

Below is my translation (forgive me if it is rough at times, I did my best) of the material that we published on our Internet site (<http://www.nautilus.org.pl>, unfortunately so far only in Polish). I (as all of us at the Nautilus Foundation) strongly believe that after reading the below you will come to the conclusion that it is certainly very much worthwhile to devote time and energy to study this case.

*Wojciech Bobilewicz
Warsaw, Poland
for the Nautilus Foundation*

"A lot of people worldwide have been waiting for this text indeed. Having published the first pieces of information about the Zdany events we have received so many e-mails that it became apparent we are dealing with something exceptional. People were astonished and it did not matter whether they were our readers from Gdansk or from Australia - there have not been pictures like that before. For the first time one could see an object whose body reflects details of the surrounding landscape features. And it was not just one picture, but the whole series of five breathtaking photographs!

These pictures were too good even for those who professionally deal with the subject. We have all grown used to the fact that UFO pictures are some blurred dots, some questionable elongated spots (which we also present quite frequently on our site). Such photographs are questioned by the scientific establishment and to tell the truth it is hard to wonder why. There are always some questions asked, such as:

Why was not this object visible?

Why has the witness made only one photograph?

Why is the witness (sometimes it happens this way) so keen and going out of his way to get someone interested in "his" picture?

And so on - we have grown used to that sort of questions. We have discussed many times that we are still waiting for a story which we could confidently show to anyone (including scientists and aviation experts) and which will simply be absolutely irrefutable. Currently we have thousands of potential UFO pictures (nobody wants to count the exact amount) and in some cases they met SOME of our criteria, but never ALL of them.

However when we saw the Zdany pictures, we were awestruck. They were five photos which could practically be immediately considered as some of the best in the world. Pictures, however, are just half of the whole issue. Equally important are the witnesses. When we saw the scene of the events with our own eyes, and - more specifically - when we have talked to the witness, then we realised that this had really happened. We have a story that we have been waiting for for many years. This is the material that can be considered as a proof closing any discussion about whether UFOs are real... We started acting, a dozen or so of Nautilus members have become engaged in the project. This was priority number one. And it was worth it.

What we have known from the start

The Zdany affair is currently such a huge material that its full publication would mean issuing a separate book devoted just to this case (by the way, we are planning to do it). Right from the very beginning, we have set up a number of sharp criteria which allowed to shape a further direction in which our research should go. Let us enumerate some:

It is not a photomontage

Establishing the above was the easiest, but also the most important fact. Everything was possible thanks to the fact that we had original camera files which had so-called EXIF, i.e. a record of the most important picture parameters. Fortunately, our friends from the US also extended their help here and have subjected the photos to a detailed analysis. Almost immediately we have received information that only confirmed our work: the Zdany pictures are not fake! Nobody fiddled with the pictures, nobody used a graphics programme, nobody tried to paste something in or "over" the originals. There are special programmes which quickly discover any tampering with pixels. Here, the verdict was clear - the Zdany pictures are 100% originals made with an Olympus camera.

It was a beginning of a long road, but establishing this fact was extremely vital. There were only two possibilities: either the pictures showed a genuine Unidentified Flying Object, or else somebody was throwing two bowls welded or otherwise connected together. This "somebody" was immediately identified as we have very quickly reached the witness who would have to be involved in the hoax. And this was a real shock.

Credibility of the witness

To understand why the witness, Mr Maciej (Matthew) T., is credible, it is not enough to see his photographs. It is not even enough to listen to his story. One simply needs to get to know this man and see for oneself that we have not had an opportunity of meeting such a credible witness since the Emilcin events of 1978.

The way he expresses himself, his reluctance in relating the story, total lack of interest in what is happening to the "Zdany photographs" - Mr Maciej T. can in every way be given as a model example of a credible witness. During the first meeting with the Foundation he spent most of his time describing what terrible accidents happen at the "black spot on the road number 2 (E30)" and why on 8 January 2006 he wanted to get away from that place as quickly as possible. He almost did not mention the photos at all and one could feel, see and sense that he did not pay any attention to them. It was far more important to him that he had seen this "something" flying around the car and that he had not been able to start the engine. For anyone who then participated in our trip to Zdany it became apparent that the man was describing authentic events and certainly is far from any "bowl-thrower". The only possible hypothesis was formed: both men are walking around the immobilised car while somebody is throwing an object from a nearby launcher, kind of a catapult (one of our photographer-friends has extremely seriously suggested such an explanation). We have taken this hypothesis into account as well, even though we treated it as an unlikely one. Half a year has passed since that time, and yet the behaviour of the witnesses and the meetings with them which followed confirm us in our belief that their credibility is the second (after the photo analysis) strongest point in this story.

