

DIO

Table of Contents

DIO & The Journal for Hysterical Astronomy:

	Page:
‡11 Concise Chronology of Approaches to the Poles: by R. K. HEADLAND	107
‡12 Richard Byrd, Bernt Balchen, & the North Pole: by RAWLINS	110
‡13 Scrawlings	112
‡14 Recovering Hipparchos' Last Lost Lustrous Star	119
‡15 Naked Came the Arrogance	120

Byrd's Bravery & Balchen's Math Vindicated:

[Note added to 1998 printing.] The two lead *DIO* articles of this issue both justly (as we now know) questioned Richard Byrd's success in his 1926 flight towards the North Pole. After this *DIO* appeared, Byrd's 1925-1927 diary surfaced at the Byrd Polar Research Center (Ohio State University).¹ The diary showed that Byrd indeed fell somewhat short (as Bernt Balchen's early data-analyses had accurately contended). However, contra widespread doubts (including those cautiously entertained within by DR), the diary made it clear that Byrd was a knowledgeable mathematical navigator, who courageously went most of the way to the Pole and kept his course remarkably well during this most dangerous of all his grand career's flights. *DIO*'s private detailed analysis of the Byrd 1926 diary was the cited basis for the *New York Times*' 1996/5/9 p.1 story on the diary and the flight. The full 1996 analysis will be published in a future *DIO* issue [*DIO* 10 (2000)].

¹ Shortly after the Ohio State University archives' (long-hidden) evidence of the truth about Byrd's 1926 "North Pole" lie-theft exploded into the world press (starting with the *NYTimes*), OSU loyalists determined to attempt Lazaran resuscitation of the 1926 claim's corpse. Turning down Cal Tech's offer of refereeing assistance, OSU instead depended primarily upon amiable on-campus talent to question DR's report. Though this report was written at white-heat in only 10 days (1996 Spring), OSU has wasted two years seeking its longed-for (but ever-elusive) refutation-chimera. OSU Press has finally (1998) published its commentary-laden photo-reproduction of the Byrd diary. This pseudo-neutral book's catechismic advocacy is embarrassingly transparent: [a] It refuses to cite the Byrd-cult-resented *NYT* pageone story (scrupulously written by the *NYT* Science Dep't's top writer, John Wilford), or *NYT*'s simple, irrefutable final-paragraph proof of Byrd's glaring triple-stage contradictions on his claimed Pole-arrival time. [b] It does not even tell the reader on which pages of the book one may find & compare Byrd's spectacular (ordmag 100 miles) 1926/5/9 7:07:10 GCT sextant-data contradiction — diary (p.85) vs. published report (p.154) — the very DR discovery which triggered *NYT*'s 1996/5/9 undoing of its own Byrd-glorifying 1926/5/10 headline. [c] The book neither reproduces nor so much as mentions two key handwritten documents (both in OSU archives & both cited in DR's report) which prove that Byrd was willing to compute backwards, deducing 1926/5/9 "data" from story instead of the reverse. [d] The book (p.57) cites two allegedly Expert reports disputing the 1996 DR analysis (though finding no nontrivial errors in it). However, neither author is experienced in the positional astronomy that Byrd navigated by. One of OSU's two apologist-Experts has such difficulty with spherical trig that his analysis contains none, though it does sport a serious arithmetic error at the heart of its prime (grade-school-level) math argument; he also mis-spells "Coriolis" 3 times out of 4. The other report (dated 1997/7/9) dear to OSU Press is the glacial-pace-learning-experience preliminary production of an OSU astronomy prof whose specialty unfortunately has no relation to the astronomy of this case. (DR's 1998/3/9 phone inquiries found that his private alibis for Byrd's three plainest internal contradictions — two not even cited in the prof's report — exhibit wildly imaginative & generous flexibility. [I hope not to be forced to publish the comic details.] OSU repeatedly refused DR's requests for access to the prof's report, even weeks after it was being publicly cited against DR. It was finally released only after *Science* pressed OSU about the incongruity.) The OSU astronomy prof's 1997/7/9 report supplies the wrong sign for all twenty-one of its solar hour-angles — and mis-spells "sextant" twenty-three consecutive times. Bottom line: OSU Press is attempting artificial creation of a sales-boosting Controversy where there is not a shadow of rational basis for substantial dispute. Since DR's 1996 analysis is variously ironclad, OSU shuns logical debate, preferring instead to trust that ambitious and/or merciful apologists will dream up motley purported refutations, so that OSU can innocently shrug: hey, The Experts Disagree. But, though the years keep passing, OSU still lacks [a] genuine experts who'll fill its discreditable bill, & (far more germane) [b] a nonfarical defense of Byrd's 1926 hoax.

‡11 Concise Chronology of Approaches to the Poles

by R. K. Headland

Archivist & Curator

Scott Polar Research Institute

University of Cambridge, England

(Originally 1 December 1993. Revised 12 May 1995.)

The following Antarctic and Arctic lists give explorations, in chronological order, towards the South Pole and the North Pole, their attainment (air and surface, and by sea in the Arctic), and the first crossings of the regions. There are several claims included for which supporting evidence is insufficient and doubts exist regarding what was accomplished. The units of measurement are in the form recommended by the *Système Internationale d'Unités*, thus latitudes are given in degrees with decimal fractions (arcminutes are not used), and grads follow in brackets [°].

A ANTARCTIC

- 1603 Gabriel de Castilla (Spain), with a ship's company, probably penetrated the Southern Ocean south of Drake Passage
Subsequently several merchant vessels reported being blown south of 60°S [66.67°S] rounding Cabo de Hornos in severe weather
- 1773 James Cook (Britain), with companies aboard *HMS Resolution* and *HMS Adventure*, crossed the Antarctic Circle (66.53°S [73.92°S]) off Enderby Land, 17 January
- 1774 James Cook (Britain) on the same expedition reached 71.17°S [79.08°S] off Marie Byrd Land, 30 January
- 1820 Fabian von Bellingshausen (Russia), with companies aboard *Vostok* and *Mirnyy*, sighted the Antarctic continent at about 69.35°S [77.06°S] off Dronning Maud Land, 27 January
- 1823 James Weddell (Britain), with company aboard *Jane*, reached 74.25°S [82.50°S] in the Weddell Sea, 20 February
- 1842 James Ross (Britain), with companies aboard *HMS Erebus* and *HMS Terror*, reached 78.17°S [86.86°S] in the Ross Sea, 23 February
- 1900 Hugh Evans (Britain) and 3 others sledged to 78.83°S [87.59°S] on the Ross Ice Shelf, 23 February
- 1902 Robert Scott (Britain) and 2 others sledged to 82.28°S [91.42°S] on the Ross Ice Shelf, 30 December
- 1909 Ernest Shackleton (Britain) and 3 others sledged to 88.38°S [98.20°S], 9 January
- 1911 Roald Amundsen (Norway) and 4 others dog-sledged to 90°S [100°S], 14 December

- 1912 Robert Scott (Britain) and 4 others sledged to 90°S [100°S], 17 January (all perished during the return journey)
- 1929 Richard Byrd (United States), with an aircraft crew, claimed to have flown over the South Pole from the Ross Ice Shelf, 29 November
- 1947 Richard Byrd (United States), with an aircraft crew, flew over the South Pole from the Ross Ice Shelf, 15 February
- 1956 John Torbert (United States) and 6 others flew across Antarctica over the South Pole (Ross Island to Weddell Sea and returned without landing), 13 January
- 1956 Conrad Shinn (United States), with crew of an aircraft, landed at the South Pole, 31 October; a permanent station was then established, sustained by aircraft
Subsequently many aircraft have landed at the South Pole
- 1958 Vivian Fuchs (British Commonwealth) and an expeditionary party reached the South Pole by motor vehicles and sledge dogs, 20 January, and continued to cross Antarctica (Weddell Sea to Ross Sea)
Subsequently several expeditions have crossed the Antarctic through the South Pole by surface and many have made one-way surface journeys departing by aircraft

B ARCTIC

- 1553 Sir Hugh Willoughby (England), with companies aboard *Bona Esperanza* and *Bona Confidentia*, reached 72°N [80°N] on Novaya Zemlya, 14 August
- 1587 John Davis (England), with companies aboard *Elizabeth*, *Ellen*, & *Sunshine*, reached 72.20°N [80.22°N] off Greenland, July
- 1594 Willem Barentsz (Netherlands), with a ship's company, reached 77°N [85.6°N], rounding Novaya Zemlya
- 1596 Jacob van Heemskerck (Netherlands), with companies aboard 2 vessels, reached 80.18°N [89.09°N] off Svalbard, 17 June
- 1607 Henry Hudson (Britain), with company aboard *Hopewell*, reached 80.38°N [89.31°N] off Svalbard, 16 July
- 1766 Vasily Chichagov (Russia), with companies aboard *Chichagov*, *Panov*, and *Babayev*, reached 80.47°N [89.41°N] off Svalbard, 16 July
- 1773 Constantine Phipps (Britain), with companies aboard *Racehorse* & *Carcass*, reached 80.80°N [89.78°N] off Svalbard, 27 July
Subsequently many whaling vessels reached high latitudes
- 1806 William Scoresby (Britain), with company aboard *Resolution*, reached 81.50°N [90.56°N] off Svalbard
- 1827 William Parry (Britain) and party, with 2 sledge boats from *Hecla*, reached 82.75°N [91.94°N] off Svalbard, 25 July
This position is farther north than the area inhabited by the Polar Eskimo of Greenland
- 1876 Albert Markham (Britain) and 2 sledge parties reached 83.34°N [92.60°N] off Ellesmere Island, 12 May
- 1882 James Lockwood (United States) and 2 others dog-sledged to 83.40°N [92.67°N] off Greenland from Fort Conger, 13 May
- 1895 Fridtjof Nansen and Hjalmar Johansen (Norway) dog-sledged to 86.22°N [95.80°N] from *Fram* in the Arctic Ocean, 8 April
- 1900 Umberto Cagni (Italy) & 3 others claimed to have dog-sledged to 86.57°N [96.19°N] from Zemlya Frantsa-Iosefa, 24 April

- 1908 Frederick Cook (United States), with a sledge party, claimed to have reached 90°N [100°N], 21 April
- 1909 Robert Peary (United States) and an expeditionary party, dog-sledged to 87.75°N [97.50°N] from Ellesmere Island, 31 March; Peary and 5 others continued north and possibly passed 88°N [97.8°N]
- 1909 Robert Peary (United States), with a sledge party, claimed to have reached 90°N [100°N], 6 April
- 1925 Roald Amundsen (Norway), Lincoln Ellsworth (United States), and 4 others flew north from Svalbard in 2 aircraft, crash landed and drifted to 87.83°N [97.59°N], 21 May
- 1926 Richard Byrd (United States), with Floyd Bennett, claimed to have reached 90°N [100°N] by air from Svalbard, 9 May
- 1926 Roald Amundsen (Norway), Lincoln Ellsworth (United States), Umberto Nobile (Italy), and 11 others, crossed 90°N [100°N] by airship *Norge* (flying Svalbard to Alaska), 12 May
Subsequently one dirigible balloon and many other aircraft have flown over the North Pole
- 1937 Ivan Papanin (Soviet Union) and party landed at 89.43°N [99.37°N] by aircraft from Zemlya Frantsa-Iosefa, established the first Arctic Ocean drift station, 21 May
- 1948 Pavel Gordiyenko (Soviet Union) and 5 others landed at 90°N [100°N] from an aircraft, 23 April
Subsequently many aircraft have landed at the North Pole
- 1958 John Anderson (United States), with crew aboard nuclear powered submarine *USS Nautilus*, reached the North Pole while submerged, 3 August, on voyage from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean
- 1959 James Calvert (United States), with crew aboard nuclear powered submarine *USS Skate*, surfaced at the North Pole, 17 March
Subsequently many submarines reached the North Pole and some surfaced there
- 1968 Ralph Plaisted (United States) and 3 others reached 90°N [100°N] by surface (snow scooter) from Canada and returned by air, 19 April
- 1969 Wally Herbert (Britain) and 3 others dog-sledged to 90°N [100°N], while crossing the Arctic Ocean (Alaska to Svalbard), 6 April
Subsequently several expeditions have crossed the Arctic on the pack-ice through the North Pole and many have made one-way surface journeys departing by air
- 1977 Yuriy Kuchiyevev (Soviet Union), with crew aboard nuclear powered icebreaker *Arktika*, reached 90°N [100°N] by sea from near the Novosibirskiye Ostrova, 17 August
Subsequently many surface vessels have reached the North Pole
- 1991 Anatoly Gorshkovskiy (Soviet Union), with crew and passengers aboard the nuclear powered icebreaker *Sovetskiy Soyuz*, reached the North Pole by sea while crossing the Arctic Ocean (Murmansk to Provideniya), 4 August

Some of these claims are controversial and have given rise to much discussion. There is a way of resolving the question of precedence at the poles by a simple modification of the question. A secure answer may be given to *Who was the first to see both poles?*

On 14 December 1911 Roald Amundsen and Oskar Wisting were at the South Pole, and both were over the North Pole aboard *Norge* on 12 May 1926; thus they became the first to have seen the South Pole and the North Pole.

‡12 Byrd, Balchen, & the North Pole by Rawlins

A1 On 1926/5/9,¹ airman-lobbyist Richard Byrd claimed to have made the 1st flight to the North Pole, from Kingsbay, Spitzbergen, in the Fokker trimotor airplane *Josephine Ford*. Various oddities of the claim have caused wide skepticism of it. But too much² of that doubt is based upon B.Balchen's long-after report³ of an alleged detailed confession by Byrd's co-pilot (& Balchen's very close friend)⁴ Floyd Bennett.

A2 After 3 crackups left Byrd sleepless (fn 13) about getting off the ground at all (Byrd *Skyward* NYC 1928 p.183), he & Bennett finally "sneaked to the plane" (*NYTimes* 5/16:3:4=5) and lifted off on 5/9 at 00:50 GCT. They disappeared to the north, lost radio contact,⁵ & returned unexpectedly early (with a leaking engine) 15^h1/2 later. Debt-ridden Byrd profitably claimed they reached the Pole but, while filming the scene, forgot (Rawlins 1973 p.264) to drop their cargo of hundreds of US flags, potentially visible to the dirigible *Norge* at the Pole (3^d later) during its pioneer flight across the Arctic Ocean.

A3 Byrd's sole companion Bennett (died 1928/4/25) told his closest friend, the great aviator & WW2 hero B.Balchen (1928 Feb, Chicago), that: "the truth about the North Pole flight . . . would shock you through your heels. It makes me sick to think about it."⁶

A4 So much is credible. But the same §A3 passage continues with a revealing fact: "By some kind of silent agreement we never mentioned this subject amongst us any more." Thus, Balchen's much-later detailed embellishments (fn 3) upon the brief statements of §A3 must be regarded as simply his own theory of the truth of the 5/9 trip (which he believed Bennett wanted to tell him), put into Bennett's mouth for effect.

B1 The *JoFord*'s takeoff time from Kingsbay (78°55'N, 11°9'E) was reported as 00:50 by Wm.Bird, the *NYTimes* correspondent with the Byrd expedition.⁷ Byrd's 5/12 telegram (*NYT* 5/13:3:2) to SecNavy said he reached the Pole c.9:15. Curiously, he later⁸ altered

¹ All dates here are 1926 unless otherwise stated. All times are GCT (Greenwich Civil Time).

² DR's initial (1972) skeptical paper on Byrd (*Norsk Geogr Tidsskr* 26:135) was not based upon Balchen's testimony. DR's *Peary . . . Fiction* Wash 1973 Chap.21 used some late Balchen data, all of which should be treated with caution unless verifiable from contemporary records or an independent source. E.g., his decades-later report (Balchen *Come North With Me* NYC 1958 p.43) of the time of Byrd's return (16:07) is simply Byrd's own final-version (§B1) takeoff-time (00:37) plus 15h1/2. However, Balchen's report (e.g., NARS autobio Intro B p.3) that Byrd did no celestial navigation in the Antarctic is verified by US-born Dean Smith & Larry Gould (E.Rodgers *Beyond the Barrier* USNavInst pp.188-189). And the slowness of the *JoFord* (which Balchen noted while he & Bennett together later flew the plane around the US to promote Byrd) is confirmed by the mean 78 knots ski-less long-distance speeds of its "sister" Fokker (piloted by the great Chas. Kingsford-Smith: see A.Fokker *Flying Dutchman* NYC 1931 p.281).

³ R.Montague *Oceans, Poles, & Airmen* NYC 1971 pp.47-48.

⁴ Balchen was also a Norwegian-born protégé of Byrd's Norse competitor R.Amundsen. Ultimately, Balchen & his former employer Byrd (whom he flew to near the S.Pole in 1929) were enemies, though not necessarily when §A3 was written. A far more able airman than Byrd (though lacking the gumption to be born a top Senator's brother), Balchen was a good man who (frustrated by years of power-suppression of rational debate: ‡15 fn 24) finally tried (wrongly) to defend a higher truth (*Norge* priority) by bending factual truth, just as Byrd bent facts to promote the equally valid higher truth that airplanes (whatever their 1926 unreliabilities), not dirigibles, were the future.

⁵ The exact time of the last apparent radio-message is variously reported. (E.g., *Baltimore Evening Sun* 5/10:1:1; *Pravda* 5/12:2:8.) In any case, no pole-attainment message survives from anywhere near 9:02. (So Byrd was for awhile not committed on key parts of his story.) By contrast, Amundsen's *Norge* told the world immediately of its success by radio, direct from the N.Pole: *NYT* 5/12 headline.

⁶ Balchen manuscript narrative. (Original at Maxwell Air Force Base.) Basis of virtually identical passage in Balchen unpubl. autobio (NatArchiv) p.142. Balchen's last (1928/4/21) chat with Bennett: p.152.

