the

area as a result of the continuing UFO activity which had been occurring at Warminster since the 1960s. I walked into my first crop-circle near Westbury in 1985 and continued my investigations in Cheshire in 1989, where I joined a local crop-circle research group. In the early 1990s, I decided to join the CCCS [Centre for Crop Circle Studies], and during the following ten years up to the present day, spent an ever-increasing amount of time researching the phenomenon in Wiltshire. As a result I became acquainted with most of the prominent researchers into this subject and regularly attended conferences up and down the country. During my field investigations, I continued to observe and videotape a series of inexplicable events, mostly sightings of what I have come to term UAPs or unidentified aerial phenomena, more commonly referred to as UFOs, balls of light [BOLs], or luminosities, often in close proximity to crop formations. Thanks to the kind generosity of other researchers, some of whom had also witnessed similar phenomena, I was able to gradually build up quite an extensive database of video recordings. I should emphasise, at this point, that throughout my research and investigations, I have endeavoured to maintain a scientific approach wherever possible.

- 1 -

AR Regarding the crop-circle phenomenon, why do you think there have been so many formations in Southern England, UK, particularly in the county of Wiltshire?

AJB It should be emphasised that crop-circles are a global phenomenon, but I do agree

that the vast majority of formations do occur in southern Britain, particularly Wiltshire and Hampshire. The short answer is that we simply do not know why this should be the case, given that the rest of the country has a preponderance of cereal growing fields. There are many theories, including the prevalence of chalk in the geological sub-strata, to which the formations may be attracted. Wiltshire also has an abundance of prehistoric and sacred sites, linking the crop-circles to so-called earth energies and ley-lines. My own view, which is rather controversial, emphasises the close proximity of many crop formations to military ranges, particularly in Wiltshire.

AR Are you implying that there is a link between the military and the crop-circle phenomenon?

AJB Yes, most definitely, and also with the UFO / UAP activity.

AR So, given what you have just inferred, do you subscribe to any specific theory regarding the origin of the crop-circle phenomenon?

AJB It may be that we are dealing with a multi-faceted phenomenon. Without going into too much detail, I would postulate at least four possible theories;

1] Highly covert military experimentation. 2] Natural Phenomenon. 3] Human circlemaking. 4] Unknown, possibly non-human agency.

There may be, of course; a combination of these theories or some other explanation. It may be that some of the simpler formations involving uncomplicated patterns could be attributed to a form of natural atmospheric vortex system. I have examined several examples of this nature in Wiltshire, and interestingly, they show many of the hallmarks found in the more complex formations, for example, swirled stems bent at the nodes without breakage, and multi-layering of the crop. I am

convinced that we are not simply looking at storm or wind damage. Most researchers overlook these fascinating patterns because they lack the eye-catching spectacle of the more complex formations. I greatly value the work of Dr. Terence Meaden in the late 1980s and early 1990s and feel that his scientific approach to investigating this phenomenon is sadly lacking from modern research. I find it hard to accept, however, that the more complex patterns can be explained by a natural, meteorological thesis.

The question of human circlemaking is highly controversial and I do not intend to discuss it in any great depth except in the context of the 777 incident. I have always stated, based on my own research, that human circlemaking involving the traditional methods of using stomping boards, ropes, rollers etc. can only account for a tiny percentage of all formations, mainly those commissioned by advertising and television companies. The overwhelming evidence indicates that the human circlemaking hypothesis cannot account for the core phenomenon by any stretch of the imagination. There are legitimate reasons for coming to this conclusion and I would refer the reader / listener to my 2001 field analysis report entitled 'The

- 2 -

Woodborough Hill Crop Formation', where these issues are discussed in greater depth. The fourth and final hypothesis involving a more exotic explanation is also covered in the above report. I feel it is vitally important to keep at least one foot firmly rooted on the ground, when considering any of these highly contentious theories, whether extraterrestrial/inter-dimensional intelligence; elementals / devas; earth energies or even our own thought projections. Scientifically speaking, there is little solid evidence to support any of these theories. I do feel that the 777 incident has provided a watershed in crop-circle research for reasons I will discuss with you in due course.

AR You have been fortunate enough to obtain some remarkable video-footage of

UFOs or 'balls of light'. Do you think there is a correlation between sightings of aerial phenomena and the appearance of ground patterns and why do you think you have been more fortunate than others to have witnessed these incidents?

AJB

There have been an overwhelming amount of sightings of unusual aerial phenomena ranging from small, multi-coloured balls of light to what appear to be larger, 'structured' objects either flying near to or actually inside crop formations. There have also been anecdotal reports of these UAPs [unidentified aerial phenomena], as I prefer to call them, actually creating crop circles. I have witnessed many UAPs myself, mostly in Wiltshire and often in close proximity to crop formations. Fortunately, I was able to obtain some very good day and night-time video-footage of these phenomena, examples of which have been used in many documentaries on the subject, including Terje Tofenes' excellent DVD, 'Crop Circles: Crossovers From Another Dimension.' On July 18th 2000 I witnessed a remarkable event involving at least nine of these small glowing lights at approximately 20.00 hrs in the vicinity of Woodborough Hill in the Vale of Pewsey, Wiltshire UK. The lights exhibited very unusual flight characteristics and one was even 'attacked' by a low-flying bird! I succeeded in obtaining some excellent video-footage of this incident, clips of which were included in Dutch researcher Bert Janssen's documentary 'Contact.' For further information regarding this incident I would refer you to my in-depth report entitled 'Case History-The Observation and Video-Recording of an Unexplained Aerial Phenomenon at Woodborough Hill near Alton Barnes, Wiltshire' [2002]. I can also recommend three excellent books which cover the vast majority of theories and sightings of these UAPs with

reference to the crop circle phenomenon. 'Mysterious Lights and Crop Circles' by Linda Moulton Howe [LMH Productions 2000 - Pioneer Printing USA. ISBN: 0-9620570-6-1]; 'The Deepening Complexity of Crop Circles' by Eltjo H. Haselhoff, Ph.D [North Atlantic Books 2001. ISBN: 1-58394-046-4]; 'Alien Energy' by Andrew Collins [Eagle Wing Books USA 1994, ISBN: 0-940829-37-1]. The latter book diligently records the vast majority of the important sightings of unexplained lights / objects in Wiltshire during the early 1990s. As I mentioned previously, thanks to the generosity of other researchers, some of whom have witnessed similar phenomena, I was able to gradually build up an extensive video database.

I feel that we are dealing with a multi-faceted phenomenon here, and it may be that there is a distinct difference between the more common and typical type of 'UFO' which has been reported on a worldwide basis throughout the past one hundred years, and the more 'energy based' aerial phenomena reported throughout the rural landscapes of southern Britain.

Am I more fortunate than others to have witnessed these phenomena? I do spend
- 3 -

a good deal of my spare time, camcorder at the ready, walking the fields especially in the Vale of Pewsey area of Wiltshire, so I suppose my chances are somewhat increased of me seeing these lights. However, there do seem to be certain individuals, and maybe I happen to be one of them, who appear to 'attract' the presence of these UAPs for whatever reason. And the evidence does suggest a possible interaction between the human mind and whatever 'intelligence', if any, these lights appear to emanate.

AR In the light of what you have just said, if you will excuse the pun, I have to ask

your views on the infamous 'Oliver's Castle' video-footage.

AJB

AR

Well, I will come straight to the point and say that throughout the entire history of crop-circle research, there are perhaps only two incidents where we appear to have incontrovertible evidence that we are dealing with a truly remarkable series of occurrences, namely 'Oliver's Castle' 1996, and 'East Field 777' 2007. For those not acquainted with the former case, a young man allegedly called either John Wabe or John Wayleigh, in the early hours of Sunday, August 11th 1996, apparently filmed a series of 'balls of light' flying across a field at the foot of the Iron Age hillfort called Oliver's Castle, near Devizes, Wiltshire, UK. As these 'balls of light' meandered across the field, a huge three hundred foot diameter crop formation resembling a snowflake appeared in seconds below the lights, which eventually flew out of view. Was this the 'smoking gun' we had long been waiting for? Well, I don't propose to go into the history of this complex case, because enough has already been said and written. My gut feeling, having worked in the computer graphics industry for almost twenty years, is that the film footage shot by our alleged cameraman is an elaborate hoax. Perhaps the jury is still out. If we exclude the 'Oliver's Castle' video from our very short list of 'smoking gun' events, we are only left with the '777 Incident.' Unlike 'Oliver's Castle', where the witness testimony is almost non-existent, on this occasion we do have verifiable evidence from reliable witnesses who have been prepared to allow themselves, along with their evidence, to be scrutinised. This is the reason why I give this incident a far higher rating over the so-called 'Oliver's Castle' video evidence.

SECTION TWO: THE MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN CROP-CIRCLE AND UFO RESEARCH

Referring back to the sightings of aerial phenomena, there have been many incidents reported in Wiltshire where these so-called 'balls of light' have been

witnessed in very close proximity to military helicopters. In your opinion, do you think the British Ministry of Defence are involved in some form of covert surveillance of these phenomena, including the crop-circles, and if so, why? AJB For reasons which I will endeavour to explain in due course, it has always been my

remit, when investigating a case at an official level, to operate within a framework of strict non-disclosure. Your question raises serious issues which I am not prepared to discuss at depth within the limited format of this interview.

That the British government has been actively involved in official research into the UFO phenomenon at least since the 1940s, and more recently the crop-circle phenomenon, has been something of an open secret. Researcher Nick Redfern amply demonstrated this fact in his excellent ground-breaking book 'A Covert

- 4 -

Agenda' [Simon and Schuster 1997. ISBN: 0-684-81937-6]. I would also refer you to another well-researched book written by the late Derek Sheffield entitled 'UFOs - A Deadly Concealment' [Blandford Books 1996. ISBN: 0-7137-2620-2]. I will quote a short extract from Nick Redfern's book which implicates the Ministry of Defence's Provost and Security Services, then based at RAP Rudloe Manor at Corsham, Wiltshire, UK, in covert crop-circle research and surveillance. '... researcher George Wingfield has learned that in September 1990, the British Government called a secret ministerial briefmg to debate the matter. According to Wingfield's information, the meeting was convened essentially to try to determine the nature of the circles, lest the British Government be placed in the embarrassing position of having to admit its ignorance of the phenomenon ... in 1991, RAP medic Jonathan Turner was stationed at Royal Air Force Lyneham. He recalls one particular occasion when, on July 15th

, a crop-circle was discovered on the nearby

Hackpen Hill. Shortly afterwards, examples of the more elaborate pictograms began appearing too. His interest piqued, Turner chose an off-duty day to visit the area and to take some photographs of the various patterns and formations which had appeared. As he soon learned, however, Turner was not alone. Parked near a

rundown farm building was a car: an RAP Police car. Turner subsequently had a brief conversation with the police officer, and questioned him about his presence. This provoked a cryptic response from the RAP policeman, who admitted that he was 'probably monitoring the activity on the Downs regarding the crop-circles.'

Were it not for the fact that Turner was himself in the military at the time, it is unlikely that the officer would have been so forthcoming. And I have to ask: on whose orders was the officer 'monitoring the activity'? Given that the RAF Police has its base of operations at Rudloe Manor, the possibility of Flying Complaints Flight involvement in the investigation of yet another inexplicable phenomenon cannot be ruled out. ...'

It soon became apparent through official scientific research and observation that we were dealing with a phenomenon which routinely penetrated air defence environments

with impunity. The aim of a defence network is to secure the region's airspace from intrusion by a foreign invader, whatever its nature and origin. All such intrusions are considered hostile until proven otherwise.

The phenomenon of the unexplained ground markings [UGM's], ostensibly referred to as 'crop-circles', represent intrusions into our airspace, down to ground level, by a hitherto unknown, possibly hostile agency, whether human or otherwise. The premature disclosure of sensitive information to the public relating to matters of a defence interest would certainly not be a desirable option as it could seriously compromise national security.

- AR So this would explain your reluctance to discuss these issues in the public domain. How does this square with your field investigations in Wiltshire where you have repeatedly reported sightings of unusual phenomena, including the appearance of the crop-circles? Many sceptics and debunkers have remarked that the military helicopter activity can be explained as simply low-flying training exercises, for example.

AJB The Alton Barnes / East Field area in the Vale ofPewsey is officially designated as a low-flying area [LFA IA to be precise]. This is not in dispute. Further information concerning military low-flying can be obtained from the Ministry of Defence [UK] website. For the past fifteen years I have devoted a great deal of my time and

- 5 -

effort researching and observing both the UFO and crop-circle activity in the Vale ofPewsey area. As a result of these observations, I have become very familiar with all types of military manoeuvres in the area involving a variety of aircraft including Apache, Lynx, Gazelle, Puma, Cobra, Merlin and Chinook helicopters, which normally operate out of local bases. The vast majority of helicopter training utilises the very familiar black and yellow 'Squirrel' Eurocopters, based at the Army Air Corps School of Army Aviation at Middle Wallop, near Andover, Hampshire. These helicopters are not difficult to spot in the landscape, as they perform fairly obvious low-flying exercises. Given my knowledge and familiarity with all this military flying, I can easily distinguish between are what are fairly obvious manoeuvres linked to routine training exercises and more suspicious and unexplained

activity. The vast majority of military training is conducted over the relative safety of Salisbury Plain on vast stretches of land known as 'Danger Areas', several miles north of the Vale ofPewsey. Much of the basic rotary flight training occurs in the immediate vicinity of the Army Air Corps base at Middle Wallop. All military manoeuvres have to be officially booked and logged, especially over civilian land such as the Vale ofPewsey. Contrary to what some uninformed researchers have stated, military pilots are strictly forbidden from using the landscape to 'joy-ride' their multi-million pound helicopters, or to endanger the lives of civilians.

Your reference to the possible interception of so-called 'UFOs' or 'balls of light' by military helicopters is therefore pertinent to the issues discussed previously. There have been many well testified cases of the military interception of these aerial phenomena, particularly in the Vale ofPewsey area. Perhaps one of the most important cases occurred on July 21st

\ 1994, involving veteran researcher Colin

Andrews, together with eight other witnesses in broad daylight. Apart from being harassed by two dangerously low-flying military helicopters [Lynx and Gazelle], for over twenty minutes, the team were able to successfully videotape one of the army helicopters stealthily approach and hover over what appeared to be a small pulsating shiny 'ball of light' near the southern slopes of Wood borough Hill, about half a mile away to the north, from their vantage point near Adam's Grave, Alton Barnes. This incident was described in detail in an article entitled 'The Military Menace' which I submitted to 'UFO Reality' magazine [Issue 2: June / July 1996] edited by Jon King. A similar incident occurred on the evening of 28th July 1992 when a large sphere of glistening orange light was approached by no fewer than three army helicopters, again in the vicinity of Alton Barnes. During the afternoon of the 20th September 2004, I observed and videotaped the interception of a small, pulsating aerial light by a Lynx military helicopter over fields near West Stowell, in the Vale ofPewsey. Many other researchers have reported similar events in this area over the past fifteen years.

AR So, presumably the pilots on board these helicopters must have been briefed as

to the nature and origin of these 'balls of light'?

AJB Of course, simply because we have a regularly occurring phenomenon, which is flying with impunity throughout a designated military low-flying area. And what better cover for the military to conduct regular training exercises whilst covertly observing and recording any unusual aerial phenomena which might occur. These 'UAP' [unidentified aerial phenomenon] incidents are presumably tracked on either ground-based or airborne radar systems, which would explain their very rapid interception by military aircraft.

- 6 -

AR Several researchers have pointed out the unusual level of military activity following the appearance of the 777 crop formation.

AJB Well, given the unprecedented importance of this event, it was perhaps unsurprising

there was a commensurate military response and I was one of the researchers who witnessed and videotaped much of this activity, which has subsequently become an integral part of my investigation.

AR Your decision to operate within a non-disclosure framework is obviously very

controversial because you run the risk of being accused by the public of deliberately withholding information that they feel it is their right to see.

AJB You make a tacit assumption that it would be in the public interest to release this information. I mean, the fact that you are reading this article is indicative of at least some effort to inform the public of the facts behind the 777 incident. However, it is important to understand that there are several legitimate reasons for withholding some information which might be deemed too sensitive. And there are other reasons.

AR Too sensitive? For whom? And for what other reasons?

AJB

:

AR

AJB

Tony, you work within the scientific community, so I assume you will have come across a situation where certain evidence emerges which demands to be treated in a way which would preserve its integrity. In the case of the 777 incident, because the evidence is of such a controversial nature, it would be reckless to have it released prematurely before certain procedures and safeguards have been put in place. For example, some of us who have been directly involved with this incident are far from happy at the way some elements within the crop-circle research community have reacted to some of the information we have chosen to release. We are very conscious of how the Oliver's Castle evidence which I have just discussed with you, was literally savaged to death by some less than open-minded researchers, the effect of which was to permanently damage the integrity of that case. Those of us involved with the 777 incident know that we have in our possession evidence of a much higher pedigree than Oliver's Castle and we are simply not prepared to make the same mistakes by releasing this evidence without firstly ensuring that proper scientific evaluation has been undertaken. And we have the time on our side.

SECTION THREE: OVERVIEW OF THE 777 EAST FIELD CROP-CIRCLE INCIDENT

How did you first become involved in researching the 777 incident?

I first became aware of the incident about a week after the event had happened. I had already planned quite a lengthy stay in Wiltshire from the 14th July 2007,

so it gave me an ideal opportunity to research the case and, of course, visit the formation. But at the time I had no idea that any video-footage had been obtained on the night in question. Almost immediately I arrived in Wiltshire I organised a meeting with Terje Toftenes, the Norwegian film producer and crop-circle researcher, who had by that time already interviewed the three key witnesses,

- 7 -

AR

AJB

AR

AJB

Winston Keech, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones.

What transpired during that meeting?

I must emphasise from the outset that I've always found Terje to be a very professional guy, of great integrity and honesty, so I took very seriously what he had to tell me. He was generous enough to use some of my video-footage in his excellent 2005 documentary 'Crop Circles: Crossovers From Another Dimension'. Terje briefly outlined the case and stated unequivocally that, in his opinion, Winston, Gary and Paula were very credible witnesses and he had no reason to doubt their testimonies.

It might be helpful if you could provide an overview of the incident.

For sure, and I would refer the reader to several articles which describe this incident in greater detail. The main article was published on American researcher Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' website in July 2007.

I was also interviewed at length by Linda regarding my experience of the military activity over the 777 East Field crop formation, and this information also appeared on her website shortly afterwards. There is also an update of the case on Lucy Pringle's crop-circle website headed 'Commas and Semi-Colons'. Lucy is a long-standing U.K researcher into the crop-circle phenomenon, whom I have always respected, and one of the few investigators willing to present the case in the fair and balanced manner it deserves. Terje Toftenes has also produced a short DVD film about the case entitled 'The East Field Crop-Circle' which contains a lengthy interview with Winston Keech. Very briefly, on the evening of the 6th July 2007, inventor and engineer Winston Keech decided to conduct an all night skywatch from the summit of Knap Hill, near Alton Barnes, Wiltshire. This is a favourite vantage point for skywatchers as numerous anomalous aerial phenomena have been observed in the area over the past twenty years. Knap Hill overlooks the famous East Field where many spectacular crop formations have occurred almost every year since 1990. Winston, or Win as I shall refer to him, deployed a battery of digital still and video cameras during his skywatch, including an image intensifier which he used to periodically scan the fields below throughout the night. Two of the main video cameras were mounted on the roof of his vehicle which was parked a little further down the hill overlooking the East Field. He began his photographic and video surveillance shortly after 23.00 hrs on the 6th July, which continued with only a very short break until about 05.00 hrs on the 7th July. At approximately 01.30 hrs, Win was joined by two other researchers, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones, who had also decided to conduct an impromptu skywatch from Knap Hill. They continued their all-night vigil and didn't notice anything unusual until shortly after 03.00 hrs, when they witnessed a sudden, short-lived bright flash of light over the East Field, the physical effects of which were apparently later seen to have registered on Win's camera equipment as an 'electro-magnetic pulse'. Following the unusual flash of light, when Win scanned the fields some twenty minutes later with the light sensitive camera, he was astonished to see what appeared to be a substantial crop formation directly below in the East Field. As dawn approached, it soon became

apparent that a huge crop formation had indeed appeared at some point during the night. At approximately 04.30 hrs, Gary and Paula decided to enter the formation, which Win captured on camera.

- 8 -

AR It does seem rather a coincidence that Winston Keech would 'choose the right place at the right time' to conduct his skywatch and be met by Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones at 01.30 hrs.

AJB I agree that the odds of choosing the right time and place are fairly remote, having

myself spent many, many hours in an attempt to pre-empt the appearance of a crop formation in the Vale of Pewsey for over fifteen years. Having said that, I guess it was only a matter of time until someone would make the right choice, and it seems that Win was destined to be that person. Knap Hill is an extremely popular site for summer skywatches, primarily because of the panoramic views it offers, so it would have been an obvious place to select. Having conducted many skywatches there myself, it is not particularly unusual to meet other like-minded people in the dead of night, however bizarre this might seem to most people, especially during the months of July and August.

AR So why do you think the 777 formation is of so much importance compared to,

say, previous crop-circle events?

AJB I have been studying the crop-circle phenomenon since about 1985, and have seen

and entered some truly incredible formations. From a visual/aesthetic perspective, I wouldn't describe the 777 formation as being particularly remarkable, although it does have much symbolic significance, with which I will come to in due course. As I stated previously, apart from the notorious Oliver's Castle video-footage which, in my opinion, is of highly dubious origin, we were still awaiting the 'smoking gun' evidence where we have incontrovertible evidence that at least one crop formation was not produced by traditional human hoaxing methods. Given that the chance of obtaining such evidence is extremely remote because of the unpredictable nature of the phenomenon, it goes without saying that should such evidence emerge, providing it was meticulously and objectively examined in a scientific manner, this would be of the utmost importance. The event which occurred in the East Field on the night of the 6th

/ 7th July 2007 may prove to be one of the most

significant crop-circle incidents in the history of the phenomenon. Period.

AR What were your impressions of the 777 formation on entering it for the first time?

AJB I was just completely blown away by the sheer size of the formation. Of course, by the time I entered the formation a week following its appearance, it had already been visited by hundreds of people. So it was difficult for me to make an accurate assessment of the formation from ground level. One researcher who did visit the formation shortly after its appearance was Rob Seaman, who has been diligently surveying and measuring hundreds of crop formations for many years now. Rob was kind enough to send me a copy of his survey of the 777 formation. The formation occurred in wheat crop, and statistically, the total length of the main arcs was 1219 feet and the maximum width of the formation was 945 feet. The largest circle was 158 feet in diameter and the smallest was about 8 feet in diameter. There was a total of 146 components, which were predominantly circular in shape. Some researchers, including Terje Toftene's, had commented that most of the main components of the 777 formations were in fact oval, but

- 9 -

this supposition is not borne out by the many aerial photographs taken of the formation and, of course, the ground survey conducted by Rob Seaman. He also noted, after spending over seven hours surveying the formation, that the lay of the crop was clockwise throughout and that underlying pathways ran through the main axis of the formation, culminating at the end of each 'arm'. Interestingly, the largest circle which was 185 feet in diameter did not display any traceable underlying pathway.

When I visited the formation, one could still see some beautifully laid out nests and swirl patterns in the still ripening wheat crop. There was some evidence of what I term 'banding' of the fallen crop across some of the larger circles, which, in my opinion has been incorrectly interpreted as 'stomping board marks'. One shouldn't overlook the testimonies of the key witnesses including Winston Keech and Gary King who were, allegedly, the first persons to enter the 777 formation. They described the ground lay of the crop to be quite varied throughout - in some of the circles the crop was very delicately laid down up to six inches above the ground with no signs of breakage to the plant stems, whereas other parts of the formation displayed a more energetic swirl motion.

SECTION FOUR: INTERVIEWING THE KEY WITNESSES

AR The witness testimonies in a case like this are extremely important. How did

you go about interviewing the many witnesses involved?

AJB Before I discuss some of the key witnesses with you, I think it is important to point out that, apart from the key witnesses, Winston Keech, Gary King, Paula Presdee-Jones and Terje Toftenes, whose names have been in the public domain for almost twelve months now, and for reasons of privacy and data protection, I do not intend to reveal their personal details. All this information remains on file and can only be accessed by permission of the witness. I also intend to honour the trust placed in me by Winston Keech, who was kind enough to begin what has become an ongoing dialogue with me and allow me access to the photographic and video evidence he has obtained of the 777 incident.

The first person I spoke to was the Norwegian film producer Terje Toftenes, whom I mentioned previously. He had the advantage of being one of the first researchers to meet and interview all the key witnesses immediately following the 777 incident. He was also able to study in detail all the raw footage obtained by Win, and was responsible for producing the 'East Field Incident' DVD and organising the Press Conference in Alton Barnes, Wiltshire on July 19th 2007.

Throughout the many emails I have received from Terje during my investigations into this case, he has constantly emphasised the absolute trustworthiness of Win, Gary and Paula, and has no reason to doubt any of their claims. I would say that Terje is an extremely good judge of character, and is not easily fooled. He is convinced

that the 777 formation was genuine, but has no idea when it actually appeared during the night. Having examined the video evidence, he concludes that there is absolutely no evidence of human hoaxing that can be attributed to the creation of the 777 formation. Interestingly, he is not convinced that the bright flash reported by Win, Gary and Paula shortly after 03.00 hrs on the 1st July, 2007, necessarily had any connection with the appearance of the formation.

