



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)  
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)  
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)  
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore  
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Apr](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: BUFORA Watch - Resignations Galore!

From: Max Burns <[alienHype@aol.com](mailto:alienHype@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1999 18:52:04 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1999 04:21:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: BUFORA Watch - Resignations Galore!

>Subj: BUFORA Watch - Resignations Galore!  
>Date: 4/9/99 5:43:01 PM GMT Daylight Time  
>From: Gloria Dixon <[rbx32@dial.pipex.com](mailto:rbx32@dial.pipex.com)>  
>To: [AlienHype@aol.com](mailto:AlienHype@aol.com)

I have deleted certain people from Gloria's original post as obviously I do not wish to correspond with them they may receive the post via fwd... And no doubt they will.

I have also enhanced the distribution of this non private post you have circulated As it seem's you did not want this to be a private communication, for reasons which are no doubt your own

So you cannot obviously moan about myself making this public knowledge?

Gloria Dixon wrote...

Max

>I would like to respond to your comments in a recent UpDates  
>posting that was forwarded to me. I will not be responding  
>again and I do not wish to receive anything further in my email  
>box about this or your lecture for BUFORA.

Well, I am sorry Gloria but if you had sent myself a private post I would have accepted your statement as it stands you must allow me the chance to reply. due to the circulation list you have submitted this to.

Why you could not just have sent me a private post I do not know. But I suppose you have your reasons.

>If I attend your lecture I shall make up my own mind as no  
>doubt everyone will. This situation has indeed resulted in 'a  
>drawing of the line in the sand', your words Max,. Anyway my  
>comments follow to the relevant part of your posting.

It is a shame that you have taken this stance as I have always listened to what you have had to say, you must also admit that you have also asked myself some quite personal and pertinent questions during our phone conversations. to which you yourself have said that I was always very candid with you in my response's to your questions. A statement you made yourself.=E2=80=A6

However we move forward with our various choices

Gloria wrote in response to my mail.=E2=80=A6

>>About eight weeks ago I had a long conversation with Gloria by  
>>telephone regarding various issues, including my investigation

>>into the Sheffield Incident.

>It was not about eight weeks ago, it was four weeks ago 11th March  
>1999 that you contacted me.

Eight weeks four weeks what's the difference you still did not  
supply me with the data after I asked you to omitting the  
originator of the report's details. until you had cleared it  
with the woman.

After I asked you on the phone to do so... And this was before  
Dr Clark had involved himself in my personal life (re council  
tax)

>>During the conversation she informed me that she had received  
a >>report from a woman who wrote that on the 24th March 1997 at  
>>approx. 22.00hrs GMT she heard a loud explosion and the sky  
>>lit up with a red flash.

>No Max, I did not inform you that the woman HEARD a loud  
>explosion. She SAW what she interpreted as an explosion and the  
>sky did not light up with a RED flash. She said that she  
>observed a very bright light twice the size of a star which  
>appeared to flash in that part of the sky, rather like someone  
>striking a match.. She was observing this from near Leeds in  
>West Yorkshire looking south...

I would not know this as you chose not to supply the data to  
myself even though you brought this up during the conversation  
about Sheffield. I can only recollect as we had discussed on the  
phone You must of thought that it may be relevant or you would  
not have supplied the info which you gave me on the phone which  
you supplied the text to Dr Clark & John Heponstall.=E2=80=A6

>She followed this telephoned report with a fax, a copy of which  
>is with Dave Clarke as well as BUFORA investigator (at that  
>time) John Heptonstall who followed this up.

>>Me ponders how many sonic events light up the sky with a red  
>>flash? Please do not jump in with it was a Tornado igniting  
>>its after burner as it would not light up the whole of the  
>>sky. \_Fact\_

>No Max, this is not a fact at all, as she did not report the  
>whole of the sky lighting up.

Must of been quite a flash to see it from near Leeds? Approx. 30  
miles away as the crow flies? But as you would not send me the  
report how do I know.

>>I asked Gloria if she could contact the women to ask if it  
>>would be at all possible for me to contact the originator of  
>>the letter so that I may question her about the report that  
>>she filed.

