January 12, 1955

Memorandum

To: Administrator

From: Nonmetallic Minerals Division

Subject: A denial of exploration assistance and summary report.

By: Lawrence G. Houk

1. Docket No. DMEA-3423 - Diamonds
Property: Hammett Diamond Mine (Kimberlite Mine)
Pike County, Arkansas

Applicant: A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank Building
Victoria, Texas

Application - Form MF-103 received July 23, 1954.
Work proposed: Rebuild some of the roads to clear away existing undergrowth. To erect small area of chain link fence. Some rough buildings erected. Pumps, pipe, motors, washing equipment, tools, will be provided as well as rehabilitation of old buildings. Core drilling and reopening of old pits.

Amount requested $20,000.00
No contract: Application denied.

2. Comments:

The application does not present a clear program for exploration of the property. The applicant did not understand the nature of the exploration assistance program and after discussions with Mr. Clinton C. Knox of the Field Team states he is disappointed and slightly confused by the program. He, no doubt, expected being set up in business by the Government. Mr. Hammett indicates in his letter of November 30, 1954, that he may start a washing and mining operation. The Field Team Report recommends denial. (1) Insufficient data were obtainable to support a contract. (2) Field Team's examination failed to reveal geologic possibilities of a worthwhile discovery. (3) Applicant did not make a definite proposal or indicate any suggested more definite practicable plan that would be acceptable. (4) Applicant stated that he would not allow samples to be removed from the property for testing.

Recommendations:

The Nonmetallic Minerals Division concurs in the field team's recommendation to deny the application. The Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines are in agreement.

LGHouk:gad 1/17/55
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Mr. Houk

600

FEB 9 1955

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank
Building
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket No. DMEA-3423 - Diamonds
Hammett Diamond Mine
(Kimberlite Mine)
A. B. J. Hammett
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Hammett:

Reference is made to your letter of January 25, 1955, on the subject application.

Your comments on the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration program have been carefully noted. This office did not interpret your letter of November 30, 1954, to Mr. Clinton C. Houk as a request for withdrawal of your application, therefore, we continued to process it to completion. Under the rules and regulations on which Government exploration assistance is granted, your program failed to qualify because the geologic probability of making a significant discovery was not considered sufficiently favorable to justify Government participation and not because of insufficient reserves as you have indicated.

The denial of your application for exploration assistance should not be considered as a condemnation of your property any more than an approval of a Defense Minerals Exploration Administration contract could be interpreted as a Government endorsement of your property.

To our knowledge no Defense Minerals Exploration Administration field team report has been released to any property owner and no exception to this rule has been made by the Washington office. These reports are made for the confidential use of the Government and are not for public distribution.

We regret that any misunderstanding has arisen in connection with your application.

Sincerely yours,

Administrator

LCHouk:gad 2/7/55
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Docket
Field Team, Region IV
Mr. Chandler, 3518
Mr. Kiilsgaard, 5222
Mr. Houk

C O P Y

A. B. J. HAMMETT
509 Victoria Nat'l Bank Bldg.
Telephone Hi-5-1662
Victoria, Texas

January 25, 1955

The U. S. Department of the Interior
Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. Mittendorf
Administrator

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 - Diamonds
Hammett Diamond Mine, (Kimberlite Diamond Mine), A. B. J. Hammett
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Mittendorf:

I have just received your letter of January 19 which is a rather disappointing letter in several respects. First of all, in my letter of November 30 to Mr. Clinton Knox, I made it crystal clear that I was not interested as of that date in any DMEA, Government participation in my project from the standpoint of Exploratory work, and that, in itself automatically cancelled my earlier application to the Department.

In view of my letter of November 30 and its contents, the second and third paragraphs of your letter of January 19, which, in a sense is a recorded sabotage and condemnation of this property; was entirely unwarranted, uncalled for and unjustified.

Mr. Knox was advised of my desire not to participate in any manner at all where in your program was concerned because of the extreme amount of red tape and cost to a legitimate mining man in Administrative expenses in order to procure some assistance on additional exploration work. It was further stated and made clear that I had intended to work from our original core drilling and our information which we have on this property and is known to us as far as these deposits are concerned and that what I had decided, was an operation of production at this time rather than experimental work such as your Exploratory work covers.

This seems to be sort of a usual pattern that has been followed many times in offices in Washington, D. C. A record is made condemning a good piece of property upon which a Government employ or his staff have never made an examination, that would justify their statements.

The only time that the Government has ever been asked to step onto this property by me was at the time Mr. Knox visited it with me in the Fall of 1954 and as I recall his personal attitude, statements, and opinion of this property at the time he visited it certainly was a complete reverse to anything that you have indicated to me in your letter and at that time it was Mr. Knox's intention to proceed with formal papers for further Mineral Exploration on another part of this property if I

so desired And here again, I wish to point out that in my letter of November 30, I definitely rejected any Exploratory assistance that had been applied for and that, in itself, made it entirely unnecessary for your office to put into your file a letter and an article denying this assistance and for the reasons you state.

