7 Unpublished Letters

A Mind-Size

A1 DIO 4.1 §1 concluded with the promise that DIO 4.2 would detail *Journal for the History of Astronomy*’s brickwall rejection of the important paper, “Pan-Babylonianism Redivivus?”, by classicist David Dicks, an internationally known scholar of ancient astronomy. (This paper, unchanged, was to become the lead paper of DIO 4.1.) We begin with the letter that accompanied Dicks’ submission of the paper to the JHA:

To: Editor, *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 1994/1/5
From: Prof. David R. Dicks [London University, ret.]

I submit the attached paper for publication in your journal. I have little expectation that you will accept it, as it is somewhat critical of many names in the establishment of the history of science; but I thought I had better go through the motions, anyway, to satisfy my conscience.

One thing I would request is that you do not send it across the Atlantic — there has been far too much unauthorised and unacknowledged pillaging of my work over there already. If you do not like it, let me know, and simply destroy it.

I look forward to hearing from you.

To: Dr. Dicks 1994/1/13
From: Michael Hoskin

. . . My initial reaction on opening your letter on my return from abroad was one of pleasure at the prospect of a paper by yourself. Sadly, instead of the presentation of new research of the quality we have come to expect from you, it is more in the form of a succession of attacks on colleagues, many of them couched in language that is overtly offensive and quite unacceptable in a ‘learned journal’. I am very sorry that you are not able to look back on your distinguished career with pleasure in a job well done — and to add further contributions to it. But if your complaints are justified (as may well be the case) then a more acceptable way of expressing them needs to be found. Sorry! . . .

DR comment: the it’s-gotta-be-new-research gambit is such a threadworn Hoskin dodge that the Editor-for-Life no longer even bothers to check whether it applies. Dicks’ paper in fact brings several novel evidences and observations to bear upon the key question of the primacy of Babylonian astronomy vs. Greek. As to whether the paper’s language is scholarly, the reader is referred to the high opinion of no less than Curtis Wilson (Hoskin’s most distinguished colleague on the board of the *General History of Astronomy*). Dicks’ reply (§A7) is a gem. (How often we know these truths. But, how seldom they are said.) The key point is precisely what Dicks points out: why is the JHA so concerned with style (*DIO* 1.2 §B2) and with keeping certain political factions safe from criticism, that it willfully ignores the sole issue that matters: does the research contribute to knowledge?

To: The Editor (M. A. Hoskin) 1994/1/14
From: David Dicks

§ 1 Editor-for-Life at §A5: “as may well be the case”.

---
A7 Congratulations! Exactly as I had expected — a judicious blend of sincere flattery and unctuous high-mindedness! Of course it would not do to publish anything critical of the establishment on which you depend for referees; I quite understand — never mind any considerations of accurate scholarship or historical truth.

To: DIO 1994/3/14
From: David Dicks

A8 I presume you’ve seen the latest bunkum in JHA [25.1:39-55; 1994/2] — ‘Neolithic Lunar Maps’! I ask you! Hoskin must be out of his tiny mind. It’s quite extraordinary what passes for “new research of . . . quality” (to quote from his [§A5] letter to me) these days.

B ISIS in Crisis: Lying Lower & Lower

B1 When the Neugebauer-Muffia decided to hold a conference 1994/5/8-9 (at M.I.T.’s Dibner Institute), Muffiosi as usual agreed not to inform DR of the event. DR phoned Isis (History-of-science-Society [HsS]) Editor Margaret Rossiter on 1994/4/22 to apprise her of this situation and to ask why the DIOs so far sent to Isis as publishable matter had not even been acknowledged. She replied that she didn’t understand them and that she had thrown all of them away. She suggested writing a letter-for-publication for Isis, which I sent (4/26), and which of course did not publish. In this 1994/4/26 letter to HsS, DR also took the opportunity to ask a few questions about the scholarship & behavior of the Muffia, and to suggest a debate (at the M.I.T. conference) of the issues in contention between us:

To: History of science Society (isis) NOT CONFIDENTIAL 1994/4/26
From: DIO, Box 19935, Baltimore, MD 21211-0935(phone: 410-889-1414)

B2 As acknowledged in your Society’s 1991/7 Newsletter (p.35), many of you have been regularly receiving the Dennis Rawlins (DR) journals, DIO & The Journal for Hystorical Astronomy. You should know, therefore, that these DR journals have pointed out at least two discreditable incidents involving: [a] Isis, and [b] the snobs known to DIO readers as the “Muffia”, that amusingly inept and lordly cult of scholars that is the legacy of the late O.Neugebauer (BrownU & Princeton Institute for Advanced Study). (As we’ll see below, it looks like DIO reportage of a 3rd such episode is in the offing.) [Note added 1994/10: HsS can’t say it wasn’t warned.]

