

DIO

UltraAcademe's Secret Files

The North Pole Priority-Conspiracy
Schemers' Own VERY Explicit Words

What Is Scholarly Consensus Worth?

Nat. Acad. Sci. VP's License to Kill — Dissent
Academe *Protected* Peary North Pole Hoax
Enduringest Science Fraud of the 20th Century

Can Academe Ever Admit Banished Amundsen
1st to the South Pole AND 1st to the North Pole?

Peary Could've Easily Proven North Pole Tale
5th Lie: After 3 Fake Lands & Exaggerated Farthest North

JohnsHopkinsUniversity President: His **Threat**
Snuffs YaleU Book Showing Peary Proofless
JoinsPearys in *Celebrating* Skeptics' Deaths
Swindles Author's Widow of Pride & Royalties

Download *DIO 24*, www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, to click on links.

Table of Contents

	Page:
Preface	3
§A US Science’s Triple Trouble: North Pole Fakers Cook, Peary, Byrd.	4
§B 3 Fake Lands + Farthest + North Pole = 5 Peary Lies. True Discoverer Exiled.	4
§C 4 Ways Peary Could’ve Proved Claim. And: Who REALLY Trusts the Press.	8
§D Double-Secret-Failsafe Cheating of Double-Pole Discoverer Roald Amundsen	10
§E Cagney AGSociety: “Not a Thing That Can Be Written”	12
§F Explain Yourself, Sirrah! Ed Stafford & Marie Peary as GoodCop-BadCop	16
§G Mogul Proudly Deceives Ward. Lapdog Press Betrays Amundsen.	18
§H Izzy’s Mantra Gutted: Peary’s 1909 Vise-on-the-Ice Forces “Incredible” Tale	21
§I Excellenz Dissembles: Dodging the Devil	24
§J What Discriminating Mil-Dew Can-Do: Disappearances Hide the 1906 Fakes	25
§K Stern, Twinkly, Husky Johns Hopkins President CELEBRATES Skeptics’ Deaths	27
§L SpyderWebs of Tractable Careerists: The Grovels of Academe	30
§M “I TREMBLE”: Godfather-Gofer’s Neutrality-Pose Kills Henshaw Ward’s Book	30
§N How Expert Was the Archon That Careerists Kissed-Up To?	40
§O THE REPORT: Mogul as Truth-Snuffer	41
§P Cavemen at Yale Press	52
§Q Trust-Me for Keeping Secrets From You	53
§R Ward Warns Academe from the Grave	54
§S Organized Swindling of the Widow	54
§T Expanding the Circle of Suppressors	56
§U 24 Ward FACTS Bowman Hid — For the Public’s Own Good. Of course.	57
§V Ultimate Secret: Bowman Knew Proofless Record Couldn’t Pass Scientific Exam	60
§W CoveringUp Coverups. Stolen Youth. University as PoliceState Convent.	66

Abbreviations & Source-Pursuits

Prefix “W” to a number indicates reference to a page in Henshaw Ward’s *The Peary Myth: A Study in American Glory* 1935 ms, unpublished by Yale Press, finally available at www.dioi.org/ph.pdf (slow download), using continuous pagination at upper-right corner. “DR” here refers to the present account’s publisher (D. Rawlins; partial vitas: scientific at www.dioi.org/vols/wm0.pdf, pp.2&44; scientific history at www.dioi.org/ji00.pdf, p.70). The prefix “F” to a number indicates reference to a page in DR’s book, *Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction?* Luce, Washington, DC 1973, online at www.dioi.org/rp.pdf, plus main reviews. (Sole major pan revealed hilarious case of credulity and fake reviewing by Christopher Lehmann-Haupt at the *NY Times*: www.dioi.org/j225.pdf, fn 22.) Prefix “BR” to a number indicates reference to a page in Robert Bryce’s definitive book, *Cook&Peary: The Polar Controversy, Resolved* Stackpole, Mechanicsburg, PA 1997. Bryce proofed the present issue with the very highest care and expertise. **NB:** DR’s & RB’s books both bear thousands of precise source-references (pp.295-320 & pp.992-1122, respectively) that should be consulted by those pursuing the subject in detail.

Conventions

All miles in what follows are nautical or geographical miles of c.6076 ft (about 15% larger than 5280 ft statute miles), or virtually 1 arcminute on the Earth’s surface. Ward follows the same usage [W15]. Newspaper citations are in the form year/month/day:page:column.

Commentary

In the letters quoted below, all bracketed comments are by DR.

US Science’s Apex Robs Amundsen & Ward by Hiding the Secret of Peary’s Prooflessness

Leading Scientists Conspire to Hide Evidence of a Holy Fraud History of an Honest Investigator Vs a Devious Establishment Scientists Cooperating: in Doing the Very Opposite of Science

Preface: Fluke Leakage of Top-Secret High-Academe Crime

- [1] It is science’s opposite to place on critics the burden of proof re a scientific contention.
- [2] It is science’s opposite to secrete evidence bearing on a scientific contention.
- [3] It is science’s opposite to threaten the publisher of such evidence.

Most if not all of the following details of high-academe conniving — in service to protecting an institutionally-useful but institutionally-overinvested world-sensation lie — might never have come to light had it not been for the late Carlton Wells, a University of Michigan English professor at Ann Arbor, who happened to see DR’s 1970 June Peary-skeptical paper in the *US Naval Institute Proceedings*, a professional journal which he took since his son was Navy. Wells recalled: in the 1930s a book critical of Peary’s North Pole legend, written by well-known (§E1 below) skeptical writer & English textbook author Charles Henshaw Ward, had been due to appear out of Yale University Press but ultimately hadn’t. We wondered how to trace its fate. Wells had the idea of writing to Ward’s textbook publisher, Scott, Foresman Co., for the address of his widow Florence Ward, on the slim chances that she was still alive over 1/3 of a century later (when Ward would have been 97!) — and that she had preserved his mss. Incredibly, both chance-dreams came true.

(Full details of pursuit & resulting finds: DR’s 1973 book *Peary . . . Fiction?* pp.281-290.)

Ward’s *English Journal* obit realized [F281]: “The passing of a man who had affected American life as much by commercial or political activity as Ward did by teaching and writing would have been featured by the daily press throughout the country.”

