



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: Satanic Abuse

From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 4 Jul 1999 16:39:19 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jul 1999 15:42:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1999 03:38:25 -0400
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>From: Roger Evans <moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com>
>>Date: Thu, 01 Jul 1999 21:35:21 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>>It never ceases to amaze me how witness testimony (when it
>>>relates to UFOs or UFO occupant sightings) can be dismissed or
>>>minimized by declaring/insinuating/assuming that it is the
>>>result of "some other condition." In ufology (for some reason)
>>>all witness testimony is immediately considered suspect when it
>>>is a UFO _occupant_ incident that is being reported. It must be
>>>"something else" or some other "condition" as you so
>>>indelicately phrase it.

>><snip>

>>>At that
>>>point the interpretation becomes a manifestation of individual
>>>denial and the act of someone who is being (subjectively)
>>>selective about _what_parts_ of any given testimony he or she is
>>>going to give credence to. I'll believe this part, but I won't
>>>believe that part because it doesn't fit into my personal world
>>>view. What is that?

>Roger wrote:

>>Hi, John.

>>"What is that?"

>>Well, to be quite frank, it's exactly what _you_ do. It's also
>>what I do. It's what anyone does with no facts or evidence or
>>proof regarding a given situation.

>There _is_ a difference Roger. I understand what you are saying
>in regard to folks who are 'studying' the phenomenon, but my
>"beliefs and convictions" are based on very personal experience.
>I have seen these things at _uncomfortably_ close range. I'm not
>talking about anything 'nebulous' either. I'm talking about an
>undeniable experience, (in broad daylight and in the company
>other witnesses) one that quite literally robs you of any
>possibility for entertaining a 'alternate explanations.' Life
>experiences such as what I have described have a way of
>effecting you deeply and leaving you with a sense of genuine
>urgency and strong opinions in regard to existing investigation
>efforts. Especially when those investigative efforts seem

>directed at just about anything and everything with the rather
>odd _exception_ of what is actually being reported.

John Velez's insistence that his beliefs about UFO abductions are validated by his own personal experience, and that we should also accept them on that basis, as with many other abductees and UFO experiencers, is a form of religious revelation.

If we take the experience of people like Velez literally we must accept that just about everything we know about the universe and the way it works is wrong. Pardon me if I require rather more than someone's reported personal experience before I do that. For the experiencer, however, evidence contradicting the absolute reality of their testimonies can be dismissed, as it is not viewed through the eye of faith. It is clear from the above paragraph that John Velez is really only prepared to countenance investigative efforts which start off by accepting the validity of his personal revelation. > >So it's not a matter of "show me" or "where's the proof" for me.

It is for the rest of us, however.

>It's about an uphill fight to be taken seriously and at one's
>word. And not just for myself either. I imagine that in 1999
>values like that sounds about as "strange" as reports UFOs or
>alien abductions, but _that_ is where I am coming from/
>responding from. (Regardless of how others may be interpreting
>my words or intentions.)

>>So unless you have undeniable proof hidden away that has
>>never been shared with this list, then you are also "being
>>(subjectively) selective about what parts of any given testimony
>>you give credence to."

>I already have (my) "undeniable proof" Roger. I have no idea
>what may constitute "undeniable proof" for you or anyone else.
>That's why I wrote the following in my original:

>>>I'm pretty much of a mind that the _only thing_ that is _ever_
>>>going to convince anyone is if they experience it/see it all for
>>>themselves.

>I cannot "arrange" for such an experience or "undeniable proof"
>for anyone. Sorry. It just seems that we live in time when a
>man's word means less than nothing, (crying shame) and that it
>is ok and proper to investigate or entertain just about any
>explanation as long as it isn't the one that is actually being
>reported.

It seems that John Velez is getting close to telling us we should just accept whatever anyone reports to us, without attempting to investigate or interpret it.

>>However, we do so using
>>our own individual belief system based on what's important to
>>each of us.

>You're wrong fella. I don't base any of my "beliefs" re: UFOs
>and alien abduction solely on "what's important to me." It is
>based on _direct_ life experience. Seems like today many have
>become convinced that their own senses cannot be trusted. I am
>not among those. I know what I have seen and experienced in the
>full light of day (and consciousness) and among others who could
>corroborate it.