B3 Not greatly to anyone’s surprise, Isis-persons have done nothing whatever about these matters. Except, of course, to try suppressing DIO ! (See under R.Kargon, below [§B9 & §B19].)

B4 And the Muffia’s reaction to DIO’s revelations of, e.g., its repeated highschool-math blunders and its Nobelist-level discoveries of the “Winter Equinox” (S.Pathak 1994/2/27 query: is this a new rock band?) and the Autumn Solstice (see sources cited in “Black Affidavit” [DIO 1.3 §10], copy enclosed) has been its standard courageous strategy: run away and hide. (See DIO 2.3 §§ §C.) Well, why shouldn’t the Muffia keep hiding? Muffiosi have learned, from decades of experience, that no amount of its mismath or misbehavior will draw the slightest public censure from the History of science Society. To a cult that places so little value on such trifles as mere scholarly integrity (a cult that is indeed dedicated to unremittent exaltation of C.Ptolemy, the most thoroughly exposed pre-muffia plagiarist in the history of astronomy), the HsS’s guaranteed inaction is a handsomely engraved invitation for that cult to keep right on behaving exactly as it pleases. The two above-cited incidents:

1. The MacArthur-Fellowship paper of Noel C. Swardlow (J.Hist.Astr. 1989) published 2 equations nicely explaining certainrigged Ptolemy “observations” of Venus. Curiously, these equations had earlier been discovered by DR and sent to Isis (for publication) in 1983. Isis’ repellant reception of the equations (despite publication-approval by Isis’ own eminent referees) is described at DIO 1.2 §13 (pp.134-5). (See also Isis suppression cited at DIO 1.1 §6 fn 4.)

2. In the J.Hist.Astron.’s 1989/5 lead paper, the Muffia’s Alexander Jones [argues] the impossibility of fitting eccentric (Greek-trig) orbits to 3 famous Hipparcian solar-position trios (data found at Almagest 4.11 and 5.3&5). And the lead paper of Isis’ 1991/9 issue (1st Uchicago number) is [a follow-up orbitual paper], founded upon the earlier JHA analysis. Though [its] math was vetted by an imposing flock of Muffiosi (most of whom will be at the upcoming Dibner meeting: all 4 scholars cited at JHA 22 are a credibility-mass-suicide so broad that [it must be shared by the whole senior Muffia-JHA combine]. Facts:

[a] Even before [the] papers appeared, DR had already published 1 of these allegedly-Impossible orbits (DIO 1.1 §6, 1991/1/14; elements reprinted at DIO 1.2 §G10). The other 2 Impossible orbits were published at DIO 1.3 §K9 & §M4 (& fn 162). (See also DIO 2.3 §8 fn 18, transmitted to Muffiosi via Johns Hopkins U: written receipt 1992/10/30.) That the three DR solutions indeed fit Hipparcios’ solar data, can be verified by highschool math.

[b] The [Muffia] “proof” of Impossibility for the 3rd Hipparcian trio is based upon [two elementary] math errors (DIO 1.2 §G9). Note: [its] equation

\[
\frac{1}{\sin^2 x} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 2x} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2} x} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 2x} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2} x}
\]

requires a 360° year. Muffa-cult slanders, still-unretracted and still-Hist.sci-uncriticized (partial compilation at DIO 1.1 §11 [§C]), include applying the label “Velikovskian” to Ptolemy-skeptics Rob’t Newton (the late eminent Johns Hopkins U physicist) and DR; thus, I will note that the only previous scholar who promoted a 360° year was Dr. I. Velikovsky. (See Dr. V.’s Worlds in Collision Pt.1 Chap.5 & Pt.2 Chap.8: pp.124, 330ff.) Since checking [Muffia] mis-math has evidently been too much for the numerous Isis people who have received DIO 1.2, the truth of all of DIO’s charges of [poor math] in this prominent Muffia-JHA-Isis [mess] has instead been confirmed in detail by Cantab mathematician Prof. Hugh Thurston, Univ of British Columbia: Math Dep’t phone# 604-822-2666, home phone# 604-531-8716.

B5 Jones’ was seen in possession of DIO 1.1 (containing one of the Impossible solutions) at the Graft ancient astronomy conference in 1991/9. DIO 1.2-3 (& 2.1) was mailed directly to Jones on 1993/12/31. His [Muffia-advice-dictated] reply? No reply. (Similar to DIO 1.1 §3 fn 7.)

B6 In the 1991/5 JHA, its Editor-for-Life, Michael Hoskin (whose amusing scholarship is examined at DIO 1.3 §10, copy enclosed) has been its standard courageous strategy: run away and hide. (See also Isis suppression cited at DIO 1.1 §6 fn 4.)