⁷ *NYT* 1926/5/10:1:7. Oslo's *Aftenposten* 5/10:4:6 has 00:55 GCT.

⁸ London *Times* 5/28:16:4, *NatGeogrMag* 50:385&373, and Byrd unpublished typescript (carbon at NatArchiv, found by Herman Friis) of 1926/11/24 navigation report [BUR] pp.2&6. Note: this report's [easy-to-manufacture] sextant data (the original records of which have never been found) exhibit a remarkably small mean error, for solar altitudes allegedly taken with a 1919 vintage (BUR p.1) bubble-artificial-horizon. (Byrd's detailed 4-part *NYT* 5/14-17 account describes use of his dr-instruments [drift-indicator & compasses]; but his sole mention of the sextant during the flight just says it got broken: *NYT* 5/17:1:3=4.) Compare to the truth of Byrd's real if inexact 1929 S.Polar flight: Rodgers 1990 p.189. Note: for the suspect N.Pole claims of Cook, Peary [*DIO* 1.1 ‡4 & *DIO* 2.2], & Byrd: all sextant data were taken by the leader of (and chief investor in) the expedition: none shared with companions. (In contrast: Amundsen's S.Pole & N.Pole trips were both verified by shared sextant data.)

both figures⁹ by -13^m to: 00:37 & 9:02, resp. The problem: though Byrd says his drift-measures showed speed c.77 knots (BUR p.2), his reports (*NGM* 50:386; BUR p.3) have him at Amsterdam I. (79°48'N, 10°8'E) at 1:22, a trip of 53 nautical miles (nmi) in 32^m (if 00:50 isn't memory-holed), mean speed c.100 knots (awful on fuel & engine).

B2 Byrd says he left the Pole at 9:15 and then (BUR p.6) became so aided, by a conveniently sudden wind from the north (just-as-conveniently absent during the northward leg of the trip), that he averaged 92 knots for the first 6 hrs of the return, thus placing him at 80°50'N (c.15°E) at 15:15 (a datum Byrd never published: see BUR p.6). His expedition's original version (W.Bird *NYT* 5/11:1:7=8, mapped 2:3=4) has him continuing south from there to Verlegen Hook (80°04'N, 16°3'E), "thence west to Amsterdam Island and home" to Kingsbay¹⁰ at 16:20 or 16:25. But 163 nmi in 70^m is 140 knots; and, using the 65^m between 15:15 & (the Byrd expedition's own *NYT* reporter's fn 10 return-time datum) 16:20, it's 150 knots, twice the plane's ski-less cruising speed! (The *JoFord*'s skis caused air-drag.) One can see why Byrd later: [a] forgot¹¹ Verlegen, [b] said he swerved towards Amst.I. ere reaching land, & [c] privately alleged [BUR p.6] he reached Kingsbay at 16:34, another¹² convenient Byrd falsehood (never published until Rawlins 1973 p.270).

B3 The implicit original-report §§B1&B2 superman-speed-discontinuities only add to the unacceptability of a claim where: [i] radio contact was lost; [ii] neither pilot used celestial navigation on subsequent witnessed trips; [iii] photocopies of putative original 1926/5/9 raw-data sheets (not a polished typescript), promised to world geogr socs (*NGM* 50:388), were never sent; [iv] NatGeogrSoc deleted (*NGM* 50:385) its own report's 1926/6/23-28 dates, to hide the embarrassment that it had publicly bemedalled Byrd on the *first* day (6/23) of its 5-day exam of his data! Before&after textual comparisons at Rawlins 1973 p.268.

C1 A theory consistent with the known data: Spitzbergen is too small for dr-navigation to surely hit it (on the return trip) from c.600 nautical miles away. So, unwilling to risk suicide (but equally unable¹³ to report failure), Byrd went far enough north to be invisible from Spitzbergen but not so far that the island was ever invisible to him.¹⁴

C2 Here, he intended to circle for enough hours that he could truly tell the world (& his conscience) that he'd gone the required distance. After about 13 hrs of this, an engine began leaking. So as not to chance being forced down upon rough, drifting ice floes, Byrd instantly sped for the nearest land, Verlegen Hook, and from there forthwith got back to Kingsbay coastwise (thus via Amst.I.). [This theory proved false. See *DIO* 10 fn 3 & §I.]

D1 Though this theory fits all available evidence, that circumstance does not prove its truth. But neither did Byrd provide credible proof that he reached the N.Pole. And, in science,¹⁵ the burden of proof is on the claimant, not the critic.

D2 Thus, we'll state the situation in a conservative, positivist fashion: the first nonsuspect claim to the N.Pole is unquestionably that of the Amundsen-Ellsworth-Nobile *Norge* expedition, which arrived there on 1926/5/12 *en route* from Kingsbay to Pt.Barrow, AK.

⁹ Note: all outward dead-reckoning (dr) times (1:22, 2:22, etc [BUR pp.3-5]) are 2^m mod 5^m, as are 00:37 & 9:02; homeward dr times (10:15, 11:15, etc [BUR p.6]) are all 0^m mod 5^m. As if original dr times were entirely 5^m-rounded, but all the outward data were finally altered by -13^m . (Interim version at *NYT* 5/16:4:4=5 used 9:04.)

¹⁰ Kingsbay eyewitnesses: W.Bird (*NYT* 5/10:1:7) & A.Lebedenko (*Pravda* 5/11:2:8, transl. Linda Olsen) have 16:20; it's 16:25 for O.Arnesen (*Aftenposten* 5/10:4:6) & C.Tomaselli (Milan's *Corriere della Sera* 5/11:3:3).

¹¹ From the 15:15 point to Kingsbay via Amst.I. (final version: *NGM* 50:386) is 132 nmi, so doing even this shorter distance in 70^m or 65^m still entails about 20 knots of sudden speed-increase at 15:15.

¹² Note that BUR stretches his total airtime by about 1/4 hr at both ends. In opposite directions! Which enhances his suspiciously short 15h1/2 by nearly a half-hour. (The 13^m would be easy to sweep under-the-rug since it is nearly the difference between CET & Kingsbay LMT. Byrd's reports all state GCT, so there is no ambiguity — unless he didn't distinguish between zone & local mean time, in which case his claim can be discarded just on that basis.)

¹³ Byrd's frantic situation was not entirely fiscal: see Rawlins 1973 p.260 on NGS' 1926 nightmare.

¹⁴ Note prior N.Pole hoaxter&non-navigator F.Cook's 1908 shyness of leaving sight of land (Rawlins 1973 p.92).

¹⁵ But the popular arena is not scientific. Thus, without direct testimony to Byrd's nonsuccess, I anticipate that the easily-forced public may well end up half-re-accepting this rickety claim. In the short term, the issue will partly depend (see Larry Gould's revealing comments at Rodgers 1990 p.294) upon whether NGS has by now gained sufficient institutional maturity to react without its customary partiality & frontfolk. I genuinely hope it has.

‡13 Scrawlings

A Squeezing Out Suicides

A1 If legislatures wish to stop Jack Kevorkian (“Dr.Death”) by outlawing assisted-suicides, then those laws should also apply to tobacco companies. Otherwise, we have a situation where: it’s illegal to help painracked elders to die, but legal to help happy&healthy youngsters to die.

A2 (In the days before assisted-suicide became an issue, it is said that crusaders had tried to wipe out unassisted suicide by making it a capital offense. . . .)¹

A3 Another way of interpreting Kevorkian’s persecutors: it’s illegal to end agony, but legal to cause it. Just the kind of logical consistency one expects of a nation whose laws are written by “legislator”-puppets, whose actions are responsive to those whose cash pulls the strings. (See, e.g., *DIO 2.1* ‡1 §A5 & fn 5.)

A4 Why has a decent and selfless martyr such as Kevorkian been pilloried so often in the press — where lobbies can slant “news” so easily? Partial explanation: about 20% of all medical billings occur in the last 6 months of life. So Kevorkian is seen by medbiz as confronting them with a stark choice, i.e., do doctors want to: [a] keep Hippocritically extending “life” when it turns into 1-way misery, or [b] take a 20% pay-cut and thereby endanger doctors’ well-being, where yacht-deprivation is a critical risk-factor?

[Mention of the suicidally-inclined permits a seamless segue to organized baseball² . . .]

B Shorts

B1 *Gowdiamus*. David Halberstam reports that a condition for baseball player Joe DiMaggio’s appearance at any function is that he be introduced as: the greatest³ living ballplayer. This is presumably what triggered my favorite Gowdyism,⁴ when sportscaster Curt Gowdy blurted out that DiMaggio was: “the greatest living ballplayer of all time”.

¹[Note added 1995.] A cute ploy by Susan Smith’s lawyer has been to generate court sympathy by saying she’s so depressed that she’s tried to commit suicide. I.e., don’t kill her because: she wants to die. [See *DIO 6.1* ‡4 §A.]

²[Note added 1995.] Baseball and tennis are fading, evidently from insufficient violence to sate the booboisie. [*DIO 2.1* ‡1 §B3 asked readers to ponder the evolution of a network-TV ad that scoffed at men who complain about soap-opera-addicted wives while they themselves watch 5 hours of wrassling. If the ad (as originally written) scoffed at the situation of women who are widowed to *football* not wrassling, then it would probably be altered — for the simple reason that football has become so critical, to distinguishing network TV from smalltime TV, that it is beyond attack.] Thus, baseball & tennis are increasingly dependent upon celebs. (The celeb-factor makes baseball vulnerable to strikes. Audiences will watch *anyone* box or play football. Not baseball, which is dead without its big-draw stars.) The trend has reached the point where even stars in the audience are used. But this can backfire. While the Atlanta Braves were vainly fighting for their lives in the 7th game of the seemingly endless 1991 World Series, their owners-in-attendance (Tarzan & Jane Turner) were viewed by national TV audiences vainly fighting off sleep. So it shouldn’t have required the 1994 strike to dampen buyers’ enthusiasm for paying \$100,000,000 for ball clubs. But all-day-5-set-obsessed men’s tennis has ingeniously turned its draining interminability to its ad: during the 1995 US Tennis&Tonsils Open, CBS cameras kept sneaking up on players’ girlfriends at ringside (usually B.Shields) to broadcast them yawning or nodding off, evidently with the idea of thereby enlivening the proceedings with candid-camera surprise-entertainment — i.e., using the spectacle of sleep to keep the TV audience awake.

³[Note added 1995.] In a city known for drawling charm & sprawling slums, Baltimore baseball shortstop & longstreaker (2131+ straight games played), admirably-square Cal Ripken, is paid \$40,000/hit: more (*DIO 6.1* ‡4 fn 9) than former-record-holder Lou Gehrig was paid in an average year. (World Series lifetime slugging averages: Rip .167, Lou .731.) If Rip played a full career at this rate, the cost would exceed \$100,000,000, easily enough to attain major political office. Hmmm: the agent (R.Shapiro) who arranged Rip’s 5-year \$30,000,000 contract is also the fiscal power behind Baltimore’s mayor. What a clever way to grow money. If Rip’s conscience is twinged by Ripoffing a poverty-blighted city (world’s champ in teenage pregnancy rates if not other sports), at least he’s taking the right therapy: reading Ayn Rand, the very bright rightist author-philosopher who (late in her career) used to go about with a dollar-sign emblem in her lapel. Now, how do you like the sound of a hitherto unspoken prediction: Senator Ripken? (Let’s hope he doesn’t end up with the dullest record in the Senate. He’s already got it in baseball.)

⁴On the other hand, some Gowdy alterations of trite phrases were excellent. He was at his best in his 1976 rewrite of an overworked & divisive reference to gentleman Joe Louis, whom Gowdy re-dubbed: “a credit to the human race.”

(This was the worst DiMaggio joke since Joe D retired & wed a filmstar, an event which simultaneously retired the previous top compliment you could pay a pro: “the ballplayer’s ballplayer”.) [Note added 1995: Joe D has now survived him upon whom his mantle fell.]

B2 Why do not the US military academies get explicit media commendation for being the only group of US academic institutions that take cheating and other unethical behavior seriously enough to repeatedly & publicly expel offenders? For all its downsides, the military life has some credits we should not ignore: self-sacrifice and heroism are extolled (as also in most religious groups), which can — with alot of luck — act as a counterbalance when civil society becomes circularly (fn 17&25) degraded-corrupt beyond the likelihood of parliamentary self-redemption. (E.g., in 98 AD, Rome was finally saved from decades of intermittent bloody caesarian terror by an intelligent general, Trajan.)⁵

B3 The US squalid poverty-cycle goes on&on — supposedly in spite of US pols’ nostrums. Leftist quackcure: tax the provident to subsidize improvidents’ fertility. Rightist quackcure: abortion-hating moral education. But, for both: whatever progress is effected occurs only among the brightest members of the (hopefully ex-)poor. OK, *these* will cut reproduction. But the dumbest fraction of the poor *will go right on reproducing at a high rate*.⁶ (This was predicted by one of the Darwins a century ago, when the possibility of widespread effective birth control first appeared on the horizon.) Thus, any temporary progress against poverty will be numerically wiped out by sheer numbers in the next generation. (I.e., the media give out encouraging “progressive” data like, e.g., a 40 million majority of the US’ Roman Churchfolk ignore the pope’s ban on birth control, while merely 20 million RCfolk follow this sex-expert’s advice. The catch? The independent 40 million will have maybe 20 million kids, while the ditto-head⁷ 20 million will have roughly 40 million kids.⁸ This is “progressive”?)⁹ Is such an elementary point simply too mathematical for our pols & press to figure out? (They never mention it.) Are they innumerate? (The Church isn’t.) Or just phony? It has to be at least one of these two options. Quite possibly both. (Each party has a stake in poverty: GOP loves the cheap labor; Dems get the poor’s votes.) If there’s no electoral choice, then taxpayer-revolt is the only non-violent exit from the subsidized-poverty cycle.

B4 The three cleverest-logic murder-film plots of the 1950s were: *Witness for the Prosecution* (remake by M.D.Fuhrman?), *Strangers on a Train*, & *Dial M for Murder*. Contra the popular-stereotypical image of female logic: the ingenious schemes behind two of these 3 great films were (long before quotas) the creative productions of women. (Agatha Christie, *Witness*; Patricia Highsmith, *Strangers*.)

B5 The GOParty will never solve the problems it got elected (in 1994) to alleviate, for the simple reason that: shorn of diversionary complaints about Dem-demons (crime,

⁵The founder of the society that gave us ancient knowledge’s pinnacle (ancient Alexandria) was the general-scholar Ptolemy Soter. And those who damned Gen. Douglas MacArthur’s 1952 presidential candidacy may be enlightened by comparing the mental health of the modern Japanese state (which he designed) to that of US society. (*DIO 1.2* fn 45 praised the prose skills of Rommel and Grant-Badeau-Twain, but the dramatic-poetic style of MacArthur cannot be compared to theirs. MacArthur’s dying speech to West Point — fortunately surviving on film — is the most affecting in the history of the US military.)

⁶Since leftists&rightists preach that making poverty, race, & class frictions atrophy requires *education*, then: why do their policies guarantee that the maximum number of children will be born to parents with the least *education*?

⁷Why has the brave&independent US press reserved this term strictly for Rush L’s audience, when most mass-religious leaders’ literal-minded followers are even more robotic?

⁸*Catechism of the Catholic Church* Vat City 1994 §2373 (emph in orig): “Sacred Scripture and the Church’s traditional practice see in *large families* a sign of God’s blessing and the parents’ generosity.” No acknowledgement (by the ungenerous male writers of this sentence) that high fertility enhances the Church’s political power (& the poverty it’s usually built upon). That’s just an unforeseen, entirely accidental byproduct. (Vat City is as chockablock with naifs & with wealth.) Question: how can there be peaceful multi-culturalism where 2 or 3 cults are competing to outmultiply everybody else? [Note added 2000: See *DIO 8.2* ‡5 §O2.]

⁹So any perceived gains against poverty are systematically swamped, generation after generation, while priests & other pols decree that interfering in the poor’s reproductive “rights” is immoral — though interfering-tax-forcing the endangered middle class to subsidize these human waves is not (fn 19).

drugs, welfare, & race-preference schemes), the *real* GOP platform would instantly be revealed nakedly for all it actually is, namely, a money-is-the-root-of-all-good program to make the super-rich even richer. (Not a crusade which, unadorned with anti-welfare-loafer whipped-cream, is likely to attract more than 1% of the vote.) So, for the GOP to ensure that welfare-related diversions will continue indefinitely, two prerequisites must be met: [a] abortion, RU 486, & Norplant (& thus women's freedom) must be suppressed, & [b] enough whipping-boy-Dems have to be kept in office to make it seem credible that the right-thinking GOP is (contra fn 21) doing its darnedest to wipe out social degeneracy, but those sneaky Liberal incubi somehow¹⁰ keep foiling them. (Does the GOP *really* want Clinton out of the White House?) It's theatre-mythology that will persist indefinitely until retired by electoral intelligence or (less unlikely) a violent coup.

B6 If Jesse Helms, the Republican Senator from Tobacco, is so much more upset at sex (e.g., the late R.Mapplethorpe)¹¹ than at his lovable weed's continuing enslavement of kids and torture-massacre of millions of adults annually worldwide, then: why is Helms not horrified at the vital support which tobacco-ad funds regularly provide the glossy skin-mags? (Losing this support — perhaps 1/3 of the latter's ad-billings — would be crippling.) Mapplethorpe doesn't sully even a hundredth the number of innocent youngsters they do. (Which is exactly why the youth-targetting tobacco industry supports the glossies & not the artist.) So, we're waiting for the kickoff of Jesse's no-doubt imminent decency-crusade for an industry-wide tobacco-ad boycott of porn. . . .