Below we’ll learn, from secret letters’ accidental (§W3 here) survival, how false scholarly consensus was fabricated&controlled by power-obsessed scientists (& lackeys, esp. the press) in 20th century academe. (*Other centuries: www.dioi.org/ad.pdf*.) Sadly, from exploding fiscal priorities, academe’s integrity-ensuring forces are now even weaker (e.g., §§W3-W10 below), as scholars’ shyness of opposing corruption (fearing the exposed’s revenge against funding) is ever-more normal. Yet all is countered by a magnificent & hard-earned cumulative achievement: modern academe is now the grandest generator of new scientific knowledge in history. This, despite: [a] inferior sectors which exploit pseudo-refereeing & slack ethics-enforcement, esp. in soft fields (which will spread, as monitors slumber); [b] persistence (www.dioi.org/ad.pdf, www.dioi.org/jL07.pdf) in sanctifying false, even crank views, for decades on end (e.g., ranking faker-astrologer Ptolemy as “Great-est”: fn 16; Peary’s steerless N.Pole), via insular-unaccountable, circularly intra-evaluated cliques (e.g., the scientifically pathetic, thus too-often vicious&dishonest History-of-science field: www.dioi.org/ns.htm; www.dioi.org/vols/wm0.pdf, pp.4-5&8-9&54-55&87 fnn 2-6).

Some welcome good news: long top villain of the Peary coverup explored here, National Geographic has half-turned a leaf on its Peary-involvement (www.dioi.org/j936.pdf, end of fn 70; R.Bryce *DIO 21* §K1), while emitting maps, programs, & videos which — given their popular orientation — are at high standards of accuracy&production. [*National Geographic History* 2020 Jan-Feb pp.3&74-89 on North Pole seekers happily doubts Peary’s claim & promotes Plaisted’s. (But no mention of the man genuinely&unquestionably 1st at the North Pole, NGS-ejected Roald Amundsen: §B18 below.)] Possibly a trend — which we are glad to encourage, while hoping it has finally become monotonic. Another unexpected surprise in the Peary history revealed here, will be the identity of the one person who was deeply involved yet 100.00%-certainly did NOT conspire: you can go ahead now to §V17 below and find out who, but it’s recommended that you instead wend your way through every sly page of the whole dark labyrinth that follows below — and induce it for yourself along the way. [Stay alert!]

A US Science's Triple Trouble: North Pole Fakers Cook, Peary, Byrd.

A1 The primary lesson and theme of what follows is that the United States' triple-North-Pole-hoax — perpetrated successively by Frederick Cook & Robert Peary & Richard Byrd — did not JUST-HAPPEN. Interested institutions' slipshod evaluations and subsequent definitely-unslipshod, short-term-clever sinuous coverups of the inevitable embarrassing consequences so encouraged and/or enabled the fraudulent trio that these organizations deserve the prime "credit" for the deceivers' variously temporary successes. (Details: *DIO 10* [2000] = www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, pp.4-5 & footnote.) The tri-hoax was nurtured by a long history of organized geography's over-enthusiastic, insufficiently-guarded fiscal exploitation [W74] of the publicity&glamour of explorer-heroes, a practice which actually began in England, with the ambition of the Royal Geographical Society's guiding force, Roderick Murchison. Provident alarms should have screamed or at least snickered when in 1898 Louis de Rougement was taken somewhat seriously at RGS (Curtis MacDougall *Hoaxes* 1940 p.141) and turned out to be a mere travel-hoaxer. But when RGS had tried to be more careful a generation earlier, it overdid caution, suspecting¹ pioneer Nile-source explorer John Hanning Speke of exaggeration, eventually finding his discoveries of Lake Victoria & of its Ripon Falls feeding the Nile were totally legitimate: after his death, when it did him no good, parallel to the immortal Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen's monumentally perverse fate (§B18), central to the long-manipulated history following here, which should impel National Geographic to prepare for Amundsen's 1926/5/12 centennial (& undo past sins) by **officially recognizing his now indisputable priority at the North Pole.**

A2 This semi-amateur nascent period of the RGS, after separating from the Royal Society, is epitomized by Murchison's inviting *Punch* to RGS meetings. Serious science at RGS matured somewhat over a century ago with the advent of competent astronomer (& power operator) Arthur Hinks as chief. The American Geographical Society's subsequent acquisition of Oliver Maitland Miller equivalently put competent skill&advice at the service of US geographers. But, whether such resources were equitably applied when the societies were faced with ethical dilemmas (e.g., §H1 below) is the subject of what follows here.

B North Pole = 5th Peary Lie After 3 Fake Lands & Farthest North. The Actual Double Pole-Discoverer Banished. Settled Orthodoxy.

B1 In 1860 when experienced U.S. explorer Isaac Israel Hayes' expedition departed Boston harbor in search of the "Open Polar Sea" — a myth originally advertised by his former Captain, the recently-deceased explorer-martyr Elisha Kent Kane — Harvard's President was among the dignitaries that saw him off in Hayes' ship *United States*, so christened with maximal mal-timing.

B2 Later that year, Hayes established his base near the coast of west Greenland — naming it "Port Foulke" for a backer — at 78°17'.4 N, 72°39'W (near Etah). But by 1861 Spring, Hayes was desperate, having lost half his sledge-dogs to disease and all of his chief scientist and sole astronomer, August Sonntag, to death. (While alone with an Eskimo, Hans: note parallel — at §D4 below — with the Peary 1909 trip chief scientist's murder by an Eskimo [F103&292], which was also initially blamed on falling into frigid water.) So Hayes perpetrated the US' 1st polar hoax, based on fabricated astronomical data (purporting to be sextant-measured solar altitudes), assisted by the convenient absence of expert Sonntag, who could have acted as check and/or witness.

B3 By mid-May Hayes had mushed to latitude 80°05'N on Ellesmere Island — but in his report to Smithsonian and to the US Coast&Geodetic Survey, he exaggerated by

¹Speke's mistreatment by RGS (much inspired by the persistent bile of jealous explorer-poet Richard Burton, Speke's former companion whose retirement from the expedition cost him co-discovery) was possibly a nervousness-factor in an ultimate accidental death (1864/9/15) from Speke's own shotgun during a pre-debate hunting break at a BAAS meeting.

90 mi the top latitude reached, to claim a record Farthest-North-on-Land: 81°35'N. He accomplished this by merely inverting a "9" to create a "6" in the degrees place of his sextant double-altitude. (Details: www.dioi.org/hay.htm, #btfz.) He returned to a nation at war, suffering no lack of excitement — uninterested in polar dramas or latitudes.

B4 On 1871/8/28, honest&driven US explorer Charles F. Hall's expedition reached Hayes' purported 81°35'N and realized that where he&Kane reported an Open Polar Sea there was actually just a slim strait, as Kane's 2nd-in-command Johan Carl Christian Petersen had earlier reported (p.149 of O.Villarejo's revealing 1961 U.Penn book on the Kane mutiny, which Hayes had joined): "it is nothing but a *passage* [consistently narrow (c.20 mi wide) Kennedy Channel, along which Kane's steward Wm.Morton & Eskimo Hans² had already travelled c.10 mi!] and none of us has seen any Polar Ocean." Hall-expedition-member & survivor George Tyson's diary entry for that date: "*Can't make any thing out of [Hayes'] charts . . . Here should be the open sea, but there is land on both sides of us!*" (G.Tyson & E.Blake *Voyage . . . Drift . . .* 1874 p.148.) What was Hayes' punishment? Nothing. "Polar Hayes" later spent unruffled years in the NY State House, because (as in embezzlement cases) the conned institutions were too embarrassed to expose him, though RGS chief Clements Markham wrote privately of regret for having given Hayes RGS' gold medal since he'd turned out to be "a regular imposter" (Scott Polar Research Inst archives: document #367/13/2; F25). (Note that the Eskimos had already been in the region [Kane 1856 2:377] & had [Villarejo 1965 pp.82&84] reported open (Summer) water of indeterminate size, which may have triggered Kane's persistent belief in the Open Polar Sea.)