Five photographs

Initially we have received five pictures. The witness suggested that there could be even around a dozen of them, as the photographer has been walking around the car all the time, taking a picture every now and then (including those depicting both men trying to get their engine to start). However, he has chosen only seven photos, recorded them on a CD and passed on to Maciej (Matthew). The CD landed in the hands of a journalist of the newspaper called "FAKT" ("Fact") who in turn has used one of the photos (we shall describe later how the Foundation got hold of the photos). According to the journalist there were 7 pictures, we have only received only 5. They had the following numbers:

P1080002

P1080003

P1080004A
P1080006
P1080007

["Czas"= "time" - W.B.]

These were the numbers that the operating system of the camera assigned automatically. It was therefore easy to establish how the events developed. The picture number P1080004A was showing the object which was framed and enlarged by the author of the photograph (this is an option available with every advanced digital camera). Let us now look at the times these pictures were taken:

P1080002

Date/time of taking the photo: 2006-01-08 12:34:57

P1080003

Date/time of taking the photo: 2006-01-08 12:35:55

P1080004A

Date/time of taking the photo: 2006-01-08 12:37:17

P1080006

Date/time of taking the photo: 2006-01-08 12:41:55

P1080007

Date/time of taking the photo: 2006-01-08 12:43:55

It is also worthwhile to show a full EXIF, as an example we shall use the EXIF from the picture marked as P1080007:

Width 2048 pixels

Height 1536 pixels

Horizontal resolution 72 dpi

Depth in bits 24

Number of frames 1

Camera make OLYMPUS CORPORATION

Camera model OLYMPUS X100, D54OZ, C310Z

Camera software v775u-78

Colour reproduction sRGB

Flash mode (none)

Focus length 6 mm

F-number F/4.1

Shutter speed 1/2000 s

ISO speed ISO-50

Metering mode Pattern

Light source Unknown

Exposure programme Normal

Light compensation 0 steps

Date/time of photo 2006-01-08 12:43

Picture 5 was missing (the photographer did not burn it on the CD which he handed over to the other witness) as well as the picture marked as P1080004 of which a close-up has been made in the camera itself, designated as P1080004A.



01 Czas: 12:34:36



02 Czas: 12:34:57



03 Czas: 12:35:55



04 Czas: 12:37:17



06 Czas: 12:41:55



07 Czas: 12:43:55



08 Czas: 12:44:16

Right from the start it was possible to establish the following facts:

Pictures are successively assigned numbers by the camera's operating system. Here comes the first factor which enables to completely refute the idea that somebody was "throwing joined bowls". Why? Because every picture was sharp and in focus which is impossible if you try to throw some object up and then attempt to catch it in the frame (we have gone through this painful lesson on 15 August). If you try to throw any object up, only approx. every fifth frame comes up relatively sharp! Here we had the absolute.

The size of the object excluded using small kitchen bowls, and even if we did indeed have to do with a hoax, somebody must have very carefully prepared a huge object. If one was not a "complete moron" at primary school and if one has a slightest idea about spacial geometry, one could quite easily calculate - based on the pictures - that the moving object was at least 2 metres in diameter as otherwise the pictures would have shown a small, unclear spot. We have demonstrated this surprising effect of objects "shrinking" in the open space during our experiment on 15 August (please read on). Of importance to us was also the description of the witness who saw the object moving nearby at the distance of approx. 20 metres. Witness Maciej T. has stressed that the object was more or less the size of a small car. The only thing that could happen was that somebody has made a model of the object (a solid construction, incredibly shiny surface) which they catapulted from a launcher. Such a hypothesis has also been rejected as the time needed to reload the catapult (cleansing the objects of any soil, stretching the ropes) would be much longer than 21 seconds, and this is the amount of time between pictures 7 and 8 - more about it in a moment.

