

Snyder

J. H. Eenigenburg
54 W. 153rd Place
So. Holland, Ill. 60473
July 4, 1980

Mr. Harold R. Denton
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Denton:

Please believe me when I say I do not enjoy writing letters, when it appears that all I am doing is sticking my nose in someone else's business and telling them what to do—far from that. My writing to NASA followed a lengthy period of unrest over the safety and well-being of our men in space. I believe that much of my work was helpful to them, but I do not expect NASA to ever admit it. Worse than that, however, is that much that they have learned was never shared with the scientific community, thus depriving independent scientists of information that could be helpful to them in their various and unrelated fields.

My writing to the energy department was prompted by their offer to assist independent inventors in the mid-western states, who were working on alternate energy sources. After fourteen years of work on mine, I felt some small assistance would be a blessing. A patent attorney and others made me leary of that route, so I withdrew my request for assistance but did offer my views on TMI, as they were already knowledgeable of my position from the basis of that request.

My writings to the NRC were two-fold; first to assist, if possible, with my fifty years of investigative and experimental work in the energy field to pinpoint the cause of the TMI mishap, and secondly, to offer an alternate assist in the cooling process of the reactor*...and now this writing, stemming from an article in yesterday's Chicago Tribune, which stated, "TMI CLEANUP DELAY RAISES PERIL: STUDY."

Now, I am in full agreement with those who feel that venting the krypton gas will pose no danger either to the environment or the residents of nearby communities and, also, the longer it takes, the greater will be the amount of deterioration that will be found when workmen finally enter the building.

The question uppermost in my mind is this: Is the nuclear core so excessively damaged that it cannot be pulled from the reactor? If this is unknown at this time, clearing the building and getting in there to find out should be done as quickly as possible. If the nuclear core cannot be pulled out, or if it is well suspected that this may be the case, I would suggest sealing off the building, as the krypton gas may well be your salvation in eventually neutralizing the nuclear core.

*This information sent to Energy Dept., not NRC, as stated.

Mr. Harold R. Denton

July 4, 1980

In view of my theoretical work, I look upon the krypton gas as the first step toward neutralizing the effect of the nuclear core. Step two will be the deterioration of the reactor and its components, and step three will be the change undergone by the core, coupled with the cladding formed by the particulates of deterioration. The theory of molecular association, with which I am involved, demands some process similar to the above. My theoretical work is based on the premise that all things and everything either undergoes a change or causes a change that makes neighboring molecules compatible, and the medium of exchange is the basic energy particles of which all things and everything is made and are in themselves particles of no mass/no charge.

The most notable example of the action of this energy and, for that matter, undisputable proof of its existence, was the changing of color of the lunar surface material. When the astronauts walked into the LEM on the moon, the dust on their suits changed color (before the vehicle was pressurized), and the dust and rocks in the sealed boxes had changed color before the boxes were opened in Houston.

My reasoning on that prediction and on the other thirteen predictions of occurrences in space were all based on the theory of molecular association, yet the occurrences were so varied and seemingly unrelated, it is difficult to believe that all depended upon the action of basic energy.

Of the fourteen predictions to NASA, eleven are confirmed occurrences. One was wrong, and I do believe that it was wrong only on the timing. One was never revealed, although NASA did inquire as to the corrective measure I told them I had, and that was employed on every subsequent mission. And, finally, one was circumvented, as I learned from Michael Collins' book, "Carrying the Fire."

It would be foolish for me to attempt to cover the mechanism of basic energy in a few pages of a letter, so I will merely leave you with a few of my thoughts, and at least get it off my chest.

1. If you cannot pull the nuclear core, seal off the building, and it will bury itself in the debris it creates. Its effect will subsequently be neutralized.
2. If you can pull the core, I would suggest converting unit #1 and #2 to fossil fuel. Theoretically, a nuclear reactor cannot be sustained on a small island.
3. I believe our government should absorb at least a great portion of the cleanup costs, as well as the conversion to fossil fuels. What is being learned at TMI will benefit all Americans, and we should all be willing to pay a little extra for that.

Sincerely,

Joseph H. Eenigenburg
Joseph H. Eenigenburg