B5 Classic short-term thinking. Non-condemnation of the Open Polar Sea fantasy and the false record-land latitudes of Kane&Hayes (F22&25) gradually became known to explorers. Little thought was given to the obvious: polar explorers who were willing to RISK their very lives in the north were oft-fiscally-desperate and thus vulnerable to the temptation to RISK their reputations, to profit from saleably exaggerated geographical records. For how this factor bore on the Peary North Pole hoax: realize that his 1909 shot was definitely his last. See *Fiction* Chap.7 (F95-108): "Last Arrow in the Quiver".

B6 Peary's brave, daring, and generally productive 1892&1895 explorations of Greenland led to his report of an alleged "Peary Channel" separating a northern land-fragment "Peary Land" (both on, e.g., J.E.Weems *Peary: The Explorer & the Man* 1967 endpaper-map) from Greenland proper (RB85&89). Problems with the name: [a] The 1st explorer to reach "Peary Land" had been Lewis Beaumont of the British Nares expedition in 1876. [b] The channel was found in 1908 not to exist (RB336&566), for the land-fragment was attached to Greenland — which Peary evidently had known all along, since when he'd reached its northern point in 1900, he'd inadvertently called it [F46] the north point of *Greenland* (Weems *op cit* p.187) not Peary Land — privately (vs publicly: Peary *Nearest the Pole* 1907 p.332). This is the earliest of Peary's faked new-lands-discovered.

B7 Meanwhile Norwegian scientist-explorer Fridtjof Nansen had in 1895 reached latitude 86°12'N, the largest latitude leap ever (vs the previous record), to that time [F35-36]. (Later bettered in Antarctica in 1909 by Ernest Shackleton.)

B8 In 1902 Peary claimed that, before Norwegian explorer Otto Sverdrup, he'd in 1899 discovered — and named "Jesup Land" — Sverdrup's Axel Heiberg Land, a claim-jump attempted via map-shiftiness [F30&50-51&57&59] & by altering his 1899 report of looking down "out onto an ice-free fjord extending some fifty miles to the northwest." This was expanded in 1903 for RGS to [F52; emph by DR]: "out onto an ice-free fjord extending some fifty miles to the northwest, *beyond which appeared yet more distant land* [Jesup Land]." This grab was so blatant and shaky that it was never accepted by anyone outside the U.S. and was quickly forgotten even at home, the 2nd of Peary's fake land-claims.

²Same Eskimo who later was traveling with Sonntag (so anxious to leave Hayes that he'd bolted southward in the dark and sub-freezing cold of December!), when he died 1860/12/22 (Villarejo *op cit* p.179) — from falling into freezing water, said Hans, who had been told by Kane in 1855 (*ibid* p.150) that naval law would subject him to execution if he abandoned an excursion.

B9 In 1900, Italian explorer Umberto Cagni swore his polar expedition reached a new Farthest North latitude $86^{\circ}35'N$, but the sextant data were not shared and (as only knowable years later: F65) his compass variations near the northernmost camp were off by over 20° . Nonetheless, the claim was accepted on Cagni's word, and was in 1903 awarded the American Geographical Society's Cullom Gold Medal by AGS Pres. Robert Peary [F66].

B10 In 1906, Peary alleged he'd on 1906/4/21 attained a new Farthest North record at $87^{\circ}06'N$ (§J1 below), and in 1907 [F72&74] claimed (*though never mentioned in 1906*: F73-75; www.dioi.org/cot.htm #crkf) that on 1906/6/24 he'd discovered "Crocker Land" (§B12 below) on the horizon from Ellesmere. As later shown by Peary's own long-hidden records, both claims were deliberate frauds (*idem*). The irony is the hitherto-unrecognized fact that he actually DID make a Farthest North if he penetrated to about $86^{\circ}1/2'N$ on 1906/4/21, which put him roughly 20 miles ahead of Nansen's 1895 leap. The only reason Peary had to fake a few extra unverified (& diary-contradicted: §J1) miles beyond $86^{\circ}1/2'N$ was to beat Cagni's unverified $86^{\circ}34'N$ fake. Thus one fake required another to top it! A leap-frauding cascade that should've warned all. But didn't. (Since doubting explorers' claims rocked the boat & was a bother.) Until it was too late — at which point organized geography still didn't check the records since it was simpler to connive in their lockaway.

B11 One who well knew (§B13) societies' slackness was Dr. Frederick Cook, 2nd President of the Explorer's Club of New York. In 1906 September, he falsely (R.Bryce, DIO 7.2-3 1996 = www.dioi.org/j737.pdf) claimed that he had achieved the 1st ascent of Mt.McKinley (now known as Denali).

B12 Meanwhile, Peary's 1906/4/21 $87^{\circ}06'$ Farthest North was accepted by National Geographic, though a typescript of his diary (formerly NARS RG401/1) later found among his papers puts him under $86^{\circ}30'N$ the previous day. And his diary for the place&moment of non-existent Crocker³ Land's discovery (allegedly seen 1906/6/24 from Cape Colgate's peak, Ellesmere Land, Canada) was revealed by DR (*Washington Post* 1989/4/20 & §E7 below) as stating: "No land visible" — thus Peary's 3rd fake land-discovery. Sadly, in part due to his fixation on seeking the Pole, Peary never discovered a separate new land. A deprivation which may've motivated his faking land-discoveries *thrice*: an all-time record.

B13 Nonetheless, at the conclusion of 1906, a year bountiful for multiple&accelerating frauds, Cook&Peary were both Guests of Honor [F82] at the 1906/12/15 National Geographic Society annual banquet! Cook told his McKinley tale and was applauded by hundreds of Washington's elite, including Pres. Teddy Roosevelt, while Peary was awarded NGS' Hubbard Gold Medal for his faked $87^{\circ}06'N$. At the same dinner, Cook learned privately (*My Attainment* 1911 p.542) Peary's 1906 sextant had been damaged (leaving only his less-stable transit: fn 24) hinting at inferior evidence for his $87^{\circ}06'N$ claim (F82), none of which prevented NGS honors. But for Cook's sly observation, we see (as again today: §W8),

No one had checked anything.