AR What were your first impressions of the main witness, Winston Keech?

- 10 -

AJB I had previously seen Win being interviewed on Terje Toftenes' 'East Field Incident' DVD. So I had already formulated a good impression of him, and he came across as an astute, intelligent, friendly and talkative guy with a scientific, engineering background. When I eventually met him, it kind of confirmed what Terje had been telling everyone, that he was a friendly, easygoing,

honest and sincere person. Since then, Win and I have become good friends and we regularly exchange research information.

AR What was Win's take on the 777 formation?

AJB Much the same as Terje and Gary King, really, that there was absolutely no evidence of any human presence in the East Field on the night in question. There's no doubt that Win is a very clever, perceptive guy, with a genuine interest in both the UFO and crop-circle phenomenon. Because of his engineering background he does have a sound knowledge of photographic and video systems and his approach is essentially a scientific one. Win was very upset at how some researchers criticised him simply because he decided from the outset that he had no intention of becoming involved in all the personal insults and wrangling which, perhaps predictably, has bedevilled the case from the start. I admire Win for maintaining his dignity throughout and contrary to what some of these so-called researchers have implied, I found him to be very forthcoming when discussing the 777 incident and sharing his evidence. Win only ever intended his surveillance footage to be available for objective and scientific analysis by serious researchers.

AR And you feel the same way about Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones?

AJB Well, Gary is very different to Win. I had the opportunity to discuss the 777 incident with him, and he came across as a very enthusiastic and likeable person. He was obviously very keen to 'spread the word' about his experience, which is perfectly understandable, given the momentous nature of the occasion. When I met Gary, he was a linguistics student at Cardiff University in South Wales, UK. Between 1985 and 1987 he had worked as a paralegal in London, before forming his own private investigator company.

A few researchers have commented that they find it strange that Gary appears to have suddenly appeared on the crop-circle scene, coincidentally with the 777 incident. Gary maintains that he has been involved with crop-circle research since 1997, when he walked into his first formation. When he met Winston Keech at Knap Hill in the early hours of the 6th July 2007, he was accompanied by his partner, Paula Presdee-Jones, also from Cardiff. I found Paula to be equally friendly, quiet and unassuming and there was no doubt in my mind that she had also been deeply affected by the events of the 6th / 7th July 2007.

AR Apart from Win, Gary and Paula, were there any other key witnesses to the

East Field incident that you were able to interview?

AJB Shortly after I began my investigations, I was informed that on the night in question, another person had coincidentally been conducting an all-night skywatch near the East Field, and had reported an unusual series of events. This person, whom I shall call John is, in my opinion, an extremely important witness, and his testimony deserves to be discussed in some detail. I interviewed

- 11 -

him around the middle of August 2007 and he was kind enough to send me a signed, written statement which described in detail what he had experienced. Although John is very keen for his story to be told, I am withholding his true identity and personal details for reasons of confidentiality. Everyone who has spoken to John, including myself, all agree that he seems to be a credible witness, with absolutely no reason or motive to fabricate his story, or deceive anyone, especially within the research community. What follows is a summary of John's experience, taken directly from his own written statement.

John was on holiday in Wiltshire with his wife, and on the evening of the 6th July 2007, he decided to conduct an all-night skywatch. With an interest in crop-circles and UFOs, he had previously visited this area of Wiltshire. The place

he chose to conduct his skywatch was a small recess or lay-by used as a silage pit by the local farmer; which is situated on the southern side of the East Field, skirted by the Alton Barnes to Pewsey road. The site is approximately a quarter of a mile from Knap Hill, to the north, and offers a panoramic 360 degree view of the Vale of Pewsey. John arrived at the silage pit at about 21.30 hrs, parking his car just inside the pit entrance, away from the main road. He sat in his car listening to music on his MP3 player. At about 22.30 hrs, a dark blue Jeep containing several people drove into the silage pit, facing his car without switching off its headlights. Someone got out of the Jeep, who John described as being possibly male, around five foot ten inches tall, slim, wearing a strange kind of coat with a lampshade-shaped hood. This person stepped directly behind the back window of John's car, where he was sitting on the back seat. John asked the mysterious person the question, 'Can I help you?' to which the figure turned away and walked back to the vehicle, which immediately exited the silage pit in the direction of Pewsey. Perhaps because John could not see this person's face due to the hood, he became rather unnerved and had even grabbed an umbrella for protection. After a few minutes following the Jeep's departure, John settled back to listen to his music, but his respite was short-lived, because about ten minutes later what appeared to be the same vehicle again drove into the silage pit and stopped a few yards from his car. On this occasion, four individuals got out of the Jeep and initially crossed the Pewsey road, stepping into the field opposite [known as South Field or Wilcot Brow]. John described these individuals as wearing dark coloured clothing, although one was clad in a light coloured lumberjack shirt. It was impossible to ascertain in the darkness whether they were male or female. After a few minutes they again crossed the road and one by one entered the East Field, hopping and jumping over the undergrowth in the foreground. They did not reappear. John was adamant that these four figures were definitely NOT carrying any equipment which may have been used for hoaxing crop formations i.e. stomping boards, garden rollers, poles, ropes or shoulder bags. As soon as the figures had disappeared into the darkness, the Jeep again drove off, this time in the opposite direction towards Alton Barnes. It did not return. For the second time in the space of thirty minutes, John felt a little unnerved but most of all curious as to why these people had walked into the East Field in the dead of night. He continued to listen to his music for an hour or so, then eventually went to sleep, waking at around 04.40 hrs the following morning. Stepping out of his car, he immediately noticed that an unexplained marking had appeared in the East Field to his right, that was most definitely not there the previous evening. This was, of course, the southern tip of the 777 formation, which was just visible from John's vantage point. The remainder of the formation was hidden due to the undulations in the field. Interestingly, John

- 12 -

told me that at 04.40 hrs, there were no other vehicles parked in the silage pit. This is odd, because according to Winston Keech and Gary King's testimonies,

Gary and Paula had driven down to the silage pit around 04.20 hrs and were filmed by Win entering the formation at approximately 04.30 hrs. After briefly viewing the formation, John then returned to his car and went back to sleep, again waking at 08.30 hrs. Shortly after, as news of the formation quickly spread,

more and more vehicles arrived at the silage pit.

AR No doubt, a very intriguing story. What was John's response and did he inform

any other researchers about his experience?

AJB John did in fact almost immediately speak to a wide variety of people, including some researchers, because he felt that what he had experienced could have a direct bearing on the 777 incident. He informed Terje Toftenes and Gary King and was rather annoyed that Terje in particular, did not include his testimony on the 'East Field Incident' DVD, which he was still producing at the time. He felt that he was being deliberately excluded, and that the public were being denied a balanced version of the events which had occurred that night.

AR Would I be correct in assuming that certain researchers, for example Win, Gary and Terje, were actively promoting a non-terrestrial explanation for the 777 formation, which is why they decided to omit John's story from the narrative, because it might have implied that the mysterious figures he had seen were hoaxers entering the field.

AJB It did seem too much of a coincidence that at least four individuals had entered the field in a rather suspicious manner on precisely the same night the 777 formation

had appeared only a short distance away. Inevitably, that is the conclusion most people, including some researchers, would come to. And it does follow that

if certain people, such as Terje, Win and Gary were promoting an exotic explanation, then yes, -it could be seen as counter-productive to include John's

story. It should be emphasised, however, that John has never stated that he thought

the 777 formation was a hoax - he is completely convinced that the figures he saw were NOT carrying any hoaxing equipment. He told me that the reactions of

some researchers to his story were downright rude whereas others were supportive.

I have spoken to John on many occasions, and he comes across as being friendly,

easy-going, sincere, and has always remained consistent when recounting his story.

AR But one still has to explain what actually happened with those strange figures.

AJB Although their behaviour seemed somewhat unusual, it has to be put into context

with the time of year and place where the incident occurred. I have spent many,

many hours during the summer months researching and investigating the cropcircle

phenomenon in the Vale of Pewsey area of Wiltshire. This has included frequent, occasionally all-night skywatches, often from the East Field silage pit area. In any other context, it would seem bizarre for people to be walking the hills and fields at night, but this is certainly not an unusual activity during the

months of June, July and August, particularly at the peak of the crop-circle season. Apart from the many campers and travellers, there are foreign tourists, researchers, and simply curiosity-seekers, all on the lookout for various anomalies

e.g. unexplained aerial lights or 'UFOs', which occasionally put in an

- 13 -

appearance. Whilst skywatching in my car, I have often been approached by inquisitive onlookers, some of whom are sociable, others simply ignore me and go about their business.

There is absolutely no evidence whatsoever to conclude that the four individuals seen entering the field by John were there to hoax a crop formation. Considering that local farmers are hyper-vigilant and protective of their soon to be harvested crop especially during July and August, it would be sheer folly for hoaxers to disembark from a vehicle, knowing that they were possibly being observed from an unidentified vehicle by someone who could quite easily have been a local farmer or resident, and simply a phone call away from alerting the police.

AR In that case, what about the possibility that John was a look-out for a hoaxing team?

AJB Very unlikely. On several occasions when parked in the silage pit area, I have been paid a visit by local farmers, police and even military police, who have questioned my reasons for parking there on what is, after all, private land. During 2007, some radical changes affected the farm which owns the East Field land and one noticeable result of these developments was a distinct increase in farm security, particularly at night. Many skywatchers, including myself, when parked in our vehicles in the Alton Barnes / East Field area were continually harassed, threatened and even subjected to identification checks by what appeared to be farm executives and the police. It would have therefore been a very unwise move to operate as a lookout for hoaxers and especially to park in probably the most high profile and accessible place to the East Field, whilst running the risk of being questioned and possibly prosecuted by the farmer or local police. Having interviewed John, who incidentally is not a resident of Wiltshire, I am satisfied that there was definitely no collusion with any alleged hoaxing activity on the night in question.

SECTION FIVE: DISINFORMATION AND THE INVOLVEMENT OF MATTHEW WILLIAMS IN THE 777 INCIDENT

AR Have your investigations uncovered any evidence of human involvement in the

. creation of the 777 crop formation?

AJB That is a very interesting question because I assume you are referring to the possibility of humans utilising traditional hoaxing methods e.g. stomping boards, planks, ropes and rollers. Considering the importance and uniqueness of the 777 formation, particularly when it became known that photographic and video evidence existed, it was perhaps inevitable that someone would come forward to claim that the formation had been a gigantic hoax. The crop-circle subject has been rife with disinformation ever since the notorious 'Doug 'n' Dave' hoaxing scam in the early 1990's.

AR Could you elaborate a little on the question of disinformation and why you think the 'Doug 'n' Dave' story was a scam?

AJB The 'Doug 'n' Dave' fiasco has now descended into crop-circle mythology, but the idea that two elderly gentlemen were somehow responsible for what was,

- 14 -

after all a global phenomenon, was preposterous and not commensurate with the research evidence available at the time. But from the perspective of spreading disinformation, the scam had a long-lasting effect which still resonates today. Predictably, every few years, an individual or team of so-called 'circlemakers' will appear on the scene to play on the naivety and gullibility of the public and, more depressingly, elements within the crop-circle research community, creating an atmosphere of confusion and cynicism, aided and abetted by the official authorities and the corporate media. And one name which always rises to the surface like an antique water buoy is Welshman Matthew Williams, who moved to live in Wiltshire in the 1990s. With synchronous precision, Williams just happens to be at the forefront of the debunking brigade eager to claim authorship of the 777 formation.

AR For those of us who are not familiar with Matthew Williams, it might be helpful if you could describe briefly his background and why you think his claims are so relevant to this case.

AJB Matthew Williams originates from South Wales, UK, and after completing his education, went to work for the British Government's Customs and Excise Agency, firstly in its Personnel Division and later in the Criminal Investigations Department. Williams admitted in an interview with UFO researcher and author Nick Redfern, that when he was with Customs and Excise, he regularly liaised with Royal Air Force [RAP] Rudloe Manor, near Corsham, Wiltshire UK.

It has been alleged by some UFO researchers, that covert UFO research was undertaken at this facility for many years, and that the base is situated above an extensive underground installation. Until 1998, the Royal Air Force's Provost and Security Services [P & SS], had their headquarters at RAP Rudloe Manor. And within the headquarters of the P & SS is a division known as the Flying Complaints Flight [FCF], which investigates complaints of low-flying military aircraft in Britain. I have already mentioned the involvement of the P & SS with highly covert crop-circle research in Wiltshire. Significantly, investigators of the P & SS undertake counter-intelligence work, hence the link with Matthew

Williams and RAP Rudloe Manor, because the FCF has the responsibility for RAF liaison with HM Customs and Excise. So one can speculate at the extent,

if any, of Williams' role in counter-intelligence specifically relating to UFOs and crop-circles, given that RAP Rudloe Manor was known to have some involvement in researching these phenomena in an official capacity. Would this explain Williams' interest in UFOs and crop-circle research, whilst he was still working for HM Customs and Excise? I first came into contact with Matthew

Williams in the mid -1990s, whilst attending crop-circle conferences around the country. There was no doubting his intelligence and knowledge of the UFO

and crop-circle phenomena. However, towards the late 1990s, Williams' behaviour became distinctly bizarre. In July 1997, together with fellow researcher

Richard Conway, he illegally entered a military facility adjacent to RAP Rudloe Manor. Their aim - to infiltrate a major defence facility and publicise their exploits and findings throughout the UFO community and general public, thus potentially jeopardising the UK's national security, should this information fall into the hands of terrorists. Williams was also claiming that he had been, together

with a colleague Paul Damon, faking crop-circles in the UK between 1996 and 1998, as a 'control experiment'. In 2000, Williams became the first person in Britain to be prosecuted by Wiltshire magistrates. He admitted causing criminal

damage to a wheat field at West Overton, Wiltshire, in August of that year. He - 15 -

boasted to reporters that the reason he had created a seven-pointed star design crop-circle was to prove to the public and other researchers that 'aliens' were not responsible for the vast majority of the formations. Of course, his criminal escapade proved nothing of the sort. Whereas most crop formations appear in one night and within a few hours, Williams took no less than three nights to create what was actually quite a small, simple and rather unimpressive design. In my opinion, this whole fiasco, despite landing Williams with a criminal record, was nothing more than a blatant publicity stunt, primarily to give the media an opportunity to once again debunk the crop-circle phenomenon, since the report of his prosecution appeared in the national daily newspapers throughout the UK.

Matthew Williams has been described by some members of the research community as a liar, charlatan, publicity-seeker, spreader of disinformation and even Government Agent. More worryingly, there are a growing number of researchers who actually believe and admire his alleged 'circlemaking' abilities, despite the fact that, apart from a few commissioned formations, there is a distinct lack of hard evidence to substantiate his claims. Given the highly dubious nature of Matthew Williams' statements, I find it hard to understand why these researchers continue to promote him in a favourable light, particularly in the context of his claims pertaining to the 777 incident. I mean, would you trust a person with a proven criminal record who has risked jeopardising the UK's national security by illegally breaking into military establishments, then publishing his findings to all and sundry.

AR How did you first discover that Matthew Williams was involved in the 777 incident?

AJB I was first informed by the London based film-maker and UFO researcher Miles Johnston. Miles had already produced a DVD recording of the 777 incident Press Conference, which was organised by Terje Toftenes, and held at the Coronation Hall, Alton Barnes, Wiltshire, UK on July 19th 2007. By that time, Williams was already claiming that he was somehow involved in the 777 incident, so Miles decided to film a lengthy interview with him, which was immediately released as a DVD and posted on the internet. Williams was insistent that, although he knew several of the 'circlemakers' by name, he wasn't actually involved in the construction of the formation. There were also nasty rumours and insinuations that Winston Keech and Gary King were involved in a scam of gigantic proportions.

AR What was your reaction when you became aware of these quite serious allegations?

AJB Well, you must understand that I was still quite new to the case, and really hadn't had the opportunity to formulate a clear picture. I resolved to remain open-minded and take seriously any new evidence, however unpalatable it

might seem. Fortunately, I was able to meet and interview several members of the 'circlemaking' team who claimed they were responsible for hoaxing the 777 formation. I intend to discuss their testimonies in detail, together with the claims of Matthew Williams, because it is important that everyone who reads this interview, has a balanced view of the 777 incident. The following information was taken from the interview Williams conducted with Miles Johnston.

- 16 -

According to Williams, the 'circlemaking team' allegedly responsible for the 777 formation consisted of at least eight people, including women. They arrived in a vehicle at the East Field silage pit at about 22.00 hrs on the 6th July 2007. They noticed a car already parked there, and one of the team decided to alert the occupant, who appeared to be listening to some music. Because darkness had not yet fallen, they decided to drive around for a while, eventually returning to the silage pit at 22.30 hrs, when they entered the field. They began work on the formation at about 23.00 hrs and completed their work around 04.00 hrs on the 7th July 2007. Some members of the team then decided to climb to the summit of Knap Hill, where they introduced themselves to Winston Keech and Gary King. There was also a mention of other vehicles parked around the perimeter of the East Field throughout the night, inferring that they also belonged to the alleged 'circlemakers'. There was even a rumour that Winston Keech had even filmed these vehicles as part of his surveillance procedure.

AR Have any other witnesses come forward to substantiate these claims, for example, Winston Keech or Gary King?

AJB Here again, we are dealing with hearsay and rumour. I asked Win if he had noticed any vehicles parked overnight in the East Field because he had been particularly keen to observe and record any suspicious vehicles seen in the vicinity of the East Field during his all-night surveillance. The only vehicle he mentioned to me was the car belonging to John who was, of course, parked in the silage pit area from dusk till dawn on the 6th / 7th July. There is a rumour that Win had indeed filmed other vehicles parked in the field, but he certainly did not mention any of this to me when I interviewed him. Of course, the presence of vehicles parked in or near the East Field during the summer months is not necessarily suspicious, for example, note the presence of John's car in the silage pit area, given the popularity of this locality with skywatchers, campers, travellers and tourists. My own enquiries have revealed that there may also have been some farm estate vehicles parked in the vicinity of the East Field for at least some part of the night. Regarding the return of the so-called 'circlemakers' to rendezvous with Win and Gary at Knap Hill around 05.00 hrs on the morning of the 7th July. By that time, of course, Gary and Paula had already departed to enter the East Field to view the 777 formation [around 04.30 hrs], but Win was still on the hill for at least another thirty minutes, until he decided to walk down the hill to meet up with Gary and Paula in the formation. Win and his partner did mention to me that there were some unidentified persons who had walked up the hill at around 05.00 hrs. As Terje Toftenes has stated, they were more likely to have been 'early bird croppies', skywatchers or even travellers / campers, many of whom had been present in the Knap Hill car park below for several weeks previously. Win told me that he could definitely not positively identify any of them as 'circlemakers'. They did not show any signs of having toiled and sweated and worked in a dirty environment for many hours making the East Field crop formation. As I will later reveal, I do not discount the possibility that certain individuals, possibly the same unidentified figures who had approached John the previous evening at the

silage pit area, may have deliberately targeted Win in order to implicate him in their version of events.

According to Matthew Williams, the design of the 777 formation was based on the Eastern 'Om or Aum' symbol. Apparently, there were several construction

- 17 -

errors, with some components wrongly placed, and despite working non-stop throughout the night, the team eventually ran out of time. Traditional hoaxing methods were applied, for example, the use of stomping boards, planks and tape measures. There was no mention of any torches or lights being used.

Preliminary planning and design was kept to a minimum with more emphasis placed on spontaneity and guesswork. All the main components were circular and not oval, as postulated by some researchers. Williams stated that the circlemaking team were angry that some researchers were promoting a nonterrestrial

explanation for their handiwork, and were not impressed at the claims made by Winston Keech and Gary King. Accusations were made that Winston Keech had been using inferior recording equipment, and he had failed to scan the correct area of the field with his image-intensifier. Whilst constructing the formation, none of the team had noticed any unusual flashes of light mentioned

by Win, Gary and Paula shortly after 03.00 hrs. Williams then provided a fairly ludicrous explanation for the flash of light - that one of the 'circlemakers' had accidentally set fire to his or her hair, whilst smoking a cigarette! He then went on to display a remarkable ignorance of the topography of the East Field,

insisting that the East Field formation was constructed 'on the level', whereas in reality it had appeared on an extremely undulating part of the field - literally one end of the formation could not be seen from the other.

Williams even suggested that the team were prepared to confess their circlemaking

to the local police authorities, risking arrest and possible prosecution for gross criminal damage, in order to prove to the world, including other researchers, that

they had made the formation. He then accused certain individuals, and I take his

accusations personally, of deliberately spreading outrageous stories regarding the

unprecedented levels of military activity over and in the vicinity of the 777 formation, which he attributed to routine training exercises.

AR When this information was eventually released via the internet and DVD, what

was the reaction from the general public and the research community?

AJB Matthew Williams is a very persuasive character and I've no doubt that many

people who did not have access to all the evidence and witness testimonies . would have been easily taken in by his version of events. One should not overlook his past history with the Security Services at an official level together with his alleged links with military intelligence. Anyone with an ounce of common sense should be deeply suspicious of his so-called 'research activities' and 'agendas', particularly his connections with the crop-circle

'hoaxing' fraternity. If one of his prime motives is to divide and conquer the less discerning amongst the research community by allegedly spreading disinformation as to the origin of the crop-circles, there is no doubt that he has achieved a modicum of success, despite the fact that many researchers, such as

myself, can see through this veil of smoke and mirrors. The discrepancies in Williams' story would become all too apparent when I had the opportunity to meet and interview several members of the alleged 'circlemaking team' he claimed had constructed the 777 crop formation.

- 18 -

SECTION SIX: MEET 'THE CIRCLEMAKERS'

AR Did you encounter many problems locating and interviewing these so-called 'circlemakers'?

AJB I had received some prior 'intelligence' via contact within the crop-circle research community as to the identity of some of these individuals. The meeting I had with them was not planned but rather came about through the intervention of two colleagues of mine who had already arranged a prior meeting, which took place in October 2007. I was able to speak to three members of the alleged team in the presence of two reliable witnesses who were already familiar with the background to the 777 incident.

They began by insisting that they were part of a larger team of about **eight** people **including Matthew Williams**, who had apparently helped in the construction of the 777 formation. I noticed that one of the female members of the team was wearing an 'Om / Aum' neck pendant. She persistently pointed to this item of jewellery in a rather obvious fashion, insisting that it was her inspiration for designing the 777 crop formation. It was confirmed that they had arrived at the East Field silage pit at around 22.30 hrs on the 6th July 2007, when they approached an unmarked vehicle, which was later identified as John's car. There seemed to be the inference that it was actually Matthew Williams who initiated contact with John by tapping on his window. During the interview, one of the team, who seemed to act as a spokesperson, insisted that he had arrived at the East Field independently, parking his vehicle a little further down the road from the silage pit, where an ancient track-way [known locally as the Workway Drove Track] meets the main Pewsey road. They began constructing the formation around 23.00 hrs, completing their work around 03.00 hrs the following morning on the 7th July. Whilst asking the 'circlemaking' team to confirm the times they actually vacated the field following their alleged completion of the formation, they suddenly began to argue amongst themselves over the accuracy of these times and even reacted angrily to one of my colleagues because he was asking them 'awkward questions'. The spokesperson mentioned that he remembered driving past the silage pit towards Devizes at around 03.40 hrs because, according to him, his vehicle had been recorded on Winston Keech's all-night surveillance footage! He even boasted that there had been enough time to return home, have a shower, then travel back to Knap Hill, when he met Win Keech and Gary King at 05.30 hrs, presumably to discuss his handiwork in the field below. Later forensic analysis of Win's video evidence clearly shows a 'completed' 777 formation at least before 03.20 hrs, with still almost an hour of darkness in hand. This fact dispels the 'circlemakers' insistence that they had 'run out of time'. There seemed to be a consensus agreement that they had all vacated the East Field by dawn, and the female member of the team confirmed that the formation had taken approximately four and a half hours to construct. By 01.30 hrs, they had apparently already constructed over half of the

formation. The importance of this remark would emerge later in my investigations when I had the opportunity to review analysis undertaken on some of Win Keech's night-time photographic and video-footage.

It was during the interview, which lasted several hours, that Matthew Williams unexpectedly arrived. He seemed rather unnerved by my presence and refrained from joining in with our discussion. Much of what he had told to Miles Johnston

- 19-

during the filmed interview, which I have already discussed with you, was more or less confirmed by his colleagues during our discussion, with one notable exception, which would have a crucial bearing on our later findings. The spokesperson

insisted that during the construction of the formation, they had definitely used lights in the form of small torches [not flashlights], due to the very low ambient light levels - there was dense cloud cover and no moonlight. He also bragged about the fact that there was virtually no prior planning or surveying required, and that most of the formation was created by guessing the proportions and measurements. There was also confirmation of one of Matthew Williams more ludicrous remarks, that one of the 'circlemaking' team had in fact accidentally set fire to his or her hair whilst smoking a cigarette, and that this probably accounted for the bright flash witnessed by Win, Gary and Paula shortly after 03.00 hrs. No other unusual flashes of light had been witnessed throughout the night. There was no mention of any other vehicles parked in the East Field during the night in question.

AR How did you and your colleagues feel whilst talking to these individuals? Could you describe the atmosphere - was it friendly or intimidating?

AJB I personally felt very uncomfortable and nervous in their presence. One of the 'circlemaking' team was at times very aggressive and actually quite threatening.

AR Threatening - in what way?