With regards to your last paragraph, it is true that the report made by Mr. Knox upon this personal piece of property was confidential and for the use of the Government. However, I know where such reports have been made by the Government in this same area and have been released to the property owners and I therefore cannot understand why you would choose to make an exception in my case. I would further ask your good office by just what method you arrive at whether there are sufficient reserves or not in a piece of property when you have never drilled one hole in it which is the purpose of the DMEA's function.

So far I have not been able to contact anyone occupying a desk in Washington, D. C. or an Engineer, private or Government who have X-ray eyes and have been able to determine the extent of deposits such as the function of your Administration is to determine through actual work and physical operations. I have spent a great deal of my time in Washington, D. C. and am fairly well acquainted with representatives who, I am sure, will agree whole heartedly with me on this matter. I might add that your letter of January 19 in reply to mine of November 30 required no answer from you whatsoever other than an acknowledgement that I had withdrawn my application and was a direct contradiction to the information given me in your office in Washington, D. C. which was the basis upon which I spent time and money to prepare the material which your office required with the original application.

I will be very much interested in finding out, which I intend to make it part of my business to do, just why such confliction in as important a type of Exploratory work as this should be thought of in the manner disclosed by your letter of January 19.

Yours very truly,

/s/ A. B. J. Hammett
A. B. J. Hammett

ABJH:pk

C O P Y

600

JAN 19 1955

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank
Building
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket No. DMEA-3473 - Diamonds
Hammett Diamond Mine
(Kimberlite Mine)
A. B. J. Hammett
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Hammett:

Reference is made to your application for exploration assistance at the subject property and your letter of November 30, 1954, to Mr. Clinton C. Knox, Executive Officer of Region VI.

Projects approved by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding materials of acceptable grade in quantities that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for the National Defense Program.

Careful study of all our information indicates to us that the probability of disclosing significant reserves of diamonds by your proposed program is not sufficiently promising to justify Government participation. We regret to advise you, under these circumstances, that your application for exploration assistance is denied.

The results of the field team examination are confidential for the use of the Government only and are not released to property owners. We wish to thank you for your interest in the Defense Minerals Program and for bringing your property to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

Elto Mossendorf

Administrator

LGHouk:gad 1/12/55
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Docket File
Operating Committee
Field Team, Region ~~VI~~ IV
Mr. Kiilsgaard, 5222
Mr. Chandler, 3518
Mr. Houk

IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

January 13, 1955

Re: DMEA-3423
Emmett Mine
Pike Co., Ark.
Diamond

Memorandum

To: L. G. Houk, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration

From: E. L. Newcomb, U. S. Geological Survey

Subject: Review of Field Team examination report

The Field Team's recommendation for denial is well justified on basis of facts presented in their report.

The present application should be denied and no further consideration made of this property until more favorable evidence is presented in a new and more complete application.

E. L. Newcomb

ELNewcomb:hlm
G-1/13/55

Copy to: Director's reading, 4212
Branch reading, 4212
DMEA (3)
Docket file
H. P. Chandler, 3520 Interior

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
RECEIVED
JAN 4 1955

P. O. Box #431
Joplin, Missouri

December 30, 1954

Airmail

The DMEA Operating Committee
Department of the Interior
Washington 25, D. C.

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett (Kimberlite) Mine
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Sirs:

With reference to your August 16 letter concerning the cited docket, transmitted herewith are the original and three copies of my report of a field examination with a denial to the applicant recommended.

Sincerely yours,

Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VI

CCK/vks

Encl. (4)

cc: DMEA Op. Com (3)
Mr. Laurence
3423 file

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
1-10-55
(date)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF MINES
P. O. BOX 431
JOPLIN, MISSOURI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Mines
RECEIVED
JAN 4 1955

December 31, 1954

REPORT OF FIELD EXAMINATION

Hammett (Kimberlite) Diamond Mine
Pike County, Arkansas

By Clinton C. Knox
Mining Engineer
Application Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
A.B.J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank Building
Victoria, Tex.

Introduction, Summary, and Conclusions

In response to the August 16 referral from the DMEA Operating Committee, the subject application was reviewed and deemed unworthy of further consideration. Later, however, a field assignment in southeastern Oklahoma, afforded an opportunity for this writer to arrange returning via Murfreesboro, Arkansas, where the day of October 25 was devoted to discussing the subject application, and examining the property with the applicant. Obviously he had become quite familiar with the area so employed a local jeep-driver to take us to the property which finally was found after much driving and searching along the dim muddy forest trails.

No records, written statements, or credible recollections were made available concerning the actual data on the prospecting and exploratory drilling reportedly done there years ago, or concerning the value and physical volume of the diamonds believed to have been produced during the obviously small amount of mining that was done there.

The total surface area of intrusive periodotite (hardebank"), periodotite breccia ("yellow or blue ground"), and volcanic breccia-tuff included in this so-called Kimberlite plug,

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
1-10-55
(date)

could not be determined by this examination, but evidently might include all the 92 acres described in the application. This writer was convinced, however, that some of the 50,000 diamonds reportedly produced in Arkansas during the past 50 years probably came from the few shallow Kimberlite (Bird-Keem) diggings in the predominant weathered "yellow ground" exposures in a 10-acre area centered around the old house indicated on the applicant's sketch map. The weathered "yellow ground" deposits apparently are the only rock type in these Arkansas peridotite plugs on which hopes for a successful commercial mining operation can be held. On the basis of the comparable yardages that have been excavated and treated, this Kimberlite "yellow ground" deposit reasonably might be assumed to have been as productive as that at the more extensively operated mines of the Prairie Creek diamond area.