B7 *TV 'snews-Balance Unbalance*. In the US, when it's a matter of press-coverage or legal adjudication of cases such as those of TonyaH, MTyson, or OSimpson (where, *coincidentally*, millions in profits are to be made), we're told that *every* side — even the scummiest — merits a fair hearing and a tediously complete defense. (Which gives an open, just image to The System.) Question: why isn't this same fine, noble principle¹² applied to: [a] politically-incorrect heresies (persons & ideas), [b] modest-sized dissenting political parties, and [c] those who question the US' religiosity?

B8 At the 1994/5/6-8 Dibner conference at M.I.T., I mentioned to Muffia capo Noel Sverdlow my delight at his entirely original solution of some Hipparchan numbers. (See *DIO 1.3* fn 277 & fn 280.) He replied with admirable modesty that it was a "lucky" hit. (See similar self-deprecation by Aubrey Diller at *DIO 4.2 Competence Held Hostage #2* p.55. See also *DIO 1.2* §D2 & fn 49.) But the comment reveals the very opposite of NS' genial implication, and we may formulate a general principle regarding the process:

The cleverer a discovery is, the more the discoverer feels it was lucky.

¹⁰ This, even though the Libs are always hugely outspent by the GOP. Our rulers' desire for cover-maintenance of Plunkittesque (fn 17) electoral pseudo-choices is the only barrier that prevents Toles' recent *Buffalo News* cartoon (reprinted: *Wash Post* Weekly Ed 1995/9/18) from coming true. (Out in public, that is. In private, it's already effectively true; though not literally, since neither party's pols are running anything. Except errands. For forces even wealthier than themselves.) The cartoon envisions a near-future here's-the-latest-from-business announcement on TV 'snews: "[We have a new merger to report. It] makes good business sense, encouraging a creative synergy. We can keep our core areas of traditional revenue, but add potential for a new customer base. While in the past we have had periods of intense competition, in today's climate we have to look at our common bottom line: money. That's why this Republican buyout of the Democratic Party is such a terrific deal for both the players and the American public . . . (Voter layoff notices will be mailed out shortly.)"

¹¹ [Note added 1995.] Helms (on whose fractional wit, see 1995 Summer *Covert Action Quarterly* #53 p.4) has a point regarding Mapplethorpe: if The US Art World wants publicly to hang photos of homosexual s-m, it shouldn't expect het tax support. This is part of the wider question of whether such public support is appropriate for a private fraternity, advancement up which appears to depend on factors often not discernable in the artistic production — and where the suspicion thus lingers that mercantile & carnal talents have filled the void. (Lucky there's none of that in het showbiz. . . .)

¹² [Note added 1995.] Similarly, creationists affect love of free speech when trying to push creationism into bio classes, and the Roman Church (forgetting for-now alot of sacred history: ¶ 15 fn 33) loves freedom of religion (pope, Baltimore, 1995/10/8). So, will both cults be inviting representatives of dissenting organizations (including atheists) for open debate in classrooms?

C Germs

- C1** The press loves the gun-control¹³ quick-fix. Except for the military.¹⁴
- C2** Eternal frustration inevitably pushes US justice-seeking movements to paranoia.
- C3** Death Row's leading cause of death is: old age.
- C4** If abortion is damned as "killing-the-unborn",¹⁵ then: why isn't celibacy?¹⁶
- C5** Primitive pleasures are fleeting; optimistic intellectual curiosity isn't.
- C6** I am therefore I think.

D Questions & Answers

- D1** Galahad question: Why do lawyers seem to be supermen when they are preventing moron-sterilizations (§B3) and delaying murderer-executions, but virtually offers when suing tobacco companies? Answer: Even sharks have their 30 yr-losing-streaks? (Or: *DIO 4.2* ¶9 §R6?)
- D2** TV 'snews' straightfaced sole-permissible-options-(&-be-sure-to-vote) question: Which¹⁷ will alleviate the US poverty&crime-cycle, [a] Libs' AFDC, or [b] Conservatives' prisons&mass-religion (physical&mental jails)? Obvious answer: Neither. (Try §D4.)
- D3** Doleful question: What do you get when you cross a weathervane with a puppet? Answer: a Leader. Case in point: the Senate Majority Leader.
- D4** Upfront question: What's the only prison that can stop crime? Answer: A condom.
- D5** The D-Bomb: *Wouldn't You Know It: [d]-Ultimate Weapon Is Made-in-[d]-USA* Today's multiple-choice question: Which of the following has destroyed more US cities? [a] Stuka dive bombers? [b] AIDS? [c] Nukes? [d] The Democratic Party? As US teenerdom (or any other echochamber) would put it: "totally-awesome".

¹³ Irony: the establishment view is the inverse of the truth. I.e., no sane US city-dweller today seriously expects to be protected (by police or courts) from a street attacker. By contrast, we do (*DIO 4.2* ¶9 §K1) need international elitist control of atomic weapons. Anyone who believes he *really* wants egalitarianism in this connection should ask himself: does fairness mean that every one of the planet's more than 5 billion persons [in series? in parallel? — either option pure-fantasy] should have equal access to placing his finger upon the discharge-button of a doomsday-magnitude nuclear bomb? (The only idea crazier than this is: faith that nuclear weapons won't be built somewhere.)

¹⁴ Same for the establishment's amusing claim (*DIO 4.2* ¶9 §A2) that the death penalty hardens society . . . but: it's OK (without 10 years of legal appeals) to attack — invariably with US media initial cooperation — bigbad nations like Grenada, Libya, Panama. (What large church is protesting this contrast? Those heroic Roman Church persons such as the Berrigans, who opposed the US war machine, have declined in public perception, as the hierarchy has delighted GOP morality by focussing its potentially useful idealistic energies on abortion instead of war-prevention — i.e., on preserving microscopic zygotes rather than thinking, feeling persons. See fn 16 & *DIO 4.2* ¶9 §A1.)

¹⁵ If promoting abortion is such a brutalizing, murder-engendering way of life, then: [a] Why have all the shootings (so far) in the current US controversy been by the "pro-life" side? [b] Why are the nations where abortion is most taken for granted (the protestant nations of N.Europe) the very ones with the lowest rates of wifebeating and murder? [c] Why (and *how*) have questions [a]&[b] been virtually banned from public US discussion — here, in the Land of the Free Press and the Home of the Brave Pols?

¹⁶ See *DIO 1.1* ¶2 §H & *DIO 4.2* ¶9 §D6. When pro-lifers ask what-if my mother had aborted me, I respond: same as if she'd become a nun — either way, I wouldn't be here.

¹⁷ While TV 'snews continues an endless debate between these two guaranteed-disaster options — a "choice" which must surely tickle Plunkitt's shade (*DIO 2.3* ¶6 fn 23) — it (religiously) avoids reminding the public of either's actual record. We're still waiting for a single instance of TV 'snews asking US pols to cite historical examples of nations which have shrunk poverty either [a] by dangling AFDC-money in front of jobless 13yr-old highschool-dropout girlpersons, or [b] by religion. The US public is especially uninformed on the latter point because the US press has kept a child-proof lid (§E4) upon the fact that the least religious of the world's nations (those of N.Europe) are those with the smallest poverty classes. [The prime danger of thought-control religion is not just its power-elitism, but its self-perpetuating cyclicality: faith-damaged moms visit the same damage upon their kids' minds, etc, *ad infinitum*. (If churches think it's wrong to kill a brainless fetus by abortion, then why is it not wrong to kill an eager, loving, curious child's brain by one-sided and-or fear-drilling cult-rote-education?) Democratic remedies become impotent & irrelevant where rational minds are numerically swamped by waves of obediently-prolific programmed-minds. (How many nations have overthrown such cyclical control by democratic means — i.e., without violence?)]

E Gutting the Best Hope for Cutting the Poverty-Cycle

Margaret Sanger promoted birth control primarily in order to help the poor out of poverty. (No other social-improvement program can long succeed if population control fails.)¹⁸ However, modern political and religious leaders have outfoxed her (with ever-loyal media assistance) by:

E1 Doling out welfare-pittances to subsidize poverty, barely enough to keep ever-abundant that immortal potential-scab cheap-labor-pool which US employers encourage, in order to beat down laborers' wage-demands. (Coincidence: the US' interest in spending gov't funds on welfare only began shortly after birth control's use became legal & effective.)

E2 Keeping RU 486 (mifepristone, aka "The Death Pill") from US women for a decade — regardless of whether the President is (purportedly) feminist or no. (How much longer is it going to take before women get suspicious of the depth of Clinton's commitment to this issue?) Note the provocative circumstance that RU 486 has been systematically kept from the citizenry of only one top nation, the US — which also just-so-happens to be the nation most unremittingly targeted by the foetus-hugger anti-abortion lobby.¹⁹

E3 Virtually banning from govprop and from TV 'snews (excuse our redundancy) discussing birth control and-or abortion in any context but that of *individual rights* — **not as part of a social-repair strategy**. (See *DIO 2.3 ¶7 §A6* & *DIO 4.2 ¶9 fn 44*. According to Willyspeak and Newtspeak,²⁰ the only permissible policies for dealing²¹ with the US'

¹⁸ §B3. *DIO* particularly stresses *societal*, not just individual, birth control for this reason — and because arguing its need (& the social consequences of ignoring it) is now almost as banned from popular US media as it has been under explicitly theocratic dictatorships.

¹⁹ This has reached the point where (§E3) young men can now be held legally hostage for *eighteen years* at the whim of a deceitful sex-partner who wishes, e.g., to prey with holey condoms — whether she is seeking to bind the man (out of love) or to drop out of school into motherhood-as-a-paying-job (out of stupidity). If the father-to-be doesn't want the child, why can't the gov't tell the mother-to-be that it's up to her to either: Support or Abort. A society that did not want more low-prospect children would entertain that approach. Instead, such an obvious & central idea *isn't even mentionable* (fn 25) in the US' self-congratulatory Free Press. (And poverty continues to expand, as "leaders" [§D3] shake their heads in mock perplexity.) I note that one of the prime secular promoters of this almost priest-like letter-of-the-natural-law lack of perspective, ACLU (which never objects to US media thought-control in this connection) regards promotion of such an option as an application of unwarranted force upon the woman. By contrast (*DIO 4.2 ¶9 §R4*), ACLU does *NOT* see *point-of-IRS-gun-forced-taxation* (to underwrite the growth of massive semi-literacy & poverty, which ACLU has been so instrumental in inflicting on the US) as applying unwarranted force upon the invaluable provident-securely-solvent middle class — the monotonic shrinking of which does not alarm pseudo-clueless ACLU in the least, *even though this is THE major longterm US threat to civil-liberties (ACLU's own middle-name)*: fn 25. ACLU's no-bad-means-to-good-ends fetish is equally priestlike, as is the ability to set that smokescreen aside the instant one's nation goes to war, & forthwith to acquiesce in the killing of foreigners, even by the formerly-scorned middle-classes one then depends heavily upon to manage such dirty work.

²⁰ At least Newt's orphanage-proposal faces (& hopes to sever) the self-perpetuating & cyclical nature of welfare-subsidized poverty. But it still falls short of asking why we must tax (into [relatively] low-fertility) providently-loving middle-class parents, in order to support the issue of improvident parents. I.e., the welfare-moms-vs-orphanages "debate" is (since neither option can stem the US' ongoing massive tide of careless parents' unplanned children) as phony as the parallel Dems-vs-GOP "debate". Just as the US needs a [genuine: *DIO 2.3 ¶6 fn 23*] 3rd party, so it also needs a get-serious 3rd option on poverty — simply placing the discouragement of unloved-child-creation ahead of guaranteeing every foetus' birth: fn 17, 19, & 25.

²¹ [Note added 1995.] According to 1995/9/13 SeeBS-News, it was a "historic" occasion: the Senate changed everything about welfare. (E.g., time-limits.) Everything except, of course, *the* one unkillable item which, if not changed, will mean that nothing has changed: bastard-subsidization, the radical-revolutionary opponents of which were called "conservatives", while "moderate" was the label for the same-old it's-not-the-babies'-fault-so-gotta-fund-our-kids bastardy-lobby. (Starring the senator whose wisdom has been improving New York for decades now: *DIO 1.1 ¶2 fn 7*.) I.e., a national TV 'snews network characterizes those pushing continued tax-subsidization for the poverty-breeder-mom profession as: "moderates". Note the ironically perverse upshot of the GOP's improbable marriage-of-convenience between welfare-loafer-haters & foetus-huggers: if welfare for the jobless is now shrunk, then *even more* tragically poor folk (than previously) will, in short-term-thinking desperation, feel limited-option-cornered into having kids just to get AFDC-pittance-cheques, hoping to fend off the wolf-at-the-door; and thus, the slum-cornucopia of pre-doomed poverty-infants (with parents just that forward-looking) may get even worse. This is "historically-moderate"? (Well, the pol responsible for the final bill *is* named: Dole.)

bastardy-tidalwave are more-of-ineffectual-same: Dem postnatal [i] AFDC,²² [ii] rehab,²³ and [iii] deadbeardad-harassment;²⁴ and-or GOP prenatal [i] punitive-example²⁵ AFDC shrinkage & [ii] insanely quixotic just-say-no-to-sex attempts to stifle poverty-area youngsters' natural erotic drive.

E4 *The Making-Murderously-Inclined-Women-Into-Moms Movement [MMIWIMM]*. How can TV 'snews take seriously a GOParty that claims to be anti-welfare even while it fights abortion? — a crusade that effectively forces unwanted children upon unwilling parents (for-their-own-good and-or as punishment for carnality), and then affects perplexity at slums' immortality. In this connection, we note that, by their own abortion-is-murder logic, interceder-pro-lifers are insisting that pregnant *potential murderers* MUST become mothers, whether they like it or not — a highly efficient prescription for creating child abuse & poverty, which is customarily what one finds on a massive scale, worldwide, in areas dominated by such pious MMIWIMM mentalities. (See fn 15&17.)

E5 *Rendering Underachievers More Well-Rounded*. Will the US' virginity-as-the-cure-for-poverty-growth²⁶ copulation-control crusade culminate in a GOP-rewrite of the civil-rights hymn? All right-thinking-Americans ardently await the international-satellite-telvised spectacle-finale: an entire football stadium (loaned by the mob-affiliated NFL), jammed with flagwaving, certified-pure teens, throat-selling the monkish remedy envisioned — as THE prime solution to the poverty cycle — by those upstandingly-religious conservative-thinktanks currently inspiring Congress. And now, ladies & gentlemen, let us bow our unworthy heads, still our too-worldly mouths, & listen, as Nancy Reagan leads the ten-thousand-throng Chorus of Undefined Orifices, singing their platinum hit:

We Shall Undercome

²² Question that effectively wonders just who *really* designs US inner-city disaster programs: Why is it that the very leftists, who swiftly realized that pouring money into late 1940s China wasn't helping the Chinese, have — even after 40 yrs — still not figured out that pouring money into inner cities (*DIO 2.1 ¶1 fn 5&9*) is equally counterproductive? In both cases, so much of the money has systematically ended up in corrupt gangsters' & druglords' hands, that they live in splendor while the poor remain poor. Final question of our little quiz: who do you suppose has paid off Congressmen to continue such policies, [a] the allegedly-intended-beneficiary poor, or [b] the corrupt warlords?

²³ [Note added 1995.] As a USA Network 1995/8/30 spot (attacking racism as an adult sickness) self-consciously says: "It's much easier to build a child than to repair an adult." (Just as Christian cultists will often get selectively agnostic when asked about god's post-life intentions for less-fortunate but morally-blameless folks who lived&died without knowledge of Jesus, so bleeding hearts will selectively face rehab's limitations — when confronted with the prospect of rehabbing anti-rehabbers. [See *DIO 2.1 ¶1 §H*].)

²⁴ Question: how many of these purported "deadbeats" ever wanted the child in the first place? (See fn 19.) I.e., how many are actually victims of the bastardy lobby? — of those who wish to encourage accidental pregnancy because the gov't is too cheapskate to arrange longterm rational encouragement for parenthood, and so depends upon the improvident to produce plenty of new kids regardless. (The effect of this upon the nation's mean cultural level is too obvious to require detailed comment.)

²⁵ True, the punitive approach may dampen *rational* folks' fertility. But how does it deal with the very, very, very occasional citizen who may be a trifle less than rational and forward-looking? What is the objection to (fn 19) the imposition of limits, upon numbers of children born to those members of the population that (even if they bothered to marry) aren't anticipating how many kids they can afford? (Society nonguiltily sets limits upon these same citizens' amounts of less important creations than children, e.g., food, housing, & automobiles.) A societal blind-eye (actually dereliction), at this critical stitch-in-time juncture, is a prescription for either brutal mass-starvation or (more likely) an even higher shrinkage-rate for the intelligent fraction of the population than already holds. The disastrous effects (of this trend) upon the rationality & sanity of US politics are already oppressively ubiquitous — and indeed are now probably irreversible by purely democratic or laissez-faire means. This is, of course, one of those instances where it's not merely a matter of starting a trend but of reversing one, since at present it is impermissible in establishment public forums to propose (fn 19) that any poor mom, no matter *how* degraded her situation, should consider (or have considered) having an abortion. What is the *societal* use of having the technical right to an abortion, if it is off-limits publicly even to suggest, to those most in need of abortion-access, that they take advantage of that right?

²⁶ This approach is fine for the provident middle & upper classes. (Whose members are so endearingly prone, to project their own refined but rather innocently-insulated values onto the poor, that they don't understand why such crusades never make any headway against poverty.) Teen virginity is a commendable guard against (not only pregnancy but) disease — and against diverting&fritting-away kids' energies at a time when they should be concentrating more upon studies than upon premature hedonism (§C5). But, as a remedy for slums' poverty, such a programme accomplishes nothing beyond playwrights' ultimate nightmare: the tragic farce (§B3 & fn 25).