There are absolutely no footprints on the snow. Such footprints would have to appear when somebody is trying to throw the object up. One would have to approach the object, take an appropriate position etc. However the photographs show a field covered with pristine snow with the only prints visible being those of a cat or a fox running through the field. The experiment we have conducted on 15 August has shown beyond any doubt that even just a few attempts to throw something up requires trampling on quite a large area. It is not even worth talking about two consecutive successful (= sharp) pictures as this is... impossible. This is the argument our American friends were telling us about as the one which can refute the claim of anything being "thrown up" in the field.

Picture P1080006 shows the object at an altitude of several dozen metres. The object - as the witness describes it - has flown towards the plane which was producing a condensation trail behind it. Despite a considerable distance the rim around the object is still visible which confirms the object must have had quite big dimensions. To throw anything to the height of 50 metres (that is our estimated altitude of the object on this photo) is beyond human capabilities, although it is probably possible using some sort of a catapult or a launcher. It is the height of a 20-storey building.

A vital element of this analysis is also the fact that on several photographs the UFO's surface reflects exactly the surrounding objects, including the sky, the sun, the car, the road, the tree, the field etc. It is something unheard of in the world and there is not even another case like that that we could relate to. The object is also reflected from the car's bonnet (hood), as well as from one of the car's window panes (on another photo - we are referring to the photograph that Andrzej Wo! niak passed to the Nautilus Foundation on 15 August).

The place of the event (almost noon, with extremely high concentration of traffic) has been very unfortunately selected for any hoax - if we assume that it was indeed a hoax.

The Nautilus Foundation in Zdany

The arrival of Nautilus to Zdany has long been planned, and the main reason was to take a number of photographs using two bowls taped together which we bought at a supermarket. An experiment like this was necessary to make a full documentation of this case, and it could only be performed in Zdany. An important point of our expedition was also to run an experiment using strong strobe lights at night. We arrived in Zdany on 14 August and we were represented by: Łukasz Bartecki, Miko"aj Jastrzêbski, Tadeusz Pi±tek, Robert Bernatowicz and Rafa" Nowicki who joined us from Inowroc"aw. In the morning we were joined by Ma"gorzata #ó"towska.

At approx. 11:30 pm we started our power generator and began our "Lights in Zdany" experiment. Two strobes were directed towards the road. Interestingly, none of the cars stopped even though the whole operation must have been visible to the drivers. The results of the experiment indicate that car drivers show zero interest about what is happening in the field, even if some strange lights are visible.

At about 2:00 am in our moveable Nautilus base (a big camper truck) we had a meeting which we registered as an mp3 file. The journalist of the "FAKT" newspaper, Andrzej Wo! niak, also joined us, and we made an interview with him. In the morning Mr Wo! niak brought the remaining photographs of the 8 January events. As it turns out, altogether there are three more pictures. Let us discuss each of them briefly:

New picture: P1080001

The first picture of the whole series. It was made at 12:34:36.

In this picture the object is closest to the photographer. The horizon, the road and the cars standing at a side of the road are clearly reflected from the surface. This picture is phenomenally vital as it clearly shows a pristine layer of snow on the field. One can discern prints of a cat or a fox but there are no footprints. If anyone were to throw any object up, then footprints would be obvious. However the snow is ideally smooth!



It is also worthwhile to pay attention to a reflex of the sun which appeared on the object's rim. Thanks to this it was possible to position the object exactly in space as we shall inform in the next article devoted to the Zdany case.

New picture: P1080004

This is the picture from which the photographer made a close-up numbered as P1080004A. It is clear that the object is high up, over power/telephone cables. This picture was taken at 12:37:17.

Despite great distance from the photographer, one can still discern (having made a close-up) the surrounding features reflected from the object's surface! In the foreground one can see the Polonez car belonging to Maciej T.

The next important observation: the UFO object is reflected in the car's window! It is very clear in the form of a bright point. An analysis of the light layout on the window pane indicates that the object is at a considerable altitude (our estimate is approximately 20 metres). It is yet another photograph where a layer of snow on the field is clearly visible without any footprints.

New picture: P1080008

This picture is "the jewel in the crown". Let us start from the basics, i.e. time. It was taken at 12:44:16. And this is an immensely important piece of information, as between the time of picture P1080007 and the time of picture P1080008 there is a time lapse of... 21 seconds!

