



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: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: **Andy Roberts** <Brigantia@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1999 04:28:26 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1999 11:32:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Stephen Gamble <e182@dial.pipex.com>
>To: <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Max Burns Lecture
>Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1999 17:54:40 +0100

It's nice to see BUFORAs chairman actually responding to something.

In this case it has taken almost 18 months of BUFORA stupidity over the Max Burns case to jolt them into action. In that time they have lost most of their best people because of it and are due to lose more.

>Possibly as a result of some of Max's postings, people are under
>the impression that BUFORA is championing Max's cause.
>This is not true.

But it is true - simply on the grounds that they are giving a platform to someone who is making statements about deaths which never happened etc etc ad nauseum. A BUFORA Council member recently told David Clarke they would willingly have mass murderers on their lecture platform if they thought it explained anything. Go figure!

>Max says that he has alternative explanations to Dave Clarke for
>what happened at Howden Moor. BUFORA is providing him with an
>opportunity to present his data.

But Max has been unable to answer any questions put to him on this list and elsewhere, about this 'alternative' evidence.

>However this is in addition, not in preference, to any
>presentation that Dave may or may not give. Like any speaker,
>Max will be subject to questions from the audience and if his
>data is lacking, no doubt he will receive a hard time.

No speaker ever receives a hard time at a BUFORA lecture, unless you count polite applause as being intellectually stretching.

>Any impression anybody has got from Max or anybody else that
>BUFORA 'supports' his work is wrong, see point 1 below.

See above.

>We hoped that Dave would come and put his side of the case in
>the near future then people will be able to make their own minds
>up. We have carried at least one article by Dave Clarke on this
>case in the BUFORA Bulletin.

BUFORA Council just have not taken notice of how this case has progressed. Their sole intention is to provide entertainment at

any cost. the cost in this case being truth about the case and their reputation. They should all read Dave Clarke's posts to this list again - particularly his 'final statement' on the matter. If a so-called professional organisation is prepared to support this charade - even by allowing its sole protagonist a platform - then ufology in the UK has redefined the term 'nadir'.

>The position is very clear on this :

>1. BUFORA does not express a corporate view on the nature of
>UFOs

A corporate stance expressing a critical distance from unproven and unprovable allegations, libel and allegation of false criminality would have kept it out of this and many previous messes. With BUFORA cheap entertainment always wins out over rationality and evidence.

>2. That unless otherwise stated, speakers express their own
>views and not the views of BUFORA or its officers. Indeed, given
>point 1, speakers can never express the corporate view of
>BUFORA.

Hence the loonies they attract. With no critical or contextual backdrop BUFORA is the ufological equivalent of Speaker's Corner at Hyde Park. Any pretence at being a 'scientific' or 'professional' organisation is subsumed by the cry of snake oil barkers.

>3. That one of BUFORA's aims is "To encourage and promote
>unbiased scientific investigation and research into Unidentified
>Flying Object phenomena". To that aim all sides of every
>argument need to be heard and subject to rigorous questioning.
>If there are defects in any of the methodology then these need
>to be highlighted.

Even when the speaker is making allegations of unproved deaths at the hands of UFOs Steve?

Allegations which he cannot support?

Allegations which may lead the South Yorkshire coroner to take legal action for withholding evidence about a death.

We're not just talking about run of the mill UFO stuff here Steve, we're talking about very serious allegations.

If any listers have relatives in any of the armed forces I'm sure you would be alarmed by stories of this type.

Unless - and this is the key point - they were backed up with names and details.

And this is the nub of the matter.

Were Max able to supply BUFORA with the facts about this alleged crash and alleged death - even in secret, before his lecture - this would at least demonstrate some substance to his tale.

He cannot, for the simple reason that neither crash nor death took place. BUFORA's critical powers, morals and ethics seem to have deserted them entirely at the expense of some muddled idea of 'free speech' and a desire to entertain.

>4. That BUFORA does not condone the use of its platform by any
>speaker to libel/defame anybody, nor is the BUFORA platform a
>place for the settling of old scores.

But that's what will happen.

BUFORA has always been a platform for the settling of old scores.

The internal politics of just why certain members of Council are determined to make fools of themselves over the Max Burns issue are deep and stretch back over 15 years and numerous resignations.

This is exactly why leading ufologists such as Jenny Randles and Dave Clarke (among many others) have left BUFORA.

>5. BUFORA does not condone things like illegal entry to premises
>or release of witness information against the wishes of the
>witness. Speakers can be challenged on these issues during
>question time.

Exactly.

Yet they are giving a platform to someone who has released
witness information expressly against his wishes.

But breaking their code of practice is ok because the speaker
might get challenged during question time.

Some sanction!

If a BUFORA member broke their code of practice, several tedious
meetings would be convened before the miscreant was hounded out
of the organisation.

Paradox is one word for this.

Hypocrisy is a better one.

The fact remains that only due to massive pressure from
within and without the organisation have BUFORA even
deemed it necessary to make a statement at all.

Some listers may believe that politics and ufology don't mix.

Many believe that they are one and the same.

The politics of reality.

If we don't fight tooth and nail over this particular issue 'The
Sheffield Incident' is going to be elevated as a 'classic case'.

Which it is.

But not for the reasons that either Max or his sad BUFORA
apologists think.

Happy Trails

Andy

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

UFO UpDates - Toronto - 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

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

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