

UFO POTPOURRI

18/292

no. 353

7090

THE IMPLANT PUZZLE

Since writing "The Implant Enigma" about 16 months ago I have received some interesting responses. Two or three individuals were quite upset because my speculative article was printed in the MUFON UFO JOURNAL. The article had exactly the opposite effect on others. Many were happy to develop a dialog on the subject and to seek some real answers to the puzzle. One man, with X-rays of his nasal passage in hand, thought he had proof of an implant. A bit of investigation showed that the implant was nothing more than a 'marker' placed there by the technician during the x-ray process. Another man sent me copies of the laboratory analysis results of testing on what he thought might be an implant. The jury is still out on this one - the results are quite puzzling.

EDITOR LETTER

Stuart Appelle, Ph.D. of Brockport, N.Y. sent the following letter to the Editor of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL for publication in the January 1991 issue:

Dear Editor:

In his article, "The Implant Enigma" (June 1990), John Schuessler suggests that a structure reportedly found in amniotic fluid during a routine chromosome preparation (NATURE, Vol. 323, Sept. 25, 1986, pg. 300) might be an alien implant. In relating this unidentified fetal object to unidentified flying objects, Schuessler implores researchers to "take the implant issue seriously." A number of readers did just that (see Letters to the Editor section August 1990). Two contributors comment on the fact that in subsequent issues of NATURE a mundane explanation of the structure was provided, and Schuessler is taken to task for "sloppy articles and sloppier research."

It is correct to point out the incomplete and misleading aspects of Schuessler's article. Indeed, his entreatment to "look at the possibilities" so as to avoid "wild speculation" invites such a response. In the same spirit, it should be noted that the information provided in these Letters to the Editor is also incomplete and misleading. While both letters correctly reference correspondence published in the October 23 and October 30, 1986 issues of NATURE, in which they mystery object was interpreted as a diatom skeleton, it is misleading to state that the object has been "identified" as such. The diatom explanation was an expression of opinion, not a presentation of proof. Moreover, the December 25, 1986 issue of NATURE provides two other "explanations" (a "fragment of tubular myelin"; an "area of meshwork of the nuclear lamina") and yet another explanation (a contaminant originating in the fabrication of semiconductors) appears in the January 22, 1987 issue.

BY JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
P. O. BOX 58485
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77258-8485

In that same issue, J. Wolstenholme, who originally reported this "mystery object amid the chromosomes," indicates that all these explanations describe objects too irregular to match the one in question. He also rejects an extraterrestrial explanation which, interestingly, he indicates accounted for the majority of the explanations sent by readers to him.

To find out if this search for explanations has been solved more satisfactorily since 1987, I wrote to Dr. Wolstenholme and received a gracious reply. As of July 26, 1990, he still did not have an explanation he regards as convincing, but continues to believe the object is likely to be an artifact originating in either the laboratory environment, the reagents used in preparation, or the laboratory equipment. He reports that "the object has been sent for more detailed analysis elsewhere," and he assures that he will let researchers know if and when the object is positively identified.

THEY MISSED THE POINT

While Dr. Wolstenholme's artifact is interesting, it probably is not related to implants in humans by aliens. I said as much in "The Implant Enigma, Part II", written weeks before "The Implant Enigma" was published in the MUFON UFO JOURNAL. The following is a quote from Part II:

"The object was many times smaller than the alleged UFO implants; but this tiny object has been spotted in the laboratory. My point was that scientists find and identify strange anomalies on a continuing basis. Why not apply the same techniques to locating and identifying UFO artifacts located anywhere in the human body?"

While some individuals are content to spend their time challenging the words written by the active researchers, many other individuals find their challenges by working with the patient/abductees and their implants. Some good examples of the latter category are David Pritchard, David Jacobs, John Altshuler, and Budd Hopkins. These 'doers' are the people who will eventually provide some real answers for the implant puzzle.

UNUSUAL QUESTIONS

A number of inquiries resulting from "The Implant Enigma" have been in the form of "unusual questions". They are offered in the form they were received in order to see if they evoke a response from anyone.

o What causes the scoop marks found on abductees' bodies? Was the flesh used elsewhere on the body to repair areas where implants were inserted?

o Has anyone tried having a psychic surgeon remove an implant?
o Originally, it was believed that implants were spherical BB-like objects. In reality, many of the alleged implants have been irregular shaped objects. Have any BB-like implants been found?

o What is the purpose of the small wire-like protrusions found on recovered implants?