

25 November, 1969.

Dear John:

Thank you for your letter and I'm pleased to hear that you received the booklet safely and hope to reproduce the photograph satisfactorily.

I was very interested in your comments about the Chunk as received from Brian Cannon and note that you will go ahead with publication of the article explaining these new developments. Confidentially and not for publication as yet, there have been some rather strange developments this end concerning the Chunk in which Arthur Matthews has become involved in testing it with a Tesla device, purportedly at the request of someone whose name he is not permitted to divulge although in a later letter to me, he admits it was a "federal authority". In a very brief and bald statement which gives no scientific explanation of how he arrived at his findings, he describes the Chunk as "man-made of common earth metals" and even goes so far as to state that it was never in space, although how he was able to test this aspect is beyond the comprehension of myself and others who have read his "report". In a separate letter, he expresses the personal opinion that the Chunk was part of the old Quebec Bridge which was pulled down donkey's year ago, so this doesn't make much sense. While this matter is too involved and as yet unresolved for me to go into details here, there are certain curious aspects to Matthews' role in testing the metal which leave me with some doubts and the impression that there has been some rather peculiar "under-cover" work going on. While, like you, I only want to get at the truth of this matter, even if Millman's report is correct, there still remains the enigma of the 9 years' silence of the government in putting out this report, its conflict with WBS's findings and analyses carried out by professional metallurgists, of how Matthews was able to test that the metal was never in space and most of all, the mysterious circumstances surrounding the finding of it in the St. Lawrence Seaway and therefore and particularly until we get an official report giving supporting technical details of the analysis of the metal, etc., I do not think we can as yet write off the mystery as completely solved. I intend to write to Dr. Millman asking for such a technical report and it will be interesting to see what, if any, reply is received from him. Therefore, may I suggest that in your article, without quoting my name, you say something to the effect that an attempt is being made to obtain an official report giving details of the analysis of the metal and that until this is received, the matter is not completely closed. Please do not refer to Matthews' role in this as I am still carrying out some investigative work on this in an effort to get at the truth of the matter. Of course, I shall have to leave it to you as to what you say about trying to get an official report, or even if you wish to say it at all, but I would appreciate it if you do not suggest that the matter is as yet completely finalized. As you will gather from what I have written and particularly some puzzling aspects connected with A.M., I am not completely satisfied with the negative report. Between ourselves, it was a foregone conclusion by most of us this end that, like the Condon Report, it would be a negative one. We may be wrong, but I think this matter is worth a little more investigation before writing it off completely. I will keep you posted on future developments, but in the meantime, keep this confidential.

Pleased to hear that you will be featuring the questionnaire in the next issue and I wish you Good Luck with the response to this.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,