B14 In his 1973 book, DR summarized [F83 (emph added)]:

In brief, . . . the geographical community had degenerated by the end of 1906 into an R.S.V.P. invitation to fraud. Pleased to respond, Cook got out of sight to the North just as soon after the winter festivities as he could. He was last seen by literate man in February, 1908, heading west across Ellesmere Land with Eskimos, dogs, sledges, and supplies, more than 500 miles from the North Pole. Cook reappeared the following year, *having left no recoverable dated record at any place visited in the interim*, and steamed from there for Denmark, claiming to have penetrated the Arctic Ocean [ice]pack in the spring of 1908 and reached the North Pole on April 21.

³Named for George Crocker — who'd crucially given \$50000 towards the 1905-1906 expedition — in hopes of further largesse. But Crocker wrote back that the 1906 San Francisco earthquake negated a repeat. So the Crocker Land fraud gained Peary no money but ultimately lost him defenders' trust.

B15 On 1909/9/1, Dr. Frederick Cook publicly announced his sensational North Pole claim, though (F86; www.dioi.org/jL03.pdf, Fig.1) he knew nothing of navigation. (Which hadn't prevented his recent tenure as Explorer's Club Pres.) Just 5^d later, trained engineer Adm. Robert Peary announced his own claim of having reached the North Pole on 1909/4/6. Peary's backers, the Peary Arctic Club of well-connected millionaires, responded to Cook by releasing to newspapers on 1909/10/13&14 testimony that Cook's McKinley climb was faked, a charge since utterly vindicated⁴ by Robert Bryce's recovery of Cook's virgin "summit" photo, the original BEFORE he cropped-off almost all the background details that gave away the photo's actual location, a point 19 mi from McKinley and but 1/4 its height. Yet it took awhile for evidence to make an impression on the public. Cook had initially headed for Denmark because he was respected in Scandinavia from his creditable 1897-1899 Antarctic wintering with the great Norwegian explorer Amundsen, on a Belgian expedition where his optimism had been an inspiration to his shipmates. Peary was unpopular in Scandinavia from offending Sverdrup (BR209-210) & his clumsy 1902 Jesup Land grab-try (§B8 above). The result in Copenhagen was what Peary biographer Hobbs rightly described as (HP372; F85&166): "an almost insane orgy of hasty approval . . . [to requests for evidence of success] Cook replied [inconsistently that] all these precious documents had been left in the keeping of a wandering sportsman in Greenland [Harry Whitney]."

B16 To the dismay of Peary's backers, Cook got away with his sham during weeks of top lecture fees. The public saw doubt of him as merely abuse of the underdog. A famous *Pittsburgh Press* 1909/9/26 poll of 76052 readers found 96% for Cook, 80% of them not willing to grant even 2nd place to Peary! (Not one voter doubted both explorers, so zero of 76052 got it right.) It was scientists' obligation to settle such controversies, but organized science instead ran for cover. On 1909/10/11, NGS and the American Museum of Natural History (both pro-Peary) jointly requested (F170) the National Academy of Sciences to appoint an adjudicating commission, but because "so much bitterness and temper" were in the air, N.A.S. President Ira Remsen was "reluctant" to do so (F171). Next day, 1909/10/12, NGS 1st *secretly* invited a Peary NGS address, *as if already accepting his claim* (F191, BR448): "Will give you a tremendous welcome." The very same day, NGS chief Gilbert Grosvenor traveled to Baltimore to confer (F171) with N.A.S. Pres. Remsen, also President of Johns Hopkins University. Upshot? The National Academy of *Sciences* turned over the evaluation of Peary's claim, which would prove to be the most enduring *science* hoax of the 20th century, to a wealthy popular-publishing outfit, the "National Geographic Society" (W70) which had contributed funds (\$1000) and publicity to boost Peary's expedition! Like asking the Roman Church to evaluate a purported piece of the True Cross?

(Actually worse, given, e.g., modern Church reforms regarding acceptance of saints.) Cook's claim crumbled under scrutiny, and he fled the country late in 1909. After Cook fell, Peary, head of the 1904 International Geographical Congress & 1903-1906 head of the American Geographical Society⁵ *HAD* to be upheld by U.S. science, or it was disaster for that enterprise's rep. & esp. that of organized geography, itself in an uncertain state (§M6), as it strained to increase the modest number of universities bearing geography departments.

B17 National Geographic backed its old friend, Peary. All science journals that commented (e.g., *Scientific American* 102:294 & 104:404) loyally came together to be conned. *For the cause of upholding science's reputation*. Again, as with 1861 (Hayes) & 1900 (Cagni): no responsible officer anticipated how the original 1909 deceit would future-metastasize. When Amundsen publicly doubted Peary in Texas, 1926 Jan, US honor required *instant* (F260; www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §M2) funding of Byrd to beat Amundsen to the Pole. Producing yet *another* hoax, as Byrd's diary revealed when unsecreted

⁴*New York Times* 1998/11/26 p.1 (John Tierney), based on Bryce's conclusive research: <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/11/26/nyregion/author-says-photo-confirms-mt-mckinley-hoax-in-1908.html>, generously citing & printing the centerfold photo of DIO 7.2 ¶7 Fig.18.

⁵It should be emphasized that the American Geographical Society never bemedalled any of Peary's 1906-1909 hoaxes. Nor did any Scandinavian society.

70 years later, placing him (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §E14) 146 mi south of where his official 1926/6/22 report to SecNavy&NGS had put him 2^h before his claimed Pole-arrival time: <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/05/09/did-byrd-reach-pole-his-diary-hints-no.html>, *NYTimes* 1996/5/9 p.1; U.Cambridge's *Polar Record* 36:25-50 (2000). And yet *another* case of institutional lockup **for decades** of the records of a Glorious Event (§D5): just trust-us. [Question: **what was wrong with making all the evidence available right away?** How could scoffed-at non-insider analysts evaluate without it? Archons instead conspired to secrete evidence as long as the lies mattered, effectively treating the public as Otter did Flounder: *you screwed up — you trusted us.*] (*DIO 1.1* = www.dioi.org/j112.pdf, ‡2 fn 7.)