Any amount of project work that possibly could be justified on the subject property in the foreseeable future, could not complete even preliminary exploration of the above-mentioned most favorable-appearing 10 acres. This applicant does not appear to have the necessary qualifications, however, to plan and carry out a comprehensive exploration program.

Undoubtedly diamonds have been found, and more can be found yet at the Kimberlite mine but a geologic probability that a discovery could be made there which would contribute materially to the defense program, could not be determined by this examination or from known geologic facts.

Recommendation

Denial of the application is recommended on the following grounds:

1. Insufficient data was obtainable in support of the application.

2. The field examination failed to reveal a definite geologic probability that a worthwhile discovery would result from any sort of an exploration project.

3. The applicant did not present any plan for the exploration proposal or indicate that any suggested more definite practicable plan would be acceptable to him.

4. The applicant stated that he would not permit any samples to be removed from the property or any diamond recovery testing or sample analyses to be made elsewhere than on the property, under his direct supervision.

Property, Location, and Accessibility

The 80-acre diamond mining property which the applicant stated is now the total extent of his ownership and control in the area, includes all of the S/2 of NW/¼ of section 14, T. 8 S., R. 25 W., Pike County, Ark. It is about 3 miles airline, due east of the village of Murfreesboro.

Since the more direct access roads to the property apparently have been abandoned, the examination trip had to be made by traveling the recently improved road southeasterly from Murfreesboro 5 miles through the Prairie Creek diamond area along the Little Missouri River, and then after turning off northerly on a narrow logging road for about 3 miles, a dim forest trail was found which led about 1/2 mile west to the old house on the applicant's property.

Except for the remains of the old house, a well, and some indications of the few test pits and shallow trenches (as indicated on the applicant's sketch map), little evidence was found in the heavy undergrowth of any prospecting or mining ever having been done in that hilly, heavily wooded tract which like all the surrounding area, so quickly reverts to the original virtual jungle.

The Applicant

The applicant appeared to have financial means and is said to be successful in his various fields of business, but made no claims to have ever conducted a mining exploration or commercial mining operation.

This writer was convinced, however, that the applicant had had some sort of interest in this Kimberlite (Bird-Keen) property, and had been instrumental in conducting some of the preparatory work, along with some desultory, small-scale, excavating and sluicing that reportedly was done there in 1942. Also he pointed out some of the land lines that he had cleared in 1948.

The applicant stated that the Arkansas Geological Survey had offered to do all the necessary technical consulting work on the proposed exploration project and lend an auger drill for use thereon. He also stated that an experienced operator, whose name he was yet not at liberty to divulge, tentatively had been employed to be in charge of the proposed project work.

The Applicant's Proposal and Suggested Alternatives

The applicant presented no plan for the proposed exploration of the property and his vague requests in the application were mostly for items of a mining development and production nature. The small amount requested to be allocated for exploration purposes only, would have been inadequate for any comprehensive exploration program on any part of the property. He considered all these extraneous items, including clearing the land, fencing it, building living and project office quarters, the washing and recovery plant, etc., were necessary and allowable, since he intended to safeguard, treat, and obtain the results of the samples entirely on the property. Since adequate information could not be obtained for evaluating the proposal, the examination was deemed advisable.

Although this writer is not qualified to set up an exploration program and analytical sample testing methods for diamondiferous deposits, during the examination, he did urge the applicant to present a detailed exploration plan, and a tentative agreement with some reliable concern which could properly treat and analyze the samples to the mutual satisfaction of the applicant and the Government. The applicant stated that permission would not be given for removal of any samples from the property.

This writer also questioned that the 6-inch open-auger-type power-drill which the applicant stated he had arranged to borrow from the Arkansas Geological Survey, would satisfactorily explore the deposit. The hard fragments of unweathered peridotite breccia found discarded at the previously worked trenches indicates that the predominant sticky, clay-like, weathered "yellow ground" surface mantle might not extend very deep in most places, and probably not exceed 40 feet in depth anywhere. Since the slight topographic depression believed to mark this so-called Kimberlite plug, lies at the head of an easterly branching ravine from Prairie Creek (see Gaddo Gap topog sheet), erosion could be expected to have more nearly kept pace with weathering than at the Prairie Creek diamond mining area, 3 miles to the south and some 200 feet lower, in the valley of the Little Missouri River. That small auger drill could not be expected to penetrate the unaltered peridotite, and probably would not recover sufficient sample of such weathered material as could be drilled, to be representative of the terrain of the shallow part of the deposit, even in the previously mentioned most favorable appearing 10 acres lying in the slight topographic depression.