AJB Well, I got the distinct impression that he wasn't going to stand for any nonsense. As far as he was concerned, we had better accept his story and as I was about to leave, he actually warned me not to discuss with anyone the details of our meeting: or to publish anything or mention any personal details. They were not the type of characters with whom you would choose to get into any serious arguments or disagreements.

AR Yet, by mentioning them in this interview, you are ostensibly putting yourself

at risk. Do you fear for your safety?

AJB I did at the time, and certainly watched my back as I left the meeting. There was no way I would have met these characters alone and without support from my colleagues.

AR It seems rather paradoxical that they didn't want you to broadcast any details

of the meeting, yet were willing to talk to you and your colleagues about their alleged 'circlemaking' activities.

AJB Only in so far as they seemed desperate to get their message across that they were

the creators, not only of the 777 formation, but of many of the other complex crop patterns which had been appearing in recent years. They came across as arrogant and egotistical, and keen to advertise their so-called wonderful achievements. I think the paradox arose as a result of Matthew Williams stating in his interview with Miles Johnston that members of the team would have been prepared to own up to the police in order to prove to the world that they were the true 'circlemaking' agency behind the 777 incident. However, the spokesperson for the team was very

concerned that they may have been spotted [presumably by John], when they had
- 20 -

entered the field and as a consequence they might have been reported to either the police or the farmer. Conscious of what had happened to Williams several years previously, it was not inconceivable that they might also be arrested and prosecuted for criminal damage. The female member of the team then remarked that they never retained any designs of crop formations they had created, should they later be interrogated by the police. So perhaps this explains their veiled threat to me to remain silent about the meeting.

AR Which, again, you are choosing to ignore?

AJB I think it is vitally important that the facts about this incident are established otherwise how are we to arrive at a balanced assessment. That is a risk I am prepared to take. And to be fair to these so-called 'circlemakers' - if they are telling the truth, then surely they have nothing to hide about their alleged activities - apart from the farmers, and the police, of course.

AR So, having had the opportunity to speak to this alleged team of 'circlemakers'

and listened to the filmed interview of Matthew Williams, have you come to any conclusions regarding their claims to have constructed the 777 crop formation?

AJB Perhaps I should begin by quoting it statement by one of the contributors to an internet website forum debate about the 'East Field Incident', which I intend to discuss in greater detail in the next section of this interview:

'I just want to add here, that the Matthew Williams account stands up, fits in with what Winston Keech says, in terms of the time frame, the people up the hill, the cars, the fmal photo, etc etc. It also fits with other peoples' experience, the guy in the silo area, who without knowing anything about Matthew Williams account reported that he was doing something in the back of the car when a Range Rover appeared I was lucky enough to hear his account of that night and what he says really points to Matthew Williams telling the truth.'

'JustMe' - The East Field Incident 2007. Crop Circle Connector Forum. Posted - Saturday, December 1st 2007.

It is not my intention to pass judgement on the character of Matthew Williams, or the team of so-called 'circlemakers' we have heard about. I only intend to comment on their claims regarding the origin of the 777 crop formation. I have already provided background information to Williams' involvement with the crop-circle subject, so it is up to the reader / listener to make up his or her own mind. Everything that he stated in his interview with Miles Johnston was already known to me and many other researchers, within a few days of the 777 incident. It is entirely possible that Williams and the other 'circlemakers' could have concocted their version of events based on circumstantial and anecdotal evidence, hearsay and information about the 777 incident already featured on numerous internet websites. I have taken the time to study in detail the statements made to me by Williams and the alleged team of 'circlemakers' and have compared their version of events of the 6th / 7th July 2007 with the statements made by some of the other key witnesses. What is significant are not only some fairly
- 21 -

obvious discrepancies between these different groups of witnesses but the fact

that the 'circlemakers' cannot agree amongst themselves on many important points. For example, according to Matthew Williams, he was not actually involved in the 777 incident, whereas all of his colleagues were in agreement

that he had helped them to construct the formation. The witness I have identified as 'John' who had arrived at the East Field silage pit at 22.00 hrs stated that the vehicle containing the unidentified figures arrived at 22.30 hrs whereas, according to Williams, it was half an hour earlier. However, there does seem to be some agreement between Williams and the rest of the team when their alleged construction work began - around 23.00 hrs. Unfortunately, thereafter, the timeline of events severely breaks down. Williams stated that it took five hours to construct the formation, with the team apparently working flat out, eventually running out of time and making several design errors in the process. This statement is contradicted by the team's spokesperson who boasted that, after completing the formation at around 03.20 hrs, he had plenty of time to travel home, shower and return again to Knap Hill soon after 05.00 hrs! Whereas, according to Williams, the team had completed the formation sometime between 04.00 hrs and 04.30 hrs, when the team had left the field, approximately at the same time that Gary King and Paula Pres dee-Jones were entering the formation for the first time. According to the 'circlemakers', the construction time was somewhere between three and four hours, and they vacated the field around 03.30 hrs. This is quite a glaring inconsistency, considering that Williams was allegedly part of the 'circlemaking' team! On the morning of the 7th July, dawn occurred around 04.30 hrs, therefore it was inconceivable that Gary and Paula would not have seen one or more of the 'circlemaking' team either in the formation or leaving the field, had Williams' version of events been correct. There was agreement of the type of hoaxing equipment used, for example, stumping boards, measuring tapes etc. However, once the details of the construction methods are discussed, we again run into a plethora of contradictions. For example; the 'circlemakers' insist that the 777 formation was a design based exclusively on the Eastern 'Om / Aum' symbol, yet there are many elements in the completed formation which are not wholly consistent with that particular design concept. Obviously, there have been numerous interpretations of the 777 formation, and it is not within the remit of this interview to discuss them in any great depth. Internet websites such as 'The Crop Circle Connector' include articles by other researchers regarding the symbolic meanings of various crop formations which are worth studying by those interested in the 777 formation. Matthew Williams and the 'circlemakers' insist that no surveying or plarming was involved in the construction of the

777 formation. However, it would be inconceivable, given the highly undulating nature of the East Field, to construct such a large pattern without a fairly sophisticated degree of prior planning.

Another striking contradiction arises regarding the 'circlemakers' willingness to confess their exploits to the police in order to be arrested, in order to bring to the attention of the public their nocturnal exploits. Yet they were also extremely keen to emphasise that all their designs and plans were destroyed because they feared they might be caught and arrested for criminal damage, especially considering Matthew Williams' previous conviction for hoaxing a crop formation. Williams also denied that the team used any lights or torches when constructing the formation, hardly a factor that would easily have been overlooked. Yet other members of the team were adamant that there was absolutely no way they would have been able to see each other in the field, due to the very low ambient light levels on the 6th / 1^h July. Of course, even a modicum of common sense would dictate that such a complex design would have required artificial light sources in order to be constructed. The use of night vision goggles and GPS positioning systems cannot be ruled out, which surely would have been referred to by the team, as they were so keen to impress upon me their 'circlemaking' skills. Neither did any of the team witness the bright flash of light reported by Win, Gary and Paula, shortly after 03.00 hrs. Then follows the truly ludicrous 'explanation' for this occurrence, that one of the 'circlemaking' team accidentally set alight his or her hair whilst smoking a cigarette! This statement alone, in my opinion, completely discredits both Williams and the 'circlemakers' as credible witnesses.

Are we seriously meant to believe that a so-called experienced team of 'circlemakers' would risk using a naked flame in a tinder dry field of wheat and then expect us to accept that setting fire to one's hair could create the kind of light phenomenon sufficiently bright enough to be noticed a quarter of a mile away, and be registered on Win's camera equipment.

Williams' statement that members of the 'circlemaking' team approached Win Keech at Knap Hill early on the morning of the 1^h July, is again not wholly consistent with the facts. We do have witness testimonies from Win Keech and John, that several unidentified individuals were seen to have deliberately announced their presence in the vicinity of the East Field on the 6th / 1^h July.

I can only conclude that, given Matthew Williams' existing criminal record,

together with the 'circlemakers' fear of being observed and prosecuted, it seems totally implausible that they would run the considerable risk of being caught by approaching the unidentified vehicle in the silage pit, then without a positive identification, enter the field. The 'circlemakers' spokesperson also told me that he had parked his vehicle further down the road from the silage pit, again in a vulnerable position. I conclude that these individuals had one purpose only, to be seen in the East Field area on the night in question, perhaps

in order to give credence to their later version of events. Does this imply that they somehow had prior knowledge that some major event was about to happen,

or are we dealing with a monumental coincidence? I think not. .

AR It does seem extraordinary that we have all these various factions serendipitously

conducting their seemingly disconnected nocturnal pursuits in the midst of an ongoing inexplicable series of events on the night in question.

AJB I agree, which is why it is so important to draw all these seemingly unconnected

strands together. We are dealing with vital components or pieces in a jigsaw puzzle with some tricky assembly issues, if you see what I mean. Gradually, the puzzle is being resolved, and the picture becoming a little clearer.

AR So, if I am understanding you correctly, from what you have already stated regarding the background of Matthew Williams and his connection to this alleged team of 'circlemakers', that we are dealing with the blatant spreading of disinformation in order to confuse and discredit the key witnesses?

AJB Of course, Matthew Williams would deny any part in a dis information campaign,

but equally, we can see all the inconsistencies in his version of events. Both he

and the team of 'circlemakers' have failed to provide even one piece of hard evidence to substantiate their claims. All we have is rumour, hearsay and anecdotal

claims, none of which would stand up in any court of law in this land.

If this is the case, it makes sense to conclude that one reason these individuals

- 23 -

are so keen to announce their presence and keenly promote their version of events, is to try and convince the less discerning members of the public and the crop-circle research community that they are the true 'circlemakers'.

AR Could it not also be a simple case of a few very egocentric individuals pretending

to be the 'circlemaking agency', masquerading as 'land artists', whilst relishing all the accompanying notoriety and 'celebrity status'?

AJB I don't doubt that the massaging of their huge egos and acquiring a certain degree of fame and notoriety are bonus points in their favour, but it should not be overlooked that the real motives behind their activities could be a lot more sinister. We simply cannot take out of historical context the continual attempt by the various authorities, for example, the intelligence agencies and the Ministry of Defence, to debunk and discredit phenomena such as UFO and crop-circle events. I have already established a proven link between the phenomenon and our defence agencies and it is unlikely that such authorities

would be keen to draw too much attention to their activities, particularly in the public arena and at 'ground level'. So they resort to employing what are termed 'sleeper agents' to do their dirty work. Since the 'Doug 'n' Dave' scam, we have noticed a continuous stream of groups and individuals who have nefariously and surreptitiously infiltrated the crop-circle subject, often masquerading as legitimate researchers, in order to pass on 'insider knowledge' of their findings to their 'superiors'. And, on the whole, they have achieved a fairly high degree of success in discrediting these phenomena in the eyes of the public, often utilising the corporate media to further their aims.

Incidents such as the 777 crop formation, especially considering its unique historical status, would be bound to attract an extremely high level of surveillance and monitoring from the intelligence agencies and military authorities, which was certainly borne out following the incident. It is therefore not surprising that individuals such as Matthew Williams and his band of so-called 'circlemakers' should immediately make their presence known following these events. I would say that 'deny everything' is their motto, when confronted with these issues.

SECTION SEVEN: THE PRESS CONFERENCE

AR I would like to discuss with you in some detail the reaction of the media, the

general public, and importantly, the crop-circle research community to the 777 incident. Was there a great deal of publicity surrounding this event and how did this subsequently affect your research and investigations?

AJB I agree with you that these are extremely important issues, because the way the general public and the research community perceived the 777 incident was heavily influenced, some would say manipulated by the press and media coverage.

When I initially spoke to Terje Toftenes, which would be only a week following the incident; he informed me that he intended to produce a short DVD film documentary containing an overview of the event, including interviews with Winston Keech, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones. This was to be followed soon after by a Press Conference, where various members of the research community, together with local and national media would be invited to attend. This would be held at the Coronation Hall, Alton Barnes, Wiltshire, UK,
- 24-

on July 19th 2007, just down the road from the East Field. Terje only had a few days to produce and edit the DVD and organise the event, and I think he did an

excellent job in his attempts to bring this important crop-circle event to the attention of the public .

.AR A cynic might argue that his motives to publicise and promote this event might

have been for commercial gain rather than scientific enquiry and debate.

AJB I disagree. Terje did not intend to seek publicity or achieve any commercial gain

and, although his DVD was for sale for a very minimal price merely to cover production costs, he was quite willing to allow it to be copied free of charge, as

he felt it important for the information to be disseminated to a wider audience.

AR Could you describe the DvN in more detail, as I gather it later came in for some criticism?

AJB The DVD was very useful in that it contained a lengthy interview with Win Keech, where he meticulously described the events of the 6th

/ In July 2007,

together with the camera equipment he used. Gary King and his partner Paula Presdee-Jones were also interviewed, and it was obvious to see their unbridled

enthusiasm and excitement by what they had experienced. Unfortunately, because of time constraints, Terje rather rushed the production and some of the edits failed to adequately include enough of Win's video and photographic evidence, apart from a few brief night-time scans of the East Field. However, it should be emphasised that the main purpose of the DVD was to provide an overview of the incident, and it would have been impossible to have included any significant amount of Win's footage, which extended to over fifteen hours. But the DVD is certainly an invaluable record of these remarkable events, and Terje should be congratulated for his efforts, despite all the production and time constraints.

AR Did you have the opportunity to attend the Press Conference and was it successful as a media event?

AJB Yes, I attended the event, which incidentally was recorded on video by London

based film-maker Miles Johnston and later released as 'Oh To Catch a Circlemaker'.

This included an updated interview with Winston Keech and myself, where I describe in detail my experiences with the military activity in the vicinity of the 777 formation during the weeks following its appearance. Unfortunately, the press conference was rather sparsely attended, not only by the

media, but surprisingly also by the crop-circle research community.

Considering

that we were dealing with a potentially ground-breaking event, this lack of enquiry

was highly disappointing. One would have assumed that researchers and perhaps even the alleged 'circlemakers' might have had some interesting questions to put to some of the key witnesses, who included Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones. Regrettably, because of work commitments, Winston Keech was unable to attend the event.

AR That was very unfortunate, because surely Win was the key witness and would

have had the opportunity to present his version of events. Why do you think the press conference was so poorly attended?

- 25-

AJB I think there were several reasons. Firstly, the press conference was held during

the week, which meant that many researchers, including Win, would have been

at work. Secondly, it perhaps wasn't surprising that elements of the press and television stayed away, given their preconceived and somewhat jaundiced view

of the crop-circle phenomenon. On a positive note, several reporters from the local press were present, which resulted in a balanced and informative article appearing in both the 'Western Daily Press' on July 20th 2007, and the 'Wiltshire

Gazette and Herald' on July 26th 2007, and both newspapers attract a wide local readership. I had rather hoped that representatives from the national press, television and radio would have taken the time and trouble to attend. Despite these failings, the 777 incident would soon be reported nationally on hundreds of internet websites, and also the UK BBC and Channel 4 television.

Several high profile crop-circle researchers were in attendance, including Janet

Ossebaard and Lucy Pringle, who to her credit, has continued to provide unbiased

and factual information about the 777 incident on her website. Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones were able to answer questions about their experiences which certainly aroused the interest of the reporters present. Terje Toftenes played his 'East Field Incident' DVD to the audience, so at least we had the opportunity to hear his and Win Keech's version of events for the first time.

SECTION EIGHT: CONTROVERSY AND DECEPTION: REACTIONS FROM THE CROP-CIRCLE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

AR Would I be correct to conclude that you were decidedly unimpressed by the

reactions of the crop-circle community to the 777 incident?

AJB Throughout the twenty years I have been researching this phenomenon, I can

honestly say that I have never experienced such prejudicial and pernicious behaviour from some elements within the research community. I have absolutely

no doubt that their motives were partly to discredit, not only myself, but also the

key witnesses to this case, particularly Winston Keech, by spreading unfounded

and malicious rumours, dis information and downright spiteful insinuations, which directly affected and threatened the personal integrity of those involved. To illustrate the level at which some of these misguided individuals are operating,

I have included a few quotations which were featured on one of the most popular

crop-circle websites, the internationally renowned 'Crop Circle Connector'.

'I'm not sure which was the more amateurish, the East Field formation, or the tin-pot con this pack of dicks has tried to get away with.'

'Farmer's Boy' - The East Field Incident 2007. Crop Circle Connector Forum. Posted - Sunday, December 16th 2007.

' ... because I believe 777 was an inside job, a man-made crop-circle event made

purely for the purpose to 'deceive' ... '

'Celtic King' - The East Field Incident 2007. Crop Circle Connector Forum. Posted - Tuesday, December 4th 2007.

- 26-

'Terje lied, yes, read my words, HE LIED, or has a memory problem!!! Shoot me down anyone, I don't give a shit anymore. The East Field was man-made ... '

'JustMe' - The East Field Incident 2007. Crop Circle Connector

Forum. Posted - Saturday, January 1th 2008.

'I have grave doubts about the helicopters story, because one of the main sources on it is known to be highly unreliable at the best of times, and I think this has received more publicity than it deserves there's too much paranoia about this helicopter stuff, in my opinion. I'm copying this to Linda Moulton Howe too, because I think she needs to be aware that these stories remain unsubstantiated, and probably will stay that way. If I'm wrong, I'll eat humble pie, but I'm not holding my breath '

Andy Thomas in an email to Doug Rogers and Linda Moulton Howe
[Earthfiles.com website] - July 24th 2007.

AR These examples are truly awful and I might add libellous and defamatory in

nature. Since when did these so-called 'researchers' assume the right to cast judgement on your competence as a researcher? And why do you think their remarks are so vindictive and malicious? Were they typical of the attitudes of other crop-circle researchers?

AJB I will discuss in greater detail some of their remarks and the individuals named above in due course. Of course, none of them have any right to attack and discredit researchers such as myself, Winston Keech, Gary King and Terje Toftenes, in such a distasteful and spiteful manner. In order to maintain my integrity as a researcher I am thus forced to go on the offensive. I was initially reluctant to name some of these individuals, but since they have chosen to discredit our names in public, I intend to return the compliment. Note that some of the accusers are 'big names' amongst the wider crop-circle community and therefore have a significant influence on other researchers and members of the public by what they write and report. I suspect their motives include spite, jealousy, the desire to inflate their already huge egos, and simply to cause confusion and mischief. They spread gossip and rumour mostly via internet websites but occasionally also the media, books and DVD documentaries. The effects can often have quite devastating consequences for the victims concerned. Fortunately, there were a few researchers who were prepared to report and investigate the 777 incident in a decent, dignified, objective and open-minded manner which it deserved.

AR When did these accusations begin? Was there anything specific about this particular case which may have prompted such an overwhelmingly negative response?

AJB The accusations began almost immediately the 777 incident began to filter through

to the research community. The key witnesses, especially Winston Keech and Gary King were viewed with a great deal of scepticism, with some researchers actually accusing them of conspiring in a well orchestrated scam to hoax the film and the entire 777 incident for reasons of self-publicity and monetary gain. It should be

- 27-

emphasised that none of these self-styled researchers had actually bothered to speak to Win, Gary, Paula and Terje Toftenes, to hear their side of the story. However, it really doesn't surprise me that elements within the crop-circle and UFO research communities would resort to such tactics. There is much evidence to point to a long-term hijacking of these subjects by not only the so-called 'New Age' community, but also by the researchers themselves, along with the media, intelligence and security services, all of whom. I have reason to believe operate and collude to sabotage, manipulate and discredit witnesses where the need arises, by spreading confusion and dis information throughout the public arena. Of course, an entire 'cottage industry' has been built up over the years around the crop-circle subject, a circus which annually turns on its axis, sprouting the same speakers, conferences and merchandise. It soon becomes evident that it perhaps

would not be in the best interest for some of these self-styled 'experts' to solve the crop-circle mystery along with the financial losses which they may incur. As a result, all serious objective and scientific research goes out of the window. From the government agencies perspective, this is fine, as I'm sure they just sit back and laugh at the whole sorry affair. The 777 incident was a good example where hard evidence for a truly remarkable event was literally trashed out of existence by elements within the crop-circle community. The emergence of incontrovertible evidence which might, for the first time provide some solid answers to solve the crop-circle mystery would no doubt be perceived as a direct threat to some of these individuals long-term interests in promulgating an exotic, supernatural or extra-terrestrial explanation for the phenomenon.

AR We can provide examples in modern scientific research where certain subjects,

for example, quantum physics, have been hijacked by what I would term a kind of populist, 'New Age' pseudo-science. And in many ways, subjects such as UFOs and crop-circles have also fallen under the umbrella of these pseudo-sciences.

AJB Unfortunately, I agree with you. Many of us do not have a scientific background or training. However, researchers such as Win Keech do, which might explain his desire to remain anonymous and distance himself from the mainstream cropcircle research community.

AR There are many internet web sites which explore the crop-circle phenomenon

in what I have already described as a pseudo-scientific context. Are there any websites which, in your opinion, deserve merit for their approach in representing this subject in a more objective and informative manner, particularly regarding the 777 incident?

AJB Probably the most well-known and frequently visited crop-circle website is the , UK-based 'Crop Circle Connector', administered by researchers Stuart Dike and Mark Fussell. It provides a valuable resource for investigators and enthusiasts to submit field reports and aerial photographs / diagrams of all the latest crop formations, as they occur throughout the year. It also offers a useful forum for debate and speculation about the phenomenon. The 777 incident was no exception, with up-to-date field reports and aerial images of the formation appearing on the website soon after the 6th

/ 7th July 2007. Similarly, the American researcher Linda

Moulton Howe also posted a lengthy report on her 'Earthfiles' website, which also included in-depth interviews with Gary King, Winston Keech and Terje Toftenes.

My own interview with Linda regarding my experiences of the military activity

- 28 -

following the 777 incident was soon added as a postscript to her initial report.

As a result of the massive, international response to the incident, an American researcher adopting the pseudonym 'Peaceful' decided to devote a 'thread' entitled the 'East Field Incident 2007' on the Crop Circle Connector Forum. This soon became a focus for debate on the incident, which is still operating to date, and now numbering over 260 pages. Whilst the Forum allowed a legitimate opportunity for researchers to discuss important issues surrounding the 777 incident, unfortunately it also provided a golden opportunity for some elements within the global research community to abuse these privileges and descend into an avalanche of personal abuse and deceit. Before I discuss some of the more disturbing aspects of how these malicious rumours were to personally affect the lives of some of the key witnesses, including myself, and irrevocably tarnish this important case, I should emphasise from the outset that in no way do I hold the

'Crop Circle Connector' website and its administrators personally responsible for the comments made on the Forum 'blog'. I think I am correct in assuming that Mark Fussell reserves the right to remove any contributors to the Forum who transgress the rules of engagement which are clearly stated on the 'Crop Circle Connector' website. The rules state unequivocally that the contributors are prohibited from using any abusive, obscene, slanderous, hateful or threatening material and doing so may lead to a permanent ban by the webmaster, administrator, and moderators of the Forum.

AR It appears from the examples you included previously, that these rules of engagement were not adhered to.

AJB That is correct, and I hold the contributors to the Forum who broke the rules entirely responsible for their actions and the comments they made. Whilst the majority of the participants behaved in an acceptable manner, there seemed to be a hard core who displayed a wholly disrespectful attitude throughout, with often libellous and highly defamatory remarks aimed at the key witnesses, especially Winston Keech. There is something very insidious and disingenuous about individuals who hide behind pseudonyms rather than conduct their communications in an open, honest and transparent fashion. Win, Gary, Terje and myself have chosen to distance ourselves from this group of dubious individuals, whose sole aim seems to be to spread dis information and unsubstantiated

rumour, whilst indulging themselves in the lowest form of juvenile, playground mentality. Those of us who consider ourselves to be serious researchers and consider the 777 incident to be of monumental importance do not take kindly to the kind of baseless character assassinations aimed at us, none of which are actually rooted in fact. These false accusations have caused a great deal of personal anxiety and frustration, especially to Win Keech. There is enough evidence within the Crop Circle Connector Forum blog alone to incriminate those responsible with legal action for gross defamation of character. With regard to the prejudicial and injurious remarks made regarding my own experiences of the 777 incident, I have decided to consult a solicitor who has been presented with all the relevant information and my colleague has assured me that I have very good grounds for pursuing a course of legal action against the persons responsible. I certainly would not hesitate to sue anyone for defamation of character should my name appear in any way, shape or form on any website, or in any book, article, documentary, in a detrimental or misleading fashion. I think I speak for the other key witnesses who feel the same way.

- 29-

AR So who were the main transgressors and can you provide examples of how their comments affected the key witnesses?

AJB Because of the fact that the 'Crop Circle Connector' is probably one of the largest

and most frequently visited crop-circle websites, I have made a point of regularly

policing the 'East Field Incident 2007' Forum 'blog'. I have noted the names of three individuals who seem to be the ringleaders in spreading misleading rumours

and baseless accusations against the key witnesses involved in the 777 incident.