B18 For over half a century following 1909, Peary's claim was generally accepted in the US as **settled orthodoxy**. No popular book or magazine or newspaper challenged it even slightly 'til the 1920s-30s. When Roald Amundsen, greatest of all polar explorers, expressed mild doubts in 1926, saying "the only evidence I could accept would be the publication of [his] complete observations", U.S. press & science displayed their respect for evidence & for free inquiry by condemning and exiling him. The *NYTimes* ("almost unforgiveable") & NGS ("compelled . . . to withdraw an invitation to Amundsen to speak") both flayed him, ruining his income from lecturing [F252]. He promptly answered his critics by becoming 1st genuine attainer of the North Pole fifteen weeks later: 1926/5/12, when he outdid the unverified forth&back trips of Cook, Peary, & Byrd by flying not only over the North Pole **but on beyond, to Alaska**, thus becoming the 1st claimant leaving no doubt of success & 1st whose diaries did not later betray failure. **Thus the very explorer whom academe and the Free** ^[snicker] **Press rushed to banish became the genuine conqueror of EACH Pole of the Earth** (since his 1911 priority at the South Pole is unquestioned). Which made the exiling institutions even angrier (fn 26) — so (§§V4&D5) these Respectable Societies **hid the records of cheaters Peary&Byrd until long after Amundsen's death, in order never to grant him the public recognition he had earned, while he lived.** (As Lake Victoria's true discoverer Speke [§A1] was exiled for life.) [After long ignoring such data-hidings, the press now ducks by ignoring *DIO 24*'s stark record of its ignorings! (Parallel spiral: 1980s case of banishes-veindication just stoking banisher's rage: www.dioi.org/qqq.htm#tzzh.)]

B19 The most eminent public doubters in the 1930s were a trio: explorer Adolphus Greely, geographer J. Gordon Hayes, and writer-skeptic C. Henshaw Ward (RB693). The last, Ward, followed his 1926/2/20 sympathetic review of Thos.Hall's 1917 doubting book, with Ward's 1934 September article, "Peary did not reach the pole", in *American Mercury*, a journal edited by iconic skeptic H.L.Mencken (whom DR met at our home in 1948 November, just before his tragic career-ending stroke). Ward then created a book that might have curtailed the success of Peary's 1909 imposture, and was polishing it when he died. The book had been invited (§T1 below) by no less than Yale University Press and, though when Ward died the book hadn't yet been placed before the Yale Publication Council (delayed by a spy working for Spyder #1 of this affair: §M4 below), there was at the Press "every expectation" (fn 56 below) that it would be published in 1936. The story of its suppression reveals how academe's pinnacle behaves whenever threatened by truth.

C How Peary Could've Proved His Claim.

And: Let's Learn Who's Got Cause to ALWAYS Trust the Press.

What Trusted press-watchdogs played lapdog by ignoring decades of secrecy that benefitted no one but lying explorers **and influential fixers who wouldn't dare lie&cheat&smear etc** — **UNLESS: 100.00% TRUSTing that mainstream media would never expose them?** As we'll see below (§O9), US science's #1 archon, Isaiah Bowman, Johns Hopkins Pres., figuratively burned Ward's book (he'd already nonfiguratively burned another book: fn 36) by falsely (*idem*) alleging (emph added): "it is a piece of dialectic and not a piece of analysis based upon the records. **It is not a contribution to knowledge . . .**" Comments:

[a] Bowman had for months been systematically conniving with Peary's comely daughter to hide the very records he condemns Ward for not analysing!

[To avoid too much repetition of noting here Bowman's central hypocrisy of attacking critics for not seeing records he himself was hiding from them, such points will be remarked below by merely interjecting a bracketed exclamation-mark.]

[b] Ward's book makes **two dozen** important **factual** contributions (not dialectic) to public knowledge regarding Peary's imposition — facts which we enumerate below at §U.

Without accusing Peary of dishonesty, the Ward book's temperate conclusion was that **he had no proof**. This theory — and even that of dishonesty — were vindicated (§E7) when Peary's records became accessible decades later. To understand **how easy, how simple it would have been for Peary to obtain data at his northernmost camp that would confirm or disconfirm his claim sooner or later**, we provide four ways of doing so:

C1 He could have repeatedly recorded the timed azimuthal difference between the compass-direction and the Sun. From these numbers, navigators or astronomers would by easy computation find compass variation [F130-132; www.dioi.org/j225.pdf, fn 17], the difference between the compass' direction and true north. But Peary testified [F227] he took no such data in 1909, though he says in *The North Pole* 1910 p.276 and in *Nearest the Pole* 1907 p.131, that **he steered toward the Pole by compass**. Before the frauds of 1906&1909, Peary, like other explorers not exaggerating their latitudes, always brought back valid compass-variation measurements from the new regions he explored (for science-gain & knowing where the compass pointed, **for daily steering**): see, e.g., his 1900 chart of the north tip of Greenland, *Polar Notes* 10:38 opp. (Fig.7) full and accurate longitudes & new compass variations. (And see accurate new compass variation measures specified all over the map accompanying Adm. George Nares *Voyage to . . . Polar Sea* London 1878.) Denmark's 1909 December rejection of Cook was based on similar considerations, as explained by arctic expedition-leader, navigation-textbook author, & Denmark's Navigationsdirektør Commodore Jens A. D. Jensen [F132]:

There is nothing in Dr. Cook's records to show that he made azimuth observations [to determine compass variation]. In the arctic regions, where variations of the compass are most important [being large and changing rapidly (see AGS' Miller at §H1 below) from place to place] — the compass is of little use unless its variations are [checked by fresh determinations] at short intervals. When one realizes that Dr. Cook [nonetheless] set his course to the pole by the compass, the most fantastic suppositions as to his wanderings are possible.

C2 Had Peary taken with him toward the Pole both halves of his 4000 fathoms of sounding wire, he could've gotten bottom-soundings giving a profile of Arctic Ocean depths from Cape Columbia to the Pole (parallel to the altitude profiles of Antarctica gleaned by Amundsen&Scott in 1911-1912). But he instead assigned [F129] half to a minor side expedition, so his soundings didn't hit bottom within hundreds of miles of the Pole [F128-130].

C3 Peary took a photo of the Sun peeking out from behind an ice pinnacle (*Washington Times* 1990/2/22), intended to show the Sun's altitude when it was just right⁶ for the Pole. [But he never brought it forth later because it established only one of the two Sumner lines needed to prove position, thus he knew that judges would ask for the other photo — so producing the lone Sun-photo would backfire.] Had he really been at the Pole, he could have proved it by two such photos or, better yet, a series of well-spaced photos.