This writer suggested the obtaining of a large preliminary bulk sample by cutting a trench with a bulldozer, shovel loader, or back-hoe shovel, through the slight ridge on the west side of the old

house. Then, if justifiable, additional sufficiently large samples of the weathered "yellow ground" probably best could be obtained by using a large bucket drill (see Bureau of Mines' R. I. 4549). Finally a deep test might be justified in which large-bore cable-tools likely could be used to obtain sufficient sample for determining the economic feasibility of recovering diamonds from the unweathered peridotite breccia at depth. If all that exploratory work indicated the possibility for a commercial operation, then the size and depth of the deposit to be explored would appear virtually unlimited.

The applicant agreed to give consideration to these suggestions and to the eventual presentation of some such definite project proposal, to be supplemented by a map showing plans, and a realistic cost estimate.

Judging from his November 30 letter to this writer, however, the applicant has abandoned all plans for a DMEA exploration project.

Clinton G. Knox
Mining Engineer

CGK/vks

cc: DMEA Op. Com (3)
Mr. Laurence
Mr. Knox
3423 file

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
~~WASHINGTON 25, D. C.~~

P. O. Box #431
Joplin, Missouri

December 23, 1954

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria Nat'l. Bk. Bldg.
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett (Kimberlite) Mine
Pike County, Ark.

Dear Mr. Hammett:

This is to acknowledge your letter of November 30. I regret this delay due to other pressing assignments which also have prevented completion of my report to be submitted to Washington, covering my examination of your property with you on October 25. Admittedly, my delay on completing that report, prior to receiving your letter, was with expectations that you might present necessary details for an exploration project proposal on about 10-acres of the most favorable-appearing part of your property, as we discussed there. I gathered from your letter, however, that instead you are contemplating withdrawal of your application.

I assure you that since becoming acquainted with you and your property, so that I now understand more clearly the particular problems confronting you, I am in sympathy with your viewpoint as a potential producer of strategic industrial diamonds. I deeply regret your expressed disappointment in the extent of assistance which I outlined as might be approved to meet some of those problems under the limitations of the Defense Minerals Exploration Program.

I plan to complete and submit my report to Washington next week, but since work by the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey members of the Field Team on such examinations and reports authorized on applicant's properties, is done in a consulting capacity for the Government, at the request of DMEA, we are not at liberty, as you requested, to release copies of reports to any individual. I am sending a copy of this and your letter to the DMEA office in Washington tonight, in case that it should feel free to send you a copy of my report.

Incidently, referring to our conversation about Government mining loans, I noticed in the December issue of the

Engineering and Mining Journal, just received, that the Small Business Administration has recently approved some loans to mining concerns, which as I previously told you I believed had never been done before. Likewise, as I previously stated, I understand that any Government agency would be given access to reports or other information in the DMEA files.

I enjoyed visiting you and your property and hereby want to express my appreciation for your time and effort, and that of the guide with a jeep that you engaged, who was able to take us to the old Kimberlite diggings (after some wandering over the various dim jungle trails).

With the Season's Greetings, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VI

CCK/vks

cc: DMEA Op. Com (w/c)
Mr. Laurence, U.S.G.S. Knoxville (w/c)
3423 file

C
O
P
Y

A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria Nat'l Bank Bldg
Victoria, Tex.

November 30, 1954

Mr. Clinton C. Knox
U.S. Dept. of the Interior
P. O. Box 431
Joplin, Missouri

Subject: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett-Kimberlite Mine
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Knox:

I have intended to write you several times since our visit on the subject property last month, but have been extremely busy and am just now getting around to it.

I enjoyed meeting you and appreciated your time spent with me in looking over the property. I presume you have already sent in your report with respect to your visit, and since this report was on a private piece of property entirely owned by myself, I presume you do not have any objections to sending me a copy of your report or asking the Department in Washington to forward a copy to me.

After our visit, I can frankly tell you that I was certainly disappointed as well as slightly confused with the type of so-called assistance that is offered under the program, and I have a feeling of dread when it comes to thinking about being involved with such a deal as you outlined. I also was considerably amused as well as somewhat disgusted with the information I have recently received from the Bureau of Federal Supply. Here we are with officials in Washington going on record to tell a person how important it is to this Administration to have a stockpile of stragetic materials, especially Industrial diamonds and describe all of the elements pertaining to our risk and future security where such a product is involved and then to learn that the Bureau of Federal Supply has been stripped of all of its authority and buying power and that the divisions which have been set up for mining and the handling of mining matters and materials which we tax payers have spent millions of dollars to create, cannot function now because - all of this important matter has been turned over to the Agricultural Department, of all people, and they are now engaged in a process of trading surplus butter and eggs and other types of surplus material they have for Industrial diamonds. Now, of course, there is only a slight fly in the ointment and that is, I am advised I will have to be a foreigner or go to Europe and thereby make a deal for some surplus butter or something else and in turn black market it for twentyfive times the amount that the Government would normally pay for Industrial Diamonds for stockpiling purposes, etc.--

If an American Citizen, taxpayer, mine owner, has any chance of survival against such a practice as this, I am at a loss to know what it would be, and combined with the proposition you outlined, I would say that whoever is doing the planning in Washington on these matters and whoever is listening to such planning is really getting the treatment.

I think possibly I will reopen my property on a small scale and start a washing and mining operation independent of the hazards and obstacles that my own country seems to feel would stop me rather than encourage me to continue with such a development.

