



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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed

From: Max Burns <MBurns6711@cs.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Jul 1999 19:00:16 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:13:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed

>From: Matthew Williams <truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net>
>To: <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed
>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 20:16:20 +0100

>>From: David Clarke <crazydiamonds@compuserve.com>
>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:05:41 -0400
>>Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:25:12 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>Nowhere have I ever claimed that six
>specific aircraft from any specific airbase were the cause of
>the sonic booms recorded near Sheffield on March 24, 1997.
>That is a simple fact, something neither Max nor his
>"Truthseeker" friends could bring themselves to accept.

David, please read this extract from your full report
downloaded from the Pufori website.

Extract below

RAF Marham's PRO Ed Bulpitt made inquiries on my behalf
and established that six aircraft from 2 Squadron were involved
in the exercise on March 24. These were Tornado GR1A's, the
photo reconnaissance version of the Tornado fighter. He said
the first left Marham at 6.45pm and landed at 9.10pm. A second
left at 6.50 and returned at 9pm, while two others left at 7.40
and landed at 9.30, along with a fifth which had left at 7.50.

The final aircraft involved left at 7.55 and was safely back by
9.35. "They were on routine low-flying through the Peak District
and all returned safely,"

End file

Dr Klark If these are the aircraft involved in the covert low
flying exercise which is what your data has revealed... and they
are the only aircraft admitted to being in the area that
night...

If you allege that military aircraft caused the seismic
anomalies that night. then the only evidence you have is that it
must have been the above mentioned planes.

But they were on the ground by 9.35pm,

Are you now alleging that there was a "Double" secret covert
low flying exercise taking place that night?

You have no evidence other than that.. it is my contention that the other aircraft that were there after the 9.35 watershed were on a secret mission to intercept the FT.....

It would explain the Double secret aspect to the night's events.

Other than that I am at present carefully nit picking through your second research paper into this incident, to pull out all the contradictions and altered witness statements for example..

Extract from Dr Klark's research. Mr Dronfield....

10pm? An 81-year-old woman pensioner at Woodlands View, Stannington, on the outskirts of Sheffield, watching the comet from her bedroom window saw a long dark cigar shaped object flying in a westerly direction across the moors from Bradfield towards Strines and the Peak District. She said it was surrounded by an eerie "glow" as if it was on fire, and was "very low" in the sky, almost at rooftop level. Speaking afterwards, she said: "I was watching for the comet from my window which has a panoramic view over the moors when I saw what I first thought was a plane come over the top of the hills beyond High Bradfield. It went towards Strines in the west and was shaped liked a long cigar which looked as if it was on fire because it glowed. I couldn't make out any wings and it made no noise at all. The light just glowed, it didn't flash, and it was very queer looking."

I telephoned Mrs Dronfield in light of the statement you allege that you took from her... And I asked her some specific questions.

1. Has David Clark contacted you?

Answer Yes..

2. Can you tell me what you told David Clark regarding your sighting?

Answer, "I told him exactly the same as I told you"

OK this is what Mrs Dronfield told us both.....

Extract from my interview Another witness was Mrs. Dronfield, an elderly lady who reported her sighting to the police. According to the police reports Mrs. Dronfield saw a cigar shaped object flying at a very low altitude towards Strines from High Bradfield at around 22.00. Her statement says the object was lit up more than a normal plane would have been.

When I spoke to Mrs. Dronfield in person, more details began to unfold. She had in fact gone to her bedroom window with a pair of binoculars intending to look at Hale Bopp. However before she had had a chance, she noticed the UFO. It was glowing orange as it came across towards the Strines area and Mrs. Dronfield kept it in view for about twenty seconds.

You seem to have altered and re worded what she told us both, of coarse you have mundaned down what she said to make it appear that she was describing an apparent low flying aircraft that looked like was on fire.....

Remember I have called her and checked this information.

Can you explain how a dark cigar shaped object could also be brightly lit all over and glowing orange..

Its either dark or it light, the terminology glowing would suggest light..

All very strange hey David.....

Matthew Williams wrote...

>However the truth of the situation, as you well know is that Max >Burns played a tape recording of one witness who states that he >was happy to allow Max to use his name, details of his statement >and claimed that the man he encountered stank of aviation fuel.

>After you got to the witness the story changes to the witness >having not given permission to Max to talk about his case - that

>Max had twisted his words. Your eyes lit up when you tried to
>use this against Max but sadly you have been put back in your
>seat because Max then produced the audio taped recording of this
>mans voice. So you neatly skip over this _major_ point in the
>case

Yes David you neatly skip over this very important piece of evidence Why?

A number of people who were at my lecture clearly heard the audio of the interview as you have from the audio tape recording of the lecture given to you by Tim Matthew's..

How many times did Dagenhart say it was aviation fuel in the interview was it six or seven times?

