

booked my appointment to see Taylor on Saturday 5th May, two days, earlier, and told no-one. How did the usual suspects find out? By now I think you'll only heed one-guess. Roberts was sensitive-on this point, and even asked for evidence Clarke had done this, when-he must surely have known [40]. Unfortunately for him, Clarke had earlier admitted contacting the newspaper, though not how he knew to do so. Clarke wrote, in the end even the *News of the World* failed to believe Max's far-fetched tale. He's being paranoid once again. If he really thinks a *News of the World* journalist 'would' allow me to order him not run a story. They did not run the story because I apprised them of the .FACTS; that's all, plain and simple" [41]. The *News of the World* were running the story right up to Friday morning before publication on Sunday. How did Clarke know I was there?

Dave Gilham of the Cornwall UFO group was (unsuccessfully) pressured by Tim Hepple state asset to prevent me speaking there 13/9/01. I was also booked to appear on a March 1998 Central Weekend Television show to debate Ufology At the last minute I was cancelled, though Roberts Clarke and Hepple appeared. Roberts emailed, me to boast the TV company had been informed I was a drug dealer, before any trial-took place. Roberts & the others had supposedly saved me the embarrassment - of being on TV. The same usual suspects who had been telling all and sundry I was a drug dealer now claimed they did it for me. In reality they were desperate to deny me a public platform.

Many In UK Ufology were increasingly concerned about the 'Ufology Wars'. Immense pressure was applied behind the scenes by Roberts Clarke & Hepple/Matthews to whip into fine groups, Individuals, conference organisers and magazine, editors.

When I was again booked to address BUFORA on 5/6/99 the campaign to get me barred was reactivated by the usual suspects. This time they failed, as new lecture organiser Malcolm Robinson, with BUFORA Council support, was in no mood to be bullied.

Roberts has admitted "it is common knowledge regarding my liking for various substances" [42]. Are his co-authors Jenny Randles-and David Clarke, this last a friend for over 20 years, aware of his recreational activities in this area? A reasonable assumption. I wrote to Jenny Randles asking for her opinion on this and related matters [43]. Randles chose not to reply. This should not be taken as disinterest in the drug convictions, of everybody in Ufology. Randles refused to publicise my December 2001 BUFOR lecture on the BUFORA UFO CALL line. Supposedly, she could not in good conscience support allowing a convicted criminal to speak. Yet she has no problem writing books with one, work that one out. More dope-cake, Vicar?

Clarke, one of Roberts' closest friends, is presumably, privy to "common knowledge" about Roberts' partaking of illegal substances. Nonetheless, he also tried to have my last BUFORA lecture stopped on. the same grounds as Randles. Clarke, has always refused to debate this case and lies about every conversation we have ever had, so no shock there.

STAGE6: INTIMIDATING & ISOLATING THOSE WHO MIGHT LISTEN TO THE MESSAGE

A prime example of this is Nick Redfern author of 'A Covert Agenda' and other books' on the subject; He is now very friendly with Roberts subsequent to Roberts viciously criticising his interpretation of the Berwyn Mountains UFO case in the *Armchair Ufology*. Indeed, Redfern has just co-authored one-book with Roberts for the US market on 'Strange Secrets: Real Government Files on the Unknown', and is soon to co-author a book with him called (according to Roberts) 'The Definitive Guide To The Berwyn UFO Case.

UFO. Rather, he told me an RAF friend in Lincolnshire reported they lost a military jet in the Peak District on the night in question despite publicly denying anything happened. He had been told the RAF had found, no wreckage or the plane [29]. At the time, I merely treated this bogus claim by Roberts and Clarke as sour grapes, but was soon to find out different. In retrospect, them spreading such specific drug-related lies about me at this very time was probably not accidental. In other words, knowingly or unknowingly, they were spinning a line of character assassination soon after given practical form by the state's dirty tricks department. Coincidence? I think not. See if you agree.

In October 1997 while a passenger in a car with two women, Susan Bradley (herself a police drugs target) and Louise Goodison, the car was pulled up by police. Goodison I hardly knew, I was a friend of the other's boyfriend. Bradley was the object of a regional drug task force police surveillance, code named 'Operation Morph'. We were all arrested and later charged in connection with drugs. I pleaded not guilty. The day of trial Bradley pleaded guilty to a charge allowing her to go free, and charges against Goodison were dropped. I was then the only person to stand trial, Bradley & Goodison now giving evidence for the crown. After a 7 day trial in September 1999 I was found guilty by a 10-2 majority verdict, and sentenced to 30 months in jail of which I served half. At present I am in the process (with new legal representation) of appealing against this conviction. As the appeal is ongoing I am not in a legal position to make extensive comment, nor would I want to.