With my very best regards to you and thanking you to send me a copy of your report, I am

Very sincerely yours,

ABJH/pk

/s/ A. B. J. Hammett

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

Defense Minerals Administration
RECEIVED
OCT 22 1954

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Box 431
Joplin, Missouri

October 20, 1954

AIR MAIL

Messrs. Ralph L. Erickson and Laurence V. Blade
Geologists, U. S. Geological Survey
c/o C. E. Wilson, Wilson's Spring
Hot Springs, Arkansas

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett (Kimberlite) mine
Pike County, Ark.

Dear Sirs:

With reference to Mr. Erickson's telephone call to me on September 23, Mr. A. B. C. Hammett of Victoria, Texas, has agreed to meet me for a discussionof the application at the office of his attorney, Mr. Lindle Hile, in Murfreesboro on next Monday morning, October 25. Presumably the applicant'S property will be visited or examined, if found justifiable, also that day.

I intend to arrive in Murfreesboro Sunday night after expected completion of a manganese property examination at Bromide, Okla., on which Don MacLaren, Geologist from your Denver office is to be the Survey member of the Field Team. Therefore, since I am to be in that part of the Region, Monday appeared to be the most logical time to request Mr. Hammet t to meet me on the subject field referral. Based upon the information I have been able to dig up on the subject property, I certainly hesitate to say that a geological examination is warranted at this time or might ever reveal any thing of signifigance. I sincerely would welcome your collaboration that day, however, if at this late date, you could possibly arrange to come to Murfreesboro.

During the telephone call yesterday from Harshman and MacLaren of the USGS Denver Office, Pete Beroni also spoke briefly to me concerning another Field Team matter in Oklahoma, and I tenatively agreed to meet him at Murfreesboro or Hot Springs before returning to Joplin that Monday night or the next day, to review material for a ~~xxxxxx~~ Field Team report that he is writing. Therefore, in case you decide that a geologic examination of the Hammett property is not warranted, I may have the opportunity of meeting you anyhow at Hot Springs.

Sincerely yours,

Clinton Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Reg. VI

cc:
DMEA Op. Com. (2), Wash.
Mr. Laurence, Knoxville
Mr. Koschmann, Denver
3423 file

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

P. O. Box #431
Joplin, Missouri

October 8, 1954

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria Nat'l. Bank Bldg.
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett(Kimberlite) Mine
Pike County, Ark.

Dear Mr. Hammett:

Referring to your September 14 letter, a trip has been scheduled for me to examine applicants' properties in southeastern Oklahoma on October 23 and 24, so I would be pleased to meet you in Murfreesboro, Arkansas, on Monday, October 25.

I would like to take that opportunity to discuss your application with you, and to visit the subject property if you could arrange to accompany me then.

Please let me know well beforehand how that proposed meeting would fit into your busy schedule.

Very sincerely yours,

Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VI

CCK/vks

cc: DMEA Op. Com (2)
Robert A. Laurence, Knoxville, Tenn.
Messrs. R. L. Erickson and L. V. Blade, DMEA Field Team
Region VI., c/o U. S. Geol. Survey-Gen.Del., Hot Springs, Ark.
3423 file

COPY: DMEA, Washington

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
[redacted]

SEP 20 1954

P. O. Box #431
Joplin, Missouri

September 16, 1954

Mr. Robert A. Laurence, Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VII
Room 13, Postoffice
Knoxville 2, Tenn.

Re: Docket No. DMEA-3423 (Diamonds)
A. B. J. Hammett
Hammett (Kimberlite) Diamond Mine
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Laurence:

This is another in reply to your letter of September 2 with regard to the above-cited field referral.

I find that this office received only one copy of the voluminous application which, however, presented insufficient information pertaining to the requested DMEA loan. I presumed that you had received copies of the subject application, reviews by the Commodity Group, and Washington correspondence. I now notice indicated thereon that copies evidently were made for Mr. Koschmann. I understood that his Denver Office of the Geological Survey was to serve on this Field Team's work only in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Therefore copies of all material in this docket file, except the application, are enclosed herewith for your information.

Supplementing my remarks in a September 3 letter to the applicant, the enclosed copy of which I believe you will find self-explanatory, I think the pertinent information given in the application can be summarized to your satisfaction in these few words:

On the proposed project to cost $20,000 at the old Kimberlite diamond mine property embracing 80 acres, the S/2 of NW/4 section 14, T. 8, R. 25, only an estimated $2,000 was for "some core drilling, bulldozing, and dragline work" to be let to an independent contractor. Aside from some part of $5,000 to be allowed for labor, supervision, and consultant's fees in connection with the actual exploratory work, the balance was requested for clearing all the dense underbrush from the peridotite outcrops, building a chain-link fence for plant protection, construction of living, engineering, and mill quarters, installation of a washing and diamond recovery plant, rental and/or purchase of equipment, and other things which cannot be construed as exploration work.

On the basis of an investigation of a much more comprehensive application a year ago (Docket DMEA-3087, diamonds - John Q. St. Clair), covering the neighboring, virtually identical deposit of the Arkansas diamond mines (Prairie Creek Diamond Area), it appears questionable that $20,000 would afford accomplishing a comprehensive exploratory core drilling program at the Kimberlite deposit.