They operate under the pseudonyms of 'JustMe', 'Celtic King', and 'Farmer's

Boy', although for reasons which will soon become apparent, these three could alternatively be referred to as Judge, Jury and Executioner. I have already included examples of the kind of scurrilous invective issued from the minds of these three individuals on the Forum blog, the effects of which have seriously undermined, not only the personal integrity of the key witnesses, but of the 777 incident case itself. For example, the 'JustMe' character, otherwise known as Sonia Bailey, who was already known to me before the 777 incident, and incidentally a person whom I initially believed to be quite trustworthy, has consistently made arrogant and conceited remarks against Winston Keech, Gary King and Terje Toftenes, culminating in the slanderous comment, already mentioned, where she had the temerity to accuse Terje of being a liar. Ironically, she was quite willing to believe the information, some would say dis information, put out by Matthew Williams. Needless to say, she is of the opinion that the 777 crop formation was a hoax.' Were it not for the fact that her influence in the cropcircle community, via the 'Crop Circle Connector', is quite substantial, I would not waste my time mentioning her name or her comments, few of which are actually based in fact. Typically, as is the case with the vast majority of the Forum subscribers regarding the 777 incident, she had neither met or interviewed any of the key witnesses. Sonia Bailey wrongly accused Win of selling his footage to the highest bidder. She also assumes she has the right to view his footage and that it should be made freely available to the world, conveniently overlooking the fact that the footage is Win's private property to do with whatever he wishes. Having read some of her disingenuous and often defamatory comments, it is hardly surprising that Win chose to remain silent and refuse to release any of his film evidence outside of a proper scientific environment. She goes on to make other unfounded statements inferring that Win had met 'the circlemakers' on Knap Hill at 05.15 hrs on the 1st July 2007, and that he had filmed unaccounted for vehicles parked in the East Field around the same time, which is information all based largely on hearsay and rumour. She stated on the Forum blog on Saturday, December 1st 2007; 'I just want to add here, that the Matthew Williams account stands up, fits in with what Win Keech says, in terms of time frame, the people up the hill, the cars, the final photo etc etc - the guy in the silo area [John], who without knowing anything about Matthew Williams' account reported that he was doing something in the back of the car when a Range Rover appeared.

Someone got out of the Range Rover ,and went over to the car, only the person who got out of the Range Rover could possibly know what the guy was doing. I asked Matthew Williams to find out for me what that guy was doing, in order to confirm it in my mind that there really were circle makers there, what he came back with was exactly right. Now, the guy in the silo [John] did meet Gary King, and upon his suggestion to Gary that this was a man-made formation, he met with a somewhat dismissive response. He has tried to tell his side of the story, but has been conveniently brushed under the carpet. I was lucky enough to hear his account of that night, and what he says really points to Matthew Williams telling the truth.'

Here is a perfect example where suppositions are not based in fact, but on muddled reasoning centred around hearsay and second hand anecdotal 'evidence'. Clearly, Sonia Bailey would prefer to trust a person with highly dubious credentials such as Matthew Williams to obtain information on her behalf, rather than take the time and trouble to interview the actual witnesses and hear their side of the story. She quite wrongly assumes that the individuals who approached John in the East Field silage pit were 'circle makers', whereas this was a story promulgated by Matthew Williams, which we have already established was manufactured at a much later date, prior to his interview with Miles Johnston. It is true that John did relay his experiences to Gary King, but Sonia Bailey is again incorrect to state that John assumed the 777 formation to be a hoax. He confirmed to me in a written statement that he was entirely open-minded as to the origin of the formation. For Sonia Bailey to conclude that Matthew Williams was 'telling the truth' is yet another example of confusing fact with fiction.

At the time of writing these remarks, she had neither spoken to Winston Keech, John or 'the people on the hill' [identity unknown] - or even Matthew Williams, to the best of my knowledge.

One of her final statements culminated in the following libellous and injurious remark, posted on the 'Crop Circle Connector' East Field Incident 2007 Forum blog on Saturday, January 12th 2008;

'Terje lied, yes, read my words, HE LIED, or has a memory problem!!! Shoot me down anyone, I don't give a shit anymore. The East Field was man-made ... '

I'm sure that, had Terje Toftenes not been the honourable and charitable person he is, Sonia Bailey would have been facing the serious charge of defamation of character.

AR So who is this Sonia Bailey / 'JustMe' character, and why is she so persistent in her desecration of this case, and by default, some of the key witnesses?

AJB As I stated previously, Sonia Bailey is merely one in long line of sceptics and debunkers, whose sole aim seems to be to discredit and tarnish the reputations of other researchers. She obviously couldn't care less how much personal grief and frustration her often arrogant and unsubstantiated remarks and baseless character assassinations have caused the key witnesses. There is no doubt that her continued presence on the Forum has had a detrimental effect on the 777 incident and how it has been perceived by other researchers and members of the public. Perhaps one clue as to her motives for persistently debunking and discrediting this incident, is her continued support for the claims of Matthew Williams. Her posting on the 'Crop Circle Connector' Forum blog on Saturday,

December 15th 2007, confirmed this fact;

'If anyone is interested, I'm converting a copy of Miles Johnston's video with Matthew Williams, it's very interesting. It's bloody huge though, so I'm splitting it up into chapters. If anyone wants me to send them a link to download it once

- 31 -

I'm done, send me a PM with a contact mail and I'll send you a link.'

My question is - why would Sonia Bailey choose to support and promote the claims of a person who, not only has a proven criminal record, but has on several occasions seriously jeopardised our national security by illegally breaking into military establishments in the UK and recklessly publishing his findings? One can only conclude from these observations that Sonia Bailey, despite her protestations to the contrary, has absolutely no intention of promoting the 777 incident, together with the key witnesses, in a favourable light. I would seriously warn anyone who welcomes a serious and open-minded attitude to the crop-circle phenomenon to be extremely wary of individuals such as Sonia Bailey and to treat anything she subsequently writes with a great deal of caution and scepticism. Furthermore, I sincerely hope that she is aware that her remarks pertaining to the 777 incident posted on the 'Crop Circle Connector' Forum blog have been duly noted and that they will not be easily forgotten by those affected by them.

AR You mentioned earlier that there were other contributors to the 'Crop Circle Connector' Forum with similar attitudes to 'JustMe' / Sonia Bailey.

AJB There are two other individuals who are frequent contributors to the Forum who have also been responsible for spreading unfounded rumours and casting aspersions as to the credibility of the key witness testimonies pertaining to the 777 incident. They are known as 'Farmer's Boy' and 'Celtic King'. Their identities are known to me and I do not intend to reveal these details for the time being.

I repeat the extremely malicious and deplorable quotation which was posted on the Crop Circle Connector 'East Field Incident 2007' Forum blog by 'Farmer's Boy' on Sunday, December 16th 2007, because I think it is important to emphasise where we are coming from when dealing with these individuals; 'I'm not sure which was the more amateurish, the East Field formation, or the tin-pot con this pack of dicks has tried to get away with.'

So here we have Winston Keech, Gary King, Paula Presdee-Jones, Terje Toftenes and, by inference, myself, being openly branded as 'dicks' and 'conmen'.

At the very least, these remarks leave no doubt of the gutter level of debate at which we are operating. It would give me no greater pleasure than to

see individuals such as 'Farmer's Boy' in a court of law facing a charge of slander / gross defamation of character and a very wise move would be to have him and his cronies immediately and permanently banned from appearing on websites such as the 'Crop Circle Connector'. The highly insidious way they think they have the right to discredit and damage the integrity of another person beggars belief. -Honest debate and constructive criticism are one thing, but to stoop to such a base level as illustrated by the above comments is totally unacceptable. Has 'Farmer's Boy' even bothered to speak to any of the key witnesses, who have at least retained their dignity by not engaging in this farrago of nonsense? Throughout the entire 'East Field Incident' Forum debate, 'Farmer's Boy', as is the case with 'JustMe' / Sonia Bailey, displays an arrogant, close-minded and cynical attitude to a subject he appears to know little about. Without having spoken to any of the witnesses he is so keen to denigrate, he comes to the fatuous conclusion that;

- 32 -

'As Bluestone correctly observed the essence of this thread has been to test the

the claims made by Messyrs. Keech and King with regard to the appearance window for this formation. These claims have been found to be unsustainable and there is nothing about this whole event that precludes the hand of man in the formation's construction. In fact everything we now know points firmly in that direction. One of my own personal interests in this has been to try and ascertain at which point along the way Mr. Keech, at least, left Knap Hill that morning genuinely believing that the crop-circle had a mysterious origin if only as a result of seeing the cars leaving the field and his subsequent encounter with people he knew to be circle-makers dismounting from one of the same cars. Personally, I suspect we can move that time back as I again find it impossible to believe he didn't scan the relevant part of East Field with his night vision kit much earlier in the night, even if he overlooked to record it. Of course, that is pure speculation on my part but I think it is worth mentioning. '

'Farmer's Boy' - The East Field Incident Forum. The Crop Circle Connector Forum. Posted - Sunday, December 2nd 2007.

Predictably, none of the above observations are based in fact, but as we have already seen, on hearsay, rumour and 'whispers in the dark'. Having taken the trouble to interview Winston Keech, I can confirm that, unlike the misleading remarks quoted above, he did actually leave Knap Hill believing the 777 formation to be genuine, and that he did not state that the people he met on Knap Hill on the morning of the 7th July were 'circle-makers', nor that the 'cars in the field', even if they actually existed in the first place, were necessarily suspicious. And none of these key witnesses 'clammed up' following their experiences, instead they merely chose to remain silent, which was their right, and for obvious reasons - presumably to avoid confronting an individual such as 'Farmer's Boy'!

Another quote by 'Farmer's Boy' was posted on the Forum blog on Friday, February 8th 2008;

, 'Out of the ordinary' is a bit of an understatement, 'Peaceful', the whole thing stinks if you ask me. So far then, we've got a dodgy formation, dodgy aerial, with bits of the formation airbrushed out, a dodgy 'earthfiles' article, including dodgy photo timings, a dodgy scientific report from a dodgy 'doctor', a dodgy DVD, a dodgy press conference and now 'Clio's' dodgy emails ... '

My question is: what is the record for the number of times you can defame a person in one sentence? 'Farmer's Boy' is surely attempting to break a world record, if the above posting is anything to go by;

'dodgy aerial shots' [Lucy Pringle], 'dodgy 'earthfiles' article' [Linda Moulton Howe], 'dodgy photo trimmings' [Paul Vigay / Lucy Pringle], 'dodgy scientific report from a dodgy doctor' [W.C. Levengood], 'dodgy DVD' [Terje Toftenes], 'dodgy press conference' [Terje Toftenes].

Of course, by this time, any respect we might have had for 'Farmer's Boy' has long since evaporated. Needless to say, I rest my case.

The individual known as 'Celtic King', who as far as I know is a prominent field investigator with the Medway Crop Circle Research Group, based in

- 33 -

Southern England, UK, was of the opinion that;

'..... the 777 [formation] was an inside job a man-made crop-circle event made purely for the purpose to deceive.'

- The East Field Incident 2007. Crop Circle Connector Forum, Posted Tuesday, 4th December 2007.

Here again, there is the blatant accusation that the 777 incident was a scam, with the inference that our key witnesses might again be involved in an 'inside job'.

Where is the evidence to support this serious allegation? At least, 'Celtic King' did conduct a field survey of the 777 formation shortly after it appeared, the

details of which were posted on the Medway Crop Circle Group website. And, of course, he is perfectly entitled to his opinions regarding the findings of his field investigations, although I do take issue with some of his methodology, which I will discuss in greater detail in due course. Unfortunately, 'Celtic King' cannot resist the temptation to resort to unfounded and baseless accusations of misconduct regarding the key witnesses of the 777 incident.

AR How did the key witnesses, particularly Winston Keech and Gary King react to all this adverse criticism?

AJB I spoke to Win and Gary during the course of my investigations, and they were both furious at the derision and hostility metered out at them from some sections of the crop-circle community. Win, in particular, was subjected to the worst kind of mindless character assassination and his personal life became a kind of hell as he was pestered, hounded and abused for weeks on end. Fortunately, he is of the opinion, and I agree with him, that much of the so-called 'crop-circle research community' is largely irrelevant and a distraction from serious scientific investigation and analysis. Gary and Paula were also subjected to the same kind of derision and unfounded criticism, largely as I suspected, as a result of the petty bickering emanating from the participants on the 'Crop Circle Connector' Forum blog.

Terje Toftenes also became a victim of these pernicious comments and, as we have already seen, was accused of being a liar. Despite all this deplorable criticism, Win, Gary, Paula and Terje have consistently maintained their dignity, by refusing to be drawn into these pointless and time-wasting arguments.

AR Apart from the contributors to the 'Crop Circle Connector' Forum, were there any other researchers who expressed similar disdain and scepticism regarding this case? .

AJB The list is too long to mention, really. Some of these researchers are quite prominent in the field of crop-circle research. For example, Freddy Silva, who wrote the informative book entitled 'Secrets in the Fields' also regrettably concluded in an article on his website that Winston Keech and Gary King were co-conspirators in a scam to hoax the 777 formation. I quote an extract from an article which, amongst other issues, mentioned the 777 East Field crop formation, which was recently posted on his website;

' .. like the notorious Oliver's Castle video hoax, the witnesses are let down by the evidence on the ground, not to mention the inconsistencies in the stories. This - 34-

implies collusion between those watching the field and those actively involved in a gross act of vandalism. '

.Does Freddy Silva provide any hard evidence to support these malicious and defamatory claims? I think not.

Two other 'researchers' who also resorted to mindless and unfounded attacks on Winston Keech and Gary King were David Cayton and Robert Hulse. Both are active UFO and crop-circle investigators based in the north-west of England, UK. Hulse and Cayton have made it quite clear to the rest of the crop-circle research community that the 777 formation was not only man-made, but also a blatant scam. They were aided and abetted in their accusations by another prominent crop-circle researcher and associate called Nick Nicholson, who resides in Wiltshire. Their faulty reasoning is again based on unfounded hearsay, conjecture and some highly dubious research methodology. For example, in a telephone conversation I had with David Cayton on Saturday, 18th September, 2007, he not only accused Winston Keech and Gary King of being a central part of a gigantic scam to hoax the 777 formation, but he also called Gary King a liar. He insisted Win and Gary knew the formation was going to be hoaxed on the

17th July, which is how Win knew where to place his cameras. He also claimed he had evidence that Win and Gary had met much earlier than they had actually stated, presumably to hatch out their plan to hoax the formation. He also accused the 'Silent Circle Cafe' owner Charles Mallett of being part of the scam. The cafe is a regular meeting place for crop-circle researchers and apart from refreshments, sells magazines, books, DVDs and other merchandise on a variety of subjects, including crop-circles and UFOs. Cayton was of the opinion that all of these individuals were primarily motivated to hoax the formation for commercial profit, as Terje Toftenes' '777 East Field Incident' DVD was being sold in the 'Silent Circle Cafe'. Cayton's research colleague Robert Hulse also came to the same conclusion. On the 'UFO Casebook' website, adopting the pseudonym 'Hubcap 9', Hulse not only accused me of lying and fabricating the entire military helicopter stories, but patronisingly added that American researcher Linda Moulton Howe was also the victim of this elaborate scam. Cayton and Hulse conducted an impromptu field investigation of the 777 crop formation. They came to the same conclusion as researcher Andy Fowlds, who had also surveyed the formation on behalf of the already mentioned Medway Crop Circle Research Group. All three investigators claimed there was evidence of so-called 'board marks' in the laid down crop within the formation. These can be described as thin white lines across the plant stems of the fallen cereal crop, for example wheat and barley. At least, Andy Fowlds surveyed the 777 formation soon after its appearance, but unfortunately he falls into the same trap as Cayton and Hulse in assuming these so-called white lines are indicative of board marks and, by definition, human hoaxing. They are nothing of the kind. I have been investigating crop-circles for over twenty years and have witnessed numerous examples of these white lines **in standing crop**, in fields where no unusual crop-circle markings are evident. I have spoken to various agronomists both in Wiltshire and the north-west of England, UK, who have informed me that these thin white lines are caused by abnormal chemical reactions during the growth of the plant stem. They are normally detected early in the growing season, when the stems are still green, which is why they are more visible. This rules out the possibility that they are the result of the pressure from a hard-edged stomping board or even human feet, and as a result, cannot be used as an indicator that a formation has been hoaxed. Likewise, the so-called 'banding' noticed in the laid down crop in many

- 35 -

formations is also wrongly attributed to the actions of mechanical pressure from a stomping board or garden roller. It is not unusual to find evidence of broken stems and other damage to the laid down crop. One has to take into consideration the amount of visitors to a formation, which can often exceed many hundreds, if not thousands, within a very short timeframe of a few weeks. David Cayton and Robert Hulse conducted their ground survey of the 777 formation almost two weeks following its initial appearance, after it had been visited and trampled by several thousand visitors. This fact alone totally negates the reliability of their findings, a conclusion which anyone with a modicum of common sense would reach. More importantly, we should not overlook the observations made by the first witnesses to the 777 formation - Win Keech, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones, who were all unanimous in describing the pristine nature of the laid down crop, with no evidence of any traditional human hoaxing methods having been applied.

Cayton and Hulse make the same tacit assumption, as do many other researchers, that they know the nature of the 'circlemaking' agency which, in their opinion, derives from an exotic, advanced extra-terrestrial technology. They do not, of course produce any hard evidence to support this claim. I do not doubt for one moment that some form of advanced and technologically sophisticated delivery

system is being deployed, and I remain confident as to the source of this technology. The precise effects on the crop such a directed and concentrated energy would have depends on many variables, for example, climatic conditions and plant, soil and chemical growth factors. We simply do not know for sure what kind of energies are actually involved, which is why I consider it pejorative for researchers such as David Cayton and Robert Hulse to be so close-minded in the conclusions they have reached as a result of their field investigations.

AR Why do you think some researchers, including Robert Hulse, have accused you of fabricating stories describing the military activity you experienced in the vicinity of the 777 crop formation?

AJB I can think of lots of reasons, Tony. Spite, jealousy, the spreading of disinformation. There is no doubt that; simply as a result of my decision to report the facts as I had witnessed them to Linda Moulton Howe, which were immediately posted on her 'Earthfiles' website, I was subjected to the same barrage of baseless personal abuse, as was experienced by Winston Keech, Gary King and the other key witnesses.

AR So why do you think some of these researchers were so keen to denounce your reporting of the military activity as 'fantasy'?

AJB As I mentioned previously, some elements within the research community would prefer to attach a 'New Age' explanation to the crop-circle phenomenon and they become quite hostile at any attempt to 'tarnish' the subject with sinister stories of 'unmarked black helicopters' and 'dangerous levels of radiation'. We are involved with a kind of religious fanaticism here - and people with very close-minded and bigoted attitudes. It could also be that some researchers actually do know the nature of the causative agency behind the crop-circle phenomenon, and are aware of the military involvement, but remain tight-lipped in order not to 'rock the boat' and offend their peers. None of this, however, does anything to excuse their deplorable behaviour meted out at witnesses such as myself, who after all are simply reporting what we have experienced.

- 36 -

Linda Moulton Howe received several emails from other researchers as a result of my interview regarding the 777 military helicopter activity which was posted on her website. I have included two particularly objectionable examples, which are clearly aimed at damaging my reputation as a researcher in the eyes of the public;

'If Andy Buckley has video evidence of all that happened in East Field on July 10th [wrong date!-AJB], why doesn't he make it available on Utube, or something like that? It seems that every idiot in the world has video of something insignificant available for the general public on Utube ... '

Robert Chapman to Linda Moulton Howe - August 2007.

Hardly insignificant, when numerous innocent members of the public were being harassed and intimidated by low-flying military helicopters and possibly also being exposed to dangerous levels of radiation.

'I have grave doubts about the helicopters story, because one of the main sources on it is known to be highly unreliable at the best of times, and I think this has received more publicity than it deserves there's too much paranoia about this helicopter stuff, in my opinion. I'm copying this to Linda Moulton Howe too, because I think she needs to be aware that these stories remain unsubstantiated, and probably will stay that way. If I'm wrong, I'll eat humble pie, but I'm not holding my breath ... '.

Andy Thomas to Doug Rogers / Linda Moulton Howe - August 2007.

Since when did Andy Thomas decide what kind of evidence should be admissible and acceptable for public viewing? And when did he assume the right to cast judgements on my competence as a researcher?

Other well-known researchers such as Nick Nicholson and Michael Glickman have been overheard, in the presence of very reliable witnesses, to express similar derogatory and defamatory remarks, much in the same vein as Andy

Thomas and Robert Chapman, in response to the 'Earthfiles' article.

But perhaps the most pernicious and insidious comments were made by Robert Hulse. In a completely uninhibited tirade of slanderous rhetoric, no doubt aimed at tarnishing my reputation as a researcher, he made the following comments on the 'UFO Casebook' website, in a futile attempt to hide behind the pseudonym, 'Hubcap 9';

'Well, 'Drdil', this is a bit difficult because I am fond of Linda [Moulton Howe-AJB], having spent some time with her whilst on her UK trips in previous years. In my opinion, Linda does some great work, but because of that, she is also a target for others who feed her information which is not entirely truthful, as a means of discrediting her. I have watched this process at first hand, and because I care about her, I have risked losing her friendship by bringing this to her attention. I have given her the names of two people who I believe are up to no good. So far, my advice seems to have fallen on deaf ears. Regarding the 'crop-circles', nauseous, black helicopters article, I have a strong feeling that it is a complete sham, designed to add authenticity to the East Field crop formation. This formation is man-made and I have filmed the evidence of the stomping board marks within it.

Whilst in the man-made formation at Sugar Hill, Upper Upham last week, I was

- 37-

approached by Andrew Buckley, the person who supplied Linda with the above mentioned story. Together with David Cayton, we asked him about the black helicopters. He quickly began to backtrack on the story details by saying that Linda had misquoted him. He said that the so-called 'black helicopters' were in fact more of a dark grey colour. I do not think for a moment that Linda misquoted him. She is rather the victim of an elaborate scam.

To illustrate the mindset of individuals such as Mr Buckley, I invited him to take a look at a series of 18 stomping board marks, all in a row across the wheat stems in the Sugar Hill crop formation. He declined to look, muttering that he didn't get involved with trying to ascertain the authenticity or otherwise of crop-circles. How very convenient, I thought, as I filmed the damning evidence. '

Robert Hulse. Posted on 'UFO Casebook'. - 13th August 2007.

AR I would have said that here is a perfect example of gross defamation of character, as I assume Mr Hulse's comments were not actually based **in** fact?

AJB Hulse is referring to a chance meeting and conversation I had with him and his associate David Cayton, in the Sugar Hill crop formation near Aldbourne, UK, in August 2007. His quote is typical of how a simple conversation can be massively exaggerated and then posted on the internet in a blatant and cowardly attempt to prejudicially injure another person's reputation and credibility. He not only accuses me of deliberately discrediting Linda Moulton Howe, who incidentally is a long-standing friend of mine and who will vouch for that fact, but also lying about my experiences pertaining to the military helicopter activity, despite the fact that my experiences were witnessed by other researchers and visitors to the 777 crop formation, and also caught on video. Presumably, he is inferring that Umberto Morazzoni and Bibbi Bostrom, who also witnessed and filmed the same military helicopter activity which I experienced on Wednesday, July 18th 2007, were lying too? Hulse then insinuates that Winston Keech and Gary King were also involved in 'an elaborate scam' to hoax the 777 formation, and by definition, committed an act of criminal damage in the East Field on the 6th

11th July 2007.

I stand by the statements I made to Linda Moulton Howe, who did a very

professional job in reporting the facts accurately. I certainly did not backtrack on my story when I was questioned by Hulse as to the nature of the type of military helicopters I had observed. At the time of our conversation, I had not had time to review my video- footage, which contained many lengthy segments of several different types of military aircraft I had filmed over the East Field crop formation in July 2007. The specific aircraft we were discussing were the three Merlin HC3 helicopters I filmed over the 777 formation on Wednesday, July 18th 2007. These aircraft are dark coloured, black or possibly dark-grey, and they carried no discernible insignia or markings on their fuselages. In Linda's report, they are described as 'black, unmarked helicopters', which I would say was a reasonably accurate description. Hulse certainly did not invite me to view any stumping board marks in the Sugar Hill crop formation and I vehemently deny that I stated to him that I didn't get involved in trying to ascertain the authenticity of crop-circles. The amount of time and effort I have devoted to researching the crop-circle phenomenon over the past twenty years can be vouched for by other genuine researchers [unlike Robert Hulse] who have supported my research activities. I hope this interview will stand as a

- 38 -

testament of my commitment and dedication to research, investigate and uncover the truth regarding the 777 incident. These are very serious allegations by Robert Hulse, and are typical of the kind of prejudicial remarks I have previously mentioned by other researchers such as Freddy Silva, David Cayton, Andy Thomas, Robert Chapman, Sonia Bailey, 'Farmer's Boy', 'Celtic King', amongst others. I do not take kindly to these and other individuals continually making blatantly false accusations, aimed at both myself and the other witnesses to the 777 incident, namely Win, Gary, Paula and Terje. I cannot speak for them, but I will not hesitate to take legal action against anyone who persistently uses libellous and defamatory remarks against my name, particularly in the public arena. If these individuals have any semblance of decency about them, they would be wise to make an immediate and unreserved public apology to those of us who have been victimised and had our reputations harmed by their disrespectful and slanderous remarks. I hope that by exposing their unfortunate behaviour, I have gone some way to limit the damage they have already inflicted on this important and historic case.

SECTION NINE: WINSTON KEECH: THE CAMERAMAN'S STORY

AR It must have come as a welcome relief to contact someone from a scientific background, in contrast to all the nonsense, disinformation and debunking you highlighted in the previous section.

AJB That's right, and it's important to understand that the integrity of this case stands and falls with the testimony of Winston Keech and the evidence he procured on the night of the 6th

/7th July 2007. Period. I think it would be useful to recap on

Win's professional background in order to allay some of the grossly unfair criticism laid at his door by these undesirable elements within the crop-circle research community.