F Trillions vs. Peanuts

The US military officially spends about 1/4 *trillion* of our tax-dollars per annum. (And its favorite GOP pols unflinchingly wish to increase this paltry sum, so that the poor Pentagon can do more than — as now — just barely scrape by.) Why this monster outlay? Facts:

F1 Nobody is invading the US. Except Mexico.

F2 Foreign spies (e.g., Russian, Israeli) can buy a billion-dollar US weapon's plans for ordmag 1% of 1% of the funds we were taxed to pay for it. (I.e., c.\$100,000.)

F3 And the US pols who rule the weapons' use can themselves be bought-controlled by foreign bribes, for similarly trivial outlays. (Ever wonder why Japan: [a] doesn't bother with massive military junk, & [b] is more prosperous than those nations who do?)

G Who Says Our Taxes Are Wasted? Three Trilling Adventures

It should comfort all of us to learn that three difficult US problems can be solved by annually spending, on each, merely about a trill apiece: \$1,000,000,000,000.

G1 We know [DIO 6.1 ‡4 §C7] that a defense-lawyerclan-subsidy trill can ensure that no one will ever go to jail again — so long as he's good-looking. And, as part of the US' medical trill (§G3), we can guarantee all citizens the plastic-surgery they need to get handsome enough to survive any jury's fussiness in such a critical department. (How to pay for the needed surgery? Simple, since we're not going to need prisons ever again, we can cancel all the current cruelly-anticrime era's outstanding orders for prisons and instead devote the funds to the doctors-of-beautification.)

G2 And, of course, we ought to throw another trill/year at the Pentagon (§F). Look at it this way, wouldn't you spend *anything* to ensure that Clinton not only rules us but the whole world?

G3 Finally: most medical plans the gov't is now mulling over will cost several thousands of dollars per year per insuree. Multiplying by the number of US citizens, we find that proper medical care will cost²⁷ the US ordmag a trill a year. Now, finally, we can close in on the true unspoken goal (of expending ever-more-astronomical portions of gov't treasure upon medical care): no one will ever again die. Instead, at roughly age 100, we'll just transform permanently (§A4) into immortal senility — wedded forevermore to artificial hearts & whatever.

G4 A striking addendum to §G3: the US is the most totally & aggressively religious of all technologically advanced nations. The great majority of its citizens will swear to any pollster that they do verily believe in the standard Christian bye&bye-skypie:²⁸ eternal life. The deal being that, as soon as they die (if suitably confessed&blessed by an establishment-religion priest), they join Jesus in heaven and become angels who live in eternal bliss forever after. Despite the purported attractiveness & much-vaunted ethereal beauty of said vision, the US citizenry appears prepared to spend a trillion dollars/year to pay our doctors to forever bar us from entering this heavenly goal of our lives. Instead, we will linger on, for eternity, upon our soiled Earth. As ever-undead vegetables. Well, if the US is going to go bankrupt, at least it'll be for an upbeat vision of the future.

G5 We can put this more succinctly and thereby face starkly what happens to logic when there is a conceptual conflict between two potent lobbies (in this case, medbiz & godbiz): the US is outspending all nations, in order to stay out of the Holy-Heaven paradise which it, above all nations, allegedly longs for.

²⁷The medical establishment frequently gets roasted in these pages. However, [a] DR is not a proponent of kook "alternate" medicinal treatments. [b] He is well aware of the benefits of US medical research, which is the best anywhere in history. (In addition, only a very flush lobby can take on the tobacco industry — so even the fat in medbiz has at least one key side-benefit. Note a bit of ironic justice: the more people tobacco slowly tortures to death, the richer its medical-lobby enemy gets.)

²⁸D.Hammett *Maltese Falcon* NYC 1929 Chap.19: "Spade laughed [at fasttalking Gutman's glittering promises]. 'I know you'll give me millions later . . . but let's stick to this now. Fifteen thousand?'"

‡14 Recovering Hipparchos' Last Lost Lustrous Star

In DIO 4.1 ‡3 fn 20, DR suggested that the Ancient Star Catalog's star PK964 (listed magnitude $m = 3$) was either δ Cen (pre-extinction magnitude $m_o = 2.60$) or μ Vel ($m_o = 2.69$). I there reasoned that PK964 was probably the former, because that hypothesis required but one error by the cataloger.

I now realize that, while connecting PK964 to μ Vel indeed requires presuming 2 errors, these errors are not independent — to the contrary, they're the very same error: an easy confusion of step-number with step-interval.¹ (Similar modern confusion-opportunity: an apartment's 5th floor is usually only 4 floors above ground.) The sole difference in the 2 mistakes is the reference frame: equatorial in one case, ecliptical in the other. As previously noted (*idem*), δ Cen is already accounted for by star PK960, whereas μ Vel is *the only star brighter than 3rd magnitude certainly missing² from the Catalog*. Details follow.

Zenith distance Z was pretty accurately recorded as 75° , giving (for Cape Prassonesi's presumed $35^\circ 5/6$ latitude) declination $\delta = -39^\circ 1/6$. The rt.asc α was observed³ as $9^h 7/12$ — and thus recorded as: 10^{th} step plus $8^\circ 3/4$. This was erroneously converted to pure degrees by addition: $\alpha = 10.15^\circ + 8^\circ 3/4 = 158^\circ 3/4$. Transformation to ecliptic coords (using Hipparchan obliqu $\epsilon = 23^\circ 11/12$) would rigorously produce longitude $\lambda = 179^\circ 56'$ & latitude $\beta = -43^\circ 44'$. Anciently, this was: $\lambda = 13^{\text{th}}$ step plus 0° & latitude $\beta = -43^\circ 3/4$. Conversion of λ 's steps into degrees involved the same mistake (as for α), so $\lambda = 13.15^\circ = 195^\circ$. And Hipparchos' position for PK964 is in fact: $\lambda = 195^\circ$ & $\beta = -43^\circ 3/4$.

This reconstruction provides a neat resolution of the last major identity-anomaly in Hipparchos' great Catalog.

[Note added 1995.] Incidentally, it now goes without saying that the Ancient Star Catalog is Hipparchos'. (As proved in 1977 by R.Newton *Crime of Claudius Ptolemy* & DR in *Skinq 2.1:62 p.73 n.6*.) The curious 1989 paper⁴ of Fomenko *et al*, which dates the Catalog to the Arabic period, is inexplicably cited (as a solid contribution) in the otherwise high-quality paper, van Dalen 1994 (n.1). The Fomenko *et al* paper's incredible date is based upon several lapses of procedure, most notably the authors' mistaken use (when going from their Table 1 to Table 3) of the Catalog's 900 AD obliquity-error ($21'$: cited at their p.225) as a constant in time. (Since the 900 AD obliquity was $23^\circ 35'$, this error corresponds to the zodiac-cataloger's astrolabe-obliquity-setting = $23^\circ 56'$ — a result already derived by DR & published in 1982 at eq.27 of *PASP 94:359*.) Given the multiplicity of indicia (DIO 2.3 ‡8 §C22) showing that the Catalog is Hipparchos', it is now way past time that the Catalog controversy be regarded as concluded. To yet continue stubbornly flying in the face of these evidences is to carry unfalsifiability to kook dimensions — and to raise the question of whether it is worth discussing historical issues at all. (Of course, one may easily understand why certain parties might wish to render reason and competence irrelevant to the evolution of ideas in this field.) For, if even the most logically & eventually one-sided controversies are to be decreed⁵ as indefinitely irresolvable, then — why investigate anything?

¹In ancient spherical astronomy, a "step" equalled 15° . See *idem*.

²Excluding stars whose light was either much dimmed by atmospheric extinction or totally blocked by the horizon.

³This is about 15^{m} high. There are other Catalog errors this large, especially in the south (e.g., the latter stars of Cen). But it must be noted that the δ Cen hypothesis requires presuming less α observational error (6^{m} high). In gt-circ measure, both errors are ordmag 1° .

⁴A.Fomenko, V.Kalashnikov, & G.Nosovsky *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae 17:203* (1989). (The paper fallaciously damns the sane 1987 study by Yu.Efremov & E.Pavlovskaja, and ignores an independent finding [Rawlins 1982] of the Cataloger's epoch. [And site. Higher precision at DIO 4.1 ‡3.] I understand that this citation was proposed not by van Dalen but by a Muffia-circle advisor.

⁵E.g., by N.Swerdlow. (See DIO 2.3 ‡8 §C20&C25.)

‡15 Naked Came the Arrogance

Shunfight at the 0G Corral:¹ Portrait of an Archon The Reality Behind Academe's Free-Discourse Pose The Muffia at the Dawn of the Ptolemy Controversy

A The PRIM0 Principle

A1 At Harvard and Boston University, while earning degrees in physics, I sought the grail of truth by (primarily under the guidance of Robert Cohen) additionally partaking of the scientific-philosophical wisdom of, among others: A.Whitehead, H.Weyl, S.Stebbing, E.Schrödinger, B.Russell, H.Reichenbach, K.Popper, H.Poincaré, E.Nagel, E.Mach, I.Kant, M.Jammer, G.Galilei, M.Faraday, D.Hume, N.Hansen, A.Einstein, R.Descartes, M.Cohen, M.Born, N.Bohr, D.Bohm, G.Berkeley, A.Ayer.

A2 My inductive ability bears a debt to their wisdom which I cannot adequately measure, let alone express. But, remarkably, not *one* of these eminent thinkers' publications ever mentioned the PRIM0 truth-determination principle — a principle that over-rides *ALL* the refined-scholarship rules and guides which naïvely earnest university students (such as DR) have foolishly spent years of labor (and thousands of dollars) to learn.

A3 This precious principle is marvellously simple & clear — and it positively resolves any controversy. Instantly. No matter how complex the facts may be or seem to be. The PRIM0-principle is simply this: the side that's telling the truth is the one with the most money. (Note that the PRIM0-principle is indistinguishable from the way TV 'snews decides truth for us: whoever's selling Truth best is telling it best.)

A4 History-of-science's Princeton Institute-Muffia-O.Gingerich [PRIM0] combine² has been teaching this principle to DR for two decades. (A kindness which is due to the combine's recognition that, in a soft field [*DIO* 4.2 ¶9 fn 46] like History-of-science, the PRIM0-principle is the only principle.) But, unfortunately for this distinguished cult, it is dealing with an invincibly-unteachable pupil: a political moron.

A5 And Muffiosi have their own learning difficulties. Even aside from inability to recognize compelling discoveries by those who dissent from Muffiathought, they also have yet to perceive the unattractiveness of gang-bully cohesiveness. There is an admirable Biblical saying (Exodus 23.2), long a favorite of Bertrand Russell's family (& of DR):

Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.

B Ringo Newton, There Ain't Room Enough on This Here Planet for the Two of Us

Few followers of the Ptolemy Controversy have the faintest idea just how long ago the Muffia began hating and slandering the work of the highly capable and respected physicist

¹ You know you're getting on in years if these are your first identifications: [a] Ringo was an OK Corral-gunfight baddie, [b] Madonna refers to Jesus' stage-mom, [c] the biggest Aug.16 celebrity-death was Babe Ruth's, [d] Sitzkrieg was the 1939-1940 "phony war". (You don't know what started *Animal House*'s food-fight?)

² Readers not familiar with the Muffia are referred to §§F1-F2.

Robert Newton (RN), Supervisor of the Space Sciences Division of the Johns Hopkins University's Applied Physics Laboratory (Laurel, MD). Fortunately for historians of this affair, RN imparted to DR a copy of his written record of his very first contact with Hist.sci's anti-heresy inquisition. (The inquisitor: O.Gingerich, later head of Harvard's Hist.sci Dep't.) It is entitled: "Notes on a Telephone Conversation with Owen Gingerich". The (largely typed, partly script) document's text follows, starting with RN's handwritten marginal note:

Written on either Dec.3 or Dec.4, 1968. That is, either on the day of the call or the next day. This note was added Feb.21, 1969.

B1 Gingerich tried to call me on Monday, Dec.2, 1968, the same day that I received the peculiar letter from *Nature* rejecting my paper about the eclipses of Caesar and Stiklestad. We did not actually make contact until Tuesday, Dec.3. The conversation lasted about half an hour. I certainly cannot reconstruct the conversation precisely, however I am rather sure that the notes which follow represent the spirit of it faithfully.

B2 He started by finding out whether I was interested in extending my work on ancient astronomical observations beyond the paper that is now in progress, and it was established that I was, although I did not intend to extend the present paper itself, except for the completion of Part II.

B3 He then stated that the subject was very complicated and no business for an amateur. [Note by DR: on OG's expertise, see §C12.] From this point, I shall not attempt to follow the conversation chronologically, but only to summarize the main points.

B4 My amateur status was shown³ by my ignorance of the literature. One cited instance of my ignorance was the work on the Babylonian "astronomical diary" by Neugebauer, which is not even finished yet, much less published. According to Gingerich, this contains a large number of observations, particularly of lunar occultations. The other cited instance was a doctoral dissertation on Ptolemy's data done at Yale about two years ago. This dissertation has not been published and, according to Gingerich, almost surely never will be [vs. fn 4], because the author [J.Britton] has gone into stock-brokering or some such non-scientific field. Gingerich did not know the author's name.

B5 Any attempt on my part to publish anything about Ptolemy will be fiercely resented by the Department of the History of Science at Yale, because of the existence of this unpublished (any chance it is unpublishable?)⁴ dissertation. Yale and Brown (Neugebauer) cooperate closely, and my attempts to publish would certainly mean that I will be denied any access to the Babylonian work.

B6 [Note by DR. As at *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 20, we pause to appreciate OG, who — despite his remarks, quoted there & here, showing his complete awareness of the Muffia cult's suppressiveness — called DR "exceedingly paranoid" for "suggesting that a cabal has been suppressing the consideration of [R.]Newton's work" on Ptolemy. Despite *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 20's 1991 publication of OG's false attack, OG has not withdrawn it.

³[Note by DR.] Muffiadum's history is a study in the need (whether careerist or psychological) to use an Enemy's supposed slips to portray him as someone whose output should be burned at the stake and forgotten forevermore. *DIO* has chronicled repeated seeee-he-is-so-worthless assaults against RN (most of which crashed). These stabs hugely tickled Muffiosi's sadistic sides. Until the approach got turned around on them. (See, e.g., "Muffia Muff-Catalog: the Incompetence-Chargers' Competence", at *DIO* 4.1 ¶4 §A.) An earlier *Little Caesar* wondered at those who can dish it out but can't take it. (Translation: you can't have Saddy without Massy.)

⁴ [Note by DR.] See *DIO* 1.2 fn 170.

B7 (The force of this threat was largely negated later in the conversation. It appears, still according to Gingerich, that Neugebauer is feeding the Babylonian occultation data to a graduate student at Yale as fast as he establishes it. Thus I would not have any access to the data before the astronomical analysis of it is published in any case. Once it is published, I cannot be denied access, whatever access may be worth at that point. I refrained from pointing out to Gingerich that this information negated his threat.)

B8 In sum of this part of the conversation, the Gingerich-Yale-Brown axis intends to exercise control over my publishing in the field of ancient astronomical observations. It was not clear to me whether I was being forbidden to publish only about Ptolemy or whether I was being forbidden to publish at all.

B9 The conversation closed with reference to my claim that there are errors in the [D.Menzel-O.Gingerich] Preface to the [1962] Dover edition of Oppolzer's *Canon*. In my opinion, he continued to show the same lack of comprehension [§C12] of the subject matter in conversation that he did in the Preface. He tried to maintain that Fotheringham's big paper (1920) on solar eclipses is full of references to the *Canon*, and that he knew this because he had just finished rereading the paper. A look through Fotheringham's paper shows that Gingerich's claim is false.⁵ He tried to maintain that the whole line of work of Fotheringham and others on finding the secular accelerations was inspired and made possible by the *Canon*. He seemed to be ignorant of the work in the field before the *Canon* was published, such as Newcomb's 1875 paper, and he also did not know that Martin at Yale is re-analysing the occultation data used by Newcomb. He felt that the error about the saros has been made so often that it has become correct, and that it is beyond all question that he was correct in his usage of the word. [Note by DR: I side with OG on this one.]

B10 (According to the biographical sketch in *American Men of Science* (does this list any women?), Gingerich has been a lecturer in the history of science at Harvard several different years. This accounts for his feeling that he is an expert on the subject.)

B11 The timing of Gingerich's phone call with respect to the [1968/11/25] letter from *Nature*, and the uncompromising nature of his call and of that letter, suggest an hypothesis: Gingerich, or a friend of his, blocked publication in *Nature* by writing a letter to them warning them that my papers on the subject are no good. He received notice of their action, and knew that I had received and been "softened up" by the rejection, and chose that time to call.

B12 I am trying to test whether Gingerich indeed speaks for the Yale department by a letter I have written asking for information about the dissertation.

B13 Since Gingerich is at SAO [Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory], I would expect that he can and will block publication in the *Smithsonian Contributions to Astrophysics*. Further, Duncombe will almost surely turn to this axis (such as Clemence at Yale) for review of the big paper [see §B16], so there is a good chance that it will be rejected by the Naval Observatory. I must probably find an alternate source of publication and try to manage for review by [Sir Harold] Jeffreys . . . or some other charitable soul.

B14 RN later added the following comments, entitled "Explanation of the Accompanying Notes on a Telephone Conversation with Owen Gingerich", dated 1980/11/17.

⁵[Note by DR.] The paper in question is found at *MonNotRAS* 81.2:104-126 (1920/12/10). While other Oppolzer work is cited, there are only a few references (at its pp.117-118) to Oppolzer's *Canon*.