>>I also asked Gloria if she could forward the report to me  
>>omitting the details of the identity of the woman until she  
>>had cleared it for me to speak with her.

>\*\*Sorry Max, but I could not possibly give you confidential  
>witness details and as far as I am concerned this would be  
>witness intrusion.

Why did you not state this at the time? Why did you tell me the  
info in the first place, if any other follow up from myself  
would be redundant?

Did I not ask you to omit the persons personal details regarding  
the report? There fore how would this be an intrusion of  
witness. confidential details?

I also stated this in my email correspondence. Hmmmmm

I also asked you to contact the woman, if I felt after reading  
the file which you said you would send to me, that it needed  
further investigation so that on the witness agreement I could  
contact her direct. To which you did not send me the file. This  
is correct is it not?

This is also before you were offended regarding my comment which  
I made regarding Dr Clarks direct interference in a personal

matter of council tax arrears. which had nothing what so ever to do with him and was no more or less than connected to a further attempt to discredit myself and there fore my investigation into the Sheffield case

(Re my comment keep your dog on a lead)

Something Dr Clark has now admitted to, to which you stated yourself during our phone conversation was not on or nothing to do with ufology.

>as John Heptonstall dealt with this at the time and  
>furthermore, he had a problem getting a response from her. This  
>means we do not intrude any further

Ohh Im sorry you did not discuss that with me on the phone, and if that is the case why did you bother to tell me about this in the first place?

>plus the fact that all the information about her sighting were  
>recorded on the fax that I received from her. This fax  
>certainly indicates that she was possibly observing part of the  
>low flying military exercise that night.

Pure speculation on your part, but at least I know where you are coming from

>I told you about this sighting as you were speaking with me  
>about your investigation and I briefly mentioned it to you as  
>it may have been relevant to this incident. Also just for the  
>record I spoke with the lady concerned the other day and she  
>does not wish to be contacted by anyone else,

But you stated earlier that it was John Heptonstall who said that he could not get a response from her. Why did you choose to speak with her the other day? You see that you are contradicting yourself with the comment about further intrusion? Obviously not for myself to contact her as you have already stated that you were not willing to allow me access to this potential witness And surely she would have not been offended if I wrote her a letter?

>as she has given BUFORA the relevant information regarding her  
>sighting in her original fax. She has nothing else to add and  
>two years on, this would be a problem anyway, because of  
>inaccurate memory >retrieval , etc.

This is a reasonable comment to make but as Dr Clark has spoken to a number of my witnesses two yrs after the incident and two yrs after I had collected my witness statements this could also be said about all the detrimental statements that have been made by Dr Clark regarding my investigation into the incident..and the subsequent interviews he has collated well after I had interviewed my witnesses.

You see my point?

But in some respects your comments are also incorrect. As she could detail her view of the occurrence which from her vantage point which would not have changed and would allow for analysis of, if the area where she witnessed this occurrence was, in the same area to which I believe that my version of the events occurred, which would dismiss the possibility that this was the after burner igniting from a tornado jet as this would not be visible from approx. 30 miles away as the crow flies.

You see my point?

Any pilots care to interject?

As well as other witnesses who reported an explosion and a red flash in the sky, this would lead strongly to the possibility that she has witnessed the explosion from a great distance. Why?

You see my point?

Well I would not know that as you have decided to keep me out of the loop

>>I have also E-mailed Gloria making the request again in  
>>writing. Did she reply to this request?

> \*\*This is absolutely correct Max. I did not and the reasons  
>for that lie in your total lack of regard and total disrespect  
>towards me because of your inflammatory comments made in a  
>prior email from you to me with regard to Dave Clarke,

"What because I said "Keep your dog on a lead"

I have respect for you Gloria, I do not have respect for people  
you are supporting, in light of the actions of Dr Clark.  
Involving himself in my personal life. (re council Tax) To which  
you yourself said that this what not on during our phone  
conversations which you know full well you said.=E2=80=A6

Have you now changed your stance?

>The fact that you apologised to me in this email in addition to  
>asking for information on the sighting report we had received  
>was unacceptable to me.