Win has a scientific background, having trained as a physicist / engineer. Having said that, he is open to researching subjects of a 'paranormal' nature, including the UFO and crop-circle phenomena. It should be stressed that, from the outset, he only ever intended the video evidence of the 777 incident to be made available for serious scientific analysis and not as entertainment to be exploited by the

crop-circle research community, the media and the general public.

AR So this would explain why he was not prepared to prematurely release any of the photographic and video evidence.

AJB That is correct. Even as a result of the few clips which were included on Terje Toftenes' DVD, Win was pestered, hounded and abused for weeks on end, castigated and met with derision from elements within the research community, so it was hardly surprising that he chose to remain silent.

AR Could we clarify what actually happened on the 6th

/ 7th July 2007, particularly

with regard to Win's methods of filming the 777 incident and the type of photographic and video equipment he used?

AJB I will provide a fairly brief account of the methodology and technical details of Win's equipment, since this information is already mentioned in Terje's 'East

- 39 -

Field Incident' DVD, and on Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' website.

Win arrived at the Knap Hill car park at approximately 22.10 hrs. He drove his Jeep through a gate which is situated at the southern end of the car park, and parked his vehicle on a raised bank which offered a panoramic view of the East Field. One infra-red CCTV YD66 monochrome video camera was mounted on a tripod and positioned on the roof of the Jeep, pointing south over a section of the East Field. A similar camera was placed in the rear of the Jeep, which pointed north towards Milk Hill and Devizes. Both these cameras had F = 16 mm X 2 magnification F1.2 lens. These two cameras were connected directly to a bank of three Bush VCR recording machines, which ran off a battery power supply. The cameras were switched on at 23.08 hrs and ran continuously throughout the night until approximately 05.15 hrs the following morning [7th July 2007]. There was a very short break of a few minutes around 03.15 hrs in order to change the tapes. After switching on the cameras, Win then climbed to the summit of Knap Hill, carrying the remainder of his equipment. The cameras he then deployed included a Sony VX2100 semi-professional camcorder [1 lux sensitivity with a X 10 zoom lens]. In practice, this camera can be made to perform beyond that capability using manual settings of the slow shutter mode, enabling it to image slightly beyond eye sensitivity. In addition to the VX2100, a CCTV camera, [2 1/100th of a lux sensitive monochrome infra-red and visible light capability] was attached to a Seben Generation 1+ Image Intensifier with a X3 lens, which was again connected to a Mini-DV JVC GRD SOOcompact high bandwidth camcorder. This combination of CCTV and night spot-scope was used to make repeated scans / sweeps of the fields below Knap Hill throughout the night. Admittedly, the image-intensifier has certain drawbacks - it has relatively bad resolution and the image suffers from some spherical aberration, which means that it is sharp focus at its centre, but slightly out of focus away from the centre - it is, however, roughly one 'thousand times more light sensitive than the human eye. Apart from these video cameras, Win also took a series of digital still photographs at regular intervals using a Sony Cybershot DSC-F717 digital camera with a XS F2 lens. All these cameras were mounted on tripods to maximise stability. The photographic and video surveillance began shortly after 23.00 hrs on the 6th July 2007, and continued throughout the night until about 05.15 hrs the following morning on the 7th July 2007. As a result of deploying a wide variety of cameras from different vantage points, Win was able to obtain over fifteen hours of continuous footage of the 777 incident.

AR Did Win have a clear strategy of how to utilize what was a very impressive array of equipment, throughout the night?

AJB Win's chief aim was to possibly obtain some high quality film footage of any

anomalous aerial lights which might occur throughout the night, although he was conscious of the fact that his cameras were also pointing at one of the most cropcircle visited fields in the UK. He was able to conduct what he has described as a 'continuous mesh of surveillance' by combining a variety of still and video cameras. Any unusual activity which occurred in the surrounding landscape, either the presence of unexplained vehicles, figures in the fields with torches, or any other anomalous light sources would be recorded and documented.

AR Would the cameras Win deployed be sensitive enough to register any unusual light activity **in** the fields?

- 40-

AJB Very definitely. Any light sources larger than a pin-head would have been instantly detected by the image-intensifier and infra-red CCTV cameras, both on the hill and by the roof-mounted cameras situated on Win's Jeep. For example, one of these cameras clearly showed the extremely small LED / MP3 player light in John's car, which was parked in the East Field silage pit over a quarter a mile away. The area where the 777 formation appeared was, of course, situated **between** the silage pit and Knap Hill, where Win was filming from. Logically, had any light sources been detected moving in the East Field, they would have been visible in the CCTV infra-red image intensifier spot-scope. Detailed forensic analysis of all the surveillance footage shot throughout the night over the East Field shows absolutely no evidence of any such lights in the fields below.

AR **There has been some criticism from some crop-circle researchers that, despite the presence of all the camera equipment, not enough was actually done to optimize the chances of obtaining more high quality images.**

AJB I would have more sympathy for these so-called 'researchers' if they had taken the time and trouble to perform the same kind of detailed surveillance operation undertaken by Win. Of course, with the gift of hindsight, it might have been possible to adopt a different strategy and to utilise the camera equipment accordingly - perhaps, for example, to obtain longer exposure images to improve the ambient light levels prior to enhancement, or even provide a 'roving camera' in the fields. Given all the problems / logistics involved in conducting what was, after all, a one~person operation, Win should be applauded and not castigated, for making the effort to record the 777 incident to the best of his ability with the available equipment. And you must excuse Win and I if we treat these detractors with a complete pinch of salt because quite simply **they were not there**. And if they want to truly understand the crop-circle phenomenon, they should make the effort to go out themselves - with cameras, recording and sharing this information in a dignified manner, for all to understand.

SECTION TEN: MILITARY ACTIVITY IN THE VICINITY OF THE 777 CROP FORMATION .

AR **Having read your interview with Linda Moulton Howe on her 'Earthfiles' website concerning the military activity in the vicinity of the 777 crop formation, it might be helpful if you could explain in more detail your personal reactions to these events and why you think some elements within the cropcircle research community chose to discredit you by casting doubt on your experiences.**

AJB The decision by some individuals, some of whom I have already named, to publicly discredit me for reporting what myself and others had authentically experienced won't alter the fact that the military authorities are implicated up to the eyeballs in some form of covert surveillance and research into the crop-circle phenomenon. Throughout the history of the phenomenon, many

credible witnesses have experienced incidents involving the appearance of
- 41 -

low-flying military helicopters, often coinciding with the presence of an unidentified aerial phenomenon [UAP]. Discounting the fact that there is a good deal of military flight training in Wiltshire, UK, of which I am familiar, there is plenty of hard evidence, often accompanied by video-footage, to support the notion that the military authorities have been conducting an ongoing, systematic and intensive programme of research into both the UFO / UAP and crop-circle phenomenon. Military helicopters have frequently resorted to some highly provocative and often dangerous manoeuvres in order to frighten and intimidate researchers and visitors in the vicinity of crop formations, particularly in the Vale of Pewsey area of Wiltshire. This was very apparent regarding the 777 crop formation where, in my opinion, the level of military surveillance was quite unprecedented. Obviously, I'm not implying that every low-flying helicopter was involved in some kind of sinister activity. However, there were many other witnesses, apart from myself, who reported being approached in close proximity by a variety of military aircraft, whilst they were innocently observing the 777 formation. For more information regarding these incidents, I would recommend that your listeners / readers study my interview with Linda Moulton Howe on her 'Earthfiles' website. More recently, the London-based film-maker Miles Johnston has released a DVD entitled 'Oh to Catch a Circlemaker', which not only includes my radio interview with Linda Moulton Howe, but also contains extracts from my video-footage of some of the low-flying military helicopter activity I experienced over the 777 formation. One of the reasons I decided to collaborate with Miles was to allay some of the doubts and criticisms from researchers such as Michael Glickman and Andy Thomas, who openly attacked me and vilified my experiences of the military activity, without having the courtesy to approach me and hear my points of view.

AR Apart from the military helicopters seen manoeuvring over the 777 formation, I gather you also witnessed military personnel on the ground, too.

•

AJB I have to be clear on this point. In Linda's report, I did not say that I had witnessed **military** personnel in the 777 formation on the morning of Monday, July 16th 2007. I had arrived at the East Field silage pit at around 09.00 hrs, having walked from the direction of Woodborough Hill, which is situated about a mile away to the south. Normally, I would drive to the silage-pit, park my car and walk into the field. On this occasion, and as part of my stay in Wiltshire, I decided to conduct a series of field investigations which included, of course, a site survey of the 777 crop formation. On the morning in question, I approached the silage-pit area on foot, and kind of surprised these 'personnel' who were already in the East Field. There were five individuals dressed in light coloured coveralls and white protective headgear which appeared to me to be very similar to biohazard outfits, who were emerging from the East Field crop formation, carrying metal cases and bags containing plant samples which they had presumably gathered from the field. There were three white, unmarked Ford Transit vans which were parked in the silage-pit area when I initially arrived on the scene and I obtained the registration numbers of these vehicles. The vans were being 'guarded' by a very official looking man whom I would describe as being about 5 feet 10 inches in height, of medium build with a very angular looking face, moustache and grey wavy hair. He was wearing a white chequered 'lumberjack' type shirt without a tie, and also wore fawn coloured trousers and black boots. When I attempted to enter the East Field, he suddenly walked in front of me, virtually blocking my entrance to the field. He emphasised that the field was private

- 42-

property, which was true, and that there were personnel in the field conducting some form of exercise, although he wouldn't elaborate any further. I described him as the 'commander-in-chief' in Linda's report which admittedly gave the whole incident a military connotation, but it was simply to describe his very authoritarian attitude when ordering his 'personnel' to deposit their equipment in the vans, which had all the hallmarks of an officer commanding his troops. What was significant was the fact that he advised me to stay out of the field and the formation. He specifically referred to the 777 formation as a biohazard, which is presumably why his 'personnel' were wearing what appeared to be protective outfits. He also warned me that there was going to be some kind of military exercise over the formation later in the morning and I would be best advised to stay out of the area. If he was part of a civilian operation, how would he know about any forthcoming military activity?

AR Have you witnessed anything similar to this in previous years in the vicinity of crop formations?

AJB On previous occasions, I have experienced 'plant sample gathering' by military personnel from crop formations in the Vale of Pewsey area, including Woodborough Hill [2006] and Golden Ball Hill [2005]. On both these occasions, there were several soldiers in the fields who had disembarked from what appeared to be Army land-rovers ..

AR Have you subsequently made any further enquiries to ascertain the origin of these 'personnel' you witnessed in the East Field?

AJB Yes, I have made further enquiries and I am reasonably satisfied who these individuals were and which company they were working for, but above and beyond that, I am not prepared to comment.

AR Following the departure of these vans and 'personnel', were you wary about entering the field, given what the 'commander' had insinuated about the formation being a 'biohazard'?

AJB I have absolutely no doubt that some of the crop formations could constitute a potential health hazard simply because of the residual energies that have on occasion been recorded on sensitive equipment such as Geiger Counters. I carry a piece of equipment called a Dosimeter when entering formations. This is used to measure an individual's exposure to a potentially hazardous environment, for example, lethal levels of radiation. On this occasion, it didn't surprise me when I was informed that the 777 crop formation was a possible 'biohazard', although it may have been disinformation simply to keep me out of the field. However, you may recall Win, Gary and Paula's description of their first visit to the 777 formation on the morning it appeared. They all described being conscious of a very powerful energy in the formation, and they experienced dry throats and throbbing headaches, all symptomatic of mild radiation sickness. Terje Toftenes, when entering the 777 formation on Wednesday, July 11th 2007, felt that there was a strong radiation; and he developed a strong headache, which improved when he left the formation.

Crop samples from the 777 formation were sent to the biophysicist W.e. Levenson, at the Pinelandia Biophysical Laboratory, Grass Lake, Michigan, USA, and he came to the conclusion that an extremely unusual form of energy had

- 43 -

interfered with the plant / seed growth causing 'bimodal germination'. I will discuss Levenson's findings in greater detail in due course, and a full report of his analysis can be found on Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' website. The UK

crop-circle researcher Lucy Pringle conducted a survey into the physical and psychological effects people had reported to her after visiting the 777 crop formation and she concluded that the effects reported had been the most extraordinary and varied she had ever received from one formation. A full report of these findings can be found on her website, in an article entitled 'Commas and Semi-Colons' .

So, as I approached the 777 formation that Monday morning, I was very specific about taking precautionary readings with my Dosimeter. I made several 'control' measurements before entering the formation and didn't notice any unusual variations from normal background radiation levels [approximately 2 millisieverts/ Y], until I entered the formation. Walking through the formation, the Dosimeter readings fluctuated between normal background radiation levels and between 6 - 12 u SV / h [microsieverts per hour], which certainly wouldn't have posed any kind of short-term radiation hazard, although it was interesting that the readings fluctuated throughout different parts of the formation, in a fairly random fashion.

Whilst I was continuing my dosimetric monitoring of the formation, at about 09.30 hrs, I noticed the sudden appearance of several military helicopters, as predicted. Over the following two hours, there were several overflights of a variety of Army Air Corps Lynx, Gazelle and Apache military helicopters. By this time, several other visitors had arrived in the formation and were all commenting on the helicopter activity. At approximately 011.30 hrs, a single Gazelle military helicopter made a series of extremely low-level passes over the formation, which some of the visitors found very intimidating. At one point, this helicopter almost landed in one of the larger circles in the formation. These manoeuvres continued unabated for about an hour, and I suddenly became aware that several people who were standing quite close to me seemed to be exhibiting some discomfort and were crouching down with a few holding their heads. I was also conscious of feeling vaguely unwell, with symptoms of headache and mild nausea. My mouth was also very dry and my ears were 'popping' - a feeling akin to suffering severe dehydration, although the weather was quite cool and breezy. I approached a few of the people who seemed to be presenting similar symptoms and they all confirmed that they had suddenly felt unwell when the low-flying Gazelle military helicopter had appeared. I immediately switched on my Dosimeter, and was surprised to see that the reading had increased to between 60 and 80 u SV/h [microsieverts per hour], regardless of whether I held the meter in the air or near the ground.

AR Could you attribute any of these unpleasant symptoms to a mundane cause, such as fuel exhaust from the helicopter?

AJB There was no evidence of any residual fumes or vapour being emitted or sprayed from the helicopter. I am familiar with observing military helicopters, and have previously noticed residual exhaust and fuel emissions which normally smell like kerosene, which has a very distinct odour, although not a common occurrence in my experience. On this occasion, there was definitely no discernible smell or vapour visible. The weather wasn't particularly warm and in any case, we all experienced these symptoms simultaneously, coinciding with the arrival of the helicopter. Interestingly, immediately following the aircraft's

- 44-

interfered with the plant / seed growth causing 'bimodal germination'. I will discuss Levenson's findings in greater detail in due course, and a full report of his analysis can be found on Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' website. The UK crop-circle researcher Lucy Pringle conducted a survey into the physical and psychological effects people had reported to her after visiting the 777 crop formation and she concluded that the effects reported had been the most extraordinary

and varied she had ever received from one formation. A full report of these findings can be found on her website, in an article entitled 'Commas and Semi-Colons' .

So, as I approached the 777 formation that Monday morning, I was very specific about taking precautionary readings with my Dosimeter. I made several 'control' measurements before entering the formation and didn't notice any unusual variations from normal background radiation levels [approximately 2 millisieverts/ Y], until I entered the formation. Walking through the formation, the Dosimeter readings fluctuated between normal background radiation levels and between 6 - 12 u SV / h [microsieverts per hour], which certainly wouldn't have posed any kind of short-term radiation hazard, although it was interesting that the readings fluctuated throughout different parts of the formation, in a fairly random fashion.

Whilst I was continuing my dosimetric monitoring of the formation, at about 09.30 hrs, I noticed the sudden appearance of several military helicopters, as predicted. Over the following two hours, there were several overflights of a variety of Army Air Corps Lynx, Gazelle and Apache military helicopters. By this time, several other visitors had arrived in the formation and were all commenting on the helicopter activity. At approximately 011.30 hrs, a single Gazelle military helicopter made a series of extremely low-level passes over the formation, which some of the visitors found very intimidating. At one point, this helicopter almost landed in one of the larger circles in the formation. These manoeuvres continued unabated for about an hour, and I suddenly became aware that several people who were standing quite close to me seemed to be exhibiting some discomfort and were crouching down with a few holding their heads. I was also conscious of feeling vaguely unwell, with symptoms of headache and mild nausea. My mouth was also very dry and my ears were 'popping' - a feeling akin to suffering severe dehydration, although the weather was quite cool and breezy. I approached a few of the people who seemed to be presenting similar symptoms and they all confirmed that they had suddenly felt unwell when the low-flying Gazelle military helicopter had appeared. I immediately switched on my Dosimeter, and was surprised to see that the reading had increased to between 60 and 80 u SV/h [microsieverts per hour], regardless of whether I held the meter in the air or near the ground.

AR Could you attribute any of these unpleasant symptoms to a mundane cause, such as fuel exhaust from the helicopter?

AJB There was no evidence of any residual fumes or vapour being emitted or sprayed from the helicopter. I am familiar with observing military helicopters, and have previously noticed residual exhaust and fuel emissions which normally smell like kerosene, which has a very distinct odour, although not a common occurrence in my experience. On this occasion, there was definitely no discernible smell or vapour visible. The weather wasn't particularly warm and in any case, we all experienced these symptoms simultaneously, coinciding with the arrival of the helicopter. Interestingly, immediately following the aircraft's

- 44-

departure, the Dosimeter readings returned to normal, and our symptoms abated after several minutes.

AR Do you feel that the fluctuating readings were directly attributable to the close proximity of the helicopter, because it is difficult for me, as a scientist, to explain how or even why there should be a correlation between the two?

AJB I will discuss these issues in greater depth in the next section. For the time being, I would emphasise that clearly there seemed to be an interaction between the arrival of the military helicopters, the crop formation, and the visitors, including myself. I cannot categorically say whether the source of the fluctuating meter

readings originated in some device onboard the aircraft, or whether unknown 'energies' within the crop formation were somehow activated by an interaction between the two. The observational evidence strongly indicates that there was a close correlation between these various factors and the sudden and inexplicable onset of unpleasant symptoms in the witnesses present, all of which returned to normal, following the departure of the aircraft.

AR As a scientist, I am naturally inquisitive and more than a little concerned to ascertain what kind of energies we are dealing with which could cause such immediate effects. Following on from your experience on Monday, 16th July 2007, I gather you were involved with an altogether more disturbing encounter two days later?

AJB Yes, the incident which was to subsequently cause so much controversy occurred on Wednesday, 18th July 2007, whilst I was visiting the 777 crop formation. Throughout the morning there had again been an unusually high level of low-flying military helicopter activity over the East Field area. I was monitoring the background levels of radiation with my Dosimeter, but hadn't noticed any abnormal readings.

At precisely 12.47 hrs, three very large, dark coloured helicopters approached the formation, flying at very low level from the direction of the village of Pewsey in the east.

AR Could you describe these helicopters in detail and why you stated in Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' report that they were 'black and unmarked'?

AJB These aircraft were later identified as RAF [Royal Air Force] Merlin HC3 military

helicopters, possibly originating from 28 [AC] Squadron at RAF Benson in South Oxfordshire, UK. These aircraft are normally used for the movement of troops, weapons and ammunition in a battlefield situation. Interestingly, the Merlin carries an impressive Radar and Laser Warning Receiver, Missile Approach Warners and Directional Infrared Countermeasures equipment. The aircraft I observed were certainly either very dark-grey or black in colour without any discernible markings or insignia. A colleague of mine had previously drawn my attention to a similar kind of helicopter, whilst we were visiting the Army Air Corps School of Military Flying at Middle Wallop, Hampshire, UK, which he described as possibly being used in a Special Forces combat situation. Therefore, I think my description of these helicopters as being 'black and unmarked' was reasonably accurate.

As these helicopters approached the East Field, they quickly broke formation, and the outer two helicopters began circling the 777 formation at very low level [no

- 45 -
more than a few hundred feet in height], whilst the other aircraft flew directly overhead. Almost immediately, I noticed an extremely strong, sulphurous smell coming from the direction of the helicopter which was overhead. Simultaneously, my Dosimeter began to register some abnormally high readings between 300 and 600 microsieverts per hour, which actually activated the alarm threshold signal, in the form of a high pitched continuous tone. Incidentally, the alarm threshold is set at 275 microsieverts per hour, which is indicative of very dangerous levels of ionising radiation. If the alarm signal had been activated inside a nuclear power facility, it would have indicated possibly lethal levels of radiation, necessitating an emergency evacuation of personnel from the building. As had happened two days previously on Monday, 16th July, I became aware that many of the people in the formation were beginning to display symptoms of what I can only describe as mild radiation sickness.

AR Could you describe these symptoms and were you affected?

AJB We were all affected to a certain degree. Some of the visitors began to panic and were extremely agitated by the close proximity of these large and intimidating helicopters flying at low-level. The physical symptoms seemed to build up suddenly, following the appearance of the sulphurous smell. There was again the throbbing headache, popping ears and really unpleasant nausea which actually caused a few people, including myself, to vomit into the crop. It was that bad. It was at this point that we all decided to exit the field in an attempt to relieve the symptoms.

AR Were you able to film any of these events?

AJB I succeeded in obtaining about ten minutes of fairly good video-footage, especially of the three helicopters circling the formation, prior to the unpleasant symptoms occurring. It was very difficult to operate the camera, whilst simultaneously trying to take meter readings: Eventually, I had to stop filming when I began to feel ill and my main priority was to exit the field. As we vacated the East Field, the helicopters immediately flew off in the direction of Warminster towards the west.

AR Are you of the opinion that the symptoms of nausea and vomiting were being caused by the emission of the 'sulphurous substance' from the Merlin helicopters, rather than as a result of an abnormally high level of radiation?

AJB The registering of dangerously high levels of radiation, confirmed by the activation of my Dosimeter's alarm threshold signal, would almost certainly produce some extremely unpleasant symptoms, including nausea and vomiting, all indicative of mild radiation sickness. Also, the presence of the sickly sulphurous odour would no doubt have contributed to the unpleasant symptoms. As with the events of Monday, 16th July over the 777 formation, there did seem to be a direct correlation between the helicopters, the 'radiation spikes', and on this occasion, the sulphurous smell.

AR Do you have any hard evidence that these helicopters were allegedly releasing toxic substances on innocent members of the public?

AJB Obviously, these are very serious allegations, so we have to be extremely careful before we come to any firm conclusions. Later that afternoon [Wednesday, 18th - 46-

July 2007] at approximately 16.00 hrs, I met with several friends of mine at the East Field silage pit, including Dutch crop-circle researchers Foeke Kootje and his partner Connie. After spending some time discussing the events which had occurred over the 777 crop formation earlier that day, we noticed that an Apache military helicopter was approaching our position from the south-east. It changed direction, then flew between a wooded area called Tawsmead Copse and Woodborough Hill, which was situated half a mile due south from the silage-pit. The helicopter was almost stationary and Foeke drew our attention to two 'projectiles' which fell from the aircraft, releasing two very distinct pink vapour trails or 'streamers' which trailed down to the ground. Foeke succeeded in filming the event, and after a few minutes, the helicopter flew off behind Woodborough Hill to the south. We didn't notice any unusual odours or ill effects at the time of the release of the 'projectiles'. However, when I returned to the silage-pit an hour later, there was a very distinct smell of sulphur in the air, drifting from the direction of Woodborough Hill on the southerly breeze. I would say with certainty that this sulphurous smell was more or less identical to the odour I had experienced earlier in the day in close proximity to the three Merlin helicopters over the East Field.

AR There seems little doubt that here we have a situation where a multitude of reliable witnesses, including several researchers, were inexplicably subjected to an unprecedented level of military helicopter activity which centred around the East Field area and the 777 crop formation. It is difficult to accept that our armed forces would deliberately set out to expose innocent members of the public to potentially dangerous toxic substances, including high levels of ionising

radiation. It also seems highly unlikely that you were all witnessing a mundane training exercise by RAF and Army helicopters, where there would not be any rational reason why they would fly from a distant base in Oxfordshire, UK, to harass and intimidate members of the public in a crop-circle in Wiltshire.

AJB Over the past fifteen years I have witnessed an abundance of military low-flying and flight-training manoeuvres over this area of the Vale of Pewsey in Wiltshire, UK. There is nothing unusual in that respect. I can easily distinguish between what appears to be fairly mundane low-level flight-training and the quite obvious interception and surveillance of crop-circle and UFO / UAP phenomena. After all, it doesn't make any sense that our Armed Forces, with relatively limited financial resources would pointlessly 'joy-ride' around the Wiltshire skies in multi-million pound helicopters to simply 'sightsee' unusual patterns in the landscape. Clearly, the types of manoeuvres I have described, which have involved both Army and RAF [Royal Air Force] aircraft, involve the pilots being deliberately vectored to a crop formation, often from a great distance, using sophisticated instrumentation, to photograph, measure, observe, and occasionally intimidate members of the public / crop-circle researchers who, from the military point of view, are merely inconvenient 'intruders'.