2 Jones is now acknowledging privately at least some of these errors. But he has publicly withdrawn nothing. And, if he ever does, he will likely avoid citing DIO, where these mistakes & the allegedly Impossible orbits were 1st published. [Note added 2005: Happily, DR’s prediction proved far too pessimistic. See DIO 6 §3 §A2.]

3 Problem: ever since DR pointed out the errors undercounting an entire 1982 JHA paper (belatedly retracted in the 1984/6 JHA), the Journal’s esteemed Editor-for-Life has ([1983/3/21: see DIO 1.2 §8] refused correspondence with DR, thus coincidentally permitting the JHA to evade its obligation to acknowledge its errors. (See enclosed catalog of muffs: [DIO 4.1 §4 §A]. No less than 17 of them have graced the JHA.)
DIO issues. [See DIO 4.1: Competence Held Hostage #1.] And all relevant academic institutions permit such behavior to continue, year after year, without the slightest criticism.

B7 Isis Editor Margaret Rossiter has thrown the same DIO copies (& all others) into her wastebasket, this despite the DIO Publ. Statement (inside back cover) explaining that each issue constitutes a submission-for-publication (to such journals as JHA & Isis, so long as they continue refusing to cite DIO). Rossiter claims (1994/4/22) she couldn’t understand the matters at issue. Comments: [a] The bold-print subtitle of the article “Muffa Oríginary” (comprising most of DIO 1.2-3) explicitly refers to Isis’ involvement. (Does DIO 2.1’s inside-cover. . .) [b] The central Isis-Isis errors which DIO 1.2 (§G9) exposes are . . . arithmetic. [Note added 2005: In 2002-3, DIO was delighted to see Margaret Rossiter courageously spearheading Isis’ liberation from Muffa rigidity. See Isis 93:500.]

B8 But Isis’ leaders are not alone in suppressing public [awareness] of the JHA-Isis [or biblical foulup].

B9 When the Johns Hopkins Univ Hist.sci Dep’t received (written receipt: 1992/10/30) news of JHA’s (or Isis’) refusal to accept the DIO subscription, the Dep’t’s R. Kargen ([late of Isis’ Board) secretly induced JHU’s library to cancel its DIO subscription. (See DIO 2.1 p.2.)

B10 The Muffa has sworn on a stack of Almajest that it will never cite DIO. And, when H.Thurston was attempting to publish DR’s discovery of the below-cited [B11] Greek—Babylonian link, a leading Muffosian exclamation- atorly attempted to dissuade Thurston from citing DR at all. For 25 yrs, that linkage’s relationship of censorship has been the sole effective Muffa tactic against the Ptolemy-skeptic dissenters it loathes: R.Newton & DR. (Muffo’s demonstrated preference for running away and hiding is perfectly understandable, given their uniformly-disastrous record when attempting direct scholarly reply. See, e.g., DIO 1.1 §5 §A, fn 15, fn 20, DIO 1.3 fn 288, DIO 2.1 §4 fn 65, DIO 2.3 §3 fn 31 & §C31.]

B11 And now, Muffa capo Noel C. Swerdlow is organizing for MIT (a Dibner Institute ancient astronomy conference 1994/5/6-8, crammed (naturally) with his Muffa pals. But NCS neither invited DR nor even informed him of the event’s occurrence. This, even though the main theme of the Dibner conference is Babylonian & Greek astronomy — and DR is discoverer of one of the major links between the two (intimately related to the 3rd Hipparchan solar orbit cited above): the first firm evidence of Babylonian use of Greek astronomical information. (See DIO 1.1 §6 §A.) This discovery is praised by the Dibner conference’s K. Moesgaard (DIO 2.1 §2 §D) and by no less than B. van der Waerden (DIO 1.1 fn 4). Cited by Dibner conference’s C. Walker 1993 (Graz 1991/9 conference proceedings) & the Amer. Astr. Soc.’s HAD Bibliography. (Uncited by Isis’ rigorously DIO-free Current Bibliography, which instead lists both [or biblical foulups]!)

The DR Greek→Babylonian discovery is regarded by Hugh Thurston’s Early Astronomy (Springer 1994 pp.123&128) as the main evidence suggesting that Muffos may have things reversed, when promoting their endearingly whacky central fundamentalist tenet: that low-brow Babylonian astrological math inspired high pre-Ptolemy Greek math astronomy. See DIO 1.1 §6 §B9-B13 (pp.53-54). [Also here at §9 §K1.]

B12 The head of the Dibner Institute, Jed Buchwald, is currently on Isis’ Council. (I am told that he was formerly at the Univ Toronto’s Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology — [whence the [or biblical] papers were issued!) Buchwald has refused to accept or return three recent DR phonecalls.

B13 Is the Hist.sci community proud of the foregoing record? — not to mention its failure to arrange a debate of the closely-related 25-yr Ptolemy Controversy? Does it wish to continue indefinitely condemning the seminal behavior of the Muffa, the JHA, & Isis? (I am hoping that the Dibner Inst will not add its reputation to this list.)