Those who know me well are certain I was not and have never been a drug dealer. Some will be undecided, but others in UK Ufology had me tried and guilty before a trial date was even set, indeed (as seen above) before I was even charged. For me it's simple: I was not guilty, but even if you believe me guilty, I have served my debt to society and should be allowed to carry on with life: including research into UFOs.

Roberts later boasted of illegally recording our September 1998 phone conversations, and playing them to a works colleague, who gave psychological comments based on information Roberts supplied [30]. Obviously such 'background' would be defamatory, based, on previous attacks against myself. He used this alleged resulting 'diagnosis' as a basis for him, Clarke and (bizarrely) proven psychopath agent Hepple telling people I was a lunatic paranoid. Clarke even referred to me in the same sentence as Osama Bin Laden while trying to prevent me speaking to a BUFORA meeting in December 2001. Roberts utilises questionable (and possibly fabricated, certainly unethical) medical opinion derived from somebody who has never met me. Contrast this with a letter from somebody who has: my family Doctor. "To whom it may concern. This letter is to confirm that the above patient of ours has never had or been treated for any form of Psychiatric illness, either in the past or currently and is receiving no prescribed medication. I hope the above is helpful to you. Yours sincerely Dr K G Bratt." (private letter 29/11/01). It is standard intelligence world practice to label people you are trying to discredit the way the usual suspects do.

In March 1998 I again visited Clarke's office in Rotherham, I supplied him with my new address and telephone number in Nottingham, so Clarke could post a relevant log. One week later my phone rang and a voice asked if I was Max Burns, then hung up. I felt this was strange and soon found out why. Next morning police arrested me over council tax arrears. I was hauled off before Rotherham magistrates. I now know Clarke supplied my details to Rotherham council. Clarke admitted, in a previous post to UFO Updates mailing list having been contacted by the council, asking about my whereabouts? The game was up when I informed Updates mailing list that the arresting officer had shown me a copy of Clarke's fax to Rotherham council, then forwarded to the police in West Bridgford where I was then living. The burning question: how would the Council know to ask Clarke about me in the first place?

last-ditch attempt to close, me down and contaminate my research; by confusing FACT with FICTION. The very thing Roberts and Clarke have accused me of throughout my investigation. When the attempted BLUE HARE hoax landed on the UFO Updates mailing list in June 1999 Roberts wrote of it:

"You've got to laugh and admire at the gall of whoever was behind this hoax (which takes several readings before the full ramifications sink in). No doubt there will, now be a flurry of 'outraged' decent Ufologists who are appalled at such a hoax **[attempted hoax: Max Burns]** being perpetrated on the 'UFO community'. They will be wrong. There is a long tradition of hoaxing within Ufology and associated subjects, and careful hoax experiments can only be helpful" *[helpful to Whom? MB]* "However unpalatable this may seem it is true. The Burns hoax is just one in a long line of instructive exercises which we ignore at our peril" Roberts continued. "As the hoaxer's say; 'caveat lector' (surely related to Hannibal Lector judging by the way Burns was chewed up and spat out!)." **[46]**.

The phrase- 'Burns-hoax' is highly significant, It subtly implies not just that I was an intended (and perhaps successful?) victim, but (subliminally) that I may even have been involved, After all, many in Ufology only scan the titles of internet postings, and sometimes don't read, never mind exhaustively analyse, the contents. One good- reason why the 'Usual Suspects' have got away with what they, have to date. When I publicly revealed the truth of my dealings With BLUE.HARE (AKA Roberts Clarke and troops as we shall see) **[47]**-Roberts quickly responded. He wrote "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! **[48]** The fact is if my post had been wrong Roberts would have been on It straight away. To feign a brush off rather than provide a proper answer is a standard tactic for the 'Usual Suspects'.

Blue Hare's message to UFO Updates was certainly eye-catching. ATTENTION A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

"We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since the mid 80's, going under the collective name of Genius Loki. We believe if are unable to determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick to watching sci-fi. Stupidity within Ufology has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years. The latest example is how the so-called Sheffield Incident/Howden Moors UFO Crash has- been promoted by certain individuals".