Regarding the incident with the three Merlin helicopters on Wednesday, 18th July 2007, there may have been a legitimate reason why these aircraft were in the vicinity of the East Field. A few weeks after the above incident had occurred, I became aware that two other witnesses had come forward, who had also experienced and filmed the unusual helicopter activity at the same time and date. They were crop-circle researchers from Italy called Umberto Morazzoni and Bibbi Bostrom, who had decided to visit the 777 crop formation as part of their holiday in Wiltshire. When the incident occurred, they were standing in the lower half of the formation, and were obscured from view because of the undulations in the field. They witnessed

- 47-

the approach of the three Merlin helicopters, and became very concerned by the intimidating low level manoeuvres. Umberto was very angry with the attitude of the pilots, because they had chosen to visit the formation to relax and enjoy the normally peaceful and beautiful landscape and his partner Bibbi was pregnant at the time. He decided to film the event with his camcorder. When they reviewed the video-footage at a later date they were astonished to discover that they had inadvertently captured what appeared to be a small, dark coloured 'object' a few feet in diameter, which was hovering in the sky above the 777 formation. They were adamant that the Merlin helicopters had been vectored into the area to intercept this anomalous 'object' which did not appear to be visible to the naked eye.

AR Were you aware of any unusual aerial phenomena when you visited the 777 formation on Wednesday, 18th July 2007?

AJB Not at the time, but I was so preoccupied filming the helicopters and taking radiation readings, that there was little chance I would have seen the 'object', particularly as it was probably invisible to the naked eye. There is evidence to suggest that some of these anomalous 'objects' or UAPs [unidentified aerial phenomenon] are only visible in the infra-red or ultra-violet region of the electromagnetic spectrum, which is why they often appear on photographically sensitive film. I have seen Umberto and Bibbi's photograph of the 'UFO', which has been posted on the 'Crop Circle Connector' website in the section devoted to the 2007 East Field crop formation. The 'object' in question is small, black and oval in shape, possibly a few feet in diameter and appears to be moving in the sky approximately a hundred or so feet above the 777 formation. It is similar in appearance to some of the other aerial anomalies which have been witnessed and filmed in the vicinity of the East Field over the past twenty years. Of course, we may be looking at an insect or even a small bird near the camera lens, so it would

be preferable to have this image analysed and enhanced before we come to a definitive conclusion. Umberto Morazzoni and Bibbi Bostrom were also interviewed by London film-producer Miles Johnston, and were featured, together with their film footage of both the 'UFO' and the Merlin military helicopters, in his DVD production entitled, 'Oh to Catch a Circlemaker'.

SECTION ELEVEN: BIOHAZARDS AND ABNORMAL RADIATION READINGS IN THE 777 CROP FORMATION

AR Assuming that there is a connection between the radiation anomalies and the crop-circle phenomenon, especially in the context of the 777 crop formation, could you explain in a little more detail your findings regarding this highly controversial issue?

AJB The monitoring of possible radioactive anomalies in crop-circles has quite a long history amongst the research community and is well-documented in the literature available on this subject. Researchers such as Colin Andrews, Paul Vigay, Dr. Eltjo Haselhoff and Lucy Pringle have accumulated a wealth of objective, scientific evidence to demonstrate a possible link between crop-circles and some disturbance in the electromagnetic field either inside or surrounding these ground markings. It is my contention that these anomalies may be a by-product of the delivery sys-

- 48-
tem which is deployed to create the formation as it interacts with the Earth's magnetic field and the medium in which the patterns appear. I am reasonably confident that the military authorities and 'powers that be' are inextricably implicated in this process.

AR Just to be clear on this point, are you implying that some agency or agencies, closely allied to what we generically refer to as the military / industrial complex are inextricably involved in creating unusual ground markings, popularly referred to as 'crop circles'?

AJB That is correct.

AR Having read through some of the crop-circle literature, would you concur that this is not one of the more accepted and discussed theories within the crop-circle research community?

AJB There are many explanations for this lack of interest. Of course, the authorities have not been forthcoming in drawing attention to these theories for obvious reasons and this fact alone explains the existence of the ongoing dis information campaign surrounding these Subjects.

AR Surely, some of the researchers you mentioned previously must have investigated a link between the use of military technology and the crop-circle phenomenon?

AJB I'm sure they have, but in most cases they have either been paid off or frightened off, because the implications of discussing these theories, particularly in the public arena, are far too risky. I will discuss these issues in greater detail in the summary, because they cannot be separated from what I have uncovered regarding the 777 incident. One author who has been largely ignored by the research community is Nicholas Montigiani and I would highly recommend his thoughtprovoking book, 'Crop Circles - Evidence of a Cover-Up' [Carnot USA Books 2003 ISBN: 1-59209-037-01 In the book, he discusses in detail the possibility that some form of exotic technology may be deployed as part of an ongoing programme involving mind control, weapons-testing and genetic crop experimentation. Certainly, there is an abundance of evidence to show that our cereal crops have been part of an ongoing programme of experimentation by hitherto clandestine agencies for several decades, and not just for the purpose of creating aesthetically pleasing patterns.

AR What experience do you have in conducting research and investigations in this

area of scientific monitoring of the crop-circles?

AJB I have only recently begun to use what are fairly standard monitoring devices to measure any possible electromagnetic anomalies in the vicinity of crop-circles, primarily because I have become very concerned about the short and long-term risk of exposure to these potentially harmful energies. Until we know more about the nature of these energies, I feel it would be prudent to exercise a high degree of caution when considering entering a crop formation.

AR But has a direct causal link been proven and have there been any surveys conducted into these potential harmful effects by any of the researchers you

- 49-

have mentioned previously?

AJB The UK based crop-circle researcher Lucy Pringle has amassed a vast database of both physical and psychological effects reported by visitors to crop formations over the past two decades, which have been documented in the many books she has written. More recently, she has begun to conduct scientifically-based monitoring of the effects on human biological systems, for example, hormone levels as chosen subjects enter crop formations. There is a detailed summary of these findings, including investigations of the 777 crop formation in the article 'Commas and Semi-Colons' on her website. As I mentioned previously, the effects reported in the 777 formation were the most extraordinary and varied that she had received from anyone formation throughout the history of the subject.

A more detailed survey was conducted by the American researcher **W.E.** Levengood, who is based at the Pinelandia Laboratory, Grass Lake, Michigan, USA. Of course, Levengood and U.S. researcher Nancy Talbot, as part of BLT research [Burke, Levengood, Talbot], have been conducting research from plant samples taken from crop-circles for many years now, which has strongly suggested that some form of powerful and seemingly intelligently controlled and modified electromagnetic energy is involved in crop-circle creation, simply because of the demonstrable changes in the plant / crop growth. I would recommend reading Levengood's laboratory analysis of the 777 crop formation, the results of which have been published on Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' website.

AR Did Levengood come to any specific conclusions regarding the 777 formation?

AJB He described how the crop in the East Field where the 777 formation had occurred had been affected by two entirely different types of energy which had simultaneously hit the field. Such was the extreme nature of these energies that they were not only confined to the region of the downed circles, but that the entire field was affected. Analysis of plant samples from the formation revealed a unique kind of germination effect which Levengood referred to as 'bimodal germination'. There were two entirely different populations of growth rates which explained the presence of the two bursts of energy. There were significantly altered node lengths in the control plants taken at different quadrants of the field. Interestingly, samples taken from the north and west quadrants had significantly higher node lengths than in the samples from the east and south quadrants. He observed that after **14** days of germination in the laboratory, the seedling samples had grown at least 90 per cent which was an anomaly he had never observed previously during all his years of analysing plant specimens taken from crop formations.

AR Did Levengood specify the type of energy that might have been responsible for these abnormal growth rates?

AJB Normally, his findings would indicate a form of microwave energy implicated in the creation of authentic crop formations. However, in the case of the 777 formation, Levengood is of the opinion that what he describes as an 'ion electron avalanche' predominated over the microwave energies, which is a kind of discharge of plasma in the atmosphere.

AR Could you explain in more detail the 'ion avalanche' theory?

AJB When there is an energetic field strength of over 30,000 volts per centimetre, you
- 50-

can knock electrons out of the 'outer orbits of air molecules and atoms, such as oxygen and nitrogen. After the energy passes and the unstable ions drop back to normal energy levels, it can give off a photon or even ultra violet energy. These energies may have resulted in the extreme plant germination rates described earlier, and also the bright flash in the sky witnessed by Win, Gary and Paula which was essentially a plasma discharge in the ionosphere. One effect of this electrostatic discharge would be to almost crystallise the plant stems, which is how Win, Gary and Paula described the wheat when they first entered the 777 formation. Levenson is of the opinion that this plasma energy could only create such a complex geometrical pattern if directed by an 'intelligence'. What is clear from all his research is that, in my opinion, we are dealing with a highly sophisticated technology with a delivery system capable of directing and focusing some form of electromagnetic beam, similar to a laser, onto the surface of the crop to create these ground markings / crop-circles. Not only do we have a system capable of producing geometrically sophisticated shapes, but which, perhaps as a by-product of the process of initiation, can significantly alter the growth rates and possibly even the molecular structure of the plants.

AR This might explain why the military and allied agencies are so interested in monitoring the formation and, if necessary, retrieving plant samples for analysis.

AJB Naturally, and this is something I will elaborate on in the summary, because there are far more controversial issues to bear in mind if we are to obtain a more complete understanding of the crop-circle phenomenon. I am sure the need for the authorities to consistently monitor the appearance of the formations might explain the presence of the so-called 'personnel' I witnessed collecting plant samples from the 777 formation on the morning of Monday, 16th July 2007.

AR There is the rather disturbing implication that if the crop is somehow 'being interfered with' by an unknown agency, and then presumably enters the food chain after being harvested, we could all be affected to some extent. I think it is vitally important to identify what kind of energies might be involved in this hypothetical 'process', given that you detected possibly abnormal levels of electromagnetic energy in the 777 formation.

AJB It has already been noted that other researchers have been systematically monitoring crop formations for radioactive anomalies for many years now, with varying degrees of success. Visitors to crop formations should be extremely cautious if they choose to enter a formation and be conscious of the health and safety issues involved. Certainly, to carry some rudimentary form of measuring instrument, such as a Geiger Counter or Dosimeter would be a prudent precaution. The instrument I used in the 777 formation was a standard RTD portable dose rate meter - Model G89E to be precise. It would normally be used to measure an individual's exposure to a hazardous environment, for example, in a nuclear power station. But there are obviously more sophisticated instruments available which would measure different kinds of physical effects, such as magnetic field strength. You asked about the kinds of energy we might be dealing with. Obviously, this is a highly complex subject and I certainly do not have the technical expertise to answer your question in detail.

One researcher called David Cayton who is based in the North-West of England, UK, has been scientifically monitoring crop formations for several years now.

- 51 -

David worked for British Aerospace as a technician and subsequently head of NDT [non-destructive testing] in the Engineering Design Department Laboratories at the Woodford, Cheshire, UK Plant for over twenty years. As part of his employment

he was nominated as 'The Radiation Protection Supervisor' for two of the Manchester, UK factories. Using a radioactive meter which is responsive to X-ray wavelength energies he has monitored numerous crop formations since 1985. On several occasions he has monitored unusually high levels of 'background radiation', including actually damaging beyond repair one radiation Geiger Mueller tube, after lowering its probe into a small 'grapeshot' crop-circle along side a large formation near Silbury Hill in Wiltshire in 1999. Within just a few seconds, the instrument's needle went completely off the scale! David, like myself, was also concerned that we may be dealing with potentially harmful energies, that could also be contaminating the crop whilst subsequently being passed on to humans via the food chain.

David read my report of unusual military activity and possible radiation anomalies in Linda Moulton Howe's 'Earthfiles' report. He is of the opinion that the UK Armed Forces would not deliberately target innocent citizens by releasing high doses of lethal radiation in the vicinity of crop-circles. I have to say that David is guilty, as are other researchers, of completely misinterpreting what I described to Linda Moulton Howe regarding my experiences. Of course, I never said or implied that the military helicopters were actually 'releasing' any form of lethal radiation onto members of the public. This fact needs to be clarified because I suspect this is why some researchers decided to personally ridicule me, having read Linda's report. I merely stated that, together with other witnesses, I had experienced and recorded some kind of electromagnetic anomaly which apparently produced unpleasant physical symptoms, including nausea and vomiting, in very close proximity to military helicopters, some of which most definitely displayed highly provocative and intimidating manoeuvres in the vicinity of the 777 crop formation. Clearly, as David Cayton mentioned in his commentary, there had to be some connection between the military activity and my Dosimeter readings because they dropped back suddenly after the helicopters moved away . . . David is of the opinion that it is extremely unlikely that it would be possible for aircraft to 'beam down' harmful ionizing radiation.

AR I think it would be helpful at this point to briefly explain the difference between ionizing and non-ionizing radiation, and how such levels of radiation are measured.

AJB Briefly, ionizing radiation consists of highly energetic particles or waves that can detach or ionise at least one electron from an atom or molecule, for example, energetic beta particles, neutrons or alpha particles. Causes could be X-rays, gamma rays or ultra-violet light. Photons of high enough energy are ionizing in the ultraviolet region of the spectrum and can cause sunburn, which is why ionizing radiation is extremely dangerous in direct exposure. It can also cause DNA cell damage in biological systems. Of course, the effects of radiation might not appear for months, years or even decades. Then we also have natural background radiation from cosmic, solar and external terrestrial sources, for example, radon.

Non-ionizing radiation is any type of EM [electromagnetic] radiation that does not carry enough energy per quantum to ionize atoms or molecules - that is, to completely remove an electron from an atom or molecule. Examples of non-ionizing

- 52 -
radiation are visible light, infra-red, microwave, radio waves, low frequency RF / static fields, infrasound. Effects on humans can include skin cancer and eye injuries, heating of cells, raised body temperature, nausea and vomiting and in the case of very high frequency [VHF] or very low frequency [VLF], feelings of anxiety, fear and revulsion.

The units of measurement of radiation levels include the RAD, the REM and the SIEVERT [SV]. For example, 100 REM = 1 SV. 1 SV can cause nausea, whereas 6 SV can cause death. The unit of radiation can be subdivided into millisieverts

and microsievverts, the unit of radiation measured by my Dosimeter. The sievert represents a very large dose of radiation, although a very significant factor is the exposure time, for example, the longer you expose yourself to sunlight [ultraviolet radiation], the greater is the risk of sunburn and skin cancer.

AR You mentioned that your colleague David Cayton thought it unlikely that ionising radiation was the cause of the symptoms you and other witnesses had experienced in the 777 crop formation.

AJB' He stated that an aircraft power supply system would not have been capable of producing at least a 240 volt, high amperage electrical supply to power a portable .X - ray generator. There are other factors to consider, for example, the pilots' exposure to such systems where the intensity could be so high that the crew would almost certainly suffer from a lethal dose of radiation poisoning! However, he does consider very seriously that since some external source was obviously influencing my Dosimeter, it was highly likely that some type of equipment, in other words, a non-ionising or electromagnetic source of radiation, was being deployed on board the helicopters.

My own view is that there may have been several different types of radiation experienced and detected from a number of sources. For example, my Dosimeter registered possibly pre-existing 'pockets' of radiation throughout the formation and its surroundings which might explain W.C Levensgood's findings. This could have been either ionising or non-ionising radiation. I would suspect the former, given the similarity to symptoms of mild radiation sickness experienced by early visitors to the 777 crop formation including Win, Gary, Paula, Ann and Terje. A number of similar, although admittedly somewhat ambiguous symptoms were reported to researcher Lucy Pringle, which again could point to some form of residual radiation source within the formation. The incident involving the helicopters is altogether more problematical. I feel that David Cayton is being rather naive to assume that our armed forces would not subject harmless citizens to high doses of radiation. I put this naivety down to the fact that he comes from a military background and is therefore somewhat biased to supporting our armed forces, which is perfectly understandable. He shouldn't overlook the fact, however, that elements within the military have on several occasions deliberately harassed and intimidated visitors to crop formations, by conducting often dangerously lowlevel manoeuvres. As I have already demonstrated, we do seem to have an ongoing situation where the authorities, including our armed forces, have displayed an uncooperative and often hostile approach to those of us who have endeavoured .to uncover the truth regarding these phenomena, for example, crop-circles, UFOs etc. They have their own agenda and it is unfortunate if we come to find ourselves in the wrong place at the wrong time. I suspect that, in the case of the 777 incident, the military helicopters were involved in some form of covert surveillance, or monitoring of the formation and its surroundings, and the presence of visitors were detrimental to their reasons for being there. Alternatively, the pilots could have been

- 53 -

monitoring the reaction of visitors to the formation to their manoeuvres. It may be that the entire crop-circle phenomenon is part of an ongoing experiment, one purpose of which is to study our reactions to its presence. The crop-circle researcher Freddy Silva told me recently that whilst conducting an on-site investigation into a large crop formation, coincidentally which was situated in the East Field, Alton Barnes, during the summer of 1999, he was approached by a large, black, unmarked military helicopter at very low level. Almost immediately, he began to feel unwell and developed a throbbing headache and a feeling of nausea. Silva attributed these physical effects to the release of infrasonic radiation from technology onboard the helicopter. Infrasound, as I stated previously, is a form of non- ionising ultra-low frequency radiation and the use of infrasonic acoustic radiation weaponry by the military, especially in Russia and the United States of America, has been documented

by reliable sources for many years now. Was Freddy Silva a victim of this type of weaponry as part of an ongoing experiment? The physical symptoms experienced by visitors to the 777 formation, including myself, were similar in many respects to those experienced by Freddy Silva - sudden headache, nausea, vomiting, acoustic disturbances such as a 'popping' feeling in the ears, and rapid dehydration - all indicative of exposure to ELF radiation, although this doesn't explain the presence of the sulphurous odour. I suspect that we had all been subjected to a combination of radioactive sources, some of which originated in the formation, perhaps of an ionising nature, and others possibly deployed by a technology onboard the helicopters, more akin to the non-ionising radiation experienced by Freddy Silva. Interestingly, I have also experienced these VLF symptoms when in close proximity to the UAPs [unidentified aerial phenomena] in the Vale of Pewsey, and perhaps there lies a clue. What we require is a more sophisticated and co-ordinated programme of scientifically-based monitoring, utilising a variety of electromagnetic instruments, more sensitive than the Dosimeter I have been using, when researching and investigating the crop formations in this area.

AR Would it be prudent, therefore, for visitors to avoid entering the fields until the monitoring you have recommended has proven beyond reasonable doubt that it is safe to visit a crop formation?

AJB Perhaps the military are correct to persuade visitors to leave the formations, because they have already established a clear and present danger, following many years of covertly monitoring the crop-circle phenomenon. It was interesting that this was the advice given to me by one of the 'personnel' I witnessed at the East Field silage pit on Monday, July 16th 2007, as part of the group who had been 'sampling' the 777 formation. I was told in no uncertain terms that the formation, and maybe parts of the field, were a 'biohazard' and to stay away from the area. I am always surprised at the naivety and gullibility of people who quite simply enter a field, which is after all the private property of the landowner, without asking permission, to enter a crop formation, which is of unknown origin, where there may be lethal deposits of radiation, and that is apart from the various pesticides and chemicals used by the farmer to spray the crops. The term 'biohazard' in that context would not therefore be an entirely unwarranted description, I feel. The levels of radiation I measured during my field investigations of the 777 formation were in the low microsievert range, with evidence of 'spikes' or fluctuations to a much higher level, especially during the presence of the military helicopters. The possible presence of both ionising and nonionising radiation should be enough to persuade anyone with a modicum of common sense to think twice before they consider entering a crop formation, especially during the period immediately following its creation, although, as we have seen, there is the - 54 -

real risk of remaining residual radiation. These findings lead me to conclude that any visitors to crop formations enter entirely at their own risk and they should be aware that they are entering a potentially hazardous environment, which, as we shall see later, may be part of some ongoing 'experiment', covertly monitored by a variety of agencies, and which could have long-term detrimental physical and psychological effects.

SECTION TWELVE: ANALYSIS OF THE PHOTOGRAPHIC & VIDEO EVIDENCE

AR Throughout this interview, we have covered many important issues pertaining to this unique and historic case. I would now like to draw together some of the strands from the evidence you have presented, in an attempt to understand more fully the nature of the phenomenon we are dealing with. As a scientist, in my opinion, the case rests or falls with the integrity of the photographic and video evidence and, of course, the witness testimonies.

AJB I think we can be absolutely certain of the authenticity and integrity of the key

witnesses, notably Winston Keech, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones. The final word on this issue, should come from Terje Toftenes who, after all, was the first researcher to interview them regarding the 777 incident. I have been in constant communication with Terje since July 2007, and in an email I received from him on the 4th November 2007, he stated;

'I must emphasise that I find both Win, Gary and Paula 100 per cent trustworthy, and their stories of what they experienced at the East Field on the 6th/7th July is the absolute truth. I have no reason in the world to suspect any of them to have any interest in making anything up. None of them are that type of personality. Win is a great guy of great integrity and was very open, kind and willing to share his material when I met him.'

And in a further email sent me, Terje stated;

'I have decided long ago to stay out of the CCC [Crop Circle Connector] Forum and have not read what has been going on and honestly really don't care what people might be expressing there. I have experienced forums like this to be more a venue for ego-exposure than a serious arena for constructive discussion.'

However, due to pressure from other researchers to defend some of the criticisms aimed at himself, Winston Keech and Gary King, Terje reluctantly agreed to provide a very brief statement on the CCC Forum, which was posted on Friday, 14th December 2007; .

'..... what I can say, is that what Win, Gary and Paula observed and experienced is pretty well exposed in my DVD from the incident. . . I still believe the formation to be genuine, it's size and circumstances of observation counts for that. But when during the few hours of darkness it was made, I have no idea . . . I fully trust Win to be a completely truthful and honest man of great integrity. As far as I can see from examining the footage there is no sign of light from any activity in the field during the dark night hours.'

- 55 -

As I have previously stated in this interview, I wholly concur with Terje's conclusions regarding the honesty and integrity of the key witnesses, after interviewing

them in detail myself Win has become a very good friend, and has been willing to share his photographic and video evidence of the 777 incident with me. I can also vouch for the honesty and sincerity of Terje Toftenes, who is an excellent judge of character. He most certainly would not place his own reputation at risk with a career as a highly respected film-producer to protect.

AR Regarding the photographic and video evidence, could you briefly summarise the nature of the scientific and forensic analysis which has been undertaken to date?

AJB For reasons which I will explain in due course, I am not at liberty to discuss with you

the precise details of this analysis. Win has been open and generous enough to allow me access to his photographic and video evidence of the 777 incident, and I am grateful that he trusts me, both as an individual and a researcher, to view this material which, after all, is his private property. I respect his wishes that any subsequent analysis should be undertaken within a strict framework of non-disclosure. This may sound undesirably prohibitive but, as I have already outlined, there are legitimate reasons why we have chosen to adopt this approach. It should be re-emphasised that Win only ever intended his research material to be studied within a secure scientific environment and, considering how we have already seen how this case has been desecrated

by some elements within the crop-circle research community, I feel he was

perfectly justified in adopting this approach of non-disclosure. You have to understand

that independent researchers such as Win and myself are not answerable to the crop-circle research community or any other individuals for that matter.

AR But am I correct in assuming that extensive analysis of the photographic and video evidence has already been undertaken by other researchers, for example, Terje Toftenes and Rodney Hale?

AJB That is correct. And this was because Win had kindly allowed them access to his video-footage. Terje Toftenes was an obvious candidate, having extensive experience within the film production industry, and access to image-enhancement technology. After studying Win's evidence in great detail, he came to the conclusion that there was absolutely no evidence of any human activity in the East Field on the night in question. Of course, any person using a light source larger than a pin-head would have been instantly detected and recorded by Win's image-intensifier and infra-red camera equipment. It would have been impossible to construct such a large and complex structure as the 777 formation without utilising some form of lighting apparatus / torches etc - an important point emphasised by the so-called 'circlemakers' when I interviewed them.

Apart from the video evidence filmed on the 6th / 7th July, Win also took a series of digital still photographic images of the East Field. He agreed to send a series of these photographic images to Rodney Hale, who is a colleague of crop-circle researcher Lucy Pringle. Rodney is a Chartered Engineer and Member of the Institution of Engineering and Technology. He is also a friend of researcher and author Andrew Collins, who has also undertaken previous quasi- scientific investigations into the crop-circle phenomenon. The still photographic images were taken with a Sony Cybershot DSC-F717 digital camera with a X5 F2 lens, at a relatively high shutter speed of ISO 400 with a 30 second exposure time. Four images were taken at 01.12 - 56 -

hrs; 01.13 hrs; 01.14 hrs and 01.23 hrs. They were all taken with a camera fixed on a tripod and pointing to the same area of the East Field where the 777 formation . subsequently appeared. In a non-enhanced state, the actual images are very dark, with only distant streetlights visible. However, when enhanced to almost daylight levels, they appear to reveal a 'shadow' in the field, which seems to closely resemble the outline of the 777 crop formation, or at least part of it. I emailed Rodney Hale, given the importance of these images, and he replied immediately, providing valuable . information regarding the procedures he had undertaken to enhance these images. Briefly, the four images were superimposed, and various adjustments were made on the computer to reduce noise and enhance the brightness and contrast levels. His conclusions revealed that by 01.23 hrs there was at least a half- finished formation present in the East Field. Andrew Collins was even more unequivocal in his response to these findings, concluding that it was highly likely the 777 formation had been hoaxed.

AR Have you also undertaken any analysis on these digital still photographic images?