C4 The most obvious proof of all: take expert-witness companions to the goal, who could verify the sextant shots there. (For Amundsen-vs-Peary on such matters, see lop-

⁶Standish has pointed out (www.dioi.org/jno1.pdf, *DIO 23* ‡1) that the solar altitude Peary reported for "the Pole" could have been observed at some time of day on 1909/4/6-7 anyplace on Earth except a corner of Antarctica. Same for the Sun-pinnacle photo.

sided [though generally ignored] detailed comparisons at www.dioi.org/j225.pdf, §§K3-K5.) Peary took on his 1909 trip only one sextant (meaning no Peary-unallowed shots occurred) a choice with obvious implications. On All-Fools-Day 1909, at Camp Bartlett, Peary (whose aide Matt Henson had the only rifle in the party: F122) ordered southward his last navigator-witness, ship's Captain Bob Bartlett — whose heft is obvious from the superspeeds reported once he'd been unloaded. Bartlett of course felt betrayed and was furious (F106). The lack of competent witnesses is a glaring peculiarity of Cook's 1908 claim and the 1906&1909 ones of Peary. At the South Pole, Amundsen and three fellow navigators shot the Sun hourly for 24^h straight. Peary oddly shot the Sun only (F116&142) at neatly spaced 1/4-day intervals (noon, midnight, 6 AM, noon, 70°W time) which makes the math of faking Pole sextant-shots even easier than it already is. It's *especially inexplicable* (F116&142) that Peary didn't shoot the Sun for at least **eighteen hours** (after 1st arrival at Camp Jesup), between 1909/4/6 noon and 1909/4/7 6 AM, **except at midnight: THE one time** (DR *Polar Notes 10:47* end-note c) a sextant shot **could NOT check his transverse wander from his intended 70°W meridian**, still unverified & thus still unknown since the *ocean-trip's start at Cape Columbia*, 413 miles of zigzag travel & 5 weeks of ice-drift ago!

C5 Peary didn't take any of the foregoing verifying steps, so that when congressmen asked what data he'd brought back to guide future explorers, Peary replied [F228]: "They would not need any data I have." Pathetic. And, scientifically, largely a waste of time.

The central failure of the world scientific community was in not applying the positivist norm of empirical science: *the burden of proof is on the claimant not the evaluators*. Thus, as DR said in his very 1st articles on the Peary fraud: if the societies didn't want the scandal of charging fraud, they need only declare the claim unproven and forever say nothing more. (In 1909, AGS and the Scandinavian societies indeed said nothing. To their glory — perhaps the only glory that came out of the entire sordid episode.) This is exactly Ward's intelligent position, which allows him to dismiss the Peary claim while absolving (or diplomatically pseudo-absolving?) all involved of proven dishonesty. It says something about academe's tolerance of a variety of opinions that even Ward's mild skepticism was angrily verboten, inspiring the conspiratorial suppressive web that is the present history.

D The Double-Secret-Failsafe Science-Establishment Cheating of Roald Amundsen, Genuine Discoverer of the North & South Poles.

D1 Isaiah Bowman was the *ne-plus-ultra* Respectable academic politician, one who acted as an early bridge between the era when universities aimed at the Jeffersonian ideal — & today's business-era: academe as cartel. Yet almost none of the admirers of his placid, efficient exterior knew that Bowman was secretly the daring Bond James Bond⁷ of academe, dedicated to employing espionage, disguise, licensed-to-kill book-assassination, and widow-swindling (§P4) — all in secret patriotic service to protect the scientific community from 1935 exposure of its enthusiastically improvident 1909 over-commitment to a lie, which had turned a geography-glamourizing but empirically baseless exploration claim into such a sacred legend that the US science establishment was by now decades-in-too-deep ever to confess voluntarily. While Bowman was for years the geographical establishment's invisible *éminence grise* for maintaining the Peary coverup, he was to the public a visible power operator ever in touch with others of his breed, and a master of playing the press to his purposes, in the tradition of Murchison, as AGS histories acknowledge (e.g., AGS' *Geographical Review 41:19&30*). Bowman was [F63-64]:

fully aware of the value of newspaper publicity and his cooperation was appreciated by the great dailies He deplored the chaff in newspaper reporting [but] it had to be taken for the sake of the wheat, and he added, "You don't bite the hand that offers food!"

⁷Bond's middle name? James. Ever-supercilious self-introduction: "Bond . . . James Bond."

Does this help explain the toothlessness of Bowman's critique of NGS' hero? (And why his publicly-rigid ethical code was actually pragmatically flexible?) Also, unlike most newspapers, NGS was not just popularizing but sometimes generously *funding* science, esp. if (as Ward points out: §O5 below) it helped to promote its excellent (as he also notes: *idem*) *National Geographic Magazine*. (See NGS' self-ad, quoted by Ward: *idem*.)

D2 Anti-Bolshie, anti-Jewish, anti-relativity, Mennonite Isaiah Bowman grew up on his father's farm, and through sheer hard work and puritanical self-discipline made the most of his natural intelligence. He was strong physically and mentally, an ascetic workaholic with a sense of humor, and a clear writing style, plus a sometime gift for self-deprecation — and a science person also versed in the classics. Ambitious but desirous of adding to the world's good — which is the terrible irony of what that desire actually wrought when (as with so many of the world's most revered and reviled leaders) the fervently noble goal seemed to justify ever-more ignoble means, as we are about to see in spiraling detail.

D3 Following a degree from Harvard, an advanced degree from Yale, and exploration in South America, he rose to become Director of the American Geographical Society 1915-1935, then from 1935 to the end of 1948 President of Johns Hopkins University, US' top science university in that day and still one of the world's greats. (Whose sagging financial situation in the 1930s he worked assiduously & successfully to restore, a noble and contributory priority, but which may've unfortunately affected his attitude towards high-profile potential science-world scandal.) Also: Vice President National Academy of Sciences, President American Association for the Advancement of Science, President Association of American Geographers, VP Explorers Club. He was even one of those who at Versailles geographically carved up Europe after WW1, creating the Germany-bifurcating&enraging Polish Corridor, as well as two shotgun-weddings called Yugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia; so, when invited in 1945 to do-it-again, he creditably commented: why would anyone trust the same people who messed it all up in 1919? A scientist-wannabe, he had turned to administration years ago. Since he was deeply anti-Jewish, DR sometimes tweaks his shade by anti-christening him "Izzy".⁸ In 1950 January, a heart-attack brought him death, evidently due to the very overwork that had brought him so high in life.

D4 During his tenure at AGS, Bowman learned that nearly⁹ pure Anglo-Saxon air-hero Richard Byrd's explorations were dubious, but he chose to keep such knowledge private, which gave him a hold over a useful public figure & surely enhanced wealthy NGS' gratitude to Bowman, at a cost to public truth which he found he could live with. In 1925-1926, Bowman&NGS managed for over a year to suppress the news-shock that Peary's closest Eskimo, Kudlooktoo (Snowbaby Marie Peary's childhood playmate), was confessing he'd murdered the 1909 "North Pole" expedition's chief scientist, Cornell University Prof. Ross Marvin, soon after Marvin had departed southward from the main party in 1909 March [F292&306; BR696&698]. Kudlookto had shared Peary's igloo the night before, a social note exceptionally edited-out of expedition-member George Borup's ms-account of his 1909 experience, before its otherwise near-verbatim publication as Borup's gee-gosh boy-scout narrative *A Tenderfoot With Peary* 1911 (Stokes: friend&publisher of Peary, who had content-control over expedition-members' books).