I am not now claiming a UFO crashed, but initially (as a genuine researcher not –prejudging he facts) gave credence to this hypothesis, along with other suggestions. Even before the BLUE HARE hoax was perpetrated, I had revised my findings in response to new evidence. At that juncture I thought a military jet had crashed. My updated research was in the public domain, and lecture contents definitely in Clarke/Roberts' possession courtesy of Tim Matthews/Hepple. The truth of my views or anybody else's was of no interest to 'Blue Hare', except as something to misrepresent.

Though I did not use bogus BLUE HARE information in my research Roberts/Clarke have tried to transform my investigation into a hoax by claiming the entire 24/3/97 events a hoax. BLUE HARE was from start to finish a distraction. As they themselves put it "This is not the place, to go into the specifics of the case. Many will be familiar with it already and it has been widely featured on UFO Updates and *UFO Magazine*. Several websites have also featured the case in depth. From our point of view it had been satisfactorily solved, But there are those who will not see reason and instead see saucers and conspiracy everywhere".

Clarke stated "the theory that the mystery man soaked in fuel was actually a RAF or NATO pilot clearly stretches credibility to its limit. Nick Pope former head of the MOD department at Whitehall which deals with UFOs... now a successful author of popular books on the subject found this claim particularly hard to swallow. He said 'I think it's ridiculous to suggest that this has anything, to do with the RAF. On the basis that a pilot from a downed jet would always stay at the crash site waiting for the inevitable military search and rescue operation'. Pope commented on the sheer implausibility of the claims made by those who believed a jet had crashed. He said, 'if an RAF aircraft had really crashed what ever the circumstances it would have been virtually impossible to implement a successful cover up'. He went on to .say, 'There would almost inevitably been a fire and in those circumstances the emergency services and members of the public would have located the crash site very quickly' **[20]**.

While Nick Pope is no expert on crashes in the Peak District or anywhere else, the Air Accidents Investigation Branch (AAIB) based at Farnborough certainly are. On 11/6/93 a Hawker Hunter jet crashed in the Peak District. The pilot was 46 year old Wallace Cubitt, Clarke referred to this crash within two days of the 1997 incident, using it as evidence to stifle questions about the Sheffield case **[21]**. Significantly, Clarke fails to mention the 1993 crash site parameters. Given Clarke and co say a jet could not have crashed on 24/3/97 without being found due to the likelihood of widespread wreckage we now look at the AAIB crash report for Cubitt's jet:

"Impact parameters. The aircraft had crashed some 1,500 feet above mean sea level on a remote area of open moorland, the soft surface of which was formed by a heather covered layer of peat estimated to be up to 50ft in depth, The point of impact had been amongst several natural water drainage gullies. The aircraft had struck the ground in a nose and left wing low altitude both estimated at between 45 and 50 degrees below the horizon. The speed of impact was extremely high estimated at above 450kt. Largely due to this high speed and the soft and deep nature of the surface most of the aircraft wreckage penetrated the peat to a great depth and formed a roughly circular crater some 50ft in diameter. Shortly after the impact this crater filled with water to a depth of approximately 8 feet, the natural water surface being several feet below the undisturbed ground level. A large quantity of peat material together with some items of wreckage, were ejected from the crater, forming a raised lip around the hole, in addition to being scattered locally in all directions... Recovery of the wreckage was severely hampered by the nature of the surface, the location and access to the site, which was approximately 2.5 miles from the nearest suitable road. After several days, during which the crater was drained as far as practicable, it became apparent no major parts of the aircraft would be accessible without deployment of significant resources. It was thus agreed amongst the authorities involved that the site would be cleared of all visible and accessible items associated with the aircraft and to leave the majority of the wreckage buried" **[22]**.

This case is. relevant because, crucially, it shows a jet could crash and easily not be found, and furthermore could also be concealed from the public. As Clarke included information about the 1993 Cubitt crash in his *Sheffield Star* piece (26/3/97) he must be fully aware of the crash circumstances. In which case, why be adamant a jet could never crash, and not be found, equally why claim such an event couldn't be concealed? The circumstances from the 1993 Cubitt Hawker Hunter Jet crash clearly support my findings, or at least the possibility they may be true.