I am anticipating a field referral possibly in a month, on a manganese application in southeastern Oklahoma. Then if this applicant for a diamond exploration has made some reasonable efforts to furnish the required supporting data, and you and I agree that a Field Team examination is justifiable, I will make the examination or assist one of your men there at that time. In my opinion, however, the above-mentioned St. Clair application which was denied for exploration in the Prairie Creek Area presented a much more favorable opportunity to investigate Arkansas diamond potentialities.

I realize that the potentiality of those peridotite pipes is primarily a geological problem and from the standpoint of the Survey it may be important to obtain some deep drill hole data there. I will be pleased to go along with any recommendations, suggestions, or opinions you wish to offer.

When a reply to my September 3 letter is received from the applicant, Iwill forward a copy to you immediately.

Sincerely yours,

Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VI

CCK/vks

Encl (6)

cc: DMEA (2)
3423 file

IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

September 15, 1954

Memorandum

To: Messrs. Ralph L. Erickson and Lawrence V. Blade, Geologists, U. S. Geological Survey

Through: W. H. Griffiths
U. S. Geological Survey

From: Thor N. Killingsord, Staff Assistant for DMEA, U. S. Geological Survey

Subject: Pending field examination of the Raymond Diamond mine (Kimberlite mine), Pike County, Arkansas, DMEA Docket 3423.

The DMEA Operating Committee, by letter dated August 16, 1954, requested Mr. C. C. Knox, DMEA Executive Officer, Region VI, to review the cited application and to conduct a field examination of the applicant's property, if he deemed it necessary. At a later date, Mr. Robert A. Lawrence, DMEA Executive Officer, Region VII, having noted mention of the previously referenced letter to Mr. Knox in the DMEA Operating Committee minutes, wrote Mr. Knox stating that as he was responsible for Survey DMEA activities in Region VI, he would appreciate copies of the application so that he could arrange for a geological field examination if such should seem necessary. Mr. Lawrence also wrote this office stating that it would be difficult for his staff to make a field examination as they were busy with DMEA work in Region VII. He suggested instead, that Survey geologists working in the Magnet Cove Area make the examination as they were near by and would be more familiar with the geology than would someone brought in especially for the job.

Acting on Mr. Lawrence's recommendation, I have contacted Mr. C. A. Anderson who has agreed to have you make the examination, if an examination is deemed necessary. It is therefore suggested that you immediately contact Mr. Knox and find out if he wants a geologic examination made. If his answer is affirmative you might establish a date on which you could make a joint examination. In the event the Bureau of Mines part of the job has already been completed you might inquire of Mr. Knox if there is any particular information concerning the application that he might want you to compile. Please feel free to contact Mr. Knox by telephone if you wish and also this office if you believe we might be of assistance to you. You should keep an accounting of the expenses of this work and submit it to Mr. E. R. Harshman of your Denver office.

Normally, a IMEA geologic report need not be too extensive but it should cover the more pertinent points. An outline of these points would include, recommendations, introduction, discussion of the applicant, location of property, geology, and discussion of applicant's proposed work. It is also customary to advise the applicant of the date you intend to make the examination so that he may have a representative present to accompany you.

To acquaint you with the pending job, I am forwarding all of the data on the application which we have in our files. If you should make the examination please forward the original and four copies of your report to Mr. Knox. One copy of the report will be for his files. Also, please send one copy of the report to Mr. Robert A. Laurence, the copy to be forwarded through this office. Please return all enclosed docket material when you are finished with it.

I realize this is a rather indefinite assignment and that you are not going to see very much even if you make the examination. Nevertheless, if Mr. Knox thinks an examination is necessary, we should make it as quickly as possible so that IMEA decision on the requested contract may be rendered with a minimum of delay.

Thor H. Kiilsgaard

Enclosure

CC: W. S. Martin, IMEA
Robert A. Laurence, Region VII
C. C. Knox, Region VI
R. H. Marshman, Region IV
Director's reading, 4212
Branch reading, 4212
Docket file

THKiilsgaard:hlm
G-9/15/54

COPIES DMEA (2)
Mr. Laurence

C
O
P
Y

A. B. J. HAMMETT
509 Victoria Natl Bank Bldg.
Telephone 322
Victoria, Texas

RECEIVED
SEP 20 1954

September 14, 1954

Mr. Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer DMEA
Field Team Region VI
P O Box 431
Joplin, Missouri

Subject: Docket DMEA 3423 "Diamonds"
Hammett Mine
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Knox:

I have just returned from the West Coast and your letter of September 3rd was on my desk. I have several other trips planned throughout the next months, however, if you will advise me possibly a week or ten days in advance of your contemplated visit to the subject property, I will be very happy to arrange my schedule to meet with yours. As a partial reply to your question under Item 3 (a), the 80 acres of land is owned outright by me and is all of the acreage that I own. At one time I did have a claim on the adjoining 40 acres that have been known to contain some deposits of peridotite. The main thing that I am concerned with is the basic 80 acres that contains the bulk of the known deposit and is substantial enough for a long term operation.