⁸ A 1938/12/17 Bowman letter to AGS' Miss E.T.Platt says Guggenheim Foundation's Director Henry Moe has received too many books and is looking to unload them: "you could send someone or go down yourself and look them over. Mr.Moe will treat you cordially in your own right and doubly so if you mention my name. . . . Good luck and best Christmas greetings. / Sincerely yours," But, not wanting Miss Platt to misconstrue Moe's name, he helpfully reassures her by appending a handwritten note: "Moe is Norwegian — very gentle!"

⁹Byrd shares with DR the distinction of being a direct descendant of Pocahontas, as DR confirmed directly from Byrd's daughter Bolling, though the recent Byrd bio by Sheldon Bart, *Race to the Top of the World: Richard Byrd and the First Flight to the North Pole* 2013 slights Pocahontas by omitting her entirely from the book's meaningfully detailed geneological discussions: www.dioi.org/by.pdf.

D5 The 1926/6/22 official report by Byrd on his 1926/5/9 North Pole try contained enough fishy data that Byrd cleaned it up and sent the new bowdlerized version to Bowman 1926/11/24, asking (§E10; F269-270) that it be kept secret anyway! Bowman of course complied, and when Byrd flew near the South Pole in 1929 with a(?) bottle of cognac as his sole navigational equipment (David Roberts, *Great Exploration Hoaxes* 1982&2001 p.161), Bowman kept it out of the ever-compliant newspapers — not to protect organized geography (never that!) — but ACTUALLY: just because it would disillusion American youth. (Relayed via wry AGS archivist Lynn Mullins 1971/4/1: F64.)

D6 So now Bowman was keeping secret the records of TWO fake North Pole claimants — which served to double-cheat Amundsen, the genuine 1926/5/12 first attainmer, until decades after his heroic death [F276] in 1928 while attempting to save the life of his 1926 co-attainer and DR's later friend, Umberto Nobile (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, Fig.10).

E Cagey AGSociety: “Not a Thing That Can Be Written”

E1 In 1934 October, Ward wrote Bowman and got the following cautious reply:

I know your writings and need no introduction from anyone else though I welcome this indirect message from my old friend [Yale Prof.Albert] Keller.

Before I can answer your questions, may I ask who gave you the assurance that the sentence you quote [Bowman's claim (§E2) that Europe accepts Peary's reaching the Pole, a quote Ward was trying to verify] represents my view?

If I said what you quote I guess I will have to substantiate it. But I want first of all to be sure that I put it that way. I do not customarily refer matters to “European geographers”! This is an American row and we can take care of it ourselves. The judicial quality is not lacking in America.

The perverse irony of these remarks will be evident as our history proceeds.

E2 Ward replied Oct 17 by surveying the deadening public unanimity regarding a controversy that still was hotly debated privately at, e.g., the Explorers Club of New York, where Cook&Peary had been 2nd&3rd Presidents, following 1st President Greely, who by this time had concluded that both men were North Pole fakers but correctly judged that Peary had at least reached a point “adjacent” to the Pole and was more generous to Peary than Peary to Greely [F54-56]. Ward (emph added):

I am mighty glad . . . you say that the Peary question is an American row, for the printed record hardly allows that there is any row: it is a chorus of “we cannot doubt Peary.”

The man who quoted your statement about "European geographers" is Stefansson. On Monday, October 1, about 10:30 . . . I sat in his office talking about the Peary row. I had put this question: "What European geographers believe that Peary reached the pole?" He replied: "Bowman has just returned. Let's ask him what he has been hearing in Europe." I heard him say, "Hello, Isaiah," and ask you about the present opinion among the best-informed men. He listened for a minute or more, exchanged a few remarks, hung up, and then reported to me in these terms: "Bowman says that it is now generally accepted among the European geographers that Peary did reach the pole."

Our interview resulted from my article in the September MERCURY, "Peary did not reach the pole." He wrote me a long letter to show that I was making an ex parte argument, that I had made several amateur blunders, and that I might now wish to study the entire question impartially, to find out the truth. We exchanged letters three times. In my last letter I put this question: "What

sort of knowledge could I hope to find which would prove that the members of the R.G.S. [Royal Geographical Society, London] are mistaken in their judgment against Peary?" His answer was, "Come down and have a chat with me." I chatted an hour and a half. But I got no inkling of any knowledge toward which he could steer me. He opined that Thomas F. Hall and J.Gordon Hayes had written their books with an animus against Peary and that most of the R.G.S. feeling against Peary was a mere following of Hayes, who was a mere follower of Hall.

Does this sound rather like the CDC tracking a disease? In this case, the ever-establishment-dreaded disease (§E9) of: DOUBT.

The [Stef-Ward] talk was very pleasant, but it did not reveal a jot of the information that would overturn Hayes's argument.

Why should Stefansson be so eager to have me, an utter novice, study the Peary question? [See §E3.] Why doesn't he publish the argument that would bowl Hayes over? He is a strange person. He impresses me [quite accurately] as having concealed motives, as working in some devious way. Yet he seemed frank and did not say a word that raised any specific suspicion.

. . . Can you help me to any information of the kind that I asked Stefansson for — data that would show why J.Gordon Hayes's argument is wrong? Do you know of any member of the R.G.S. who believes that Peary did reach the pole?

E3 Read carefully greasy-eminence Bowman's 1934/10/24 bizarre response (emph added) to Ward's interaction with Bill Stephenson (Vilhjalmur Stefansson's pre-showbiz born-name), an explorer whose main exploration had been the 1913 *Karluk* disaster (which had lost the ship & several lives), a contretemps rendering him henceforth desperate (e.g., RB920-921) for the security of joining the polar establishment's insiders, where volunteering to reproach authors of skeptical heresy and propagandizing for Peary (via We-Know-Info-You-Don't arrogance) made him a maid-man.

I [Bowman] wish I could talk as freely as I should like to about the Peary matter. I understand why you got the impression that you did of Stefansson. I am sure that he, too, *is unable to relate some of the things that bear on the final disposition of the Peary question*. These are *complications* [see §V16 here for the obvious proper reaction to such evasion] that involve the family and records kept by them. Some time I may talk with you about it but *it is not a thing that can be written*. So far as I personally am concerned, *I wish to remain out of the discussion* if it involves quotations in print or any use of my name. If this seems strange to you I can explain orally when we meet.

With such artful duckings&peekings going on at organized geography's societal pinnacle, one must ask how — given the hypothetical premises of a free people, boasting an advertisedly free academe, ever-watchdog-monitored by an ever-self-boasted Free Press — the Peary Myth could have survived for 10 minutes, much less 10 decades.