B14 For years, Muffosi have slandered DR behind-the-back, instead of engaging in face-to-face open debate, as DR has repeatedly urged (American Journal of Physics 1987/3 p.236, DIO passim, & 1994/4/20 to Dibner Institute). The upcoming Dibner Inst gathering represents a convenient opportunity finally to arrange such an encounter, since Muffosi Swerdlow, Toomer, B. Goldstein, Aaboe, Jones, Pedersen, Britton, Graßhoff, etc. will all be on hand. [In the event, Pedersen did not appear.]

B15 But I also request the opportunity to cross-examine these scholars, regarding their logic, slanders, & the more sensational among the dozens of hilarious Muffa scholarly-pratfalls which DIO & JHA have pointed out over the last few years. (The Muffa, with customary integrity, hasn’t publicly acknowledged any of them.) See enclosed 45-item partial catalog: [DIO 4.1 §4 §A]. See also “Black Affidavit” (DIO 1.3 §10, pp.176-177), which accents some of the funniest.

B16 More importantly, I further request that (as thoroughly as possible in the limited time before the Dibner meeting) this DR catalog BE REFEREED (in part) to the 3rd edn of DIO to the 3rd edn of DIO. . . . (b) The central Isis-Isis errors which DIO 1.2 (§G9) exposes are . . . arithmetic. [Note added 2005: In 2002-3, DIO was delighted to see Margaret Rossiter courageously spearheading Isis’ liberation from Muffa rigidity. See Isis 93:500.]

B17 At the proposed debate, Muffosi will greatly outnumber skeptics (see DIO 2.1 §2 §H20). Well, that’s OK by DR. Question: just how high must the odds be, before Muffa braves are willing to openly debate those they have never hesitated to slander in private?

B18 The following 45 (yes forty-five) errors by Muffosi (Muffa-circle scholars & forums) have been pointed out serially since DIO’s inception, over 3 years ago. (Many are displayed in the satirelet, “Black Affidavit”: DIO 1.3 §10, pp.176-177), which accents some of the funniest.

Footnotes:

4 1994/4/15, 4/17, & 4/20. My concerns about the upcoming Dibner conference were very briefly indicated (4/20) to Buchwald by phone & my phone number (410-889-1414) was left with her on all 3 occasions. (There is always an answering machine on here. I.e., Buchwald did not phone back while I was out.)

5 It will save time if the Muffa will, previous to the conference, simply cite those DR-listed errors which it does not agree to. This substantial catalog of Muffa muffs is enclosed here because the very same Muffa has for years baselessly claimed that the work of their nemeses R.Newton & DR are riddled with scores of serious mistakes, even though Muffosi have yet to meet challenges to produce the alleged lengthy list of alleged RN-DR errors — a list which continues to exhibit a Joe-McCarty-like elusiveness: DIO 1.3 fn 252. Having themselves noisily & haughtily raised the issue of proveness to errors, Muffosi have only published a very occasional note to support this broad-brush smear-falsehood against others’ work, & showing no interest in tending to the beams in their own eyes.

6 See, e.g., DIO 1.1 §5 fn 12; and DIO 1.2-3 §E4, §G3, & §M7.
The day before embarking for M.I.T., DR ran into sometime Isis person and HsS biggie Robert Kargon on the Johns Hopkins campus (Ames Hall—Gilman Hall, 1994/5/4, 13:10 EDT). I asked him straight out why he had, behind my back, gotten my journal DIO removed from the JHU Library. His sneering reply: “You call that a journal? No refereeing . . . .” (In light of Isis’ [oribital] affair, ironic comment here would be too easy.) So I replied that he should go right ahead and referee it. Kargon: “That’s really how I’m going to spend my time.” (Catch-22, anyone?) As Kargon tried fleeing, as fast as his feet could blur, DR commented (to his back) on the arrogance, and asked why it was impossible to correct such JHA-Isis errors as 128 = 65 (see DIO 1.2 & 4.1 [& Comments on Hostage #1]), simply because he didn’t like the journal announcing the errors. Kargon spoke without the slightest (deliberate) humor & with naked contempt for DIO’s “screed”; as for his action at the Library, he explained (implying no censorship intended) that JHU’s library can only hold so many journals. (I wasn’t previously aware of Kargon’s librarian credentials, nor of his concern over library space problems.)

I arrived at M.I.T. late on 5/5, and appeared next morning at the conference, to the obvious joy of Mufiosi. I there handed out the following letter to the participants & the audience.7 (Throughout the 3 days, the former usually outnumbered the latter.)


B23 I have come to this conference — emphatically uninvited — to provide (insofar as that may be possible from the floor) the shunned other-sides of the two central ancient astronomy controversies: [A] the interrelation of Babylonian &Greek astronomy, and [B] the honesty of the honest Mufia’s hero, C.Ptolemy.

