July 15, 1956

Dear Oscar:

Three days ago a farmer walked in with a meteorite for identification. It is the first found in Riley Co. The mass was about 10x8x5", heavily stained with iron, and with the crust so weathered that it was almost identical with the interior. It belongs to the farmer but he gave me permission to take a small slice. I sent one piece to Henderson for identification. Enclosed, is the other piece for your collection.

It will be called the Mayday stone. I will send you the coordinates and the technical data when the search is wound up. Discovered in July 1955; brought here July 1956.

It fell in the side of a dry stream a few feet above a farm pond, and the farmer marked the spot with a stake so we could recover it. The soil is a run off from a higher ridge, free of stones except for a few small limestone concretions.

Yesterday we went up and surveyed the site. We just had 2" of rain and the soil could be probled to a depth of a foot. Probes around the location found nothing; but, my daughter Margaret found a second small piece about 3x2" The farmer is an old man, cooperative, and we are going back for further search.

The main mass has crust on only 20% of surface, the rest is pretty raw, and under the saw it breaks off easily. Hence I suspect more fragments in the immediate locality.

We do not have a mine detector here, and if yours is handy, shoot it up. In return I will get you a larger piece if I get control of one.

Otherwise, I am really happy to give you this little piece in return for that iron you gave me in 1935 and which I have shown to several thousand people. I hoped to find meteorites in Kansas, but I never suspected my own daughter would beat me to it.

I need that mine detector - the early model - the latter one is too tricky.....

(over)

Schmidt cameras too big an angle to use visually. If you want an f:4 visual you make a Wright type.

I know about ATM-#3 -- don't believe it as it reads. Here is what probably happened:

In those days everyone assumed a f:l to f:3 could not make a good image because of inability of work-manship. Schmidt probably stuck in a high power ocular on the end of a prism -- this minimizes the curved field. His idea most probably was to show that the big sphere had good definition at high powers (hence tombstone inscription). The ocular probably did not use the whole cone anyways. The author probably did not understand the situation. Hence the misleading report.

Had some correspondence with Smith, nice fellow.

Still working on track of Dec. 17 fireball; since we bought this house have had no time or money to make trips. Starting point still rough. My probably ground point some 50 miles from where U.Nebraska is looking. (They wrote me and asked me to quit the search as it would cause "hard feelings") I am saving your letter with search advice as it is most valuable.

Have a stone pier finished for the 10" now to remount it. Backyard is fine, can see 7.5 on the North Polar Sequence on good nights. We bought an old school house and are trying to remodel it via FHA (which we haven't got yet).

This is in unseemly haste, but I hope you will understand. Let me hear from you. We have a suspected meteor crater about 5 miles from the Mayday site but more about that later.

Best ever,

Student brought me a piece of Norton last spring but the geologist I lent it o for study changed schools and took it with him. Thanks for the contribution to the GPO.

latter one is too tricky.....

. il of em toed bluck toldwarb mic

(mayo)

to find meteorites in Kansas, but I never suspected by