



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: **Andy Roberts** <Brigantia@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 13:21:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 08:31:10 -0400
Subject: Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed

>From: Max Burns <MBurns6711@cs.com>
>Date: Sat, 10 Jul 1999 18:52:09 EDT
>Subject: Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed
>To: Updates@globalserve.net

>Its about time I gave you all a behind the scenes look at what
>has been going on for over two years regarding my investigation
>into the Sheffield incident..

was highly entertaining and demands comment. Let us first say
this:

Firstly, most of what Max says is based in some truth. But note
the words 'most' and 'some'.

Secondly, most of what Max says is open to interpretation and
his particular brand of paranoid 'spin doctoring'.

To reply to each and every tedious allegation would be time
consuming and boring. But I will happily do that on the list or
in private. For now here are a few observations. Thanks to EBK
for the chance to see how contested UFO investigations
actually are, warts and all.

>Houses in South Yorkshire were rattled by an unexplained
>Airborne explosion on the night of March 24th (1997) and
>witnesses at Marjorie Hill claimed to have seen a UFO hovering
>over a hill side at the time of the mysterious detonation.
>Why has Tim never passed on these witness details to myself?

Have you asked Tim? Why should he? And this was obviously the
witness named in the newspapers as elementary research would
have shown.

>Article continues.... The explosion was powerful enough to be
>picked up by Edinburgh University's seismic unit....
>Not true, the seismic disturbance at 21.52 was picked up by
>Leeds University....

>Who, Max, along with many other centre supply the BGS with information.
>Dr David Clark has re interviewed the witness Dan Grayson, Dr
>Clark reports that Dan Grayson has never told me he saw a UFO
>or the Triangle that night, and in-deed was now quite happy
>that what he saw was the search and rescue helicopter.
>The thing is that in issue 12 page 43, Dan Grayson actually
>said,And this is well before I had had anything about this case
>in print anywhere.
>And I quote
>"Although my sighting was later than everyone else's, I know
>what I saw was no plane or helicopter"

Max seems to have a problem with witnesses who change their minds. This is entirely their prerogative and is not in any way indicative of a cover-up, being 'silenced' or whatever other paranoid fantasies are cool in the dark side of UK ufology.

>At the same time Andy Robert's, reports that the case has been
>solved by David Clark, to be a Bolide meteor etc mundane,
>although some unknown researcher from Rotherham, (meaning
>myself would have others believe otherwise)....

I'd be interested to see myself quoted as saying that Max. According to a witness I interviewed a few days after the event a bolide seemed possible. It was never a main contender for the case and was part of a theory in progress. No big deal there.

>David Clark, has already written up his 26 page in-depth
>report for BUFORA, which despite request's will not release to
>me, stating Bolide meteor or military jet, etc. Mundane, etc.,
>etc.

Surely you would have read it in BUFORA's publication?

>Which just happens to agree with the official party line BGS &
>the Royal astronomical society (Dr J Mitton)

And your point is exactly?

>At around this time Andy Robert's releases a copy of his
>tabloid style attack on others the armchair ufologist, makes
>some derogatory remarks about myself.

Certainly did - I suggest listers read it on the Magonia site - it's called the Armchair Ufologist and it's quite good if you like to see the soft underbelly of UK ufology exposed. It's the sort of publication people love when they are not in it!

>At the Bufora conference they allege that I approached then and
>casually exclaimed to give my research credibility and only
>them who are out to discredit myself, that "I had bribed a
>witness with cannabis".

Actually Max we're stating it, not alleging it. For the simple reason that the conversation took place and Max did in fact state clearly that he had bribed a 'traveller' (hippy who lives in an old bus for our US readers) with marijuana to get him to relate his UFO sighting.

I have stated this many times and despite Max's threats of legal action if I did not retract (which haven't materialised) and Matthew Williams' attempts to bribe me into silence I will continue to raise it. Because when you have an investigator who openly admits to this kind of behaviour I think it is reasonable to suggest that it casts doubt on all aspects of his investigations. When it is further backed up by the fact that Max is currently on bail for a very serious drug charge I think that throws an enormous shadow across anything he says.