I have just reread the accompanying notes of a telephone conversation I had with Owen Gingerich on December 3, 1968. As the handwritten note suggests, I did not date the notes originally, and when I did date them on February 21, 1969, I was unsure whether I wrote the original notes on December 3 or 4. In any case, they were written almost immediately after the conversation.

B15 The paper about the "eclipses of Caesar and Stiklestad" is a short paper I prepared with the intent that it be a letter to the editor of *Nature*. It was rejected twice by *Nature* and never published as such, although the information in it appears in *Ancient Astronomical Observations* [R.Newton 1970], pp.81-86 and pp.70-73.

B16 The paper mentioned [at §B2], and the "big paper" mentioned [at §B13], both refer to what [eventually] became *Ancient Astronomical Observations* [R.Newton 1970]. At one time I expected to publish it as a paper in the *Astronomical Papers Prepared for the Use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*, but that never worked out. I do not know whether that was for the reason hinted at or not; I never actually submitted the paper to the Naval Observatory, because I was discouraged from doing so although I was originally encouraged to. I prepared *Part I* of the book [R.Newton 1970] and distributed it in preprint form before I started *Part II*. I think this must be why the subject of Ptolemy came up, since I showed in *Part I* [R.Newton 1970 p.20 & Table II.2] that Ptolemy's solar observations were fabricated.

B17 [At §B11] I suggest an hypothesis which I tested by writing to Yale asking about Britton's dissertation. I did receive an answer identifying the dissertation and its author, and I subsequently got a copy from [University Microfilms]. I also did another test:

B18 The paper sent to *Nature* was originally rejected on the ground that it was so short that it was incomprehensible, and it needed to be lengthened before it could be considered. I revised it slightly, lengthening it by half a dozen lines in the process, and resubmitted it. Again it was rejected, this time because it was too long! At the same time, I got another call from Gingerich, with suspicious timing. He reminded me of the earlier call and wanted to assure me that he meant business. I consider that the hypothesis is established.

C God Save the Grand Inquisitor

C1 At *DIO* 1.2 §11, it was recounted that, on 1976/11/12, a few days after DR mailed *Science* the first précis⁶ of his least-squares analysis of the Ancient Star Catalog, a man phoned c.8PM for DR from Cambridge (Mass) and — finding DR not at home — grilled DR's wife for details regarding his person & plans. The caller did not leave his name. However, in light of the foregoing and the common factor of post-submission timing (see §§B1, B11, & B18): is anyone now incapable of inducing the caller's identity?

C2 Since there are those who wish to blame the unpleasantness of the Ptolemy Controversy upon DR, the reader should be reminded that the foregoing shunning-obscurity (§B) occurred several years before DR had even entered the Controversy. (See also the reception of DR's occasional attempts at amiability: *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 20 & ¶3 fn 7, *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fnn 20&31. [Note especially the 1st reference & here at §B6: the almost comical perversity of OG's knifing of DR.]

⁶Dated 1976/11/1, the document was the first to reveal DR's by-now-wellknown absent-error-waves test — which flunks both Ptolemy & the Muffia: see fn 34.

C3 Another pre-Controversy happenstance: around 1974-5, I became interested in the modern Media-hustled revival of astrology and other occultist garbage (ESP, UFOs, etc). CSICOP's Ray Hyman warned me that learning the particulars of astrology would be useless since believers were invulnerable to evidence. And Ray was right. But the excursion turned out to be a twofold godsend when I later got into the Ptolemy Controversy. [a] I had learned that astrologers need only three manuals: [i] astronomical tables, [ii] geographical⁷ tables, and [iii] an interpretational rulebook. When I later noticed that Ptolemy's prime works were just these three (*Almajest*, *Geographical Directory*, & *Tetrabiblos*), I gained an unobvious clue as to his goals & priorities. [b] It was helpful to have experienced, firsthand, just how remotely far-out cranks' evidence-immunity can go; so, fortunately, my later encounters with the Muffia were something less than a complete shock.

C4 But, for me, this history actually starts in 1965-6, when I first got to know the Johns Hopkins University Hist.sci Dep't and its history-of-physics professors Kargon & Spencer; the latter often repeated (even on the athletic field) his favorite saying:

We don't want the history of physics to be written by senile physicists.

The proprietary nature of this guiding principle afforded useful later insight (§G9) into the actual psychological mechanics underlying the purported reasons for Hist.sci resentment of the terrible bottom line of the Ptolemy Controversy: mere physicists, not Hist.sci specialists, discovering some of the prime secrets of ancient astronomy.

C5 [Always friendly in a personal way with the JHU Hist.sci crowd in those days, I later played alot of softball with Kargon on the Hist.sci team. In 1984, about the time I'd become a political untouchable in the eyes of the *JHA* Editor, Kargon suddenly concluded that my facile switch-hitting habits were "obnoxious". (His newfound partiality was especially weird since Kargon was the first Hist.sci person who had warned me of the peculiar bigotries of the Muffia, and had described Hoskin to me as just a power-operator who was trying to get his then-young journal off the ground.) Considering the sharpness of language Kargon had routinely used when discussing other scholars (e.g., Aaboe;⁸ and see *DIO* 2.3 ¶6 §F1), I was not especially surprised at the tone of his disapproval of DR. (Another possible factor in his alienation: I had around this time informed Kargon that the Ptolemy Controversy was becoming a lesson-rich war of two worlds — scientists vs. Hist.sci. From this time, a one-sided chill settled into our relations.)]

C6 The first detailed R.Newton papers proving Ptolemy's fakery were published (1973-1974) in the *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*. (All Fellows of London's Royal Astronomical Society receive its house journal, the *QJRAS*, as a perc of RAS fellowship. That is how I first heard of the Ptolemy Controversy.)

C7 Without reading the articles carefully at the time, I presumed that there must be something to the exposure. But about the only specific datum I initially absorbed from the material was the information that R.Newton worked nearby. (I lived in Baltimore, less than an hour's drive away.)

C8 On 1974/11/15, I met⁹ with the wellknown Harvard & Smithsonian astronomer & historian Owen Gingerich at Goddard right after he had delivered a talk there, and since JHU-APL is very near Goddard, I asked OG (as we chatted in the right half of the audience area of the hall) whether R.Newton had also come to hear the talk. At the sound of R.Newton's name, OG reacted with a strange look, replying: no, but-why-do-you-ask? I

⁷ Astrologers' geographical manuals are not (like, e.g., Strabo) concerned with descriptive geography, but are mere lists of longitudes and latitudes. Ptolemy's "Geography" (*Geographical Directory*) is of the latter type: c.8000 sites' longitudes & latitudes, by far the largest such compendium surviving from antiquity.

⁸ The criticism of Aaboe was that his *œuvre* was inappropriately slim. This represents a failure to understand that Aaboe's work is largely inductive (not merely slapping together a biographical piece on someone: the standard Hist.sci project); thus, a huge amount of mental effort will inevitably produce just a few pages of results, but such results may represent much more novelty & intelligence than the Hist.sci norm.

⁹ I had first met OG on 1974/2/11.

mentioned the *QJRAS* papers. At this, a visibly agitated OG burst out with an unqualified assurance that R.Newton's analyses of Ptolemy were worthless & disreputable scholarship, completely unaccepted by the establishment — adding that a top Yale expert (unnamed at the time but clearly Asger Aaboe, Hist.sci, Yale Univ) was preparing a devastating response. (Which has never appeared.¹⁰ Under Aaboe's name, at any rate.)

C9 Later that day, I joined OG at a purely social gathering of scholars. During the conversation, I brought up some suppressive (& overly personal)¹¹ behavior by Editor Jos. Ashbrook of *Sky & Telescope*.¹² OG listened with obvious interest but said nothing about the matter in front of the group.

C10 The next day, we talked by phone, at which time OG only now (privately) volunteered that he had had a parallel experience with Ashbrook (who years earlier had for ordmag a year unjustly condemned OG as misinformed for having made certain "errors" which in fact were based on JA's own use of an obsolete source). Naturally, I was interested in finding someone who knew that my account of an utterly weird JA encounter was credible. (I would not have believed it myself. Until it happened.) But when I asked what one could do about it, OG said that nothing could be done: JA is just "like that". OG added that he presumed that I would not do nothing, but added that if I did react to JA: "You'll only hurt yourself."

C11 This translates: you can't fight City Hall. What I didn't know at the time was: Gingerich is City Hall. One is reminded that most scholars who quote Sherman's war-is-hell appraisal fail to add that he made it so.¹³

C12 OG was a wellknown & (I then thought) highly respected figure. I inexcusably permitted these (at best) irrelevant factors to persuade me — and so stupidly accepted (for many months) what OG said about R.Newton's charges against Ptolemy. (In retrospect, I am puzzled that OG's opinion is so overrated. His errors [*DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 66] are less telling than the fact that he remains virtually the sole regular participant in the Ptolemy Controversy who has never¹⁴ made an important original discovery in ancient astronomy. I doubt he even claims to have done so.

¹⁰ If it is under 20 pp, *DIO* would be happy to publish Aaboe's attack on R.Newton. (This suggestion is not purely libertarian; I would expect Aaboe's comments to contain worthwhile material & reflections.)

¹¹ Still a sickness at *S&T*, I'm sorry to report. On the other hand, it must be said: whatever Joe's oddities, he was a marvel of astronomical lore, and I miss his "Scrapbook" entries in *S&T*. (See Sam Goldstein's 1987 appreciation in *JHA* 18:147. I even agree with Sam's choice of Joe's best entry: on solar oblateness.) It has been a comfort to me that, at the time of his justly-lamented death, we were back on good terms. (Reconciliation was triggered by a funny incident — cited at *DIO* 1.1 ¶3 §A3 — which Joe took in just the right spirit. We remained friends from then until his death.)

¹² DR had criticized *S&T* for its ludicrously-superfluous censorial policy of refusing ads for the nutty Velikovsky journal *Pensée*; so an enraged *S&T* had tried to wreak vengeance by rushing into print a review (1973/9) implying that DR's new polar book, *Peary . . . Fiction* was unreliable. (To JA's dismay, no one paid the slightest attention to his piece. *Fiction* is now regarded as a standard in its field, cited even in *Encyclopedia Americana*'s Peary entry.) *S&T* then added to its glory by: [1] suppressing DR's reply to the review, and [2] refusing (for all time subsequently) to besmirch *S&T*'s pages by citing DR's work. E.g., *S&T* has for nearly a decade suppressed the fact (probably known to *S&T*: its letter of 1987/3/2) that the famous supercompact refraction-correction format (now found in top astronomical & navigation manuals the world over) was invented & (1982 April) first published by DR. (See Rawlins 1982C eqs.8a&8. For improved *DIO* refraction & extinction formulas [of professional-level accuracy], see *DIO* 2.1 ¶4 fn 17 & other fnn there cited.) In 1986 July, *S&T* (whose Editor co-publishes with Gingerich) instead credited (*S&T* 72.1:70) the format to two later scholars. Apparently, in certain archoncal circles (not exclusive to Cambridge MA), if one simply doesn't like an inventor, no consciences are bothered when his due credit is stolen for a decade. (If now independently confronted with DR's priority, I suspect that agile *S&T* will go in another direction: losing interest in the invention's worth.)

¹³ Sherman also offered (1865/4/19) the most admirably generous peace in the history of warfare.

¹⁴ But see *DIO* 1.3 fn 223 for citation of a key observation (which I believe should be credited to OG) that helps to narrow options for alibiers of Ptolemy's fakes. [See also where OG was right against an incorrect DR theory: *DIO* 11.2 p.30.]

D Censorship Encountered

D1 Over a year went by with no involvement of myself at all in the Ptolemy matter. That changed (faster than) overnight due to an incident that finally smelled odd enough to alert me that something seriously wrong was going on. The 1976/2 *Sky&Telescope* carried a virtually ad-copy review by CUNY's Janice Henderson of *A Survey of the Almagest* (Pedersen 1974), authored by a prominent Hist.sci prof who then ran *Centaurus*, a journal which has carried a number of pro-Ptolemy papers but never one by the center of the skeptical contingent. (Still the case — 20 years later! Same for the equally captive reviewing journal, *Sky&Telescope*: fn 12. After 2 decades of such utterly one-sided promotion of Ptolemy, both journals now have accumulated an enormous face-investment in continuing to suppress the truth about the greatest faker in astronomical history.)

D2 What struck me right away was that the *S&T* review did not even mention the *existence* of R.Newton's work, simply noting that there used to be doubts about Ptolemy but that "Pedersen's book goes a long way toward reestablishing¹⁵ the reputation for integrity that Ptolemy deserves."

D3 Henderson 1976 was not merely an ad for Pedersen's book. It was an even more enthusiastic ad for Ptolemy's *Almagest*: "the greatest astronomical treatise of antiquity, a compendium of all mathematical astronomy known at the time", and (quoting Neugebauer 1957) "one of the greatest masterpieces of scientific¹⁶ analysis ever written".

D4 When I learned that Henderson was a Yale protégé of Aaboe, I realized that a revealing re-write of OG's 1974/11/15 confident assurance had since taken place: OG had said at that time that Aaboe would publish evidence showing R.Newton was wrong; but, over a year later, Aaboe had published nothing (& never has in the 2 decades since) in reply to RN; instead, his personal henchperson was scoffing at RN's position while entirely ignoring RN's evidence — not even telling *S&T*'s readers where they might consult it. I did not yet realize that noncitation had already *for seven years* been standard policy among Ptolemy's defenders, being just about the only weapon they felt comfortable with. (Besides private slander of dissenters — which needn't be accurate, since the party discussed is never on hand to correct errors.) Nor did I realize that attack by protégé-proxy was equally standard.

D5 Question in passing: would a clique with confidence in the evidence for its position behave this way? Would it for 20 years evade repeated suggestions of face-to-face panel discussion or debate? (The most public pre-DIO debate challenge is published right in the *AmerJPhysics*: Rawlins 1987 p.236.)

D6 Two decades ago, O.Gingerich was involved in the AAAS scientists-vs.-Velikovsky bearbaiting episode (which, for courage, matched the US invasion of Grenada); thus, we conclude that he is not unwilling on principle to endorse or even arrange such debates. (Likewise, O.Neugebauer published, in *Isis*, a review of Velikovsky — but would not answer R.Newton.) Or, perhaps it would be more accurate to conclude (from OG's approval of debate with V but not with RN & DR) that OG is not unafraid of debate *when he knows the evidence is in favor of orthodoxy*. (One recalls that during the Watergate impeachment days: those who knew the law were openly saying that the Nixon defense lawyers' strategy only made sense if the defense believed its client was guilty.) Another question is raised by this

¹⁵From the discussion of Pedersen 1974 pp.255-258, this strikes me as an accurate induction from the book (p.371 raises the thought of fraud but then backs off on p.372 by calling the evidence simply a mystery). However, Pedersen announced during a 1983/6/4 symposium that he had known all along that Ptolemy faked observations and felt that readers of his book ought to have understood this. I leave it to Pedersen & Henderson to work that one out. During a 1987/2 *JHA* review of Toomer 1984, Pedersen repeated in print this appraisal of Ptolemy's observations. (He did not mention RN or DR.) So that is his position for now. [This suggestion ("for now") was originally written in 1988. I refer the reader to *DIO* 1.2 fn 99.]

¹⁶Whatever its pretensions, the *Almagest* is actually not a scientific work but a mathematical one: *DIO* 2.1 ‡2 fn 11.

contrast: does OG believe that Velikovsky is worth more attention than the leading world controversy in ancient astronomy? Or is it rather simply that: until his opponents become prominent enough in the popular press (thus a palpable danger to orthodoxy) OG won't debate them? (Similarly, Ptolemy's top Hist.sci defenders — who do not include OG in their inner sanctum — did not publicly attack RN until the press began noticing him in 1977: §F4.) If so, then: [a] this implicitly makes the press a large factor — almost an arbiter — of what are important issues in academe; and [b] one must conclude that power-academics who attack scholars' attempts to create press sensations are simultaneously & revealingly reacting only to the very same low-appeal approach which they profess to scorn; thus, they are effectively encouraging that proscribed behavior — and are penalizing those who prefer logical discourse to popular-media p.r.

D7 It was on 1976/2/25 that I first read & photocopied Henderson 1976. I was so perplexed (§D2) by Henderson's review that on that very day I made two unsuccessful attempts to reach her by phone. I then phoned R.Newton (same evening). We had never previously had any communication. I asked him right off about the Henderson review's noncitation of his papers. It didn't seem to surprise him: he said this had been going on for 7 years, since R.Newton 1969! The stench of rottenness was getting stronger.

D8 He mentioned O.Gingerich's having warned RN (§B) that he would no longer be permitted to publish such charges. (This would not be the last time OG tried throwing his weight around: §H9.) So RN had had to send his Ptolemy-doubting papers to the *QJRAS*, because that journal was deliberately seeking opinion papers.

D9 This first (2/25) chat did not persuade me of much regarding Ptolemy, but the arrogant centrist treatment of heterodoxy made a powerful impression. I was on the verge of beginning a long experiment, which I have since found increasingly intriguing: testing the extent to which a small band of mutually backscratching scholars is able to control opinion in a specialty area — entirely regardless of incoming evidence's strength. The secret of such success is the same as one of the keys to the Peary North Pole fake: just as Peary was in 1909 geographically isolated, far out on the Arctic Ocean ice (and thus protected from scrutiny), so any modern specialty academic establishment is intellectually isolated by its very specialization. What external sanctions on misbehavior can apply, when outside observers are given to believe that they cannot even understand the matter under discussion? The implicit insulation from checks & balances is the core ingredient of a recipe for corruption. Moreover, there is no deputed academic court of appeal for such matters (§J3) — no recognized mechanism for dealing with cases of abuse. Isn't anyone out there even a *little* concerned that modern academe — with all its genuine lofty intellectual merits & credits — has come to such a low, degraded state in the vital area of freespeech? (See §J4.)