Another area of dispute is conflicting reports about the activities of Mike France's mountain search and rescue team that March night in 1997. On both Updates mailing list and in UFNW Clarke has maintained there was "a thorough search which was able to rule out any chance of overlooking a crash site". **[23]**. Yet a thorough search was not conducted. Solid evidence here is search team leader Mike France's comments to another *Sheffield Star* reporter Gail Robinson. She wrote "Mountain rescue team leader Mike France says simply: 'the 40 square miles being

which may have been accumulated. Also I am going to suggest to them that they be prepared to pay the costs of researchers who have had their time and money wasted".

This letter was NOT reproduced in *UFO Magazine* although a more recent article by Nick Pope alluded to the admissions without naming Roberts/Clarke [52]. All is not lost for *UFO Magazine* however. After publication in *NFB* I will give *UFO Magazine* the chance to reproduce this article in full.

After the Clarke/Roberts admission, of involvement in the BLUE HARE attempted hoax, why just own up to the one? UTNW Chapter 7 analyses the Alex Birch Photograph. In 1962 a supposed UFO photograph was taken by Birch. It was viewed at the time by the MOD. Many considered it the real deal. Towards the end of the last millennium Birch changed his position and now claimed he had 'hoaxed' the photo when a small boy. Further down the line Birch reverted back to say it was a real picture and had only claimed to hoax it to make it the entire story leave his life once and for all. Roberts wrote of this "the new claims caused considerable consternation, among UFO researchers, many openly hostile to the case, and felt that, Alex 'a self confessed hoaxer' could not be trusted in the light of his earlier admissions" (UTNW p.134), What Roberts says of Birch applies equally to himself and co-author Dr Clarke at least, though possibly not to Jenny Randles, who seems a genuine Ufologist. I asked Roberts whether Randles was involved in any of his hoaxes, and he replied in the negative. Yet until we know who all his co-hoaxers are, any close associates of Roberts Clarke & Hepple must remain suspect. As Clarke Roberts and company are obviously NOT acting as UFO researchers it is legitimate to ask what their agenda really is, and on whose behalf?

"By their own admission, they have intentionally blurred the line between reality and fantasy asking at various time for both to be accepted as truth (UTNW p. 143). Exactly.

Interestingly, in our email exchanges Roberts, a hoaxer & serial planter of disinformation in Ufology since the late 80's wanted to 'confirm the facts' with me. As Roberts himself said concerning Alex Birch "a self confessed 'hoaxer' could not be trusted in the light of his earlier admissions" (UTNW p.134). Ufology must not ignore this situation. Not only do we want to know what Roberts Clarke & their co-conspirators have been up to, we need to see relevant documented evidence, in the meantime, all we can do is not believe anything they say about Ufology unless corroborated by genuine researchers. When I sought answers from Roberts on these matters, he was typically sneering stating of his hoax 'experiments', 'now the game is obviously to say we've just made it up recently... I have, no intention of releasing information on any past, current or future alleged experiments" [53]. This statement even contradicts Roberts previous post a couple of weeks earlier claiming "results of some of these experiments will be made public when the time is right. Others, necessarily so, will remain embedded with the subject" [54]. Such playground insults and evasions are characteristic of Roberts and too secret state 'Psyop'. His and Clarke's hoaxes are not, however, characteristic of genuine UFO research.

On the basis of what has been revealed, will Jenny Randles now write no more books; with Roberts? Will Clarke distance himself and act accordingly? Will Roberts press the button to self-eject from the supposedly ethical Independent UFO Network (IUN)? If not, why not?? Or have you already worked it out...

STAGE 8: HYPOCRITICALLY ATTACKING THE INDEPENDENCE OF OTHERS

Clarke, Roberts & Randles wrote 'in the introduction to 'The UFOs 'That Never Were' "What can we do to reassure the reader that we are not some puppet of the intelligence community" (UTNW p.12). What indeed? BLUE HARE put it thus. "Ufologist Max Burns had become unhealthily obsessed with the Sheffield Incident. Despite having no evidence for these allegations Burns

Roberts & Clarke were now turning up the heat after my article in *Alien Encounters* issue 13 July 1997. Clarke was informed by a local newsagent about my forthcoming article, and asked her to direct me to the *Sheffield Star's* Rotherham office 50 yards away. When I visited, Clarke was rude and demeaning. I asked for comment on my article, he merely said it was all wrong. We agreed to disagree and remained cordial for a while, Clark suggested at that meeting we exchange home phone numbers with a view to sharing information. Looks like that was our first date. I never suspected anything at that point and just thought he was behaving like a spoilt child or maybe having a bad day? I never make snap judgements about anyone, all should be allowed time for you to see them for what they really are.