4 (b) This portion of information was taken from United States Government material and also from a report made several years ago by a mining engineer (deceased) and former partners of the property. I do not know the yardages of the material and this information combined with other information such as the logs, etc., if in my possession would eliminate the necesssity of any exploratory work by the Department of the Interior. All of the records, logs, and engineering data were destroyed together with other effects in the fire referred to in my report.

3 (c) As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, if I were in possession of this information regarding drill holes, logs, and recoveries at various levels, I would not need this Government assistance at this time. The original engineering information contained in Government files, and in our engineers report, I believe showed that there had been a definite outcropping of this peridotite in a total of 92 acres.

5 (b) You are correct on the proposed work and that it will actually consist wherein exploratory, drilling, test-pitting, trenching, clearing, and road building to be of a minimum and will include the main work on the sites of the old workings.

5 (d) The State of Arkansas in their letter of July 6th, a copy included with my application, will furnish Geologic and Engineering basic assistance together with others with whom I have not as yet made definite committments.

6 (a) and (b) The $2,000.00 is only a partial estimated cost. Part of the balance of this work is to come out of money appropriated under Item 6 (b) and personal funds.

6 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) and (f) are items which I intend to break down in proper form after I learn whether or not this Government assistance is available for this project and I also intended to do this work with your cooperation so that the breakdown would be satisfactory for the purpose intended.

Since this valuable property is now under one ownership and I am perfectly willing to make expenditures for the conduct of a good operation on this property together with the world-wide conditions that exist and especially the position the United States is in when it comes to a supply of Industrial Diamonds, I believe that this is a very opportune time to make an exploration project on this property and to back it up with a source of supply for this country in the event of another emergency which is probable and quite possible. With a source of supply of Industrial Diamonds right here in the United States, the value to our country could be tremendous and I believe you will agree it would be much better for the Government to be doing business here at home with its patriotic people rather than to be depended upon our enemies and those who have favorable leanings toward our enemies as is the case with our present foreign producers of Industrial Diamonds and that source of supply and operation could be cut off very suddenly.

Yours very truly,

ABJH;pk /s/ A. B. J. Hammett

COPY: DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

P. O. Box #431
Joplin, Missouri

September 3, 1954

Airmail

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank Bldg.
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket DMEA-3423 (diamonds)
Hammett Mine
Pike County, Ark.

Dear Mr. Hammett:

Your application for a DMEA project contract was referred to me for field appraisal. Other urgent assignments, however, will prevent me from making the trip to examine your property during the week of September 6, as suggested in your August 23 letter to Washington. I will advise you as soon as possible when I can schedule meeting you at the property.

In the meantime, to be better prepared for that examination, I would appreciate receiving all the additional pertinent data you might be able to obtain, or any useful information you can recall, especially with respect to the following questions which have occurred to me while reviewing your application:

Please refer to your copy of the application

under item 3 (a), is the 80-acre tract that you described all the land you possess or control that may be benefitted by the proposed exploration? The sketches you submitted indicate that you also own the adjoining NW¼ of SW¼ of that section14, and that the deposit also extends into that as well as the tract designated as property of the American Diamond Co.

4 (b) that portion of past Arkansas diamond production which reasonably can be attributed to your property, is not clear to me. The yardages of the material was not stated from which you mentioned recovering 1/10 to 37/100 carats per yard during pilot plant operations from 1932 until the fire.

4 (c) Is there any possibility that you can obtain copies [illegible] the logs of the holes drilled there, and the recoveries indicated [illegible] various level intervals, especially of the 900-foot hole you [illegible]d? Do I understand correctly that that peridotite outcrop [illegible] in area?

5 (b) Of all the project work you proposed, I expect that only the actual exploratory drilling, test-pitting, and/or trenching with the very minimum of clearing and road building to those sites, and comprehensive engineering and geologic interpretations, could be construed as exploration under existing DMEA regulations. Please send me a sketch map and cross sections to indicate your tentative locations of the proposed project work as related to present mine workings and geologic features.

5 (d) Among the recommendations required in my reports concluding examination of applicant's properties, is that concerning the experience and background of the person (or persons) charged with the supervisory, geologic, and engineering aspects of the proposed project, particularly with respect to the engineering and geologic consultants you have in mind and the fees, they may charge as you provided for under 6 (b). Likewise, particularly in the exploration for diamonds, please mention the person or firm who will make the recovery analyses, and describe the method you expect to be used.

6(a) Comprehensive exploration of the potential deposit you described to cost only an estimated $2,000 for the proposed core drilling, bulldozing, and dragline work, seems questionable. I suggest that you submit a careful estimate of the costs, broken down for detailed preparation of the proposed project contract so that it can be drafted acceptable to you if approved in Washington.

6(b) Likewise, please include an itemized schedule of numbers, classes and rates of wages, salaries or fees for the necessary labor, supervision, and engineering and geologic consultants.

6(c) An itemized list as required.

6(d) An itemized list of the three categories required: (1) to be rented; (2) to be purchased; (3) owned by you.

6(e) Please furnish a detailed list showing the costs, etc.

6(f) Please furnish a detailed list showing the costs of the buildings which would be needed for exploration work only.

