

AMERICAN METEORITE MUSEUM

OPPOSITE METEOR CRATER ON HIGHWAY 66



POST OFFICE BOX 1171
WINSLOW, ARIZONA

August 29, 1948

Mr. Oscar E. Monnig,
Secretary, The Meteoritical Society,
1010 Morningside Drive,
Fort Worth, Texas.

Dear Mr. Monnig:

Please ignore my suggestion in a former letter that you bring the Haskell meteorite to the Albuquerque meeting. It now appears that we shall not attend. We shall be on a field trip through September.

I request that you report to no one even the approximate location of this discovery, a policy which we are forced to adhere to until certain matters are attended to by the Meteoritical Society.

In my absence from the meeting I wish you would bring to the attention of the Council the importance of having a M.S. committee work on a statement of policy to be brought before the 1949 meeting regarding respect for each other's field activities among the members. You and we have done most of the field work in the west and I think we have set a good example in this respect but unless something is done to correct the present state of affairs the science of meteoritics will suffer great damage.

Following are some suggestions which it seems should be considered:

Work On Fire Balls

1. Should there be such a thing as a prior claim on such a survey and if so what serves to establish the same?
2. When such a claim has been established what should be the attitude of other scientists (a) toward the one who has established such claim (b) regarding important information that may come into their hands ?
3. Relative importance of "by mail" surveys to "on-the-spot" interviews in establishing prior claim.
4. Should there be a division of territory limiting the activities of each meteoriticist? If so, to what extent?
5. Should one regional director have the responsibility of designating the worker, or workers, who are to be responsible for the survey ? Also the collecting (if any) in connection

with a witnessed fire ball ? This would mean that any who wished to work in a given territory should clear through the regional director.

6. How handle border line instances where two or more regions are involved ?

Unwitnessed Falls

When the discovery of an unwitnessed fall is made the discovery in itself constitutes a prior claim unless it can be proven that the discovery resulted from field work done by another. In such instance should there be a consideration given to the second party ? If so, how?

Should there not in all instances of discovery by whatever method, be a prior claim on the part of the discoverer? And should not any subsequent worker show the courtesy of asking for permission to work in territory where another has already established prior claim?

The enclosed historical sketch of the Norton, Kansas affair certainly establishes reason enough for some such action.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "H. H. Nininger". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

H. H. Nininger

HHN:AN