On a later (March 1998) visit to Clarke's Rotherham office, I shared further research with him and he offered me a different police log in exchange for the one I had. I agreed. We had a heated debate and Clarke became very agitated and defensive when I stated my evolving view a military jet had crashed that night. After disappearing for a good 15 minutes he returned. This time (having received instructions perhaps?) he was up for a good row, got very angry and kept telling me I was wrong. In the end I left, having decided something very disturbing was going on: the outburst seemed contrived [12]. Clarke then told all and sundry I had become abusive, not the other way round.

Tim Matthews AKA Hepple recorded my June 1999 BUFORA lecture and forwarded the audio to Clarke. A review of my lecture was sent by Clarke to the BUFORA council 09/06/99 and on 11/6/99 Clarke also posted the review to UFO Updates mailing list. He wrote:

"I obtained special permission from the base commander to access the flight log for Coningsby earlier this year. The log clearly shows that four Tornados took off and four returned safely to the base at 2125 that night following a routine exercise over the North Sea".

Clarke continues:

"Today I contacted Caroline Hogg, the base Public Relations Officer who deals with all inquiries to Coningsby. Had the base received a letter from one Max Burns asking to access the log, and making a claim about a crashed aircraft? 'Not to my knowledge' she said after recovering from laughter. 'And I deal with all members of the public who contact the base'. In my presence she searched all correspondence logs since 1997 (the base PRO keeps meticulous records of all letters received) and the only person to have contacted the base about the March 24, 1997, incident was surprise, surprise, David Clarke".

This account by Clarke is staggering, and clearly points to lying somewhere along the line. For a start, the base flight log I was shown on my visit to RAF Coningsby 03/09/01 shows only two aircraft taking off. Then there is the fact we are supposed to accept the RAF Coningsby CSO apparently showed Clarke a list of every contact to the base regarding 24/03/97. How exactly could he obtain such cooperation, if he did so?

Clarke's very public allegation I had never spoken or written to Caroline Hogg the Community Service Officer at RAF Coningsby in Lincolnshire was also repeated to BUFORA National Council [13]. A bare-faced lie. On my visit to RAF Coningsby 3/9/01 not only did I meet Hogg, following up earlier correspondence and phone calls, she denied ever having spoken to or having any contact with Clarke [14],

Typical of lies about witnesses is Clarke's interview with RAF Engineer Jonathan Dagenhart. The latter told me in a phone-conversation he freely agreed to be recorded that on the night of 24th March 1997, on Snake Pass on the small viaduct over Ladybower reservoir just after. 11pm the mini bus he was travelling in was flagged down by a man stinking of "aviation fuel". During the,

Many issues are raised by the actions of the Roberts/Clarke cabal. One of the most important relates to their fabricating documents data and incidents. A useful contribution with regard to the hoaxing situation in UK and global Ufology has come from the respected editor of *UFO Magazine* Brazil, AJ Gevaerd. On UFO Updates he wrote:

"I believe that UFO researchers should have their activities in investigating the phenomena and all set of its variations, but they should; also be ready and prepared to expose hoaxes and hoaxers as part of such activities. Here in Brazil many researchers have divided their time between UFO investigations and exposing hoaxes and perpetrators. Hoaxes are a cancer in Ufology".

Gevaerd's conclusion based on his extensive twenty year history within Ufological research should not be taken lightly:

"Some military, government, and religious obscure powers are the only ones to benefit from hoaxes, besides the perpetrators themselves. This is why I believe that hoaxers must be tirelessly exposed. Doesn't matter what the cost is" [56].

It is hoped that editors of UFO and paranormal magazines will reflect on these wise words, and expose Roberts and Clarke as serial planters of disinformation spanning three decades and will cease to publish articles by them. Hopefully after being apprised of facts in this article editors will act accordingly and not give copy space to The Usual Suspects.