[B] Mufiosi reveres & laud the Serapic-priest-astrologer Claudius Ptolemy as “the Greatest Astronomer of Antiquity”, though Ptolemy has been known to knowledgeable astronomers for centuries (since Tycho, 1598) as a massive plagiarist and indoor faker of alleged “observations”. Two simple examples. [i] Ptolemy’s grossly erroneous solar “observations” agree 50 times better with Hipparchus’ indoor solar tables than with the actual outdoor position of the Sun. See, e.g., D. Rawlins American Journal of Physics 55/235 (1987) p.236. [ii] Ptolemy’s fabrications were so clumsy that he inadvertently assigned discrepant dates to the same celestial event (the 136 AD evening greatest elongation of Venus): 136/12/25 (Almagest 10.1) & 136/11/18 (Almagest 10.2). DR (idem): “That is, Ptolemy in the Alm states that he observed first-hand the same celestial event on two different occasions thirty-seven days apart — a blunder unique in astronomical annals, and the coup-de-bloop for the notion that Ptolemy was a legitimate scientist.”

B24 In faithful imitation of the unfalsifiability that characterizes better-known fundamentalists, the Mufa claims that such revelations have not altered in the slightest [a] its high evaluation of Ptolemy, or [b] its precisely-null evaluation of modern skeptics. (Curious contrast: merit here&there in Mufa output and has therefore praised it on numerous occasions. But, as with one voice, Mufiosi profess to find exactly zero value in all DR output.) The cultishly-cohesive Mufia is actually proud of that unblemished record.

B25 History of ancient astronomy is too wonderful a field to be left exclusively to persons so lamentably lacking in the very skills and attitudes which are the hallmarks of science.

B26 If you are interested in open & evidence-responsive discussion, technical competence, unexpected new revelations of the roots of high ancient astronomy, plus occasional supplementary-satire shirt-unstuffings, then you are urged to get on the mailing list for DIO & The Journal for Hysterial Astronomy. A few sample DIO-JHA copies will be available from me (until the supply is exhausted), either at the conference or at my room [# 1907] in the Cambridge Center Marriott (617-494-6600) . . . .

B27 Attached to this 5/6 handout were photocopies of: [a] the 45-item list, [b] DIO’s 4/26 letter to Isis, & [c] “Black Affidavit” (DIO 1.3 10). As pointed out at DIO 4.1 fn 2, “HsS’s standard submit-a-formal-ms reply (contra DIO 2.12n 16), to DIO’s 4/26 letter [text above at §B2-§B3], evaded the debate-challenge (by delay) & no-commented the 45-item list, despite emphatic 4/26 urging that the list be REFEREED BY COMPETENT SCHOLARS — preferably by real scientists’ . . . .” (See §B16.) We will reprint that HsS letter (1994/5/6) below (§B31-§B32), after a few further comments here: [a] The HsS 5/6 letter is in just the same tradition — and is about as sincere — as the Hoskin letter quoted above at §A5. [b] My encounters with numerous tooth-grinding Hist.sci people (§B19 & fn 11) did not encourage me to believe that Isis was genuinely anxious to publish DIO’s accounts of its hilarious attempts at technically competent astronomical scholarship.

B28 Particularly disturbing was the fact that the HsS letter begins with the blatantly false claim (§B31) that HsS & Isis were unaware that the DIOs sent them were submissions to Isis. (Resorting to deception is frequently attractive to a certain type, since it can provide short-term relief from an irritating critic. I will not here re-discuss the deeper, longterm damage one thereby suicidally cooperates in permitting an imagined enemy to inflict: see DIO 1.3 §P3.) Given the HsS concern at the threat it perceives in DIO, it is incredible on the face of it that not a single one of numerous high HsS recipients of DIO ever noticed this. (And the point is, in any case, irrelevant to the necessity of retracting errors one is informed of in detail: especially key errors, which have appeared prominently in one’s own journal.) Moreover, on 1993/12/31, DR directly mailed copies of DIO 1.2-3 to both of those top HsS and Isis officials who were responsible for the orbital disaster (lead paper of Isis 1991/9): Stephen Brush (1991 HsS President) and Ronald Numbers (1991

---

7 [Note added 1994/10: The audience, from time to time, included 0 Gingerich, G.Toomer, D.Pingree, G.Saliba, and my former Kirkland House (Harvard) tutor, physicist & historian Erwin Hiebert.]
Isis Editor), with LARGE-LETTERED handwritten notes§ on both copies, at the Table of Contents (p.94 = inside front cover), reading: “SEE p.140” (S.Brush) and “SEE pp.123, 140” (R.Numbers). At p.140, one finds (§7) the plain DIO declaration: “See inside back cover DIO [publisher’s] statement: this DIO analysis is hereby submitted to Isis, with no editorial constraints whatever.” §is’ (post-conference) letter follows:

To: DR, DIO, P.O.Box 19935, Baltimore, MD 21211-0935 1994/5/16
From: Isis [John Hankness, Managing Editor]

B31 I am sorry that we did not recognize previous issues of DIO that you have sent to our office as formal submissions to Isis. I must confess that somehow we missed the third paragraph of the inside back cover. [DR note added 1994/10: See fn 8.]

