

18.11.86.

12, Chelsham Close
Warlingham
Surrey, CR3 9DN
England

Dear Prof de Grazia,

It is with regret, after much heartsearching thought and advice from other scholars, that I must now decline your offer to submit an article for your primeval art book.

As you know, I have always not wished to be associated with the school who believes that flint was a mouldable material for the ancients, or those who think that flint sculptures can be found in the Chalk quarries. I had already made this known to the British museum, after they gave my address to one of their number, and told them to contact me. No doubt they thought, we will give him another loonies address.

I do not think that it is in the interests of the scientific progress of the fashioned flint religious sculptures, to liaise with the above schools. For the 'establishment' to see that we are working alongside them, can only bring even more scepticism from them. We now have clearer archaeological and anthropological pathways open to us, and I feel that I must join APAN specialists and pioneers. I well understand the difficult position you have landed yourself in, only wishing to help in an open minded and scientific manner, but you were not to know of the inexpertise of most of the people with the "Primeval Sculpture" setup. Pietro Gaietto was one of the first open minded scholars to visit me, and promise help, but this did not come to proper fruition, but I still think Pietro acted in all good faith. It is just that our research now follows quite different paths, and so we must part at this time.

I wish you now ill feeling, and apologise if I have inconvenienced you, in saying that I would submit articles. I wish you good luck, but as I say, I wish to play no part in this organization. Another reason, is your intention of liaising with the art collectors and dealers market. Mind you, I am realistic to know that we will not be able to stop this eventual step, we living in a very materialistic society. But to set out purposely to make big business of it is wholly wrong and can only bring unscientific progress, as many of the 'masterpieces' will be lost for research and study, to people out to merely make money, and hide the sculptures away in bank vaults for investment. Mind you, many museums do this already, but that is another argument.

But once people find out that the fields are knee deep in the flint sculptures the market will drop out, so only the initial stampede will make money. It is a hobby that all with interest, and experience can take part in, and that is how it should be. As it is, the profs think that they alone own archaeology, and that only they know anything about it.

So I am afraid that we must go our separate ways. Should you ever wish to inspect some of my collection, then you may do so, but I wish only to publish in more archaeological journals etc; and not in publications which will be under the heading of science fictions or the "lunatic fringe" etc;. Perhaps the moulded flint brigade will prove us all wrong one day, and prove that flint was ~~is-~~pliable, but until that day, I wish to stay with the flints that are fashioned, in undoubted human flaking techniques, which can be reproduced by experienced people today.

Many thanks for your initial good intentions when I first wrote to you, and good luck in your quest for recognition of your ideas about quantoevolution. I still think that the timescale should be somewhat condensed, but not quite so drastically as 14,000 years. Whatever the timescale, our findings 'fit' into the correct sequence of events, even with the catastrophes and close approaches of Venus and Mars etc;.

Only time will tell who is correct,

Kind regards,