AJB I have over twenty years experience of working in the graphic design industry, and am familiar with computer software programmes such as Adobe Photoshop. I undertook detailed analysis on these digital still images mentioned above, and there is absolutely no doubt, in my opinion, that they do reveal a shadow in the East Field which does seem to resemble at least the northern half of the 777 crop formation. Obviously, if this is the case, it is extremely important evidence which indicates that something very significant had happened in the field over two hours before the 'bright flash oflight' witnessed by Win, Gary and Paula shortly after 03.00 hrs on the

July 2007. Of course, it doesn't prove that the formation was a hoax, because we simply do not have any conclusive evidence from the remainder of the surveillance footage, to suggest that this was the case. But the presence of some kind of marking might indicate an 'ongoing process' in the East Field between 01.12 hrs and 01.23 hrs.

AR Did Winston Keech comment on these findings?

AJB Win agrees that something appears to be present on the photographic images, but not necessarily in the field. He made the following statement, which was included in the 'Commas and Semi-Colons' article, posted on crop-circle researcher Lucy Pringle's website;

'with respect to Hale's analysis, I do agree that something appears present on the enhancement. ... my concern is with noise artefacts in the Sony's internal processing and that at such low light levels, the effect of shadow from cloud / streetlight scatter and reflection from Alton Barnes must be considered the photos were very long exposures the camera image sensors produce random noise signals called dark noise the images were also compressed in ajpeg format which also increases noise and distortion effects which may have added previously hidden image compression artefacts

Win also confirmed to me that because the Sony digital camera was moved between shots, the field of view and zoom ratio is different for each, and artificially aligning them to produce a composite image, which was the method adopted by Rodney Hale, introduces noise and artefacts especially from lens spherical aberration. Win was

- 57 -

appreciative of Hale's efforts but reserved judgements on his findings. I agree that these four digital still images are vitally important evidence, because they do appear to show some unusual process was active in the East Field at the time they were taken. But I must emphasise that, under no circumstances, do they imply that the 777 crop formation was a hoax, because we simply cannot say for certain when, or how the formation actually appeared in the field. There have been many examples where crop formations have appeared over several hours and even days, with no evidence of human hoaxing. There is no reason to assume that any unexplained 'circlemaking' agency, excluding human hoaxing, would necessarily have to operate within a given timeframe. For example, a formation could be 'created' in a series of successive stages, over a period of several hours, or even days.

AR Apart from these still photographic images, have you undertaken any further analysis of the video footage Win obtained of the 777 incident?

AJB Win very kindly supplied me with over fifteen hours of his surveillance footage.

This

footage was obtained using a variety of cameras, the details of which I have already referred to in this interview. I have access to the entire sequence of CCTV video footage, which began shortly after 23.00 hrs on the 6th July 2007, and ended around 05.00 hrs on the 7th July 2007. The majority of this footage was filmed on the infrared

CCTV YD66 monochrome video cameras which were mounted on the roof of Win's Jeep, overlooking the East Field. The analysis of what is a massive amount of surveillance material will naturally require a great deal of time, patience and care.

Win has devoted a significant amount of his spare time digitally enhancing the footage. He particularly concentrated on the section of the footage filmed immediately before and after the 'bright flash of light', which was observed by himself, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones at 03.13 hrs. Each frame was enhanced

using an analogue brightness and contrast amplifier, and doesn't appear to show any crop formation in the field **prior** to the 'flash oflight' .

My own analysis of the entire sequence of video-footage from 23.00 hrs to 05.15 hrs is still very much in the preliminary stage. However, I do concur with both Terje Toftenes' and Win's conclusion **that there is absolutely no evidence of any human activity in the East Field during that period of time.** Histogrammatical frame by frame analysis of the footage reveals no evidence of any light sources, whether of artificial or natural origin, in the 'target area'. Naturally, any light source larger than a pin-head would have been optically visible anyway in the image intensifier Win was using to scan the fields. Similarly, the infra-red CCTV cameras reveal no evidence of any static or moving light sources in the East Field throughout the night. For example, one of these cameras clearly shows the small LED / MP3 player light source in John's car, which was parked in the East Field silage pit over a quarter of a mile away. The area where the 777 formation appeared was situated **between** the silage-pit and Knap Hill, where Win's cameras were positioned. Logically, any sources of light larger than John's LED / MP3 player light, which was, in any case, smaller than a torch-light, would have been instantly detected and clearly visible in the East Field, and captured by the CCTV infra-red camera.

I am very excited at the possibility of undertaking even more sophisticated analysis of both the photographic still and video-footage, within a professional and scientific environment. The aim would be to determine precisely when, and if possible, how the 777 formation appeared in the East Field during the night. Using the technique of image-restoration / clean-up algorithm to further enhance the video evidence via pixel replication, bilinear interpolation and cubic spline interpolation, it should be

- 58 -
possible to increase the amount of information in the original image by reducing the overall noise level. In order to enhance and magnify digital images, additional pixels must be added and their values determined. The simplest way to do this is by repeating pixel values. For example, to magnify an image twice its original size, every pixel value can be repeated once in the horizontal and vertical directions. The result, however, is simply a larger image composed of larger pixels, which is not very appealing. A more efficient method is to calculate intermediate pixel values, once again using some combination of their surrounding values. For example, bilinear interpolation uses a pixel's four nearest neighbours and produces results that are much smoother than pixel replication, but tends to be rather blurry. Cubic spline interpolation, which uses the values of twelve neighbouring pixels, produces somewhat sharper results. Obviously, such intensive analysis is extremely time-consuming, and it may be some time until a more complete picture emerges of the processes involved in the creation of the 777 crop formation. And we do have time on our side.

- 59 -

SECTION THIRTEEN: CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

AR Has the ongoing forensic analysis revealed any indications as to the nature of the first cause of the 777 crop formation?

AJB When all the pieces of the jigsaw are fitted together, we begin to understand more

fully about the first cause which, in my opinion, points towards the deployment of a highly sophisticated delivery system which is technologically capable of creating complex ground markings on the landscape, wherever there is a suitable medium present, for example, cereal crop.

AR Could you elaborate further regarding the nature of the agency or agencies

responsible the deployment of this technology?

AJB As I mentioned previously, I have to be very careful when revealing specific information relating to these issues, considering that the agencies responsible have gone to considerable lengths to cover up their clandestine activities. What I am about to tell you is of an extremely sensitive nature and, as a result, is restricted to a summary of the salient points relevant, not only to the 777 crop circle incident, but to the phenomenon as a whole. I therefore do not propose to reveal any information which not only might jeopardise the national security of this country, but my own safety as a citizen and a researcher.

Essentially, the crop-circle phenomenon represents a long-term 'false flag' programme utilising both Directed-Energy and Psychotronic weapons systems deployed by a number of agencies, the precise identities of which I do not propose to reveal. These weapons systems are deployed mostly 'at high altitude levels by sophisticated carrier systems which enable the advanced laser or maser microwave 'cannons' to create simple and complex patterns at ground level. Some later 'fine tuning' of the formations is achieved by portable microwave systems deployed both aerially and at ground level. More traditional human hoaxing methods are utilised, if necessary, to create elaborate details such as 'swirl patterns' and 'nests'.

AR It might be helpful if you could explain briefly what exactly is a Directed-Energy or Psychotronic Weapon? And what would be the reasons for this ongoing 'false flag' programme?

AJB I will go into greater detail concerning the nature of these weapons systems in due

course, but for the time being, a Directed-Energy Weapon [DEW] is a type of weapon that emits energy, for example, electromagnetic radiation, in an aimed direction, without the means of a projectile. A Psychotronic Weapon [PW] is similar to a DEW, except that the energy is emitted in the form of sound waves; and could be used against a human target to manipulate behaviour patterns, including thought processes, via subliminal sound or visual messages. The reasons for this ongoing programme are multi-fold, which I have summarised as follows;

- 1] The development and testing of Directed-Energy and Psychotronic Weapons.
 - 2] An ongoing mind-control programme, activated primarily to observe the long-term
- 60-

effects of these weapons systems on unsuspecting human subjects, and to observe their reactions to a contrived false flag 'alien' phenomenon, for example, the crop-circles, by encouraging a 'new age' interpretation of the patterns via the insertion of so-called sacred motifs and geometry into the designs, and strategically placing them near sacred sites, both in the UK and abroad.

- 3] The contamination of the food chain via chemical and genetic manipulation of crop DNA as a result of the deployment of the weapons systems mentioned previously. Analysis of the evidence from crop samples from formations has strongly indicated a catastrophic genetic breakdown of the food chain due to the accidental and deliberate release of experimental biological warfare agents in the form of chemical toxins, microwave [both ionising and non-ionising] radiation, which could cause irreversible mutation and damage within cereal crop DNA, whilst passed on to humans via the food chain as a contaminator.

AR What you have described is extremely disturbing as it implicates these agencies, whatever their identity and origin, in a clandestine programme of stupendous proportions, whilst potentially endangering the lives of millions of innocent people. Would it be possible for such a programme to have remained undetected for so many years and, given what you have said, do you now rule out a more

exotic hypothesis for the crop-circle phenomenon?

AJB The evidence is overwhelming that earth-based agencies are entirely responsible for the core crop-circle phenomenon and there is simply no need to resort to an exotic explanation, for example, extra-terrestrial or supernatural/paranormal hypotheses.

There is the possibility that a tiny percentage of the simpler formations can be explained by the meteorological hypothesis discussed earlier in this interview, or alternatively by traditional human hoaxing methods. Should you doubt that the weapons technology I have described exists, I would draw your attention to the many thousands of internet websites and scientific / academic journals and papers which testify to a long-term programme of development and testing of these weapons systems. My long-term investigations, not only into the crop-circle phenomenon as a whole, but more specifically the '777 incident' illustrates clearly how the salient points I have just described more than adequately explain the witness testimonies, and the forensic and photographic evidence pertinent to this and other similar cases.

AR You have been researching the crop-circle phenomenon for many years now. When did you first become aware of a connection between the use of a sophisticated earth-bound technology and the appearance of these patterns?

AJB From at least the early 1990s. During my field investigations, it soon became apparent that there was a heavy military presence over the formations. Discounting the possibility of flight training, I just assumed that military pilots were viewing the crop-circles as something of an aerial curiosity, or even using them as part of their manoeuvres, as 'ground targets'. It was only when I began to make several contacts within the military that I became aware of how closely involved they were with the phenomenon, although any further enquiries with my 'contacts' were often met with a disapproving silence which, of course, made me highly suspicious. I have already mentioned the involvement of the Ministry of Defence and the intelligence community with the crop-circle phenomenon, and this has recently been confirmed with the release of hitherto classified documents by the UK National Archive which highlight the sensitivity by which they treated the appearance of these unusual ground

- 61 -

markings. Up until approximately 2000 I was willing to accept that the majority of crop formations could not be explained by either a meteorological or human hoaxing hypothesis, without necessarily attributing their cause to an extraterrestrial or 'supernatural' agency. In 2001, I became aware of an article by John Wilson entitled 'Mosaic and Tessellated Patterns' [Dover Publications, New York 1983], a copy of which I still have in my possession. Four of the fractally-generated patterns featured in this article had somehow been reproduced perfectly in the fields of Wiltshire, UK in 2000, a year before I had read the article. I was convinced that this could not have been a coincidence, given that these four highly complex patterns were not only reproduced in the same article, but had been replicated on the ground with an astonishing degree of accuracy. I subsequently came across a series of articles published on the internet [that are still online, to the best of my knowledge], which postulate the theory that the crop formations had been produced by a satellite-based microwave technology, using **computer-generated templates**, through which a concentrated beam of microwave energy had been 'fired' to create sophisticated geometric markings on the ground. A similar, although less complex effect . occurs if one tries to reproduce the pattern of a paper doily on a piece of paper by spraying an aerosol paint from above, through the doily [template]. The patterns I had observed in the article by John Wilson had probably been computer-generated, and could have easily been integrated into some form of delivery system within a microwave transmitter. There was good reason to suppose that many similar patterns had been generated over the years and up to the present day, utilising the same process.

AR I have read the article you have mentioned and also viewed aerial photographs

of these crop formations which appeared during the year 2000 in Wiltshire, and agree that they are absolutely identical. The chances of four such patterns emerging is way beyond the possibility of chance, thus demonstrating a causal link between the computer-generated tessellated patterns and their subsequent appearance on the ground. Have you discovered other references within the research literature of a technology-based system being utilised to create the crop formations?

AJB Yes, shortly afterwards, I became aware of two articles which had been posted on the internet entitled 'Crop Circles: The Military Use of a Microwave Cannon' and 'The Crime Weapon Identified', both translated by George Hoskins. Both articles hypothesise that the crop formations were due to the firing of an aerially-based military microwave cannon. Evidence of this could be observed in W.C Levengood's research concerning the bending of crop-stalks, which was indicative of a VHF [ultra-high frequency] microwave effect. Other phenomena of an electromagnetic nature were also observed in the vicinity of crop formations which could be the by-products of a Directed-Energy system being deployed, for example, electrostatic sounds and anomalous light phenomena such as so-called 'balls of light' or 'luminosities'. Residual radiation released by the microwave cannon could also explain the physiological and psychological effects on human visitors to the formations, for example, 'altered states of consciousness', mental confusion and the symptoms of exposure to radiation such as headache, nausea and vomiting. It should be noted that all the above effects were reported by visitors, including myself, to the 777 East Field crop formation. Significantly, these articles re-emphasise a causal link between computer-generated tessellated patterns as templates through which a concentrated beam of microwave energy is fired to create the complex geometric patterns on the ground.

- 62-

AR Do the articles explain why these high-energy weapons are being deployed to create the crop patterns?

AJB The articles more or less confirm what I have already told you, that a RPM [High-Powered Microwave] technology is currently being developed, and in some cases, already being deployed in battlefield situations to destroy enemy electronic equipment. Outrageous though it seems, the evidence suggests that these Directed-Energy and Psychotronic weapons systems are being covertly tested over non-military areas, using civilians as unwitting subjects. **In** order to cover up these clandestine activities, the operators of these systems wish to encourage the belief that extraterrestrials or some other 'supernatural' or 'paranormal' agency is creating the crop formations. As we have already implied, there is ample evidence to demonstrate that the intelligence agencies have actively encouraged a climate of disinformation surrounding the crop-circle phenomenon by planting ' sleeper agents ' masquerading as so-called 'hoaxers' within the research community, often aided and abetted by the researchers themselves, many of whom either promulgate the extra-terrestrial or supernatural explanations, or conversely argue that all the crop formations are manmade, using traditional hoaxing methods.

Although the hypothesis described above might sound absurd to most researchers and members of the public, it has nevertheless been corroborated by the long-standing distinguished and well-respected French UFO and paranormal researcher Jacques Vallee, author of 'Passport to Magonia', who was the inspiration for the scientist Claude Lacombe in Steven Spielberg's UFO movie 'Close Encounters of the Third Kind'. In a recent article posted on the internet entitled 'Crop Circles: Signs From Above or Human Artifacts?', Vallee concluded following several years of intensive research, that the crop formations are a product of a sophisticated laser, maser and microwave transmitter as a result of electronic warfare experiments, and could be used for a number of military purposes, including the destruction of incoming enemy missiles. Vallee is also of the opinion that the crop formations could also be a part of

a long-term **psychological warfare experiment**, with various 'false flag' hypotheses, for example, the extraterrestrial explanation, deliberately planted amongst the cropcircle and 'new age' research communities, thus enabling their real motives and purposes to be hidden.

AR You also mentioned earlier a book entitled 'Crop Circles: Evidence of a Cover-Up' by Nicholas Montigiani, who seemed to have come to the same conclusions, that the majority of crop formations were being created by some form of Directed-Energy weapons system.

AJB That is correct. Nick Montigiani's book is a very revealing insight into the claims made by a well-known and respected French scientist Montigiani contacted whilst he was investigating the crop formations in the UK. Because this scientist was employed by a large military research establishment located near Paris, France, for obvious reasons he was keen to preserve his anonymity. The scientist / engineer informed Montigiani that the field of applications for microwaves in its military and civilian development had become widespread. He had been researching the crop-circle phenomenon for over a decade, and following a series of laboratory experiments involving the application of microwave technology to wheat stems, had come to a global and coherent conclusion regarding this enigma.

His familiarity with these microwave systems within military research enabled him to demonstrate with a high probability that a RPM [High-Powered Microwave] generator or cannon, which had been under development for over twenty years, is

- 63-

now available to many countries, including France, the UK, Russia and the USA, for both civilian and military applications. The generator or cannon is situated within an aerial platform, for example, an orbiting satellite or dirigible balloon, which must also furnish the electrical power necessary for its operation. Alternatively, it could receive its energy directly from the ground via a transfer system, possibly involving microwave transmissions. Montigiani had already been informed by the French scientist that during numerous laboratory experiments, he had already succeeded in reproducing nodal bending in wheat stems, as observed by crop-circle researchers such as Nancy Talbott and W.C Levengood, through a series of pulsed microwave discharges. In the case of a much more sophisticated Directed-Energy Weapon, for example, a High-Powered Microwave cannon, suspended from an aerial platform, the beam would have to be far more precise and co-ordinated.

According to the French scientist, if packets of microwaves are transmitted by successive pulses at very high powers for short periods, there would be a weak but sufficient energy to alter both the stems and ears of the crop. The water contained in the nodal part of the stem is instantly vaporised. Many witnesses, including myself, have witnessed during circle formation, the rapid vaporisation of the plant stems, often as a massive curtain of steam or water vapour rapidly rising upwards from the crop. The reason for this is the water, which represents a high percentage of the matter constituting the ear and stem of the crop, will almost reach boiling point within the stem and the node. Because the node consists of watery cellulose, it soon goes soft and pliable as a result of this microwave bombardment, until it collapses by folding inwards at the lowest level under the weight of the thicker top part of the stem, or ear. This accounts for the nodal enlargements and the phenomenon of 'blown' or 'exploded nodes' which has been observed and photographed many times in plant samples taken from inside crop formations. It would also account for the so-called 45 degree 'magical bends' in some of the crop stems.

AR So, if I am correct, these weapons systems have been deployed and tested for many years now, principally for use in battlefield situations to destroy enemy equipment, including incoming ballistic missiles. The sinister aspect concerns their use on human targets, particularly in the area of what I would term 'neurological modification' - in other words, mind-control. Not only is this

technology demonstrably capable of artificially creating a sociological phenomenon we commonly refer to as 'crop circles' over several decades, but it appears that there have also emerged legitimate military reasons for monitoring the biological effects such a 'phenomenon' would have on the participatory human subjects.

AJB That is true, but we must not overlook the multitudinous and undesirable effects these weapons have on the ecosystems of the planet and I have already considered their use as biological warfare agents. We do have an abundance of evidence from samples taken from the crop formations of contamination to the food chain via chemical and genetic manipulation of the crop DNA.

An article in the journal 'Air & Cosmos' [issue 1842 - May 10th, 2002] states that the Electronic Warfare Division of the DSTO [Defence Science and Technology Division] utilised RF [Radio Frequency] and RPM [High-Powered Microwave] weapons systems, otherwise known generically as EM or UHF [electromagnetic or ultra-high frequency] weapons. These are weapons emitting electromagnetic pulses, sufficiently energetic enough to disturb or even destroy the electronics of other energy weapons systems.

- 64-

'Air & Cosmos' also confirmed that for the last decade, France has been conducting a 'black programme' of UHF weapons. The French Ministry of Defence has developed 'E-Bombs' [electromagnetic bombs] based on 'flux compressor generators' or 'high voltage generators' coupled with high-powered pulses deployed using combat drones or UAVs [unmanned aerial vehicles].

AR You have already mentioned DEWs [Directed-Energy Weapons] and PWs [Psychotronic Weapons]. Could you describe these weapons in a little more detail- how they function and the effects they have on civilian and military targets?

AJB Directed-Energy Weapons are essentially laser delivery systems which utilise energy in two primary forms; electromagnetic [EM] radiation [typically lasers or masers], and particles with mass.[Particle Beam Weapons] - whereas a Psychotronic Weapon emits energy in the form of sound waves and could be used against a human target to manipulate behaviour patterns, including thought processes, via subliminal, sound or visual messages.

AR What is a maser?

AJB A maser [M.A.S.E.R - Microwave Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation], is a laser adapted to magnify microwaves.

Therefore, Directed-Energy Weapons can be categorised according to the type of energy they use, for example, light, sound, radio, plasma, particles etc and the effects they have on various targets. These include physical damage, sensory interference, destroying machinery and physiological effects on human targets. There are various kinds of EM [Electromagnetic Weapons], including Microwave Weapons; Pulsed Energy Projectiles [PEPs]; and Tactical High Energy Lasers [THELs].

A laser delivery system has numerous advantages over conventional weapons systems. Because a laser beam can travel at the speed of light, a potential target is instantly destroyed and has little or no chance of evading detection. Thus, such systems can theoretically defeat artillery and missile attacks in ground, air and space combat.

A laser weapon operates by generating brief high-energy pulses. For example, a laser pulse of one million joules has roughly the same energy as 200g of high explosive and has the same effect on a target, which would be instantly evaporated. The Pulsed Energy Projectile [PEP] destroys its target by emitting a powerful infrared laser pulse which creates a rapidly expanding plasma. The effects on machinery and particularly human targets are overwhelming and catastrophic, the electromagnetic wave causing

pain and paralysis. The Tactical High Energy Laser [THEL] has been jointly developed by the USA and Israel, and is designed to shoot down aircraft and missiles. A Particle Beam Weapon [PBW] is essentially a plasma weapon, using charged or neutral particles. These weapons fire a beam of plasma, which is an excited state of matter consisting of atomic material.

AR What are the physical effects of Directed-Energy Weapons on human targets?

AJB DEWs cause a number of potentially serious and often fatal effects on human targets. These include damage to the central nervous system and brain damage, difficulty breathing, vertigo, nausea and vomiting, heart problems, permanent hearing damage, as a result of exposure to ultrasound. There can also be psycho-physiological damage, including epileptic seizures, hallucinations, 'altered states of consciousness' and

- 65 -

disorientation. It has already been noted that many of these symptoms have been reported on numerous occasions by visitors to crop circles over the years, including, of course, the 777 crop formation.

AR Without revealing too much sensitive information, could you possibly identify some of the agencies / organisations currently engaged in the research and development of this technology?

AJB It would be unwise of me to reveal the identity of organisations involved in the development of this highly sensitive technology. If the listener would care to search and browse the many internet websites on the topic of Directed-Energy Weapons systems, he or she would rapidly come to the conclusion that this technology exists on a global basis, and is under development throughout many of the world's premier universities and scientific and military establishments.

AR You also mentioned the existence of Psychotronic Weapons. How do these weapons differ from the Directed-Energy systems?

AJB Psychotronic Weapons are potentially a good deal more frightening and dangerous than Directed-Energy Weapons. They are similar in that the weapon emits energy in the form of a carrier beam aimed at a selected target, whether human or machine, without the means of a projectile. It is highly likely that these weapons are already deployed utilising existing satellite technology. Alternatively, there are also groundbased systems which have been in existence for many years that have similar capabilities. For example, H.A.A.R.P [High Frequency Active Auroral Research Project] near Gokona, Alaska, is funded by the United States Department of Defence, the US Air Force and US Navy. It consists of a large array of antennae linked to a megawatt power emitter. It is a weapon capable of interfering with navigation and communications systems destroying enemy missiles, and is also used to modify meteorological systems in a given region by affecting the circulation of winds in the upper atmosphere. More disturbingly, HAARP also has the potential to alter cerebral functions in human beings by the propagation of electromagnetic [EM] radiation. For obvious reasons, the secrecy surrounding the development of this mind-altering technology reflects the tremendous power that is inherent in these systems. Whoever possesses this technology has the potential to control the minds and actions of large swathes of the human population. I contend that the crop-circle phenomenon is one example of an ongoing mind-control experiment which utilises both the Directed-Energy and Psychotronic Weapons systems.

AR And within the context of the crop-circle phenomenon, I would be interested to . explore in a little more detail the mechanisms by which these systems are actually deployed.

AJB It is clear following several decades of detailed forensic analysis and research that whatever processes are responsible for the creation of the crop formations, they seem to have an airborne origin. We have already established that there is a link between reports of inexplicable aerial phenomena, variously described as 'balls of light', 'luminosities' and, of course, 'UFOs'. Clearly, if we are postulating that there is a

delivery system capable of producing complex geometrical patterns on the ground, for example, the Directed-Energy Weapon, then such a system must, not only have a point of origin, but also be capable of being deployed somewhere in the upper atmosphere by what could be described as a 'carrier' technology.

- 66-

There are three possible 'carrier' devices already known to operate within the earth's atmosphere which would be capable of deploying the weapons systems described above. Most people are familiar with the so-called 'Star Wars' or SDI [Strategic Defence Initiative] anti-ballistic missile project, postulated by the former United States President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s. More than twenty years later, literally hundreds of military and civilian artificial satellites are constantly in earth orbit, many of which have been funded by classified 'black budgets'. It is highly likely that some of these artificial satellites serve as communications relay or surveillance platforms via which a Directed-Energy Weapon could be deployed. Crop-circle researchers such as Nancy Talbot and W.C Levengood have concluded that whatever energy system is being utilised to create the crop formations is likely to have its point of origin in the upper atmosphere, particularly the ionosphere or troposphere. There are two other possible candidates for a carrier system, both of which are capable of carrying Directed-Energy Weapons, together with other telecommunications and surveillance equipment, and more likely to be deployed to create the complex and geometric ground markings, rather than satellite-based technology. This is because such systems would operate from a much lower altitude, thus significantly decreasing the distance between carrier and target, thus allowing for a higher degree of precision and accuracy.