6(g) A detailed list is required showing the cost of repairs, maintenance, analytical work, accounting, workmen's compensation, insurance, payroll taxes, etc.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any assistance or suggestions that I might be able to give in preparing the foregoing supplementary information which I believe would be to your advantage to submit at this time.

Very sincerely yours,

Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer
DMEA Field Team, Region VI

CCK/vhs

cc: DMEA (2)
3423 file

AUG 1 3 1954

Mr. Clinton C. Knox
Executive Officer, DMEA
Field Team, Region VI
Post Office Box 431
Joplin, Missouri

Subject: Docket No. DMEA-3423 -
Diamonds - A.B.J. Hammett
Hammett Diamond Mine (Kimberlite Mine)
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Knox:

Please review the subject application and arrange for a field examination if you deem it necessary.

Please determine, if possible, the value and physical volume of production, drill logs, and acreage of the peridotite breccia. The possibilities of making a significant discovery is the principal determination to be made and should be based upon known geologic facts.

Copies of memoranda from the Geological Survey, dated July 28, 1954, and from the Bureau of Mines, dated August 11, 1954, are enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. Martin

ACTING Chairman, Operating Committee

Approved:

D. M. Larrabee

Member, Geological Survey

J. H. Hedges

Member, Bureau of Mines

Enclosures 4

LGHouk:gad 8/13/54
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Docket
Operating Committee
Mr. Albert H. Koschmann
Mr. Chandler, 3518
Mr. Newcomb, 5227
Mr. Houk

AUG 13 1954

Mr. A. B. J. Hammett
509 Victoria National Bank Bldg.
Victoria, Texas

Re: Docket No. DMEA-3423 - Diamonds
Hammett Diamond Mine (Kimberlite Mine)
Pike County, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Hammett:

Your application for assistance in exploring the subject property has been reviewed by the Nonmetallic Minerals Division of the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration and has been referred to Mr. Clinton C. Inox, Executive Officer, DMEA Field Team, Region VI, Post Office Box 431, Joplin, Missouri, for further consideration and possibly a field examination.

The Regional Office will contact you at an early date if an examination is to be made. Any assistance that you may give the members of the field team during the examination will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittenderf

Administrator

LGHouk:gad 8/13/54
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Docket
Operating Committee
Mr. Albert H. Koschmann, Region 4
Field Team, Region VI
Mr. Chandler, 3518
Mr. Newcomb, 5227
Mr. Houk

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF MINES
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

August 11, 1954

Memorandum

To: Mr. Lawrence G. Houk, Chief, Nonmetallic Minerals Division
Defense Minerals Exploration Administration

From: Commodity Specialist, Construction and Chemical
Materials Branch

Subject: Application of Mr. A. B. J. Hammett, Docket No. 3423,
for aid in exploration for diamonds

The property under consideration comprises the S. W. $\frac{1}{4}$, and the S. E. $\frac{1}{4}$, of the N. W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 14, Township 8, Range 25, Pike County, Arkansas, with a total area of 80 acres, and lies about 2 miles northeast of the property of the Arkansas Diamond Company, which is located in Section 21 of the same township. While the existence of a diamond-bearing Kimberlite pipe on this property has been reported in the geological literature, it apparently has not been thoroughly explored.

It is now proposed to spend $20,000 exploring the deposit. We doubt that a thorough evaluation of the property can be made for $20,000.

While the prospect of developing a commercial source of diamonds from this property does not seem favorable, it is suggested that the field team be asked to visit it, and report its reaction to this application. We also suggest that, if the report is favorable, the field team be asked to submit its observations on how the deposit should be sampled and evaluated.

Henry P. Chandler

IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

July 28, 1954

Memorandum

REVIEW OF APPLICATION DMEA-3423 (diamonds)

To: L. G. Houk, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
From: E. L. Newcomb, U. S. Geological Survey
Applicant's name and address: A. E. J. Hammett, Victoria, Texas
Name of property: Hammett Diamond Mine (Kimberlite Mine)
Location of property: Near Murfreesboro, Pike County, Arkansas
Summary of applicant's proposal: $20,000 requested --
Independent contracts for core drilling, bulldozing, dragline excavation -- $2,000
Remainder for supervision, equipment, supplies, buildings, etc.
Sources of information on applicant's property:
U.S.G.S. Bull. 540, p. 534-546
U.S.G.S. Bull. 735, p. 271-322
U.S.B.M. R. I. 4549
Comments: 1. Past production from the Kimberlite Mine limited to a very few stones (80% of district production from Arkansas mine).
2. The applicant's proposal is vague and is not supported by adequate data.
3. Most of the requested funds are to be used for mine operation, equipment and supplies. Not for exploration purposes.
4. Of all the diamond properties in the Pike County area, this property shows the least promise of producing a significant quantity of diamonds.

RECOMMENDATION: A field referral is not warranted. Unless the applicant presents more substantiating data and a feasible exploration project, I recommend the application be denied.

E. L. Newcomb

ELNewcomb:hlm
G-7/28/54
Copy to: Director's reading, 4212
Branch reading, 4212
DMEA (3)
Docket file