B32 Now that we do recognize your work as a submission to Isis, we must ask that you come a bit closer to meeting the guidelines in the “Suggestions for Contributors to Isis” found in the front matter of each issue of Isis. Indeed, if we are to take DIO seriously as a publication (which I expect is your desire),§ item 7 of our “Suggestions” precludes us from considering something that you have already published in DIO.

B33 Please send us a manuscript (following the guidelines of our “Suggestions”), & we will be happy to consider your work for publication in Isis.

B34 Reactions: [a] Having already submitted unpublished work to Isis in the past, only to find it later published under another author’s name (DIO 1.2 §113), I was not about to repeat that mistake. (Scholarship must either be submitted to Isis — risking theft — or it isn’t citable? How nice for archons.) [b] Isis appears to be under the curious impression that DR fervently desires DIO to be blessed by the imprimatur of being taken seriously by the HsS. Comments: [i] I think that the question which is most germane to HsS wellness is: when will DIO start taking Isis seriously? [ii] DR knows perfectly well that he is already taken in deadly earnest in higher HsS councils. (Given the distinctly non-blasé reactions to DIO, cited at §B19 and fn 11, it would be fruitless for the HsS even to try denying this.) Indeed, upon learning of DIO 1, the HsS tried calming the anticipated storm by publishing a note on the new journal — but then foolishly undid its own pretense by giving Mufa nonsense page one, then in 1994/4/26 open letter to the Society. Your just-send-us-a-manuscript reply (§B31-§B33) evaded the 4/26 letter’s entire substance. (Will you even allege that this was accidental?) In case the HsS is trying to be funny, trust me: you don’t have to try.

B35 But the most critical questions are, as usual, the unspoken ones. [a] What of the 45-item list of Mufa & HsS muffs? It was not copyrighted at the time. (It’s since become DIO 4.1 §4 §A.) And what of refereeing and/or publishing it (§B42 & fn 11)? Also: why no contact with Hugh Thurston, an expert at both the math and the literature, who (as Isis was informed: §B4 & §B38) had already examined the matter? [b] What sort of games are we playing? DR submits DIO analyses for years without reply or a single citation of his results, and then is supposed to believe Isis’ sudden expression of desire for more scholarship? After all these submissions, Rossiter then asks rather (4/22) for a letter for publication; but, when it’s sent (4/26), it isn’t published. Instead, Isis re-reverses direction, lies (§B30) with characteristic Hist.sci adeptness,§ and asks for: yet another ms. (One—ever-changing, ever-doing-nothing editorial act is so familiar that DR explicitly declined to jump through any more hoops: fn 11.) [c] Bottom line: Isis has published false science and is ducking its responsibility to retract. This evasion has been accomplished with such sly subtext that it has merely been boldprint-headlined in DIO 4.1’s Competence Held Hostage #1, now read by hundreds of leading scholars the world over. (When it comes to natural comedy — of the shifty-eyed Jonathan Winters variety — there’s nothing that’s quite up to a gang of scurrying careerists.) [d] In its hope to have DR pre-censor his DIO 1.2-3 exposures of Hist.sci buffoonery, Isis pretends that DR must write its retraction for it — as if DR must act as a truth-double for Hist.sci, or as if Isis cannot tell the truth unless DR is pulling puppet strings to move its tongue. Comments: [i] DR has already submitted plenty of material which Isis is free to use. (As for copyright: Isis can break its own rule. It has certainly treated DR exceptionally in the past when it felt like it! — see To: M.Rossiter & Hist.sci Soc, Cornell U, Ithaca, NY 14850 1994/7/6

From: DR, DIO, Box 19935, Balto, MD 21211-0935 (410-889-1414)

B36 I have received the History of science Society’s predictably non-responsive 1994/3/16 reply to DIO’s 1994/4/26 open letter to the Society. Your just-send-us-a-manuscript reply (§B31-§B33) evaded the 4/26 letter’s entire substance. (Will you even allege that this was accidental?) In case the HsS is trying to be funny, trust me: you don’t have to try.

B37 DIO’s 4/26 letter detailed high History-of-science atrocities, attaching a 45-item list of often-astounding scholarly errors (most easily-verifiable) published by leading Hist.sci forums, including your Society’s Isis. And the elementary-school-level Muffa muffs of Alexander Jones’ 1991/5 lead JHA paper — repeatedly cited in the list — underlies Jones’ 1991/9 Isis lead paper. The 4/26 letter asked that you seek scientifically able parties to referee these matters. (See, e.g., DIO-J.HA 1.2 §E3-E4, F3, H12, J2, J7, G9, & fn 73.) However, the HsS has reported no alien contacts since.