E The Awful Stakes

E1 Decades ago, a small group of History of science scholars rejected centuries of knowledgeable astronomers' consensus¹⁷ that Claudius Ptolemy — Mr.Geocentricity of antiquity — had faked data. They did so while slandering numerous prior scholars in this area as fools. (See, e.g., Neugebauer 1957 p.206. And Neugebauer 1975 pp.16, 274, 331 n.6, 334 n.10, 350, 734 n.14, 935 n.7, 937, 942 n.1, 959, 965 n.6, 976. And Toomer 1975 p.201 & *DIO* 1.3 §R2.) [For a happy contrast, see Neugebauer at his best at *DIO* 6.1 ‡1 fn 100. Also the admirable remarks of Neugebauer 1975 p.vii.] Insofar as hypercriticism represents commitment to high personal standards of scholarship, this peculiarly rude approach isn't a pure negative. But the Muffia is itself not quite genius-level. Thus, with respect to aggression-tactics: for this gang to savage others' scholarly acumen is about as smart as starting a poison-gas war when your self-created Enemy is upwind. (Didn't WWI

¹⁷E.g., Tycho's star-catalog preface (1598), Delambre 1819 pp.lxvii-lxix, Peters & Knobel 1915 p.15, C.Payne-Gaposchkin *Intro to Astron* 1954 p.266.

Germany actually do this?) As a conspicuous tactic of the Neugebauer cult, attacking others' alleged incompetence appears to be one of a number of manifestations of what the psychologists call "projection".

E2 The attempted shift of opinion in Ptolemy's favor has never really taken hold outside Hist.sci; but even the partial success was a definable Achievement of the Muffia, which made it feel Important. Since there was never any strong evidence for Ptolemy, the cult went far beyond reasonable conclusions from evidence, in order to prove its case. It is possible that an early conscious realization of a key fiscal & careerist reality played a rôle in the sham this group has perpetrated upon the scholarly community. That reality: how can one raise funds for research in a field where the central document is a clumsy¹⁸ fake? And, even assuming the best initial Muffia motives, the awful problem lingers nonetheless: when a Cultleader & followers have for decades damned all dissenters as fools & knaves, the cult acquires a huge stake in making its position look valid.

E3 [Paragraph added 1995.] Thus, there is no way that such instinctively-turf-sensitive, gang-warring parties can independently choose to make peace. E.g., at the very moment when the *JHA* was making the potentially-fruitful (if insultingly handled [*DIO* 6.1 ¶3 §C5]) gesture of creditably acknowledging *DIO*'s math-correctness on a single point, the Hist.sci Society re-opened hostility (in the HsS's *Isis* 86.2:309; 1995/6) by using¹⁹ non-mathematician Muffioso Alan Bowen (who co-vetted the very *JHA* 1991 elementary-school mis-math which the 1995 *JHA* was now correcting!) to pass off, as virtually worthless, Cambridge University-trained mathematician Hugh Thurston's valuable,²⁰ gentle, open-minded, & highly capable Springer-Verlag book. (Which has won well-deserved praise from the Royal Society's D.King-Hele at *Nature* 370:339. [We are happy & obliged to here thank *Nature* for listening to *DIO* 1.2 fnn 12&96.]) Bowen's unprovoked (§F4) denigration of non-Hist.sci-cultist Thurston naturally has no relation to: [a] Hist.sci's professional-survival-instinct desire (§C4) to insist that scientists can't do history as well as the Hist.sci cult. [b] Springer's recent dropping of Muffia-capo G.Toomer's valuable 1984 *Almajest* (an event which, despite the book's flaws [& Toomer's seething, irrevocable loathing of DR], *DIO* genuinely deems regrettable). [c] Thurston's temerity in defying a private Muffia warning never to cite DR [*DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 7 & ¶3 §E2]. (Understand: Thurston's text only mentioned two DR results, while repeatedly and respectfully citing numerous Muffia achievements. But 99% assent is not enough. Just as no medical procedure can permit mere 99% sterilization. The book-burner mind won't tolerate ANY heresy.) Not to mention: [d] Thurston's *JHA* note [*DIO* 6.1 ¶3 §C] correcting a Bowen-vettee's error.

E4 The unbreachable barrier that prevents any progress towards compromise here is that, at this late date, if Ptolemy's fraudulence is *even seriously considered*²¹ by academe (much less generally accepted), the loss of face by the Muffia cult would humble its precious pretense to expertise. And it knows it. Indeed, the effect on the viability of the whole highly insecure field of Hist.sci could be unpleasant. And Hist.sci knows it.

E5 Reality: if a couple of rogue physicists (RN & DR) could be right after all, while the cream of Hist.sci experts could have been (even *might* have been) adamantly & slanderously wrong for decades, well — Hist.sci archons don't need to be told what questions will immediately surface. Each of the several (very few) major universities that have established Hist.sci departments could start asking why the university's reputation need be

¹⁸ See *AmerJPhysics* 55:235 (p.236 item 4) or *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B23 item B ii!

¹⁹ Designating a Muffioso to review Thurston is about as innocent as deputing Wilberforce to review Darwin.

²⁰ See *DIO* 3 §L8 & *DIO* 4.2 ¶6 fn 1.

²¹ I.e., decades of uncompromising Muffia archonal bulls have infallibly established the orthodoxy that Ptolemy was The Greatest. Thus, the Muffia's high priests have locked themselves inescapably into rejecting even mild agnosticism on this subject. Consequence: religiously-obsessive inability to compromise with either heretics or heresy; i.e., the Muffia's years of unbending decrees (& cumulatively dishonest pretense that heretics contribute nothing) have forced it to continue striving for complete & utter *expurgation* of dissent (& all disobedient dissenters) on Ptolemy. (Such poison infects even a productive scholar like Britton: §I3.) Meanwhile, Muffiosi slanders (e.g., *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §C7 & ¶3 §D2-D3) paint the skeptics as the rigidly nutty side of the Controversy!

dragged down by association with such embarrassments.

E6 Therefore, if Hist.sci promotion of Ptolemy as "the greatest astronomer of antiquity" is a horrifically ironic mistake (whether originally by wellintended folly or no), the awful truth *cannot be admitted* (at least on the record). The stakes are too high. Important faces are too deeply into potential egg. No matter how clear & potent the still-incoming evidence may get, it cannot be allowed that the very astronomer repeatedly puffed by the Hist.sci establishment as The Greatest of all ancient astronomers is in fact the biggest faker of the lot. The irony is too gross. Too perverse. Too hilarious. Too damaging to the whole Hist.sci business, whose top²² Ptolemy expert decreed that R.Newton 1977 "tends to bring the whole topic [of Ptolemy's manipulation of his material] into disrepute" (Toomer 1984 p.viii). But, the evidence has gotten so unfriendly to the defenders that many now content themselves with an increasingly watered-down version of the former position: Evans, Włodarczyk, & O.Gingerich have essentially, though not as explicitly as acknowledged homeopaths, been reduced-diluted just to arguing that the manifold evidence convicting Ptolemy is not utterly conclusive. That is a long way from the confident Gingerich 1976 assertion that Ptolemy was the best thing that ever happened to ancient astronomy. Such transformations are among the nuttier features of The Controversy — the nuttiest being that many Muffiosi will deny there has even been a transformation.

E7 This and indeed all of the dementedly illogical, inconsistent,²³ & burgeoningly dishonest history recorded here is the inevitable consequence of this nightmarish vise — this tarbaby commitment to a short-term-smart course of trying arrogantly to stonewall out of a mess. A mess created in the first place by, primarily: arrogance.

F The Muffia & its Godpop

F1 The above-cited notoriously contentious & turf-possessive Muffia clique was fathered by (& long godfathered by) the late Otto Neugebauer, of BrownU & the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, who for decades Princetinted his own talents & his colleagues' reps to the curious cause of glorifying the most transparent faker of ancient science, C.Ptolemy. (The common factor in this & ON's other odd fixation, Babylonian math astronomy as source of Greek [*DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 27], is: sell-convincing modern academe's grant-dispensers that ancient astrologers' texts are high-science, which thus merit high-funded, high-expert-Muffia analysis.) ON managed to breed & plant at prominent universities a small but virulent clique of clones: Asger Aaboe (Yale), Bernard Goldstein (UPitts), & Gerald Toomer (Brown, Harvard). Each of these breeder-reactioners has in turn attempted to clone further grad students.²⁴ (Yes, it sounds like bad science fiction. And it is.)

²² Toomer has been called *the* Ptolemy expert. (See *DIO* 2.1 ¶2 §H21.)

²³ See *DIO* 2.3 ¶8 §C25.

²⁴ [Note added 1995.] Those (incl Rawlins 1991W fnn 172&236) who are unawed by Princeton socialite-scholars & the MacArthur Foundation shouldn't miss J.Hitt's highly perceptive (& funny) inside-look at MacArthur winners. The PU connexion (Hitt 1995 p.96): for years, "it didn't hurt to be a professor at Princeton (where foundation president Adele Simmons once served as a dean). In fact, five of Princeton's many MacArthur geniuses . . . all live on Hartley Avenue." (This doesn't sound much like the original MacArthur intent of aiding needy nonestablishment geniuses: Rawlins 1991W fn 236.) Systematic catering, to the tenets of archon-angels who arrange such manna, is a Princetintation-plague whose side-effects include a lingering inability of Hist.sci (with its high Princeton Inst contacts: Rawlins 1991W fn 172) to distance itself from Princetintate-god Neugebauer's obsessive fantasy that pre-Ptolemy Greek astronomy was primarily Babylonian in origin. The reader may judge for himself whether these social factors had any relation to Neugebauer-protégé N.Swerdlow's 1988 MacArthur, a \$285,000 prize for (Hitt 1995 p.98): "technical analyses of the works of Ptolemy & Copernicus [which] have led to a greater understanding of the development of astronomy". (For other views&facets of Swerdlow, see *DIO* 2.3 ¶8 §C, Rawlins 1991W fn 167, & Dicks 1994.) If there simply *had* to be a Muffia-circle MacArthur prize, it might have been slightly wiser to choose John Britton, who continues seeking & occasionally making (fn 31) genuine discoveries and who does not have the academic seniority of Swerdlow (also productive: ¶13 §B8). It would be good to see Britton free to pursue ancient mysteries fulltime. (Note: there is no difference between JB & NS on the subject of *DIO*; they both loathe it.)

F2 This seething clique has made genuine contributions to knowledge — including my own knowledge. For this I have for over a decade repeatedly published²⁵ my appreciation (entirely unreciprocated);²⁶ and I shall naturally continue a policy of evenhanded citation, since that is the heart of honest scholarship. It is on this point of policy (citation of those with whom one simply disagrees) that the Neugebauer clique most blatantly exhibits both its scholarly & temperamental shortcomings — and reveals a cohesiveness of purpose which I will unfashionably but quite justifiably refer to as conspiratorial. (Written confirmation of this assessment will appear below,²⁷ from an unexpected source: the Neugebauer clan's most loyal public flack O.Gingerich.) The group's other characteristic is its innocence of the techniques & openminded attitude of modern science — a precious ferity which has led it into so many entertaining howlers, omissions, & muffs in matters of astronomy, mathematics, & statistics, that readers will understand why *DIO* regularly refers to this gang as: the Muffia. (See 45-item catalog of Muffia muffs at *DIO* 4.1 ¶4 §A.)

F3 (I do not mean to imply by the foregoing that the Muffia's historical accuracy is a whole lot better²⁸ than its science. The clan's greatest scholarly strength — especially Toomer's — is probably bibliographical. But Muffia affinity for deliberate noncitation of heretics is obviously fatal to one's trust even in that.)

F4 The Muffia currently explains its reluctance to cite heterodoxy by complaining of DR's behavior. (Classic self-fulfilling prophecy: my criticisms are entirely *in reaction* to the censorial behavior now justified thusly.) The problem with that alibi is obvious: R.Newton never reacted as forcefully as I have to Muffiosi. But a Muffia citation-blackout (Rawlins 1991W §D4) was applied to him for about a decade — abandoned only when R.Newton 1977 (*The Crime of Claudius Ptolemy*, Johns Hopkins Univ) became widely noted in the popular press. (See §D6 & *DIO* 2.3 ¶6 §E3.) ([Remark added 1995.] Likewise, gentlemanly Hugh Thurston is now attacked, shortly after he committed the heinous offense of publishing the irresistible [*DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 137] heresy that DR had solved the source of the Babylonian System B yearlength: §E3 [& *DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 16]. Earlier polite scholars, who became victims of Muffia anti-heresy assaults, are listed at *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §C5.)

F5 So explaining years of Muffia noncitation of RN will require a *different* ad-hoc excuse, a situation that creates an Occamite problem which we will also encounter in the evidential pros&cons of the Ptolemy Controversy itself: Muffia attempts to answer the charges against Ptolemy (invariably appearing in arenas where reply is highly unlikely to be published — e.g., book reviews) always concentrate largely upon just 1 single sector of the evidence. Thus, a reader will not realize that the unlikely alibi generated for this special part of the Ptolemy problem is inapplicable to Ptolemy's other fabrications. Each ad hoc scenario (e.g., Evans 1987) seems less grossly implausible in isolation; for, only when one sees, all at once, the whole crazyquilt of unattested Muffia hypotheses (applied to the task of resuscitating Ptolemy), does one discern just how unlikely they are in conglomerate.

F6 The scholarly acumen of O.Gingerich (Harvard & Smithsonian) is not much respected by these Muffiosi capos, but OG's unrequited loyalty [Gingerich 1976, *DIO* 2.3 ¶6 fnn 17-18] is such that I will loosely speak of him as an adjunct member anyway. (Has OG imagined that backing Muffiosi might land him a permanent Princetitude post? Note in passing: those familiar with the hidden politics of the Peary affair will find a parallel

²⁵ See Rawlins 1991W fn 16 & fn 174 for extensive lists of examples of *DIO*'s recognition of & gratitude for Muffia contributions and discoveries. [See also *ibid* fn 2.]

²⁶ [Note added 1995.] The 1995 *JHA* has finally acknowledged a few corrections [*DIO* 6.1 ¶3 §A1], but there is still (*ibid* §§ G-H) no Muffia admission of *DIO* contributions. Indeed, despite the collapse of lead-paper-billed "proof" that Greek trig orbits couldn't be fit to Greek solar data, the Muffia still coherently stands behind its incoherent (*DIO* 1.2 fn 209) Babylonian *arithmetic* purported solution of the trios A&B data of the *trigonometrician* Hipparchos (*ibid* fn 75). The mental requirements here are as obvious as absent: common sense, testability, & generosity. I.e., nothing essential has changed.

²⁷ See §H8 item [5]. Also §§ B5-B6, B8, G13-G14, *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §A8, *DIO* 1.2 §D4 [& *DIO* 6.1 ¶1 fn 7].

²⁸ See *DIO* 1.2 fn 92 & fn 116.

between V.Stefansson's rôle in it, and OG's rôle in the Ptolemy Controversy.)²⁹

F7 OG is #2 editor at *J.Hist.Astr.*, whose Editor M.Hoskin (Cambridge Univ) & Hoskin's best friend Olaf Pedersen (Univ Aarhus; long an Editor of *Centaurus*) have also aided the Muffia tactic of destroying dissent on Ptolemy. Thus, I include them & theirs under the Muffia banner, as well. (That does not imply that the central Muffia exactly reveres Hoskin or Pedersen. See, e.g., *DIO* 1.1 ¶5 fn 6.)

G Fear & Dissembling

G1 On 1976/3/2, a few days after my first talk (§D7) with R.Newton, I again tried & failed to reach Henderson at CUNY (Queens). On the evening of 3/3, I phoned OG about the review. He told me that Henderson was a protégé of Aaboe, himself a protégé of the ultimo in these matters, Otto Neugebauer, whose name I knew quite well and for whom I had at the time the highest regard. OG acted not sympathetic to the noncitation approach, one of a number of comments he made which had me for quite a while hoping that he was trying to encourage free debate on the Ptolemy issue.

G2 Later that evening, I finally reached Henderson by phone in Queens and asked her: [a] why she hadn't cited the R.Newton papers I'd seen in *QJRAS*, and [b] how she accounted for the suspicious agreement which R.Newton had demonstrated between Ptolemy's allegedly outdoor "observations" & his indoor tables, especially³⁰ for the Sun. (E.g., was this correlation being explained away as due to Ptolemy's data-selection?) We also discussed the fact first pointed out by R.Newton 1973-4 (p.14): that the framing instrument allegedly used by Ptolemy for measuring lunar zenith distances (*Almajest* 5.12-13) would instantly reveal that the Moon's distance from Earth did not vary by a factor of nearly two (!), as the Ptolemaic lunar theory required. (Neugebauer actually believed Ptolemy knew of this error: §G12.) And I raised an amazingly revealing bit of evidence, which though long known, has been insufficiently emphasized by skeptics, and which is to me by far the strongest proof that Ptolemy never observed: he didn't even know his own latitude (error -14'). No regularly observing astronomer who (as Ptolemy claims at *Almajest* 3.1&7 and 7.3) made numerous observations for years on a transit circle (*Almajest* 1.12), could possibly be so far off. That is obvious to any scholar with the slightest understanding of observational astronomy (a class which I increasingly came to realize did not include alot of Hist.sci persons).

G3 But it was equally obvious from Henderson's replies that: she didn't even pretend to know the answers; i.e., *she* didn't know what the justification for *her* ignoring R.Newton was. Surreal. All she could say in response to questions of astronomy & statistics was that: her mentor Asger Aaboe knows the answer; let me give you his phone number! (It all reminded me of a longago conversation with a young nun whose defenses of the deity were entirely: speak to my priest.)

G4 It is worth adding that, given O.Gingerich's good relations at this time with *S&T*, it is likely that he was involved in the selection of this cipher as a reviewer.