It is very clear that in many circumstances our senses *cannot* be trusted, and the human brain is capable of extreme radical misperception of a wide range of stimuli. Velez seems to think he has some special immunity from such things.

It is also clear that the human brain can create "virtual experiences" which are absolutely indistinguishable in all respects from consensus reality. In Magonia magazine we have published a couple of reports from people who have had such virtual experiences "in the full light of day and consciousness". Ironically, it was only because these experiences were so trivial that the experiencers came to recognise that they did not represent reality. A more remarkable experience, remote from everyday banality, would be much more difficult to "disprove" - leaving the experiencer more convinced of its reality.

Let me give an example, suggested by my colleague Peter Rogerson, which may appeal to the musically inclined members of this list. Many people report memories of past lives. The arguments about the reality of such experiences closely mirror arguments about UFO abductions - the experiences are totally real to the individual concerned, and although often recalled as a result of hypnotic regression, they can be spontaneous. Let us imagine that a person recalled a previous existence in the Vienna of 1820. They give vivid accounts of the social and artistic life of the time, including being at the premiers of many of Beethoven's great works. One they recall is Beethoven's Saxophone Concerto, the manuscript of which was subsequently lost. Now anyone familiar with music will see the problem here - the saxophone was not invented until decades after Beethoven's death, it is impossible he could have written such a concerto. This "howler" is the equivalent of the many scientific howlers in abduction accounts.

Of course, abductionologists get round these problems in a way that is not possible for the past life regressionist who has come up against the "Beethoven Anomaly" - they simply say it's magic! Well actually they say "we don't know what the aliens are capable of, maybe they can float us through brick walls", but basically that is an appeal to magic. (I suppose Beethoven could have been a time-traveller who had regular meetings with Adolph Sax in the late nineteenth century, but I doubt if even the most gullible past life researcher would fall for that one.)

>No one should base their opinions or beliefs solely on "what is >important to them" as you say. Beliefs -should always have- much >stronger underpinnings than that. I question everything Roger. I >did't come by any of my convictions easily or casually.

But surely that is just what *you* are doing. You are basing your opinion on what is important to you -- your own experience, virtual or otherwise. This is not necessarily important to others.

>>Leanne simply guesses in a way that "doesn't fit >>into your personal world view," as you put it.

>Leanne is entitled to any "guesses" she may care to take. I was >responding to her use of the term "condition" (implying >something other than an actual experience) when referring to >reports of UFO abduction. Like I said, it would be nice to see >some folks investigating what is being reported first before >creating explanations that they are comfortable with. I don't >recall seeing any reports of abduction or UFO sightings that >were prefaced by: "because of my 'condition' I saw or >experienced the following."

But by implication that phrase does precede all abduction reports. It can never be emphasised enough that we are *not* studying abductions - any responsible aliens have long since departed - we are studying the witness, and the witnesses verbal account, along with any (usually ambiguous) physical evidence the aliens were careless enough to leave behind. The "condition" of the witness is vital to such investigation.

>Reports, especially contact reports >from reputable, honest people should be checked out like cops >do, as they are reported before allowing ones own personal >speculations to enter the picture.

Yes, I agree. Contact and abduction reports *should* be checked out like cops do. One of the problems with this however, is that the experiencers and their investigator/minders seldom allow this to happen. If cops are investigating a serious crime and have a suspect they will not only interrogate them, but will subject their family and close friends to a grilling, they will speak to employers, workmates, neighbours; in a serious case they may organise stake-outs, arrange phone-taps, etc. Is this really what John Velez wants investigators to do in abduction cases? We cannot combine "protect the witness" with "check out like cops".

I am often puzzled by the total absence of apparently vital people in many abduction reports. We know practically nothing, for example, of what Linda Napolitano's husband and family think of her experiences, yet I'm sure that if this case was being

investigated by cops they would all be interrogated at length. There are many other cases in which spouses, parents and close relatives flit around in the background to the story, but never seem to be questioned by investigators. It may in fact be that this has happened but that the investigators have for some reason decided not to publish the results of this questioning. In the immortal words of someone or other: "I think we should be told".

>Peace,

>John Velez, Witness/Experiencer

--
John Rimmer
www.magonia.demon.co.uk
Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[[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](#).