Gloria, do you mean that it was un acceptable that one of your  
friends had behaved in a manner un becoming of a Dr. I only  
pointed out the facts of the matter, as you and Dr Clark are  
such good friends. =E2=80=A6 and the "keep your dog on a lead  
statement was not even directed at yourself" A fact that you  
know. and I challenge you if you are in dis agreement to that  
statement, to re post the E-Mail which you are referring to.

Which clearly shows that I was not in any way insulting to  
yourself?

>The damage had been done and this why you  
>have had no response from me.

What? You had four weeks to respond to my request even if it was  
with a no you cannot have the data, it is still well before I  
posted my factual post to Updates

>Why should I respond to you, Max,

Because you are/were the director of investigations for BUFORA,  
and I had made a request for data that you yourself had informed  
myself about. Which was well before your horror at my bringing  
this to the attention of the Updates list, Re: the personal  
choices you had made in light of your decision not to supply  
myself with the data as requested. In light of the decisions you  
have made in the proffering support for David Clark, in light of  
your Choice to resign as director of investigations for the  
BUFORA ORG. because the BUFORA group are allowing myself to  
speak.

I only want to present my case and simply allow the membership  
to decide for themselves I also agree that Dr Clark is allowed  
and entitled to his own opinions, regarding his investigation  
into the Sheffield Incident.

Although I disagree with his conclusions, why is it so important  
to have myself prevented from presenting the other side of the  
coin?

Details of which during our many telephone conversations you  
agree that were obviously present with regard to Dr Clark's  
findings that just seem to have been glossed over, to the point  
that you would resign your position as director of  
investigations. Something I myself am sad to see, and I urge you  
to re consider the choices you have made

>when you write Email and post more inflamatory comments on the  
>internet?\*

Gloria, I was only reporting the facts as I see them in response  
to Mr Wooton's posting to the updates mailing list. which you  
must agree are correct? With exception to the details from the  
woman as discussed earlier in this post. regarding her sighting  
of something which she felt warranted communication with you in  
the first place...about the night of the 24th March 1997

As you would not supply me any further details. I could only  
recall it as we discussed it as I did not record or write down  
notes from our telephone conversation as you said you would

forward the details to myself.

>>This is really strange behaviour from the Director of  
>>Investigations, as I had made a request for data which she  
>>informed myself about orally.

>\*\*\*There is nothing strange about my behaviour at all. Actually  
>I think it is rather appropriate under the circumstances. In  
>any case, I NEVER pass on witness details to anyone, who is not  
>a BUFORA investigator and even then this has to be with the  
>full permission of the witness.\*\*

Ok if you say so

>>She has not supplied it or even replied to my mail. Why she  
>>even bothered to tell me about this I don't know. But at least  
>>I was willing to follow up on the report with an  
>>investigation.

>\*\*\*I bothered to tell you about it, Max, because during your  
>phone call you were talking about your investigation into the  
>(Howden Moors case)

Insert by Max Burns the Sheffield Incident

>Howden Moors Case (see above) and, as I also said above, this  
>was followed up by myself and John Heptonstall at the time of  
>the sighting the day after the incident.\*\*

Hmmmmmm

>To reiterate, I do not wish to receive any more contact about  
>any of this. I have absolutely had enough of it all. These  
>issues have led to my resignation from the council of BUFORA,  
>an organisation of which I have been a member for 9 years and a  
>council member for four years. I am deeply angry by all of this  
>and your attacks upon me via UpDates are inaccurate and  
>inflammatory.

My comments were not attacks on you but merely making comment on  
the facts as we had discussed above, obviously if by your  
actions in your proffering of support for Dr Clark you felt the  
need to resign from your position. you have lost your  
objectivity in this matter.

You yourself stated to myself that I had made and raised some  
important and serious questions regarding the incident, and the  
alleged true facts regarding the incident However as you said in  
a post to myself we must agree to disagree. and I urge you to  
withdraw your resignation from the BUFORA ORG.as it would still  
be a great loss to the group.

And I still remain most sincerley

Max Burns

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)**  
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.  
To subscribe please send your first and last name to [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

---

[ [UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#) ]

**To find this message again in the future...**  
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.  
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: [webmaster@ufomind.com](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).