H.A.B.E [High Altitude Balloon Experiment] is essentially a large stratospheric balloon, or dirigible, adapted to carry a support structure or platform which would house the weapon in the form of a laser or maser cannon. The balloon would be capable of flying to an altitude of 30 kilometres and could easily carry a payload of up to 4 tons. The system is totally silent, almost invisible, and when airborne can reach speeds of up to 70 metres a second parallel to the equator, and would circumnavigate the earth over several days or weeks, depending on its altitude. An onboard gyroscopic mechanism would, allow considerable stability in focusing the impact point on the target - the directional precision of the laser or maser being within 10 micro radians. The HABE programme was originally developed by the Air Force Research Laboratories Space Vehicles Directorate, at Kirtland Air Force Base in New Mexico, USA, on behalf of the Ballistic Missile Defence Organisation. Given the sophistication and precision of this technology, it would be entirely possible for the HABE system to be deployed in creation of the ground markings / crop-circles. Because such systems are constantly in need of testing and modification, a long-term project involving the creation of high precision ground targets would be ideal. Technically speaking, in order for the HABE system to create a complex marking on the ground, this procedure would have to be carried out in probably less than a minute, which more or less corresponds to the many eyewitness reports of very short duration circles formation. During this short elapse of time, the dirigible balloon would have covered a distance of approximately 4 kilometres. At an altitude of 30 kilometres, this would only account for 8 degrees of angular movement, which would fit well within the parameters of most of the crop formations witnessed to date. Apart from HABE, another potential carrier system capable of deploying microwave energy systems is S.H.A.R.P [Stationary High Altitude Relay Platform]. SHARP was first conceived in 1980 and the first public demonstration occurred in October 1987 at the Communications Research Centre, in Canada. The SHARP concept, rather than HABE's dirigible balloons, utilises pilot-less aeroplanes or UAVs [unmanned aerial vehicles] as platforms, carrying the weapons payload.

Rather than an airborne dirigible balloon, such as HABE, or an unmanned aerial

vehicle, such as SHARP being deployed as an air to ground delivery system, it may be more advantageous to combine a ground-based energy generator, for example, the HAARP system, to create the ground markings. On these occasions, a focused beam

- 67 -
of microwave energy would be fired from the ground to a high altitude relay aircraft [such as HABE or SHARP] equipped with a reflector, which would send the beam back to the ground in order to create the ground marking.

AR Would the 'firing' of it beam of microwave energy from an orbiting carrier be visible at ground level?

AJB In most cases, probably not. Most crop formations appear during the hours of darkness and there have been occasional eyewitness reports of bright flashes of light in the sky in areas where crop formations have subsequently appeared. You will recall the bright aerial flash which occurred over the East Field on the night of the 6th / 7th July 2007 witnessed by Winston Keech, Gary King and Paula Presdee-Jones during the 777 incident. I have observed many similar inexplicable aerial flashes over the past twenty years, mostly in Wiltshire, which were definitely not related to thunderstorm activity, or military manoeuvres on nearby Salisbury Plain. This 'flash phenomenon' often occurs at extremely high altitude and is normally of very brief duration, although on a few occasions, can be seen at ground level. There have also been several daylight sightings of this phenomenon, which seems to be electromagnetic or electrostatic in origin. The appearance of these aerial flashes of light often coincides with other aerial phenomena, including the 'balls of light' which I have already referred to in connection with the crop-circle phenomenon. Although there may well be a mundane explanation for these luminous phenomena, it does seem reasonable to conclude, given their proximity to localities favouring the appearance of crop formations, that one likely explanation for these aerial flashes of light might be the firing of a Directed-Energy Weapon or some similar device, either from an orbiting platform in the upper atmosphere, or alternatively at ground level.

AR You have already provided an overview of the relationship between these exotic weapons systems and the crop-circle phenomenon and have established fairly convincing evidence that one of the main components of this ongoing experimental 'programme' is the disturbing issue of mind-control, involving the use of Psychotronic Weapons. Quite apart from the biological, chemical and genetic manipulation of our cereal crops as a result of this technological experimentation, the implication that human beings are being used as unwitting 'manchurian candidates' in what appears to be a clandestine confidence trick of stupendous proportions, must surely be of the most profound concern to us all. I think it would be of tremendous importance to discuss the wider implications these weapons systems are having on the human mind, because it is exceedingly worrying that this aspect of the crop-circle phenomenon seems lost on the research community and regrettably, has not become an urgent topic for debate, despite the warning signs being so obviously self-evident.

AJB This doesn't surprise me, given the gullibility, naivety, ignorance and apathy displayed by the crop-circle research community and members of the public. Throughout this interview, I have attempted to demonstrate a causal link, via my research and investigations into the 777 East Field Incident, between the crop-circle phenomenon and an advanced, sophisticated weapons technology. We are dealing with what is potentially the most terrifying issue to confront the human race throughout the entire history of our species, eclipsing even the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Whilst it is true that throughout the past, there have been numerous attempts to exert a degree of control and coercion, whether politically, philo-

\, - 68 -

sophically or theologially over the human race, it is only comparatively recently that

scientists have acquired the technological means to potentially brainwash and programme subliminally the minds of large percentages of the population. Apart from the corporate media, including television, radio and newspapers, the rapid development of mind-altering technology, specifically Psychotronic Weapons systems, represent the Endgame in global mind control. Recent events concerning the imminent global economic 'collapse' should alert us to the dangers confronting the human race and our fragile planet.

AR Would I be correct in assuming that military mind control programmes originated before the Second World War?

AJB Well, one could extrapolate that the wars themselves are part of this ongoing attempt to manipulate and shape the future of the human race. Between 1940 and the early 1970s, there were many research projects involved with studying the effects of mindcontrol techniques using, in many cases, unwitting human subjects. Some of these were highly classified CIA [Central Intelligence Agency, USA] projects, including MKULTRA; ARTI-CHOKE; CHATTER; MKDELTA and MKOFTEN, amongst others. Many high profile members of the medical and scientific establishments were involved to investigate and experiment with various forms of mind-control and behaviour modification. In 1968, Ronald K. Siegel, an Associate Research Professor in the Department of Psychiatry and Bio-Behavioural Sciences at UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles], United States of America, published a professional paper entitled 'A Device for Chronically Controlled Visual Input'. This rather cryptically described a device he had developed whereby images would be projected directly into the brains of experimental animals via their optic nerves.

In his 1970 book, 'Between Two Ages', Zbigniew Brezezinski, a long-time 'Establishment Strategist', accurately predicted the kinds of Psychotronic Weaponry that the United States Administration is now developing. He stated that it would soon be possible to exert the mass behaviour control of citizens by seriously impairing their brain performances over an extended period.

A conference attended by high level officials from many countries was held in Washington DC, USA, in 1983 sponsored by the Defence & Foreign Affairs and the International Strategic Studies Association. A summary of the conference's agenda reads: 'the group will be discussing the essence of future policymaking the new technologies of communications - satellites, television, radio and **mind-control weapons** and it will be the psychologically based systems which determine the world's fate in the coming years: the condition of the minds of populations and leaders and, on a more basic level, what good is a weapons system if public opinion or political constraints prohibit its deployment.' This final sentence highlights the unprecedented and covert nature of mind-control technology.

AR Could you describe in "detail some of the psychotronically-based weapons systems which have been developed since the 1970s?

AJB The American Air Force 1982 'Final Report on Biotechnology Research Requirements for Aeronautical Systems 2000' states that 'subsequent work should address the possibilities' of directing and interrogating mental functioning, **using externally applied fields.**'

Many scientists have warned that recent advances in neurophysiology could be used to manipulate human brain function. For example, in June 1985, Michael Persinger, who has worked with the United States Navy's EM weapons project has stated in

- 69-

scientific journals that 'the technical capability to influence directly the major portion of the human population by generating neural information within a physical medium which all members of the species are immersed in is now marginally feasible.'

In May 1999, a United Nations neuroscientists conference took place in Tokyo. Some of the scientists present declared that: 'today we have intellectual, physical and financial resources to master the power of the brain itself, and to develop devices to

touch the mind and even control or erase consciousness.'

I have already mentioned the highly controversial HAARP system [High Frequency Active Auroral Research Project]. The European Parliament recently passed a 'Resolution on Environment, Security and Foreign Policy.' They considered the HAARP system to be a global concern by virtue of its far-reaching impact on the environment. It regretted the repeated refusal of the United States Administration to provide evidence to the public hearing or engage in any kind of debate on this issue. One of HAARP's potential uses is as a communications system, utilising ELF [Extremely Low Frequency] transmissions. As we have seen, the mind-control subliminal messages are carried on radio frequency broadcasts. The HAARP facility could be used to broadcast global mind-control messages.

Another ground-based relay network system, situated in the USA, and similar to HAARP, is called G.W:E.N [Ground Wave Emergency System]. Ostensibly, it is a military communications system, similar to our own UK civilian mobile phone relay network. GWEN consists of over 300 stations spread across the United States. Each station can transmit in a 360 degree circle to a distance of 250 to 300 miles. It operates in the VLF [Very Low Frequency] range, with transmissions between 150 and 175 kHz. It is also immune to massive broadband destructive interference produced by a nuclear weapon generated EMP [Electromagnetic Pulse]. Although its main purpose is to provide a survivable link between designated bomber and tanker bases, there is no reason why the GWEN system, as could our own mobile phone relay network, be modified and used as a carrier for subliminal mind-altering technology.

AR Would it be true to say that the United States of America is at the forefront of research and development into mind-altering technology?

AJB The development of mind-altering technology has a long history, and probably originated in Russia during the 1920s, when the scientist Vladimir Bekhterev launched the Commission for the Study of Mental Suggestion in Leningrad. Since then, Russia has been a leading innovator in para-psychological and mind-control weapons research. However, there is no doubt that in recent times, and perhaps as a response to the Russian, 'supremacy' in mind-control research, the United States has gained the initiative.

Judy Wall is one of the world's leading researchers and commentators on the military use of mind-control. She is also the editor and publisher of 'Resonance', the newsletter of the MENSA Bio-Electromagnetics Special Interest Group. She has published several articles on the internet, warning of the potential threat to the human race of this mind-altering technology. Two such articles are entitled 'The Military Use of Mind Control' [1998] and 'Aerial Mind Control: The Threat to Civil Liberties' [1999]. Wall had uncovered evidence that the United States Department of Defence [DOD] had been utilising Psy-Ops tactics [Psychological Operations] against Iraqi troops in Kuwait during Operation Desert Storm in the first Gulf War. Manoeuvres consisted of a subliminal mind-altering technology carried to the enemy troops on standard radio frequency broadcasts in the form of 'vague, confusing and contradictory orders'. This 'silent sound' technology was capable of directly

- 70 -

manipulating and modifying human EEG [electroencephalograph] patterns to artificially implant, amongst other things, negative emotional states and feelings of fear, despair and anxiety.

This mind-altering technology is called the 'Silent Sound Spread Spectrum' [SSSS], sometimes called 'S-Quad' or 'Squad', and was developed by Dr. Oliver Lowery, of Norcross, Georgia USA, in 1992. Initially, supercomputers are used to analyse and

replicate human emotional EEG patterns. These patterns are converted into nonaural carriers in the VLF [Very Low Frequency], or VHF [Very High Frequency] range, and are then propagated acoustically or vibrationally, either for direct microwave induction into the human brain, or through loudspeakers, earphones or piezoelectric transducers. The 'Synthetic Technology' system named by the United States government whereby thoughts and ideas are directly inserted into a person's mind by an electromagnetic transmitter operating in the microwave frequency band. Lockheed-Sanders have manufactured a Directed-Energy Microwave Weapon used for a process called Voice Synthesis whereby audible signals are beamed remotely into a human brain. '

Apart from the United States involvement in mind-control technology, research and development, Judy Wall also discovered that in 1979, the then Soviet Union had already published a list of potential weapons of mass destruction [WMD], which more or less describes the types of Directed-Energy and Psychotronic Weapons we are already familiar with;

Radiological Weapons - which use radioactive materials to produce harmful effects similar to a nuclear explosion [the so-called 'Dirty Bomb'];

Particle-Beam Weapons - these utilise charged or neutral particles to affect biological, including human targets;

Infrasonic Acoustic Radiation Weapons and Electromagnetic Weapons - which operate at certain radio- frequency radiations which could have an injurious effect on human organs.

Of course, there may very well be other similar weapons systems, either in various stages of development, or currently deployed as part of some highly classified 'black operations' programme.

Allowing for the extremely sensitive nature of this subject, I would like to take this opportunity to ask you, Tony, if during your many years working as a research scientist involved in radio astronomy, were you made aware of the existence of the kinds of weapons technologies we have been discussing?

AR Without going into too much detail, Andy, you must understand that many . scientists and engineers are bound by the U.K Official Secrets Act rOSA] and are simply not at liberty to discuss their involvement in certain areas which are deemed to be highly classified, including the development and deployment of prototype weapons systems. Scientific research is, of course, highly compartmentalised and operates mostly on a 'need to know' basis. So I hope you will forgive my reticence to provide any definite answers to your question. I view the information you have provided with a high degree of concern and I think that, because the issues you have raised are extremely alarming and controversial to say the least, you should not underestimate the dangers inherent when discussing them in the public arena. You made the point that here we are dealing with what are probably some of the most highly classified technologies known to man, and that to protect them from public scrutiny would be in the

- 71 -

best interests of our national security within the binding nature of the Official Secrets Act.

AJB I accept that I am placing myself at risk in discussing these issues, although much of the information I have shared with you and the listener is already in the public arena, and is available in books, journals and on numerous internet websites. As a researcher and investigator, I feel duty bound to explore all avenues of enquiry, however controversial and challenging. I have chosen to discuss the issues surrounding these weapons technologies because, in my opinion, they have a direct bearing, not only regarding the '777 incident', but also the crop-circle phenomenon . as a whole. I have already established a causal link between the crop formations and military weapons technology and have described in detail how visitors to the 777

East Field crop formation, including myself, witnessed the often intimidating and unprecedented levels of military activity during the subsequent weeks following the appearance of the formation.

AR Well, I think we can be quite clear at this stage, of the identity of both the experimenters and the lab rabbits. I guess we have to determine the legitimacy of the experiment within the broad definition of national security and the 'need' to control the destiny of an ever-increasing and volatile human population, with all the accompanying social and environmental problems. Perhaps we should be asking the question, 'Who are the real enemies?'

AJB I think it is fair to assume that the overwhelming consensus view of the general public is that a nation's appointed Ministry of Defence exists primarily to defend itself from a perceived hostile threat, whatever its point of origin. In recent years, however, we have seen how drastically the goalposts have moved, with the definition of who or what is the actual enemy becoming increasingly ambiguous. Whilst sovereignty and national security are still presumably the main priorities of a country's armed forces, it does appear that some agencies, whilst ostensibly affiliated to 'the military', have nevertheless been working to their own agendas and conducting research and development into sophisticated technologies capable of mass destruction, including mind-control, whether as biological, chemical, nuclear, or as I have demonstrated Electromagnetic and Psychotronic weapons systems.

On July 21st 1994, the United States Department of Defence [DOD] proposed that electromagnetic weapons be targeted against, not only proven enemies, but anyone who was perceived to be a threat to the DOD.

A study by the United States Air Force [USAF] Scientific Advisory Board, issued in 1996, quoting USAF General John Jumper 'predicts that the military will have the tools to make potential enemies see, hear and believe things that do not exist.' Was this statement by General Jumper a coded reference to phenomena such as UFOs, the paranormal and most importantly, crop formations?

Also in 1996, the same Scientific Advisory Board published a 15-volume study of future developments in weapons technology entitled 'New World Vistas', a section of which referred to a process called 'Biological Process Control' [BPC], in other words, the fusion of man and machine. BPC envisages a future existence where pulsed electromagnetic sources, particularly Psychotronic Weapons, successfully couple with the human body in order to control muscular movements, emotions, sleep patterns and short and long-term memory. General Jumper predicts that mind-control technology will be used against political enemies - individuals they perceive as a threat, for example, those of opposing political viewpoints, 'subversives' such --

- 72-

· counter-culture individuals and biological 'undesirables'. Potentially, the list is endless.

AR By bringing our attention to the existence of this perceived technology of mass destruction, you presumably run the risk of being categorised as a 'subversive' and 'counter-culture individual' by the powers that be. Does this cause you a certain degree of anxiety?

AJB Well, I have to be careful not to assume a political stance where this kind of controversial

material is concerned. I have endeavoured to present the facts as I see them

· pertaining to the 777 East Field incident and the crop-circle phenomenon as a whole.

And these facts indicate that we are essentially dealing with a long-term 'false-flag' mind-control programme / experiment involving the deployment of a highly sophisticated earth-based technology which utilises both Directed-Energy and Psychotronic weapons systems to create on a global scale the complex ground-markings ostensibly labelled as 'crop-circles.'

AR You have no doubt heard of the principal known as 'Occam's Razor', which states, that all things being equal, the simplest explanation is usually the correct one. On reviewing the evidence thus far, there is no need to resort to an exotic explanation, whether it be extra-terrestrial or supernatural for the crop-circle phenomenon, however unpalatable this may appear to the 'believers' amongst the research community.

AJB I quite agree, and the 777 East Field incident is a unique and historic case where the evidence points to the type of technology I have described previously.

AR What future plans do you have regarding this case?

AJB It is vital that this case continues to receive the respect and integrity it fully deserves and that there is no further targeting of the key witnesses with malicious and defamatory remarks which has bedevilled the case thus far. Despite these setbacks, we intend to pursue a rigorous programme of intensive scientific analysis of the photographs, video-footage and the other forensic evidence available to us. As a result of the unwarranted and unacceptable behaviour of some of the individuals and researchers mentioned throughout this interview, any future investigations into the 777 East Field incident and other similar cases will be conducted within a strict framework of non-disclosure. And that is as far as I intend to elaborate on these issues for the time being.

AR It therefore remains for me to thank you, Andrew, for taking the time to discuss this fascinating case, together with all the wider repercussions, however disturbing, and I wish you well with your continuing research and investigations.

AJB My pleasure, Tony, and many thanks to you for offering to conduct this interview within an atmosphere of scientific curiosity, respectfulness and open-mindedness.

- 73 -

SECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and publications which I have listed in this section, and this is gratefully acknowledged.

Notes.

Section Two.

P.5.

P.15.

Section Six.

P.21,30,

31.

Section Eight.

P.26.

P.26,34.

P.27,31.

P.27,37.

P.31,32.

P.32.

P.33.

P.33.

P.37.

P.37,38.

Section Twelve.

'A Covert Agenda' by Nicholas Redfern. Pgs.224-225.

'On the Trail of the Saucer Spies' by Nick Redfern. Pgs.205-206.

'JustMe' - 'East Field Incident 2007' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.

- posted: Saturday, December 1^S 2007.

'Farmer's Boy' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Sunday, December 16th, 2007.

'Celtic King' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Tuesday, December 4th, 2007.

'JustMe' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Saturday, January 1th:2008.

Andy Thomas - Email to Doug Rogers via Linda Moulton Howe.
 - July 24th, 2007.

'JustMe' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Saturday, December 15t\ 2007.

'Farmer's Boy' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Sunday, December 16th, 2007.

'Farmer's Boy' - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Sunday, December 2nd, 2007.

'Farmer's Boy' ~ 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Friday, February 8th, 2008.

Robert Chapman - Email to Linda Moulton Howe.
 - July 24th, 2007.

'Hubcap 9' [aka Robert Hulse] - UFO Casebook Forum.
 - posted: August 13t\ 2007.

P.55. TerJe Toftenes - Email to Andy Buckley.
 - 4t November, 2007.

P.55. Terje Toftenes - 'East Field Incident 2001' - Crop-Circle Connector Forum.
 - posted: Friday, 14thDecember, 2007.

- 74-

ECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and publications which I have listed in this section, and this is gratefully acknowledged.

Articles.

P.2,3.

P.3.

P.6.

P.8.

P.8,57.

P.26.

P.26.

P.34,35.

P.43,44.

P.47,48.

P.51,52.

'The 2001 Woodborough Hill Crop Formation.' [Field Analysis Report]
 by A.J. Buckley. Available from the author.

'Case History - The Observation and Video-Recording of an Unexplained
 Aerial Phenomenon at Woodborough Hill, near Alton Barnes, Wiltshire,
 July 18th

, 2000.' [Field Analysis Report] by A.J.Buckley. Available from
 the author.

'The Military Menace' by Colin Andrews and Glen Edwards aka Andrew
 J. Buckley. .

UFO Reality magazine. [Issue 2: June / July 1996).

'Part 1: 1033 foot long East Field Wheat Crop Formation' by Linda
 Moulton-Howe. [July 2007).

[www.earthfiles~ com].
 'Commas and Semi-Colons' by Lucy Pringle. [2008].
 [http://www.lucypringle.co.uk/articles/commas/] .
 'Is this the proof that our crop-circles are not of this earth?'
 Western Daily Press. [Friday, July 20th 2007].
 'So, who made this then?'
 Wiltshire Gazette and Herald. [Thursday, July 26th 2007].
 'Review of the 2007 crop-circle season' by Freddy Silva.
 The Crop Circular website. [www.cropcirclesecrets.org].
 '070707 East Field Wheat Crop Formation: Lab. Analysis' by Linda
 Moulton-Howe., [2007].
 [www.earthfiles.com).
 'Black Helicopters over the 'AUM' Crop Formation of East Field on
 18th July, 2001' by Umberto Morazzoni and Bibbi Bostrom.
 [www.cropcircleconnector.com] .
 'My specialist comments reo apparent recordings of high levels of
 assumed dangerous, ionising radiation by Andrew Buckley beneath
 low- flying helicopters over East Field Crop Circle on 16th & 18th
 July, 2001' by David Cayton.

- 75 -

SECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to

be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim

use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and publications

which I have listed in this section, and this is gratefully acknowledged.

Articles.

P.62. 'Mosaic and Tessellated Patterns' by John Wilson. [Dover Publications, New York, 1983].

P.62. 'Crop-Circles: The Military Use of a Microwave Laser Beam Cannon' by George Hoskins. [2005].

[http://www.ovnis.atfreeweb.com/l5_crop_circles.htm] .

P.62,67,68. 'The Crime Weapon Identified' by George Hoskins.[2005].

[http://www.ovnis.atfreeweb.com/l7_habe_crime:...weapon.htm].

P.63. 'Crop-Circles: 'Signs From Above or Human Artifacts?'" by Jacques F. Vallee.[2003].

[http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/ciencia/ciencia_vallee07.htm].

P.64,65. 'Air & Cosmos Magazine.' [Issue 1842 - May 10th, 2002].

P.65. 'Directed-Energy Weapons.'

[Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia].

P.67,68. 'SHARP - Stationary High Altitude Relay Platform' by Friends of CRC.

Article prepared by George Jull.[1996, 2001].

[http://friendsof_crc.ca/SHARP/sharp.html].

P.70. 'Aerial Mind-Control- The Threat to Civil Liberties' by Judy Wall.

[http://ravenl.net/commsolo.htm].

Also published in Nexus Magazine.[October / November 1999].

P.70. 'Military Use of Silent Sound' by Judy Wall.

[http://ravenl.net/silsoun2.htm].

Also published in Nexus Magazine.[October / November 1998].

Other related articles include;

'Psychotronic Weapons: Brain Manipulation From a Distance.'

[<http://istina.rinlenglufu/text/360.html>].

'Electronic Mind-Control' by Mark Bond.

[<http://www.newsfinder.org/site/more/electronicmindcontroll>].

- 76 -

SECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to

be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim

use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and publications

which I have listed in this section, and this is gratefully acknowledged.

Books.

P.3. 'Mysterious Lights and Crop-Circles' by Linda Moulton-Howe.

[LMH Productions 2000 - Pioneer Printing USA. ISBN: 0-9620570-6-1].

P.3. 'The Deepening Complexity of Crop-Circles', by Eltjo H. Haselhoff.

[North Atlantic Books 2001. ISBN: 1-58394-0464].

P.3. 'Alien Energy' by Andrew Collins.

[Eagle Wing Books USA 1994 - ISBN: 0-940829-37-1].

P.4,5. 'A Covert Agenda: The British Government's UFO Top Secrets Exposed' by Nick Redfern. [Simon & Schuster 1997 - ISBN: 0-684-81937-6].

P.5. 'UFOs - A Deadly Concealment' by Derek Sheffield.

[Blandford Books 1996 - ISBN: 0-7137-2620-2].

Other books referred to in this interview;

'On the Trail of the Saucer Spies' by Nick Redfern.

[Anomalist Books 2006 - ISBN: 1-93365-10-6].

'Crop-Circles: Evidence of a Cover-Up' by Nicolas Montigiani.

[Carnot USA Books 2003 - ISBN: 1-59209-037-0].

- 77 -

SECTION FOURTEEN: References and Bibliography.

Except where specifically acknowledged, the information included in this work is believed to

be 'common knowledge' and its source is many and varied. Whilst there has been no verbatim

use of copy, it is possible that some has been gleaned from various articles and publications

which I have listed in this section, and this is gratefully acknowledged.

DVDs.

P.3. 'Crop-Circles - Crossovers From Another Dimension' by Terje Toftenes.[2005].

P.3. 'Contact' by Bert Janssen.[2001].

P.8. 'The East Field Crop-Circle 2001' by Terje Toftenes.[2007].

P.16. 'The East Field Press Conference 070701' by Miles Johnston. [2007].

P.16. 'Interview with Matthew Williams' by Miles Johnston. [2007].

P.25. 'Oh To Catch a Circlemaker' by Miles Johnston.[2008].

- 78 -