



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 Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Jul 1999 02:12:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jul 1999 08:28:37 -0400
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sun, 4 Jul 1999 16:39:19 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>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.

Hello John hi All,

I've done some 'healthy' snipping here for brevity. If you've been following the thread you don't need it all repeated anyhow. :)

Mr Rimmer writes:

>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.

"Religious revelation?" I'm not going to touch that stretch in semantics with a ten foot cattle prod. I'm not much into "word games" John. That is what you are indulging in when you take my rather straight forward statements and add labels like "religious" to them. I'm sure that you are among a very small minority that interprets what I have written as an expression of "religious revelation" on my part. Like a monochromatic artist (when it comes to me) you always seem to reach for the 'same brush' and somehow you never capture the true to life color of the original. Only your own severely limited interpretation of it.

BTW, I have never asked anyone to "accept" anything I say on "any basis." I don't stipulate how someone should 'take' what I

say or how they should think about it either. Unless of course the reading of it is as far 'off base' and colored by personal prejudice as yours is.

>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.

Hey, you seem to be making progress John. Yes, that is exactly correct! I don't know how the percentages break down but, I'd say that the larger percentage of the two (what we know as opposed to what we don't know) would represent; - what we don't know.-

It is arrogant to think that we "know so much" (that we can be truly sure of) about the Universe that we live out our short lives in. I have been an avid amateur astronomer for 28 years John so I'm not unfamiliar with the sciences and some of the current theories/cosmoconceptions. Truth be told, we know paltry little. It's safer to operate under the assumption that what we "think we know" may be wrong, and very probably is.

That is, if past history is anything to go by! :)

> It is clear from the above paragraph that John Velez is really
>only prepared to coutenance investigative efforts which start
>off by accepting the validity of his personal revelation.

Never said any such thing. You need to take off those glasses that seem to color everything you read and read what is actually written and not what (you think) I am saying. (Or, what you want to hear!)

>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.

Again, you put your words in my mouth and your interpretation/ 'spin' on my "intentions." Never, anywhere, in any post I have ever written have I intimated such a thing. In fact the exact opposite is true. And, unlike a great many I have paid it more than mere 'lipservice.' See *** response below.

>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.

You're amazing John. I have never had so many completely inaccurate words and intentions attributed to me by one person in my 50 years of life. What really gets me is, you don't even know me from Adam. Yet your interpretations of what I "mean" or "intend" are spoken with such authority. As if you actually knew what you were talking about! I find it most amusing really. It seems that the one who speaks with "religious fervor" is not me, but the guy you see in the mirror each morning. You claim to know more about me and where I'm coming from than my own momma does! <lol>

I wrote:

>>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.

John responds:

>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.

*** First:

"Minders" John? Why don't you just say "keepers!" As if we were all somehow less than human or of less than human intelligence. Your use of a term such as "minders" when relating to those reporting UFO abduction experiences reveals the depth of your feelings of condescension towards those reporting abduction experiences. It never ceases to surprize me when some folks

'look down their noses' at people they are _standing at eye level with._ Remeber the song; "Come down, come down, from your Ivory tower, . . ." :)

You're nowhere near as 'smart' or 'astute' as you think you are Johnno! The day you realize how very little you really know, will be the day you have truly learned something of genuine value. It will be better than mere knowledge, it will be a piece of profound wisdom you will have acquired.

As for:

>One of the problems with this however, is that
>the experiencers and their investigator/minders seldom allow
>this to happen.

Unadulterated cowflop!

I must appologize to those who may be sick and tired of hearing this, but for John's benefit I will repeat the story -one mo' time.-

When Budd and I consented to do the NOVA segment (which was the very first 'public' anything I had ever done,) we were _hoping_ for a scientific treatment of the material and ourselves. As everyone knows, that never happened.

I had requested of the producers (not the other way around) that I be given the following tests as a condition of my participation. They managed to jerk me around and never performed a one of them.

1. A complete psychiatric evaluation conducted by a professional(s) of their own choosing.
2. A polygraph examination. (Not that I believed that a polygraph would prove that my experiences actually happened, but it _would show_ with some level of reliability whether I was intentionally fabricating my report or not!)
3. A complete medical examination including exposure to x-ray radiation or MRI or CAT scan (anything short of a surgical procedure) to determine if there were indeed any 'foreign' or 'unusual' objects in my body.
4. (After consulting with my family members) I gave them permission to interview/question any of my family members. I also provided some names they could use to as character references to check me out.
5. I gave them permission to enter my home and conduct any kind of physical testing they may have wanted to perform, (short of tearing down walls and such)

As for Budd; who is one of those "investigator/minders" who you claim that, "seldom allows this to happen." Budd gave them -complete access to his files, (which they _never even looked at once!_ And he invited them to record how he investigates a report. (I won't get into the highly selective 'editing job' that the folks from NOVA did with that.) But he made himself, his records, and his methods completely available and open to them. More recently it was mentioned on this list how Budd has submitted the "writing samples" he has accumulated over the years to Stewart Appelle at Cornell for analysis. He has lab reports on ground trace evidence and scads of material that could be/should be checked out by medical professionals which just sits there awaiting perusal by independant experts. Where are -they?-

I'm afraid the truth is, that 'the shoe is on the other foot' John. Myself, and Budd have made ourselves as "available" as anyone can possibly make themselves. Just haven't been any 'takers' is all.

Your comment is nothing short of pure fabrication based on an existing and apparently deep seated prejudice/bias on this subject. Rather than spending so much of your time 'searching -my- soul, it is your own which bears closer scrutiny.

>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".

Once again you 'twist' one of my statements to fit your own interpretations. When I say, "check it out like a cop" I mean, check out the credibility of the individual, go to the scene of the alleged crime to look for evidence, interview potential witnesses, look for medical evidence, ground traces etc, etc. You are quite correct in that there are some sensitive privacy and witness protection issues. But it is nothing that an intelligent, experienced, and thoughtful investigator cannot navigate safely.

>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".

Aha! I knew we could agree on 'something' and this is it!

Peace,

John Velez, -Nobody's Fool!

jvif@spacelab.net
ABDUCTION INFORMATION CENTER
<http://www.if-aic.com/>

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

[[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](#).