G5 I spoke to RN again 3/3. When I brought up the possibility of a verbal debate, he was not sanguine about the idea, largely because he had been earlier invited to a gathering where he was to be the sole skeptic and his paper was to be shown to the other side without reciprocation! He also had been quite ill at the time. (Curiously, the next time he was invited by OG to speak, 1984/6, he also happened to be ill. Though he was [in the event] able to talk, no debate was scheduled — despite my 1984/4/6 urging of this to OG. By contrast, I am always healthy; and OG has never invited me to talk anywhere.)

²⁹ But whereas VS wanted to be known as a freethinker, OG says he is a practicing Christian.

³⁰ See *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B23 [B] or Rawlins 1987 p.236.

G6 RN mentioned that John Britton (another Aaboe protégé, who had since become a stockbroker)³¹ had invented a way to explain Ptolemy's erroneous obliquity (Britton 1967,³² Britton 1969); but Britton's theory didn't answer the question that applies throughout the *Almajest*: why did Ptolemy's "observation" of the obliquity perfectly agree with an erroneous value, pre-established long before (by Eratosthenes, in this case), while disagreeing with the real sky by an amount far larger than Ptolemy's own (*Almajest* 1.12) estimate of the measurement's error (the same situation as for the solar observations)?

G7 On 3/9, after another chat with OG, I phoned Aaboe and asked some of the same questions I had put to Henderson. No problem here, regarding shyness: he filled me in with the greatest of confidence and ease. Superficially, he was far more impressive than RN (whose voice was very quiet and nervous). Aaboe was conversant with all of the texts and with the entire Ptolemy Controversy. A pleasure to listen to as he rolled along.

G8 However, aside from his confident air, he had no convincing answers to the question of the agreement of Ptolemy's allegedly outdoor astronomical "observations" with his indoor tables. Aaboe spoke of errors of observation, instruments, calculation, & rounding. Perhaps these dodges would work with a neophyte science reporter, but they of course could not persuade physicist DR, since they did not address the central point (§G2[b] & §G6).

G9 When I then asked Aaboe about R.Newton (wondering why mere disagreement had led to such bad feeling), he said that RN's research was: "incompetent work in my realm". The proprietary message (§C4) outweighs even the arrogance. (I hope that a lasting achievement of *DIO* will be the establishment of a forceful public reminder that: those who banish scholars are *gambling*; they are gluing their reputations unremovably to the inevitably risky evaluation-prediction that the exile is utterly worthless *and will forever remain so* — that is, he will never make a single valuable discovery throughout his entire career. [Thus, if he does, the banishers *must* fake its worthlessness: *DIO* 4.2 ¶9 §T, *DIO* 6.1 ¶3 §B2.]

G10 Three days later, I attended a Hist.sci conference at Johns Hopkins and there met a Muffia protégé, whom we will call L. I also supped with a leading mogul (Hist.sci, Yale Univ), who defended W.Heisenberg's infamous attempt to build an atomic weapon for Hitler with a novel line of exoneration: well, Heisenberg had to do *something*. This archon steadfastly refused to own that Heisenberg had done anything amiss. (Other than fail.)

G11 A week passed, and yet another archon (since deceased) from Yale's Hist.sci Dep't visited the JHU campus for a Hist.sci event. I asked him (skeptically) about Ptolemy's astrological work *Tetrabiblos*; he replied that at least it was astrology at a high level.³³

G12 Ten days later, another Muffia protégé — whom we will call W — joined me (1976/3/29) in a clandestine visit to R.Newton (at his Silver Spring home), whom neither of us had ever met. It was an entirely amiable chat. W asked about a single RN slip (cited at *DIO* 1.3 §O3) which has become a Muffia favorite (since so few other slips can be found in his Ptolemy work). RN openly discussed it (as also at R.Newton 1977 p.130). Later in our chat, he enlightened both his visitors by pointing out an astounding error of arrogance by O.Neugebauer. (See *DIO* 1.3 fn 284.) The 3-way conversation lasted from about 20:30 EDT until around midnight.

G13 As we left and got into my car, W said that I must *never* tell Aaboe of our visit to RN. (*DIO* will continue to protect W's identity until receiving clearance to do otherwise.)

G14 Soon after, I phoned shy W's colleague L (who had already known of the visit before it occurred) to find out what the problem was. I was told, in so many words, that W

³¹ Despite his Muffia inclinations, it is fortunate that Britton continues his customarily-high-quality work. A pearl is his induction that the Babylonian tablet-fragment BM 55557 is a collection of integral 4th-power calculations.

³² Later published as Britton 1992.

³³ But, in fact, the *Tetr* is as nutty as any other astrological work. See excerpts & DR's comments thereon in the *Skeptical Inquirer* (*Skinq* 2.1:62 [1977] pp.70-71). Ptolemy's promotion of exploitive superstition tells us what he really was. (Just as Jesus' magic-show "miracles" tell us what he really was. [The utterly unremorseful 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia* 3:17 states that Giordano Bruno was imprisoned & condemned by the Inquisition primarily for drawing attention to this common-sense view — & alleges it was *purely coincidental* that Bruno was also a proponent of the Church-proscribed heliocentric astronomy. He was burned alive at the stake, Rome, 1600/2/17.]

simply wished not to lose little things like: publication, grant-funds, & conference-invites.

G15 The reality was now out of the bag. The course & nature of the modern Ptolemy Controversy was determined. I.e., an ancient scandal was irrevocably doomed to become a modern one.

H Referee Anonymity Abuse: Backshooting-Slander as Peer Review

H1 Soon after, DR learned that *JHA* Editor MAHoskin had called, for early 1977, a meeting at the Royal Astronomical Society, where R.Newton's work was to be attacked — but to which RN was not invited! Upon learning of this, DR immediately sent MAH (in two pieces) the full version of his analysis (§C1) of the Ancient Star Catalog. It was not read nor even noted at the meeting. (Nor did the *JHA* referee it. In fact, Hoskin did not even acknowledge receipt — until after DR inquired at the Roy.Astr.Soc.) Indeed, the high-handed nature of the paper's treatment probably accounts for the stolidity of the PRIM0-clan's demented, even dishonest³⁴ refusal (to this day) to acknowledge the force of its arguments. After treating the paper so badly, to now admit its value would implicitly reveal how untrustworthy the Muffia's pretended expertise can be. (This is not to imply that the Muffia's work & judgement is worthless. Far from it.³⁵ But its suppressive policies are as unreliable as they are unethical & transparently motivated, particularly the skewed policy of citing heretics' supposed errors, not their useful contributions [*DIO* 6.1 ¶3 fn 6].)

H2 Next, DR — realizing that Hist.sci was simply incapable of evaluating his star-catalog statistical arguments — submitted the paper to a real science journal: the *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, which — after long delays due to OG&co — published it in 1982. (Meanwhile, the paper was strongly endorsed³⁶ by the great Bart van der Waerden, author of a classic Springer-Verlag statistics text.)

H3 One of the anonymous *PASP* referees chosen was none other than O.Gingerich. Now, most scientists believe that a referee's job is to analyse the technical aspects of a paper. But OG didn't bother with any of that. What follows is the full text of OG's referee report, which was expected to remain forever secret from DR & the rest of the academic community:

To: *PASP* 1977/7/8
From: Owen Gingerich
Professor of Astronomy & the History of Science, Harvard University

H4 It is rather awkward for me to be a reviewer for the paper by Dennis Rawlins. I have had long telephone arguments with him about Ptolemy's integrity as a scientist. He sent a version of this paper to be presented at a session of the IAU in Grenoble last summer, and because it was so badly written and unclear³⁷ I did not read it. And as a result he believes that there is a conspiracy to suppress [sic] all criticisms of Ptolemy.

H5 I do not wish to be seen as part of a conspiracy, but I must agree with your previous reader that the message is almost incomprehensible. I think that his two arguments are sound as far as they go, but in both cases I believe that legitimate alternative interpretations could be proposed. [DR: none mentioned; likewise at fn 41.] I think that it would be a disservice to his own attack on Ptolemy to publish arguments so obscurely framed.

³⁴ See *DIO* 2.3 ¶8 §§C10-C15.

³⁵ See fn 25.

³⁶ The private letters of van der Waerden were highly supportive & helpful. See also his *Die Astronomie der Griechen* Darmstadt 1988 p.175.

³⁷ Astronomers may judge the DR 1976 paper's clarity & value by an excerpt from its most technical section, published at *DIO* 1.1 ¶7 §F3 (as part of DR's 1990 lecture, delivered by invitation to the Amer Astron Soc).

H6 Mr.Rollins [sic] has almost become paranoid about this, so if you turn it down in its present form I hope that you will be extremely careful in framing your letter.

H7 Gosh, what a nice guy. So, even back in 1977, just as soon as *JHA*'s O.Gingerich saw DR's horrible absent-error-waves test (later Rawlins 1982C) and before he even understood it, he was already stating privately in writing that (though he claimed to find no factual or technical error in it): there **MUST** be an alternate explanation. And, he of course helpfully added that DR was crazy — a desperate (failed) ploy to prevent DR's critical discovery from ever being published.

H8 DR's private reaction follows.

This Referee Report uses libelous personal statements to cast doubt upon the validity of scientific conclusions which are embarrassing to the Referee's own repeated public stance. In this way, he avoids dealing with the technical content at all — which is perhaps fortunate, considering that not one factual statement in the Report is accurate. . . . Literally. (Incredible? — not if you know the Referee's record re fluffs, in both astronomy and gossip.)

[1] I have never had a verbal argument with O. [Several friendly chats.]

[2] He has confused two papers of quite different date, subject-matter, math-level, and method of analysis.

[3] The Star Catalog tests were conceived and executed entirely subsequent to the IAU section on Ptolemy at Grenoble, so their alleged obscurity cannot possibly have been the cause of the first paper's non-presentation, which OG's own 1976/9/15 letter to me ascribes to lack-of-time (he ought to get his stories straight). The earlier paper was 3pp. and its basic equation was arithmetic. No-time? Not-clear to OG? Well

[4] OG's failure to present the first paper at Grenoble (1976/8/31±1) can hardly have been the cause of my criticisms of ancient-astronomy-historians' cohesive non-reply (to R.R.Newton's demolitions of Ptolemy) for the very simple reason that my censuring of this behavior was right in the addenda to the Grenoble paper! (Mailed to OG, 1976/8/19)

[5] It is amusing and ironic that OG should now attempt to brand as mere Conspiratorial Dementia these conservative appraisals of historians' systematic peculiarities re Ptolemy (and re RRN, whom they then refused to discuss in print, while regularly reviling him behind his back — still the case with Neugebauer and his disciples Aaboe & Toomer). The fact is that *everyone* familiar with this cult's introverted ways was aware of the realities (and freely discussed them, privately). For example, the scholar who first (*Science* 1976/8/6) broke the Ptolemy-defenders' 2 year public silence (re RRN's 1973/12-1974/6 *QJRAS* papers) later wrote me (1976/9/15): "So far the Neugebauer camp has not been heard from. Perhaps my merely mentioning Newton in a review of Neugebauer has placed me beyond speaking terms." The identity of this, my [fellow paranoid]? Owen Gingerich. . . .

I am reminded of the exasperation of a recent critic of other irrepressible Independent Thinkers who have plagued astronomy (generally from the outside) — he notes wearily how much time, labor, and page-space are required to set straight only a paragraph of pseudoscience mis-statements.

I [had] taken similar pains once previously with OG; his reply, unable to refute a single one of a long string of demonstrations of factual screwups, instead simply went off in other directions — and launched a whole new thicket of misinformation!

And I always thought it was we Paranoids who were out of touch with reality.

H9 About the same time, OG answered an invitation to debate DR by sending (to the party offering to publish the exchange) another private charge that DR was a nut. (Text quoted at *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 20.) When this gross letter was sent to DR, OG got mad at the transmitter! — and, to this day, he has not recognized any fault of his own in the matter.

H10 We end this section by citing two striking realities, each of which will usefully educate the uninformed, regarding the true current state of US academic freedom:

[1] O.Gingerich will never acknowledge misbehavior in any of the here-noted episodes (§§B5-B6, H6, I1).

[2] Not *one* archon will criticize OG's behavior. In public, at any rate. (Which explains the broad scope of one of this article's sub-headlines. [See *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fn 15.] Academe has finely-honed senses of proportion & propriety: it bans not its criminals but their exposers.)

H11 Similarly: not one scholar has ever (publicly) criticized Hoskin's 1983/3/21 banishment of DR. When I say that alot of modern academics live under a reign of terror, it's realities like this that I'm thinking of.

H12 These realities — as well as the fact that the most basic common sense *can be suppressed for decades on end* — recommend a mild warning to the public: one must be just a little bit wary of academe's pronouncements. Even though I have no (or am not aware of having an) argument with most academic orthodoxies (especially in the science arena, which is by far the sanest of them all), the problem is that, when controversies arise, the public can be kept uninformed about even the very fact that there *IS* a controversy. So, since one cannot (without laborious private checking) know which of academe's consensuses are the ones which are reared upon rotten foundations, it is wise to remain mildly skeptical about all of them — *until open-court mechanisms for settling controversies are finally established*. (See §J3.)

I Ivy League Grab: Mean Motions & Spirit

I1 On 1980/4/13, DR sent a fateful letter to OG, imparting the shocking information that all the Muffia's top snobsters had mis-stated the mathematical sources of the *Almajest* planet mean motions. (Full citations at *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fn 38. See also *DIO* 1.2 fn 56. On Muffia amnesia about this: see *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fn 47.) Those who had published mathematically incorrect equations: O.Gingerich, O.Neugebauer, & O.Pedersen. (See also G.Toomer's misconception: *ibid* §C15.) I.e., all Muffia capos had mathematically screwed up the solutions of these 5 mean motions, and DR's letter bore mathematically fitting solutions for all 5. [Two historically false: see *DIO* 11.2 (2003) p.30.] (Letter's text at *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 §C5. Planet-by-planet Muffia-vs-DR fit-comparisons at *ibid* §C3.) Muffia's pristine record: [a] no (explicit) retractions, & [b] 1984 publication (Toomer 1984 App.C) of most (the three³⁸ undeniable ones) of DR's five solutions (this after referee OG had suppressed 1983 publication by DR! — see *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 §C7) — but without the slightest credit to the discoverer, or to R.Newton 1982 (pp.103&108 n.11) where RN published the same three solutions for DR, two years ahead of Toomer 1984. (In the more than ten years since, not one Muffioso has acknowledged the undeniable publication-priority here. Is this the sort of scholarly integrity which Harvard Univ and the Princeton Inst wish to be involved with?) I.e., the very cult that for years consistently contradicted the solutions is now implicitly pretending to have invented most of them, while not crediting the scholar who actually did recover [most] of them. This is as extreme³⁹ as academic brass gets.

³⁸Mercury, Venus, & Saturn — whose [valid] solutions' identical factors are right in Ptolemy's own preface (*Almajest* 9.3) to the tables. The other two [nonhistorical: §I3] solutions were first published at Rawlins 1987 p.237 (Mars) & fn 29 (Jupiter).

³⁹But academic archons will do nothing about such sham. (See §I2.) Why? Because a scandal makes academe *look* dishonest. (If you ever questioned whether there are natural comedians, this almost perfectly perverse situation should dispel any doubts.)

I2 On 1994/5/8, when publicly challenged by DR from the floor, at the M.I.T.-Dibner Inst meeting, neither Toomer nor OG would claim these discoveries for themselves. And DR proposed that, *after 14 years*, there should be public acknowledgement of the identity of the true discoverer of solutions important enough to be featured by Toomer in a special final Appendix C to *the standard modern edition* of the *Almajest*. This reasonable suggestion has met with silence since. DR has requested⁴⁰ leading Hist.sci persons to inquire of Gingerich about the matter (to push OG to make up his mind as to whether he wishes now to claim nonreceipt or subsequent misplacement of the 1980/4/13 DR letter to him). None has reported doing so. [No Muffia asked; but in 2003, D.Duke asked for a copy, and OG sent one. (To DR, not Duke; but we'll assume here that OG is now acknowledging receipt.)] This, in spite of *DIO 2.1* ¶3 §C's extensive publication of the historical record of this appropriation.

I3 OG's 1983/7/23 reaction to DR's §I1 planet-mean-motion solutions? Same ploy⁴¹ (echoing §H5): there's-got-to-be-an-easy-alternate-explanation. (Question: why has *Muffia* output, e.g., §B4, not been suppressed on similar grounds? I.e., the alternate-solutions gambit is an argument *for skeptical discussion, not for suppression*. And this conveniently-broad alibi can kill *any* paper an editor dislikes: in the entire history of science, no one who found a solution to an empirical problem has ever been a ble to pre-guarantee that another solution [whether valid, plausible, or just an Occam-nightmare contraption] won't fit the same data. Should one have suppressed I.Newton's corpuscular optics just because the wave-theory provided an alternate explanation?) [Note added 2003. Though the OG & Moesgaard Mars solutions were indeed false (& grossly nonfitting), DR's perfectly-fitting Mars solution (and the Jupiter one as well) has also turned out to be false: see A.Jones' true solutions at *DIO 11.2* p.30 and ¶4 eqs.31&45. Jones' finds prove positively that all 5 motions are based on period-relations (as DR was 1st to propose: 1980/4/13), so there is no longer any doubt (contra Toomer 1984 p.672) that the revolutionary 1980/4/13 DR solutions for the other 3 planets are correct. And, along with most scholars in the field, Gingerich appears (*DIO 11.2* p.30 item [a]) very creditably to have acknowledged that the above (§H5) alternate-theory alibi against DR's Ancient Star Catalog analysis is dead.] Comments: [a] Does occultist-level invincible-unfalsifiability alibi-wriggling-out get any funnier than the *there-must-be-an-answer*⁴² faith-foundation? [b] If OG was certain from

⁴⁰ E.g., *DIO 2.1* ¶2 fn 25.

