



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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:00:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
>>lives.

>>Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
>>situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
>>themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
>>abduction experiences.

>Hi Greg, All -

>Couldn't we turn this around and say, "Documentation please" on  
>alien abduction? Couldn't we say "Anecdotes not welcome..."  
>Aren't we working here with little in the way of documentation  
>of alien abduction?

Perfectly reasonable. Though there's quite a large literature on  
abductions, where the anecdotal reasons for believing in them  
are set forth in great detail. There are also Eddie Bullard's  
studies, which put some scientific heft behind the proposition  
that something not readily explainable is going on (or at least  
not explainable by some of the familiar attempts at  
explanation). There's also Stuart Appelle's paper in JUFOS,  
which sets forth the difficulties in accepting the belief that  
abductions are real, but also sets forth the equal difficulties  
in believing -- at the present state of available evidence --  
that they aren't.

Claims like John Rimmer's are, by contrast, made very casually,  
with, as far as I know, no supporting documentation, no deep  
argument, not even any mustering of data pro and con. That's why  
I asked for documentation -- not to be a brat, not to answer his  
snipe with one of my own, but in the hope that he'd provide  
some, so this wretched argument could be elevated to at least an  
elementary level of rational discourse.

Stewart's paper grows more relevant every day. I'm not saying he  
has the answers to all our questions -- but he's merciless in  
saying which theories have been advanced without much data to  
prove them.

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).