B38 Cambridge-trained mathematician (& 1994 Springer astronomy-history author) H.Thurston: [a] has already refereed the 1991 JHA-Iss Jones errors (1st detected & published by DIO) and [b] has verified the ordmag I’ fits of all three DIO Greek orbits that solve the very Hipparchos solar-position trios which Jones declared unrepeatable. Thurston’s phone numbers were provided in 5/16-recommended “Suggestions for Contributors to Isis” to a Church organ.

11 For reasons obvious from the 4/26 letter & DIO-J.HA 1.2 fn 165, I won’t jump through the editorial hoops of a journal whose censorial priorities are intimately known to me in advance. If you deem Dr. [a] to eventually find a technical excuse for continued inaction, or, failing that, [b] to try minimizing the debacle by ignoring refereeing and just running an inevitable-observatory reply by inclusive Jones, then: you can play these games without my further input. An editor now suggesting submission of yet another DR ms to Isis (contra ideem) has the same grip on reality as one who, after gagging & drooling (1983/6) a visitor to his house, then plans to meet criticism by straightforwardly mailing the victim a polite invitation to a 2nd visit. Facts (most already published & sent you) that are causing you to DIO re-disrespectfully decline: [a] Involved Hist.sci archons have reacted with evasion, disdain, and— or naked hostility to Hist.sci-critic DR’s inconvenient fertility. They ought (see last parenthesis of DIO-J.HA 1.2 §D4) to have long since
B40 We can save alot of wasted correspondence if we cut right to the bare facts you’re universally avoiding.

B41 Even while your History of Science Society Newsletter (e.g., 1994/1 p.1) boasts of outward signs of HsS success (increased circulation & funding), the HsS continues to suffer a systematic decline in substantial technical competence and thus integrity. Which is why the Society is running scared-censorial with respect to DIO: you’re worried that the larger academic community will catch on. Well, given the [simple] math errors supporting your [leadoff] 1991/9 Isis paper (Jones), HsS’s trepidation is understandable. In striking contrast to Isis’s suppressive fear of DIO’s criticisms: the lead article of our current DIO 4.3 severely attacks a central DIO scholarly position, as well as DIO’s entire approach to science-history. DIO has sufficient confidence in the soundness of our work that such publication (and this intensely self-critical event will certainly not be unique) is no problem for us.12

B42 I repeat my 4/26 request that you REFEREE (& publish): [a] the Jones math errors underlying JHA-Isis’s paper-pair, & [b] DIO’s discovery of the 3 historic orbits Jones declared unfindable. (Isis’ honest printing of the resulting ref report would constitute a hypothetical metamorphosis which you can accomplish on your own, without editorial-formality-botheration of DIO. See DIO-J.HA 1.2 §[113]c & fn 165.) Until you perform refereeing (which you know should’ve preceded your cart-before-horse invitation of a DR ms for Isis), further correspondence is pointless.

B43 Nonetheless, DIO stands by its unqualified and regrettably-unmutual invitation to verification of a HsS publication of a Hist. Sci. Soc. manuscript (up to 15 pp), on this or any other scientific-history subject. In brief, Hist’s years of monumentally unprincipled treatment of DIO (and R.Newton & DR) will not be returned in kind.

cc: David Lindberg (HsS Pres), Eliot Marshall (Science), etc.

B44 No reply has been received.

heeded Andrew D. White’s 1896 lesson at Hist Warfare Science with Theology . . . 177:78. (Careerist-identification test: do historians not care how history will rate their rôle in key scholarship’s reception?) These archons include: reply-squacker Thackray, library-stimizer Kargon, return-to-sender Hoskin, wastebasket-case Rossetti, chat-ducder Buchwald, & back-turner Toomer. [b] You haven’t reported reaffirming the material DIO has sent HsS (including the 4/26 letter’s 45-item list, which you can reflip & publish, anytime) & haven’t phoned volunteer-ref Thurston. [c] During DIO’s 3.5/2 years, math-indept Isis (even its Current Bibliography!) & HsS have set a vacuum-seal ban on all citations of the seminal findings & achievements of numerous mathematically able DIO papers. (Hist’s archons have long arrogantly promoted their own handsome journals as judicious Class, privately [§198] scorning DIO as unreferred [!!!] Trash. So confrontation-comparison of DIO’s impregnable math vs. Hist’s 45-gaffe list, is a HsS inversion-narrative.) [d] Buchwald (HsS&Buch) & you ignored, until 8 days too late, the 4/26 letter’s urging that face-to-face debate be arranged at the then-upcoming 5/6 Dibner Inst-Mufa reference. [e] At the Dibner meeting, DIO sample issues were stolen. [f] DR’s last submission to HsS Isis met with censorship (1983) and (effectively) theft (1989). (By the very scholar HsS censorship had protected? See what I mean about effortless risibility?) You don’t even reply to DIO’s 4/26 report of Isis’ behavior on this. (Details: DIO-J.HA 1.2 §[113] & fn 164. See also fn 56-58.)