>There has now been an add on to these alleged events by Andy
>Robert's, That I was seen smoking a cannabis joint, this new
>accusation comes nearly 2 yrs after the conference....

Max, you appear unable to get even your ad hominem attacks factually correct! Where exactly did I say this? Copy please.

>In two subsequent editions of the Armchair ufologists, Mr Andy
>Robert's gives myself a three or four page spread in each
>issue, where his attacks on myself and my research continue,

Read them people, read them for yourselves.

>Later on Andy Robert's informs myself by email that he had
>illegally recorded our phone conversation, and had illegally
>played this to a third, a colleague from where he works, who
>had given psychological comment on the recording based on what
>ever back up info Mr Robert's had chosen to supply, obviously
>it would not have been complimentary based on his previous
>attacks against myself

Yes and yes, but not the last bit, I just let the evidence speak for itself.

>The comment from Mr Robert's Colleague, who has never met or
>spoken with me is that I show the traits of a habitual drug
>user, with all the personality swings etc..Mr Robert's then
>forwards this illegal medical diagnosis to all and sundry,

That's what he said based on your phone call, your emails and
your writings Max. His opinion.

>What the relevant medical authorities would make of this highly
>immoral and Irregular behaviour I don't know, I just know that
>any self respecting psychologist would never give a diagnosis
>without meeting with the person concerned.

He isn't self-respecting. And yes Max, mental health
professionals frequently offer opinions over the phone based
purely on symptoms described to them.

>Does anyone else find this behaviour so far quite shocking? As
>well as a string of offensive e-mails coming my way mostly from
>Andy Roberts.making comments like....
>"Its all pre programmed Max all pre programmed"

And so it was/is/will be Max, the parabola of your beliefs,
paranoia and ever increasing fantasies was obvious from the
start.

>It was Dr Clark who was extremely angry shouting and pacing
>round his office, with his work mate also becoming even more
>verbal.. I am always up for a debate and it is obvious that Dr
>Clark and I will no doubt have to agree to disagree regarding
>this case..

Unfortunately opinions differ as to what happened that day.

>1998 early part of the year, I am booked to give a lecture for
>the Bufora membership, the lecture is postponed one month and
>is due to take place at the 5th May 1998 AGM...
>Mike Wooten/Clark/Roberts and co start a behind the scenes
>campaign to have me stopped from presenting my findings,

Yes, that's right, we did. For the reason that Mike (who edited
BUFORAs journal for many years and virtrually ran BUFORA
for as many) and David (then BUFORA press officer) and myself
(and many other people including their Director of Investigations
Gloria Dixon) firmly believed that Max should not be allowed to speak
on a BUFORA platform for all the reasons obvious in both Max's
and my posts.

Max has more or less completely destroyed BUFORA, whose
membership is down from over 1000 (when Mike Wooten was a
driving force) to less than 500 and falling. This is entirely
due to the Max Burns effect. BUFORA have lost two journal
editors, one press officer, a director of investigations and
many sensible members. On the other hand they have preserved the
right of free speech for fantasists at all costs.

So it was worth it.

>Monday May 7th I have a meeting with Phil Taylor the features
>editor about the Sheffield Incident.... 1.00pm arrives and guess
>who calls the News of the World and asks for Phil Taylor by
>name, and professes to inform Mr Taylor that I am a drug
>dealing liar...and have made the whole thing up.....

And your evidence for this is?

>I do have a charge pending and the charge is intent to supply
>amphetamine. I have pleaded not guilty to the charge, other than
>that I cannot make any comment on this matter, due to the laws
>of prejudice and subjudicy.

Which is precisely why numerous people thought you were highly
unsuited to giving lectures to a national UFO body. The tabloids
would have made a meal of it and BUFORAs credibility would have
plummetted further.

>Also Andy Robert's had advance notice of one of the trial dates
>which should have occurred on the 17th May 1999, 5 days before
>my legal team could inform myself..

The implication being? (other than you should have got yourself a legal team who could use a 'phone properly!).

>"My masters at MI5 have asked me to wish you all the best for
>May 17th"
>Ever heard this saying? "Many a true word spoken in jest"

And your implication is? Obviously that I am working for MI5. Max, as I've told you a million times, I would if they paid me.