Genuine researchers would not pollute the research field, distort facts, make allegations about people they know to be untrue, and generally cause havoc for legitimate research over many years. I hope you the reader will look at the facts and draw your own conclusions. The key question was put by one Ufologist four years ago, and still stands. "It's been amazing to see a group of UFO researchers actually ganging up on yourself, for the sole purpose of disproving this case. Many people have asked me the question why a gang of UFO researchers have made it their job to do what the Government do best" [57]. Roberts and Clarke cannot say the data is not factual: they will either say nothing and go quiet for a long time pretty much like their friend Agent Hepple/Tim Matthews did when *At War With The Universe* came out. Or they will go on the offensive. I say let them explain themselves in full regarding the very disturbing current situation they have helped create in UK Ufology. I know they will try and confuse the issue with as many side questions as they and their allies can manufacture. Nonetheless, I hope this article provides insights into real Ufology and the war currently taking place for Ufology's soul.

At least I am not standing in the shadows, like the Usual Suspects. But then, I have nothing to hide.

© Max Burns 2003

bigearpublishing@yahoo.co.uk

Addendum:

Joe McGonagle, the website owner of ufology in the UK and close friend of Clarke and Roberts. Attempted to have me removed from the speaker list for the French conference in Châlons -in-Champagne on 15th October 2005.

This has been part of a longstanding campaign against me spanning eight years. Completely covered in my usual suspects article.

regarding the actions of a few in UK Ufology. These people I call the 'Usual Suspects' Andy Roberts David Clarke & Tim Hepple/Matthews plus bit-players like Martin Jeffrey. It is about time they were properly introduced.

Many things were written about me on the internet in magazines and local news papers mainly the *Sheffield Star*. *Sheffield Star* propaganda was the work of (now Dr) David Clarke formerly of the Star. Clarke, a prominent sceptic in UK Ufology, is a published author on various UFO related subjects including the 2000 book 'The UFOs That Never Were' (hereafter UTNW) co-authored with Jenny Randles & Clarke's close personal friend of many years Andy Roberts [1]. Clarke has a doctorate in mythology & folklore from Sheffield University, ironically, appropriate to his fabulous writings, though not perhaps in the way he intended. Roberts, has written and co-written a number of books and articles on UFOs and the paranormal in UFO magazine, *Fortean Times* and others. The full biographies of Roberts & Clarke (almost) are on their website www.flyingsaucery.com. As with agent provocateur and Nazi thug Tim Hepple (now Matthews) previously, the modus operandi of Clarke and Roberts is now subject to scrutiny. Although the main focus of this piece is Roberts & Clarke, Jenny Randles does feature. Unlike Clarke Roberts and Hepple, Randles is a genuine Ufologist, her oeuvre worthy of analysis in a future NFB. Hepple/Matthews is also in the frame for performing crucial tasks in the enterprise. Roberts & Clarke's admiration for Hepple is best displayed by these Hepple words featuring on their web site:

"You destroy peoples hopes and dreams, attack their beliefs, bring them down and use every low tactic at your disposal" Tim Matthews July 2000 [2].

The facts are presented below in broadly chronological but also thematic order. It is my considered view that from start to finish this is almost a textbook case in the lengths to which spooks will go to discredit any Ufological investigation getting too close to the truth, in which investigators show themselves to be both genuinely independent and persistent. I do not say what happened in my case applies to all UFO investigations: but merely is one containment stratagem available for use in particularly sensitive cases. That said, I trust Ufologists will recognise at least some of the behaviour patterns involved. What follows are eight possible stages in derailing a UFO investigation. It only reached eight because I persisted: and no doubt additional stages will be embarked upon after this article.

STAGE 1: SUPPRESSION AT SOURCE - GETTING A FALSE STORY ACCEPTED

Who exactly owned the Flying Triangle sighted near Sheffield (on Howden Moor) in March 1997 is debatable: either UK/US military, alien or a foreign power. Take your pick. Evidence advanced here concerning the usual suspects MO is not dependent on any specific interpretation, but in its own right points to something important happening. As I began to collate evidence, others were also active: trying to cover up such evidence, and muddy the trail.

Within three weeks of my investigation starting, Tim Matthews got in on the (disinformation) act. The now defunct *Alien Encounters* magazine [3] reported that:

"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. RAF Tornados were despatched to search for wreckage in case the cause was an aircraft crash, but nothing was found. Rumours quickly filtered out that the explosion was caused by a Black Triangle crashing, but they were quashed by Tim Matthews of LUFOS, who said that nothing had been reported taking off from BAe



**THE USUAL SUSPECTS:
ANATOMY OF A DISINFORMATION
CAMPAIGN IN UFOLOGY**

by Max Burns