What does it imply? That if it was a mistification, somebody would have to pick up the object, take a position, take a swing and throw it a dozen metres or so up - all within 21 seconds! It is simply impossible and closes any discussion on the "throwing the bowls" hypothesis. We have verified it empirically by performing a number of field experiments and attempting to throw our bowls. Coming back to picture marked as P1080008, one needs to observe that between the object and the photographer there are branches of a tree, which clearly indicates that the object is at a considerable distance from the camera. What is funny, one can discern Maciej T. on this photo who is looking exactly at the object. The angle at which he is looking at the object is also a good guidance for a proper positioning of the object. As with the remaining photographs, here too the whole horizon is reflecting from its surface. Despite tree branches, its elements are very visible.

CONCLUSION

At the moment we have 7 photographs of an Unidentified Flying Object, of which each is unsurpassable when it comes to UFO pictures in general. Taking into account that there are seven photographs we suggest (supported by our American partners) that in Poland, on 8 January 2006, some of the best, most credible and best documented UFO photographs in the world have been made.

Throwing the balls, or... a total shock!

This element of our stay in Zdany must have been the biggest surprise. We were preparing ourselves to take a series of photographs of salad bowls taped together and hovering in the sky which were being thrown by Łukasz Bartecki and Mikołaj Jastrzębski. It turned out that it was a very difficult task, and to tell the truth the whole "throwing up experiment" was one big streak of disasters. This issue will come up later, but let us try to arrange our conclusions.

An object consisting of two bowls with the diameter of 21 centimetres practically already from the distance of 10 metres from the photographer has "shrunk" incredibly and was visible as a spot.

Fatal flaws in the "throwing-up" technique resulted in the object frequently dug ruts in the soil, and sending it up in the sky to an altitude higher than several metres was impossible. It got worse from trial to trial. As an excuse or justification for the two "throwers", it has to be admitted that two attached bowls were difficult to properly grasp by the rim and that it would be incomparably easier to throw just one bowl (because of its flying characteristics).

The bowls which we were throwing were horribly smeared with the soil which they were hitting quite strongly. At the end they contained many traces of "close encounters with the ground". Neither Łukasz nor Mikołaj managed to throw the bowls from outside the frame as they were not capable of throwing them close enough to take a picture. One more remark: framing similar to the pictures from 8 January 2006 quickly proved useless as the object... was hardly visible! The object consisting of two 21-centimetre bowls was simply a small bright spot against the dark background and this was probably the greatest surprise to the participants in the experiment.

Both "throwers", despite appeals, good advice and instructions, were not able to throw the bowls even once such that the connected bowls remained horizontal in the air. Throwing the bowls 'freesbie-style', at an angle, made them fly higher, but then the whole object was always flying with one side lower and got buried in the soil.

The time which lapsed between a throw, running to the bowls, cleaning it with a cloth from the soil which stuck and a new throw coordinated by walkie-talkies with the photographer amounted to several minutes! Performing such a throw within 21 or 15 seconds was clearly beyond the capabilities of both gentlemen.

Coordination with the photographer was far from perfect. First the "thrower" was sending the bowls in the air (at first mostly in the ground, but that's another issue), and then it turned out that the photographer was pressing the shutter release button either too late or too early. Only when we introduced walkie-talkies and were loudly shouting "1... 2... 3... NOW!" did it improve a bit. However the lamentable and embarrassing results of this "game" do not even qualify for a publication on the Nautilus Internet site. There is no doubt that our "throwing team" must work hard in the future so that we can take decent pictures.

Proportions were staggering. In a dozen or so pictures we have made, only one was relatively good. The whole "throwing of the bowls" operation was one big streak of embarrassing disasters and a show of exceptional ineptitude of our "throwers", even though they really did their best. One needs to admit, however, that two salad bowls joined at the rim are exceptionally cumbersome and unwieldy for this kind of operations, and their flying characteristics are awful. Despite everything, the effects of these throws on 15 August were a big surprise to us!

All our team have been creating a lot of havoc for an hour or so at road number 2 (people running to and fro on the field, people walking with walkie-talkies on hard shoulders and waving to the people in the field etc.). Drivers were slowing down seeing this commotion in the road and practically speaking we can assume with a 100% certainty that we have been spotted by them. One thing needs to be admitted: this section of road number 2 must be the worst location of all for performing such experiments.

This is not the end of documenting the Zdany event. We have assigned tasks and we will present you on our Internet site with further materials from this case. Even now the documentation we have collected is large enough to allow us to turn to Polish research institutes which will be asked by the Nautilus Foundation to express their viewpoints in this matter. We also intend to let the Polish Academy of Sciences know; in fact, we have already established contacts with them.