>On top of that Dr Clark now alleges that I have manipulated a
>medical Doctor, due to the trial on the 17th May being canceled
>due to my medical Doctor, diagnosing that I had severe food
>poisoning.

>To which I provided a proper and legal medical certificate.
>Which confirmed My medical status to the Judge,

I'm sure you did. But it seemed more than a tad 'odd' that you felt able to run round the Peak District looking for SAS men less than twenty four hours before your trial was due to begin.

>At Tim Matthew's last conference, Judith Jaafar asks Andy
>Robert's how he managed to obtain such privy information before
>my legal team....

>Apparently he went red in the face and was unusually stuck for
>a smart Alec reply....

Puhleese Max.

>The Newly Reformed IUN.... is this the high moral standards
>that they profess to use? You have read the catalogue of things
>that they have been engaged in their attempts to protect their
>patch their own and their research....

The IUN is not newly reformed Max, it's been in existence since 1987. We have never professed high moral standards. And yes, research must be protected from contamination by fabricated facts. Nothing wrong with that.

>Matthew Williams informed me that there is an undercurrent
>behind the scenes trying to discredit my case and myself. aint
>that the truth....

And Matthews evidence is? Would this be the Matthew Williams who admits hoaxing crop circles, believes the Queen and the Freemasons run everything but only because they are manipulated by the aliens? I think so.

>Earlier this yr. in Feb. I believe I was booked to give a talk
>for the Bufora Membership once again the booking was for June
>5th. ... the campaign started again with the Usual suspects
>engaging in a repeat performance of there antics to try and get
>me removed from the lecture, However they failed, so the NEW
>IUN PLAN came into play

>Enter BLUE HARE,

Ahh, your Close Encounter of the Furred Kind!

>Does Tim Matthew's know who the Blue Hare group are?

Have you asked him?

>I believe he does, this plan that was hatched by the Robert's
>Clark and obviously Matthew's as otherwise he would not have
>known that there were some other info in the offing....

Surely MI5 could come up with something more imaginative. Unfortunately Max your paranoia has got the better of you once again and nothing we say can alter that. Or put it another way:

If we deny the bluehare hoax you won't believe us.

If we admit to the bluehare hoax how can you be sure we are telling the truth?

>Andy Robert's has bragged that he will be is in possession of a
>photograph of myself in the peak district park, carrying a
>metel detector....

I hope to have one soon, yes.

>So he obviously knows who the Blue Hare group are....

Not so - But as you know I tend to end up as a clearing house for rumour, gossip, hoaxes etc etc. Knowing what I know about other hoaxes it wouldn't surprise me if a photo came my way.

>Come on folks, they have been behind everything else the
>pointers are there.

Max! Paranoia again. 'Behind everything else' is a rather bold statement. I have seen little evidence of anything from you to back this up save a desire for you to have a scapegoat for your fantasies and lack of facts to back up your beliefs about the Sheffield case.

>In real life they sneaky back door low life's which is proven
>by the large catalogue of facts that I have outlined here today
>and that is only in there attempts to silence myself, plus
>others who are feeling the teeth of this sick old lion

No facts from you Max - merely a series of interpretations, misperceptions, assumptions and beliefs.

>IS THIS MORAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT?

No! But you don't have to shout.

>I think not, should they be embarrassed? I hope so.... So I
>throw it open, if you were in my shoes what would you think?

We aren't at all embarrassed for investigating a case thoroughly and scientifically and then protecting the facts about that case from being overwhelmed by fantasy and wishful thinking.

>For the record I am still investigating the Sheffield case and
>will not be deterred

Good Max, glad to hear it. When you can answer just one - just one of the three questions (see my last post) we have been posing you for two years now, then perhaps the case will progress.

>If this is these peoples idea of moral high ground then we are
>all in trouble.

More of a moral grassy knoll actually Max.

>What do you good people think I would be pleased to hear your
>comments on this?

Easy - some people will be horrified, some will be amused, some won't care less, some will be indignant, some will agree with Max, some with us, some a little bit of both. Life will go on.

Happy Trails

[[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](#).