

Comments re Smith's Report

Summary para 2 - The magnetic component was a 0.2% carbon low chromium steel containing boron.

The composition, as shown on p. 2 shows 1.06% carbon and no boron. (but also see p. 3 para 2).

Examination of Samples - p. 3 (top para). "The analyses were made for all elements likely to be alloyed with iron". This statement shows a prior assumption that metal was of terrestrial manufacture. Such an assumption is unscientific. They would not find unexpected elements if they did not test for them! We therefore do not know what else might be in the metal. The further statement about the lack of presence of other elements would appear to be unfounded.

p. 3 paras 1 & 2 - many errors admitted, and apparently due, partly at least, to small area observed. However, this sample & gone him was much larger than most, if not all of the moon rocks returned by the Apollo astronauts. How can scientists be so certain about the results of moon rock analysis if so many errors are involved in analysis?

Comments - p. 7 - para 3 - He goes to great length to explain how a "skull" could be found on banks of St. Lawrence, but has previously stated it is most probably ladle residue and less likely, furnace skull (p. 6)