⁴¹ See *DIO 2.1* *ibid* §§C7&C18-C19; also *DIO 1.1* ¶1 fn 9. Likewise, a K.Moesgaard 1983/12/15 referee report discouraged publication of DR solutions to a quite different Ptolemaic problem by adopting the automatic alternate-solutions-are-easy mantra. However, again, in the decade since, he has yet to produce any of these allegedly-easy alternatives. Instead, the "alternatives" proposed are either lousy fits (*DIO 1.2* fn 129 & *DIO 2.1* ¶3 §C4 [note: former ref misrendered at latter's fn 25 in 1st printing]) or solve a completely different problem. Moesgaard — an extremely able scholar, sadly trapped in a careerist world — has been the most irrepressibly-volunteering fount for such exercises in Muffia-suppression-alibi artistry. (So far.) See the amazing Moesgaard 1987 noncitation remarked at *DIO 1.2* fn 56. He has made no comment on this or several other oddities: *ibid* fnn 126, 129, & 170, and *DIO 2.1* ¶3 fn 23.

⁴² C.S.Lewis *The Problem of Pain* 1940 Chap.9 ("Animal Pain") attempts to slither out of one of the several fatal internal contradictions of Christianity: why god visits pain upon animals who have no souls (to purify by deserved adversity) and who do not share Original Sin. Thus hideously cornered, Lewis actually suggests that animal pain might be merely an illusion! (This is where one ends up if one thinks about it. Less scrupulous religionists' usual solution: don't think about it.) Do not miss a theology-on-the-rack followup 1950 exchange regarding animal pain (reprinted: Lewis *God in the Dock* 1970 pt.1 chap.20) between Lewis & C.E.M.Joad (both dep't heads at Cambr Univ! — see *DIO 1.1* ¶8 fn 13). Joad gives a deliciously nimble pseudo-evasion of the Problem of Evil, inadvertently accusing god of [i] unlovable virtuous automatohood, and [ii] brooking no competition for that rôle. Lewis then gives his precious overview-answer to the problem of animal pain (pp.167-168 & 170 *emph* added): "if God is good (and I think we have grounds for saying that He is) then the appearance of divine cruelty in the animal world *must be a false appearance*. What the reality behind the false appearance may be we can only guess. . . . What really matters is the argument that *there must be an answer*: the argument that if, in our own [as distinct from the animals'] lives, where alone (if at all!) we know Him . . . then in other realms where we cannot know [much about] Him . . . — then, despite appearances to the contrary, He *cannot* [DR: vs. above *if-at-all*] be a power of darkness. For there were appearances to the contrary in our own realm too; yet . . . they have somehow been *got over*." To watch this theologian (the world-renowned "apostle to skeptics") get so desperate as to seek refuge in semi-solipsistic agnosticism (in order

the outset that there **MUST** be equally convincing alternate explanations — even though he can't find them! — for all evidence that seemed to contradict his views, then he must have known positively *from the outset* that his scholarly position was correct. So we all await impartation of the precious secret (possessed also by hero Ptolemy — as well as by a fellow specialist in Christian apologia & other fiction, C.S.Lewis: fn 42) of how to **KNOW** the answer to a problem *before investigating the evidence*. (See Princeton Institute-Muffia-godpop's 3rd-grade-math-level screwup-of-prejudice [*DIO 6.1* ¶1 §H4]. See also Princetitute-funded Britton 1992 p.xvi's regrets that R.Newton's accursed "work has come to represent a counterview of Ptolemy's contributions *which has proven difficult to dis-lodge*" [emphases added] — a Muffia phraseology which inadvertently gives us a glimpse within the Inquisitional mind, whose aim is not openminded pursuit of truth but rather: the Extirpation of Sacrilegious Evil. [See *DIO 6.1* ¶1 fn 5.]) This is the key to all *a priori* geni⁴³ throughout history: they treat incoming evidences not as the ultimate arbiters of truth but as low, subsidiary junk — which acquire significance only when they are finally [if ever: *DIO 6.1* ¶3 fn 6] fit to the pre-known Higher Truth.

Final question:

Why are faith, slander,⁴⁴ & misreportage⁴⁵ ho-hum-tolerated in the top **scientific** councils of the US?

J The Rule of Law: a Fading Memory

J1 Most current scholars cannot remember the day when science-journal refereeing was not anonymous. However, a half-century ago, nonanonymous refereeing was common procedure for the American Physical Society.

J2 And what is the standard modern archonal excuse for today's norm of star-chamber refereeing? Answer: referees must be promised anonymity if they are to comment frankly upon papers authored by those *who can affect their careers*. Not only is this a classic band-aid approach to a deep-rooted problem, but it is frying-pan-to-fire-hilarious — in the clumsiness of its devastating implicit admission of the central reality, namely, young scholars are terrified that unseen archons could sever their lifesblood (§G14): the grant-funds & publication they must have to survive in an era when even tenure doesn't mean much anymore. (Another reason DR must be stamped out: if his defiance succeeds, this could encourage

to evade an out&out proof that his entire structure is without foundation) is alone worth the price of the book. (One sees why an inventive fictionist is best-suited to this sort of thing.)

⁴³ Indeed, it's this that convinces OG that Ptolemy was a genius. See OG's catch-all alibis at Gingerich 1980 p.264, which are *required orthodoxy* in much of the curious Hist.sci community (parroted also, e.g., at Graßhoff 1990 pp.205&215): fudging observations to accord with theory isn't fraud, it's absolutely MAHvellous; "Ptolemy, like many of the brilliant theoreticians who followed him, was perfectly willing to believe that his theory represented Nature better than the error-marred individual observations of the day. As one of America's Nobel laureates remarked to me, any good physicist would do the same today. [DR: (a) Why not name him? (b) Is Congress reading this?!] . . . It is *marvelous* to find these foremost theoreticians so clearly voicing their belief in the primacy of theory over observations. . . ." (*Emph* added.) Unfortunately for OG, none of the scholars he cites ever says (clearly or unclearly) that it is better to force observations to fit theory. Thus, he must cite alleged verbal exchanges and their alleged implications. Which shows how wonderful it is that we have Hist.sci dep'ts — without whose discernment (of what great scientists *really* thought), we might never have figured out that scientific immortals believe data-faking to be a superior form of intellectual activity.

⁴⁴ See §§H4-H6 for OG's behind-the-back 1977/7/8 referee report, in which he offers no criticism of DR's science (other than OG's occult belief that alternate-explanations-must exist) — but instead says DR is insane. See also *DIO 1.1* ¶1 fn 20.

⁴⁵ At p.76 of OG's *Eye of Heaven* (1993-revised: n.3 at p.79) which updates his earlier papers, he avoids public admission that horrible DR unquestionably solved most of the *Almajest* planet mean motions. He instead **unrevisedly** repeats the claim (*DIO 2.1* ¶3 fn 19) — which his own 1983/7/23 *QJRAS* referee report acknowledged the falsity of — that Ptolemy's Mars mean motion is based upon his alleged arc/time ratio (*Almajest* 10.9). DR sent OG a far better-fitting [though also false] Mars solution as long ago as 1980/4/13, and OG's 1988 *JHA 19*:142 note acknowledges awareness of the solution.

scholars to believe that one doesn't *have* to cower to archons. An intolerable vision.)⁴⁶ The upshot is: overarching, ever-present fear of making highplaced enemies⁴⁷ — thus, reign-of-terror-freezing of free discourse and equitable evaluation of scholarly output.

J3 (The *Wash Post*'s prize-winning science reporter B.Rensberger notes that, for years, there has been discussion of the idea of establishing a court for settlement of academic disputations — but archons keep killing the proposal, claiming that academe is so honest that there is no need for such a body. OK, while we're at it, let's just scrap the US court system, too, since US society is so trustworthy & fair that: there's just no need.)

J4 The close of Mill's more-revered-than-read 1859 *On Liberty* (emph in orig):

The worth of a State, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it; and a State which postpones the interests of *their* mental expansion and elevation . . . [and] which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes — will find that with small men no great thing can be accomplished; and that the perfection of the machinery to which it has sacrificed everything, will in the end avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.

References

- Almajest*. Compiled Ptolemy c.160 AD. Eds: Manitius 1912-3; Toomer 1984.
 John Britton 1967. *On the Quality of Solar & Lunar Param in Ptol's Alm*, diss, Yale U.
 John Britton 1969. *Centaurus* 14:29.
 John Britton 1992. *Models & Precision*, NYC.
 B.van Dalen 1994. *Centaurus* 37:97.
 J.Delambre 1819. *Histoire de l'Astronomie du Moyen Age*, Paris.
 DSB = *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, Ed: C.Gillispie, NYC.
 O.Gingerich 1976. *Science* 193:476.
 O.Gingerich 1980. *QJRAS* 21:253.
 Gerd Graßhoff 1990. *History of Ptolemy's Star Catalogue*, NYC.
 Janice Henderson 1976. *Sky&Tel* 51:117. Review of Pedersen 1974.
 Jack Hitt 1995. *Esquire* 124.5:92.
 Karl Manitius 1912-3, Ed. *Almajest*, Leipzig.
 O.Neugebauer 1957. *Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 2nd ed, Brown U.
 O.Neugebauer 1975. *History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy (HAMA)*, NYC.
 R.Newton 1969. *Science* 166:825.
 R.Newton 1970. *Ancient Astronomical Observations*, Johns Hopkins U.
 R.Newton 1973-4. *QJRAS* 14:367, 15:7, 107.
 R.Newton 1977. *Crime of Claudius Ptolemy*, Johns Hopkins U.
 R.Newton 1982. *Origins of Ptolemy's Astronomical Parameters*, U.Maryland.
 O.Pedersen 1974. *Survey of the Almajest*, Odense U.
 D.Rawlins 1982C. Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific 94:359.
 D.Rawlins 1987. *American Journal of Physics* 55:235.
 D.Rawlins 1991W. *DIO-J.HA* 1.2-3 ‡9.
 Gerald Toomer 1975. Ptolemy entry, DSB 11:186.
 Gerald Toomer 1984, Ed. *Almajest*, NYC. Aka *The 1984 Almajest*.

⁴⁶ [See *DIO* 6.1 ‡1 §16.]

⁴⁷ Despite numerous obvious non-parallelisms, I am nonetheless reminded of the impassioned closing pages of E.Eyck's *History of the Weimar Republic* (Harvard Univ 1963, Sci Ed 1967), summing up the suicidal events culminating in Hitler's Chancellorship (emph added): "The attempt by the German people to rule themselves had failed. A time now came when Germany *ceased to be a state based on law*. This was the time when German judges allowed their courtrooms to be overrun by [the cult] who drove out the people whose noses they did not like; when the judges saw their independence and security abolished and *their professional advancement become dependent on the way their decisions pleased the ruling party*"

DIO

Thrice-yearly *DIO* & its occasional *Journal for Hysterical Astronomy* are published by:

DIO
 Box 19935
 Baltimore, MD 21211-0935 USA.

Telephone (answering machine always on): 410-889-1414. Fax: 410-889-4749.

DIO is primarily a journal of scientific history & principle. At present, a good deal of *DIO* copy is written by Dennis Rawlins (DR) and associates. However, high scholarship and/or original analytical writing (not necessarily scientific or historical), from any quarter or faction, will be gladly received and considered for publication. Each author has final editorial say over his own article. If refereeing occurs (only with author's explicit permission), the usual handsome-journal anonymity will not — unless in reverse. There are no page charges, and each author receives at least 50 free offprints.

The circumstance that most *DIO* articles are written by scholars of international repute need not discourage other potential authors, since one of *DIO*'s purposes is the discovery & launching of fresh scholarly talent. Except for equity&charity reply-space material, submissions will be evaluated without regard to the writer's status or identity. We welcome papers which are too original, intelligent, and/or blunt for certain handsome journals. (Dis-sent & controversy are *per se* obviously no bar to consideration for *DIO* publication; but, please: spare us the creationist-level junk. I.e., non-Muffia cranks need not apply.)

Permission is hereby granted to other journals to reprint appropriately referenced excerpts from any issue, to date, of *DIO* or *J.HA* (edited, if desired, to these journals' stated standards), whether for purposes of enlightenment or criticism or both. Indeed, except for *DIO* vols.3&5, other journals may entirely republish *DIO* articles (preferably after open, nonanonymous refereeing). No condition is set except this single one: *DIO*'s name, address, and phone number are to be printed adjacent to the published material and all comments thereon (then *or later*), along with the additional information that said commentary may well be (and, regarding comments on DR output, will certainly be) first replied to — if reply occurs at all — in *DIO*'s pages, not the quoting journal's.

DIO invites communication of readers' comments, analyses, attacks, and/or advice. (Those who wish to be sure of continuing — or not continuing — on the mailing list should say so. It is hoped that our professorial readers will encourage their university libraries to request receipt of *DIO*: complete sets of back issues are available at no charge.) Written contributions are especially encouraged for the columns: Unpublished Letters, Referees Refereed, and regular Correspondence. (Comments should refer to *DIO* section-numbers instead of page-numbers.) Contributor-anonymity will be granted on request. Deftly or daftly crafted reports, on appropriate candidates for recognition in *J.HA*'s pages, will of course also be considered for publication. (A subject's eminence may enhance *J.HA* publication-chances. The writer's won't.)

Free spirits will presumably be pleased (and certain archons will not be surprised) to learn that: at *DIO*, there is not the slightest fixed standard for writing style.

Potential contributors: send to the above address a *spare* photocopy of material (not to be returned) and phone *DIO* about 3 weeks later.

Each issue of *DIO* will be printed on paper which is certified acid-free. The ink isn't.

©1995 *DIO* Inc.

This printing: 2003\11\2.

ISSN #1041-5440

A Fresh Science-History Journal: Cost-Free to Major Libraries

DIO

Tel: 410-889-1414.

Fax: 410-889-4749.

DIO — *The International Journal of Scientific History.*

Deeply funded. Mail costs fully covered. No page charges. Offprints free.

- Since 1991 inception, has gone without fee to leading scholars & libraries.
- Contributors include world authorities in their respective fields, experts at, e.g., Johns Hopkins University, Cal Tech, Cambridge University, University of London.
- Publisher & journal cited (1996 May 9) in *New York Times* p.1 analysis of his discovery of data exploding Richard Byrd's 1926 North Pole fraud. [*DIO* vol.4.] Full report co-published by University of Cambridge (2000) and *DIO* [vol.10], triggering *History Channel* 2000&2001 recognition of Amundsen's double pole-priority. New photographic proof ending Mt. McKinley dispute [*DIO* vol.7]: cited basis of 1998/11/26 *New York Times* p.1 announcement. *DIO* [vol.4] identification of prominent astronomer who stole Royal Greenwich Observatory file on Neptune case: vindicated 1998. [*DIO* vol.9.] *Nature* 2000/11/16 cover article pyramid-orientation theory: *DIO*-corrected-recomputed, *Nature* 2001/8/16.
- Journal is published primarily for universities' and scientific institutions' collections; among subscribers by request are libraries at: US Naval Observatory, Cal Tech, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Oxford & Cambridge, Royal Astronomical Society, British Museum, Royal Observatory (Scotland), the Russian State Library, the International Centre for Theoretical Physics (Trieste), and the universities of Chicago, Toronto, London, Munich, Göttingen, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Tartu, Amsterdam, Liège, Ljubljana, Bologna, Canterbury (NZ).
- New findings on ancient heliocentrists, pre-Hipparchos precession, Mayan eclipse math, Columbus' landfall, Comet Halley apparitions, Peary's fictional Crocker Land.
- Entire *DIO* vol.3 devoted to 1st critical edition of Tycho's legendary 1004-star catalog.
- Investigations of science hoaxes of the –1st, +2nd, 16th, 19th, and 20th centuries.

Paul Forman (History of Physics, Smithsonian Institution): "*DIO* is delightful!"

E. Myles Standish (prime creator of the solar, lunar, & planetary ephemerides for the pre-eminent annual *Astronomical Almanac* of the US Naval Observatory & Royal Greenwich Observatory; recent Chair of American Astronomical Society's Division on Dynamical Astronomy): "a truly intriguing forum, dealing with a variety of subjects, presented often with [its] unique brand of humor, but always with strict adherence to a rigid code of scientific ethics. . . . [and] without pre-conceived biases [an] ambitious and valuable journal."

B. L. van der Waerden (world-renowned University of Zürich mathematician), on *DIO*'s demonstration that Babylonian tablet BM 55555 (100 BC) used Greek data: "*marvellous.*" (Due to this discovery, BM 55555 has repeatedly been on display at the British Museum.)

Rob't Headland (Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge University): Byrd's 1926 latitude-exaggeration has long been suspected, but *DIO*'s 1996 find "has clinched it."

Hugh Thurston (MA, PhD mathematics, Cambridge University; author of highly acclaimed *Early Astronomy*, Springer-Verlag 1994): "*DIO* is fascinating. With . . . mathematical competence . . . , judicious historical perspective, [and] inductive ingenuity, . . . [*DIO*] has solved . . . problems in early astronomy that have resisted attack for centuries"

Annals of Science (1996 July), reviewing *DIO* vol.3 (Tycho star catalog): "a thorough work . . . extensive [least-squares] error analysis . . . demonstrates [Tycho star-position] accuracy . . . much better than is generally assumed . . . excellent investigation".

British Society for the History of Mathematics (*Newsletter* 1993 Spring): "fearless [on] the operation of structures of [academic] power & influence . . . much recommended to [readers] bored with . . . the more prominent public journals, or open to the possibility of scholars being motivated by other considerations than the pursuit of objective truth."