And not a smell like aviation fuel as you allege

Mr Matthew's you were there you heard the audio twice, like to comment?

I now ask these other people to come forward with a statement who were at the lecture and also heard this very important piece of evidence.

Matthew Williams
Richard Conway
Stan Conway
Roy Hale
Chris Martyn
Neil Cunningham
Steve Gamble
Judith Jaafar
Malcolm Robinson

Some points

Was Dagenhart fully aware how I was reporting this case?
Yes he was

Did Dagenhart want to remain anomenous?
No he did not

Did he give me permission to use his name?
Yes he did

Did he make all his comments freely and without prompting?
Yes he did.

Was he very excited about being involved?
Yes he was..

You can also hear extracts of the audio on the Pufori web site.

Jeroem sorry I have lost the URL from my system could you post this to the list please?

Below if you do not have the time or the inclination to visit the excelent Pufori web site (keep up the good work Jeroem and team)

Then below I re produce the relevent extracts from the Dagenhart interview and the comparisons in the interview which Clark alleges took place.. after readfing the extracts you will be in no doubt what so ever, that Dr Clark has either been decieved by Dagenartor he is directly involved in this cover up..

There are no other choices available _ Fact_

I know which one I think it is..

After reading this I would be pleased to hear suggestions What do you the readers think?

Just some other anomalies that have come up..

It was stated that the the fire and rescue commander it was all down to reports of a bang and flash in the sky.. I have checked and sonic means sound, sonic booms do not cause flashes in the sky.. so what we are really talking about here is explosion with heat flame and a flash..

And not the after burner of a jet, as that would not cause smoke plumes to rise from the peak district moorland.

And would not have been visible from the home of Mr Morton and mother to the grid ref point they pointed out to the visiting police officer..

A distance of 10.3 miles as the crow flies

Let us talk about Mr Dagenhart Mr. Jonathan Dagenhart

This is what Dr Clark alleges was said, when he alleges he interviewed Dagenhart, in an unbiased and un-pressured manner!

"I was a passenger on a minibus which was traveling across the snake pass towards Sheffield, late on the night of the 24th March last year. When crossing the viaduct Over the reservoir the bus was flagged down by a man who was acting suspiciously.

How do you suspiciously flag down a mini bus?

The Dr Clark then wrote, regarding the alleged interview.

He did not seem to know where he was and just said he needed to get to Sheffield. This guy was covered in fuel of some sort, and from the smell I thought it was Paraffin or diesel, but since then Ive joined the RAF and I can say it was a smell like aviation fuel.

That is simply not true and I have proved it

I commented

This is a stark turnaround of events From a man seven days earlier was using words like brilliant, also when I asked him if he wanted to remain Anonymous, he replied Im not bothered. Pay careful attention to how this mans persona and attitude changes

Further to that

Mr. Jonathan Dagenhart
Telephoned me on the 12th of May at approximately 11.30 and sounding very flustered with a shaky voice informed me that I had twisted what he said and he no longer wanted to have his name put to his original statement. He has also spoken with Mr. Phil Taylor at the News of the World informing him that he was going to lose his job over the statement that he had made to me.
When I spoke to Phil Taylor at the N.o.T.W. he said the guy was almost in tears on the phone.

Was he made to retract his statement?

May I add that Mr. Dagenhart is under the employ of the RAF where he works on jet engines and when I questioned him about who had spoken with him about this he just said a source. I further questioned him as to whether it was his employer the RAF who had silenced him and he replied that he could not say on that he ended the conversation and was very upset.

Why would the RAF be hauling an engineer over the hot coals like this?

To the point of him telling a national news reporter that he was going to lose his job?

And trying to imply that I have twisted what he has said

Audio tapes do not lie._ Fact_

He verified the content of the taped transcript of our conversation to Mr Mike Jarvis reporter for the News of The World and made his statements freely and without prompting.

When asked, at the time did he want to remain anonymous he replied "I'm not bothered". All of which is on tape and can be cross verified by Mike Jarvis at the News of The World.

I hope you all agree that for someone to turn around from being 'not bothered' to 'I'm going to lose my job', adds more weight to my case. Why would the military be pressurizing a member of their work force to retract a statement about something they claim has not occurred.

I reiterate to you all I have the Dagenhart tape and he made all comments freely and without prompting The RAF are trying to make someone retract a statement about something that they claim never happened anyway Why ?

Back to the comparative look, from the transcript of the audio

So I said when Mr Dagenhart told me it was aviation fuel, I said

Burns Ah absolutely superb
Dagenhart And I will put my money on that

I will put money on that, sounds pretty certain it was aviation fuel to me

Further on in the Dr Clark interview with Dagenhart, he wrote.