12 Indeed, DIO is willing to print whatever scholar you, the Mufa, and-or the JHA wish to send us, however blunt. We have (DIO-J.HA 1.2 §[113] & fn 167 and DIO 4.1 §[22]) regularly cited our detractors’ papers & praised their valid findings. (This, even while you & Mufosi warnings in DIO’s 3-1/2 years, math-indept Isis (even its Current Bibliography!) and HsS have set a vacuum-seal ban on all citations of the seminal findings & achievements of numerous mathematically able DIO papers. (Hist’s archons have long arrogantly promoted their own handsome journals as judicious Class, privately [§198] scorning DIO as unreferred [!!!] Trash. So confrontation-comparison of DIO’s impregnable math vs. Hist’s 45-gaffe list, is a HsS inversion-narrative.) [d] Buchwald (HsS&Buch) & you ignored, until 8 days too late, the 4/26 letter’s urging that face-to-face debate be arranged at the then-upcoming 5/6 Dibner Inst-Mufa reference. [e] At the Dibner meeting, DIO sample issues were stolen. [f] DR’s last submission to HsS Isis met with censorship (1983) and (effectively) theft (1989). (By the very scholar HsS censorship had protected? See what I mean about effortless risibility?) You don’t even reply to DIO’s 4/26 report of Isis’ behavior on this. (Details: DIO-J.HA 1.2 §[113] & fn 164. See also fn 56-58.)

13 This is so perverse that one wonders if Ptolemy was attempting to refute a critic — or (one may speculate) an ancient who had a theory that was (vs. the equant) more accurate at the equant. (Not necessarily a Keplarian theory, though I wouldn’t rule out such.)

14 The errors of “observation” were 20°+ (VE), 35°1/2 (SS), 33° (both AE). The two 1st disagreements with theory (VE&SS) occurred because Ptolemy’s fabrications were not carried out from his solar tables but rather by the simple-arithmetic method discussed at [6] §[A2]. For the irony of these discrepancies, see J.Hyster.Astron 1.2 in 64-65.

C Oddly Large Errors

C1 In J.HA 1.2 (§3), DR resuscitated an R.Newton letter which threw light on one of 0 Gingerich’s dimmest effusions. I later came upon a DR letter of the same period which did provide its text here. The letter comments on the peculiar coincidence that all of Ptolemy’s perfectly theory-accordant Mars “observations” (Almajest 10.7-8) are pretty near orbital octants, where the equant theory (adopted by Ptolemy) is least satisfactory.15 (See R.Newton Crime of Claudius Ptolemy 1977 p.302.)

To: Robert Newton

1980/11/11

From: DR

C2 The [item] 0 added (since the [SAO] preprint of 1977) to his [1980] Sept. QJRAS paper was (p.262, bot.) that both observational and theoretical errors were far larger for Mars (than for Jup. & Sat.). 0 doesn’t say so, but the devastating point here . . . is that: if there were lots of observations in the big hypothetical data bank 0 believes in, then why didn’t [the allegedly-just-selecting-not-fudging] Ptolemy choose non-octant [observations], where the [errors] would be much smaller? That is, in a large collection of real observations, there would be . . . more data of small error than large; thus, even “selected” (theory-accordant) observations (0’s hypothesis ii) would tend to cluster around the times when the theory’s error is null . . . . This is obviously not the case for Mars.

C3 Similarly, one sees that, of the four alleged solar observations reported by Ptolemy (Almajest 3.1&7), most are from the least accurate seasonal points of his solar orbit (§6 A2): A.Equinov & S.Solstice, which are more than half again worse than his V.Equinov, and nearly twice as bad as his W.Solstice.

C4 Alleged observations of the W.Solstice are entirely unreported by Ptolemy, though the WS is the most accurate of his solar theory’s 4 seasonal points. At epoch 140 AD, the lateness error of Ptolemy’s solar theory was about: 26°1/2 + [10°3/4]sin(λ°38°), where λ° is true longitude. The errors of this theory16 at the cardinal points were: 20° [VE&SS] 33° [AE] 18° [WS].

C5 Again (as at §C2): if Ptolemy were merely selecting-theory-accordant observations from a real data-pool (instead of entirely fabricating the alleged observations), wouldn’t we expect most of his data to be reported for his solar theory’s most accurate cardinal points, the V.Equinov & the W.Solstice?15