"Questioned about the clothes this man was wearing, In light of Max Burns' claims, Dagenhart told me "they were just ordinary dark clothes he definitely not wearing the sort of uniform associated with RAF pilots, I would have recognised that uniform immediately"

On the audio the taped interview

I then asked the direct question

Did it look like a flying suit he was wearing?
Dagenhart Um I don't know he'd got clothes on but I mean it was dark and he'd got dark clothes on that's all.
Burns And he didn't know where he was?

Dagenhart No
Burns Yer and there were no vehicles in the area
Dagenhart There was nothing. A police car past us about 2 minutes after we passed him Ur cos. wed got a full minibus there was no room at all to get him on so we drove off.

No mention of the man acting Suspiciously.

Here is where I informed Dagenhart of exactly How I was reporting this story.

Burns That night I've got multiple witnesses to an enormous UFO flying about everywhere
Dagenhart right
Burns A military interception and they're trying to cover it up but you know I'll send you a copy of this if you like
Dagenhart yer brilliant

Mr Dagenhart seems very excited and relaxed at the moment using words like Brilliant! I then continued to question Mr Dagenhart.

Burns Do you remember anything else was his English good
Dagenhart No it wasn't it was very poor very poor.
Burns Yer I think he might have been a NATO pilot or co-pilot
Dagenhart Yes he was of sort of African sort of origin very very dark skinned
Burns And it was definitely aviation fuel
Dagenhart yes
Burns And you can substantiate that because you now work for the Royal Air Force on jet engines
Dagenhart Yes
Burns And he really didn't know where he was going
Dagenhart He didn't know where he was going it looked like he just walked off a hill
Burns Really did he have any mud or anything on him Could you tell was his clothing dirty
Dagenhart I couldn't tell
Burns But as you work for the Royal Air Force on jet engines your absolutely 100% certain that it was aviation fuel not diesel

Dagenhart yes
Burns I might contact you again if that's OK
Dagenhart Yes well this is my parents number and I'm
hardly ever here
Burns Well I'll leave a message for you
Dagenhart yes
Burns Now in my report do you ant me to change your
name keep you anonymous
Dagenhart To be honest I don't care

Dr Clark then wrote,

According to Dagenharts statement on May 12th," At no stage in
any of this conversation did Max Tell me he was going to use
what I had told him in a story claiming that I had seen the co-
pilot of a Tornado which had been shot down by a UFO"

I replied

Mr Dagenhart was fully aware of how I was reporting this
incident Which was recorded on tape with permission of
Dagenhart.

I have the full interview on tape.
Further on in the alleged interview Which I believe was
nothing more than the military official new statement by
Dagenhart. The Dr Clark also asked Dagenhart
how he would react, if Max claimed he had been
silenced as a result of withdrawing his testimony

I hope you will agree that this is rather a strange
question to ask .
It is almost if the other researcher knew that I would
allege that Dagenhart had been forced to retract his
statement.

Because he has

Due to the fact that I had my original interview on audio
cassette Which completely contradicts the Interview the Dr Clark
claims took place between him and Dagenhart so obviously as Mr
Dagenhart made his Comments To myself first and really had no
need to lie anything after should be viewed as highly dubious

Ok back to Jonathan Dagenhart

David Clark alleges Dagenhart responded
"I havent been silenced by anyone, I just don't want my name
connected to a story like this and that is why I intend to tell
Max not to involve me any further,"I just told him all what I
saw that night and that is all I know".

I stated
That last line sounds like the comment of someone under pressure
and under Questioning, He did tell me all he saw that night the
truth not the bull that has been Peddled after my original
interview on the record from a very excited man. After the other
researcher had spoken with him and his bosses plus god knows who
else He sounds like he has been beaten with hickory sticks

How could he lose his job over something the RAF has claimed has
not occurred?

There are a number of other points.

How did the airforce even know about this in the first place to
be able to pull him into an office and threaten him with losing
his job?

If none of what I allege were true why would the airforce be
even bothered about my claims and what dagenhart had said to
myself?

I find it highly irregular practice for the RAF to be behaving
in this manner For a none event?

The only logical conclusion for the behaviour of the airforce,
and the subsesquent denials by Dagenhart after he had been
threatened with his job is that a tornado jet has in deed
crashed on the moors during this incident.

John Beaver Yorkshire water also said to another researcher. The police told me that the RAF had admitted there was a plane doing a night time exercise and it had gone through the sound barrier. Now are the Police lying to John Beaver is John beaver lying to the other researcher or is the other researcher lying to us now.. You see this alleged credible statement is claiming something the RAF have still not admitted to. And in fact at the time John Beavers men were told to stand down the RAF would not even admit Too having any planes in the air that night.!

Who's lying?

Please feel free to comment on these indisputable Facts

Max Burns

Its nice to be important but its more important to be nice

[[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](#).