E4 Ward's 1935/10/26 reply must have jolted Bowman by its perspicacity (emph added):

Dear Mr.Bowman

I feel when I read your letter of the 24th that I have somehow thrown you off the track of the simple question which I asked when I first wrote to you. I asked if it is true that “most of the best-informed geographers of Europe now concede that Peary probably reached the pole.” Surely there is no dark secret about that. I found in my talk with Stefansson that I had badly misunderstood

one of his statements, and I want to be sure that I did not misunderstand this one — or that he did not misunderstand you. Did you forget this original inquiry of mine? Or did the situation mysteriously change when I told you that my informant was Stefansson?

Your first letter was easy-going and jocular; you said that the Peary question could be thrashed out in America. But now you grow serious and impress upon me the idea that *nothing can be made known in America*. This is mystifying.

You tantalize me by saying that you would talk with me, but cannot write. It will be six months before I can be in New York again. If you wrote me anything confidentially, I would agree to destroy your letter, never to print anything about its contents, and never to write or speak of what you tell. But you doubtless know best. You have experience of the danger of the written words.

Thank God there is one man in the world who is willing to speak out, Commander Valentine Wood, of the U.S.Navy, retired. He vouches that when he was just out of Annapolis he checked Peary's note-book (not knowing what it was) and found it careless, erroneous, and probably faked. Do you happen to know anything about his reliability?

Both Ward and DR initially took Wood more seriously than warranted. Bowman and DR, on viewing the actual Peary 1909 diary (an opportunity Bowman denied Ward), discounted the Wood story. Note that Peary testified that his record had never been out of his possession; when asked by the Congressional Committee to leave his diary with them, he replied [W144-145]: "I do not care to leave it with the committee or anyone. I do not care to let it out of my possession; it never has been." [Note the contrast to Cook's risible story of leaving allegedly essential North Pole records with "a wandering sportsman in Greenland" (§B15 above).] But Wood's account should've been argued, not suppressed. And so much else in Ward's book is valuable that one weak item can't justify killing the whole.

E5 Next May, Ward finally got to NYC and interviewed Bowman, though columnist Mark Sullivan's inside-knowledgeable if non-neutral researcher Will Shea (in reply to Ward's 1935/3/28 question, "can you guess whether [Bowman] has anything valuable to tell me?") had earlier issued a half-right warning, plus a telling profile (1935/3/30):

My opinion of [Bowman] is that he has nothing of importance to tell you [wrong] and that if he had he wouldn't tell it [right]. . . . He is a politician among scientific men. To hold his post at the head of the American Geographical Society he played ball with the Peary crowd. [For AGS fear of NGS' power as late as 1971, see honest admission at F294 item 22.] He allowed the Society's magazine to become . . . a propaganda sheet against Cook and for Peary. [Bowman's publication of G.Isachsen's 1929 paper, hugely exaggerating speeds possible over sea-ice, testifies to that: F292 item 7.] Being "on the make" he has never let his conscience be his guide but has always observed carefully on which side his bread was buttered.

E6 Ward diary 1935/5/18&19 on his meeting with Bowman (emph added):

who talked prolixly about "his idea of Peary that could be expressed in one sentence" — which was this: As a human being, relying on hunches, I believe that he reached the pole; but as a scientist I have to say that there is nothing to argue about, since *no evidence is accessible*. . . . He was cordial and talked very well, but somehow I got the impression of a man who wants to prove how wise and deep-seeing he is.

Have written to Bowman with all my art, asking him to enlighten the world by publishing that one sentence.

E7 Ward's 5/19 letter pleads for merely that small frank concession. Vainly:

If your non-scientific hunch that Peary reached the pole is correct, why wouldn't you be doing the best thing possible for his ultimate reputation if you told the world what you told me: that the evidence of Peary's achievement has never been made accessible? That fact is, as you said so clearly and forcefully, the crux of the controversy. [But what would 1909-robocertifier NGS say?] If the believers in Peary continue to talk about his "proofs" when none have been published, they will only be convincing scientists that there are no proofs.

The editor of the *Mercury* misrepresented me [Ward] badly last September when he invented for my article the title "Peary did not reach the pole." I have never made such a statement. No unbiased man can make it. No one can yet prove whether Peary was honest or dishonest.

This was long before discovery that Peary's Jesup Land (§B8) & Crocker Land (§§B10&B12) were based on his having *post-inserted passages into his records*, pretending to have seen both these lands, though the original records contained either no such sighting or in the latter case flatly contradicting said sighting. The unambiguous evidences are at www.dioi.org/cot.htm#xtdv [F52] & www.dioi.org/cot.htm#ypcx, resp. The 2nd-cited posting includes a photo of the No-Land-Visible diary page.

I [Ward] am just as much interested in evidence for his honesty as I am in the indications that he was dishonest. I am curious about the puzzle and should welcome one solution as gladly as the other. If you did no more than to say for publication that the concluding statement of report 1961 [Congressional Naval Affairs Committee] is true, you would do more to clarify the controversy — and to open a channel for the truth about Peary — than any man has yet done. In making such a statement you would not be taking part in a controversy; you would be showing all the squabblers what the real issue is.

Oughtn't you to illuminate the whole matter with this brief statement of fact? It seems to me that by dictating one sentence you could accomplish more for an understanding of the Peary mess than all the arguers have accomplished by writing their thousands of pages [of] dialectic.

E8 Bowman's 1935/5/20 reply ended the correspondence [partly quoted at F290]:

No, I shall not enter the controversy except with proof in my hands, or at least new evidence. There is too much feeling abroad to permit one to say "boo" on the Peary question without being misunderstood by one side or the other. Nevertheless, I appreciate the spirit which prompted your suggestion and thank you for it.

E9 Translation of Bowman's "too much feeling abroad": too many publicly noisy critics were *increasingly and justly suspicious that the scientific community had connived in protecting a spectacular scientific fraud*. So it was up to organized science's Ultimate Mogul [§K4] to intervene & Do-Something to smother such a dangerously contagious (§E2) grassroots-fire. Was Bowman being honest in telling Ward no evidence was available even while he was in early negotiations (§F2) that would lead to Bowman's viewing the records at the late explorer's own home on Eagle Island, Maine? The key here: *he wasn't going to tell Ward that — until he knew whether the data supported Peary's claim*. (See below at §J5 — and at §G5 item#2: keeping open all options.) Indeed, the fact that he kept his review and the records themselves publicly-secret to his 1950 death is *an unmistakable admission that they didn't support it*. (As his private remarks reveal, anyway: §V9.)

E10 Another handy — too handy — excuse (§V16) for secrecy was that Cook might misuse¹⁰ Peary's records. Weems *op cit* p.vii [F290]:

... Isaiah Bowman ... suggested that neither the diary nor the observations be made available to the public in order to prevent Frederick Cook's supporters from possibly manufacturing refutations or otherwise twisting the contents to suit their own use.

Byrd later guarded his own hoax by conjuring the like bugaboo that *those dishonest fur-riners would misuse his data*, so he asked (Bart *op cit* p.367) Bowman to hide his records, too! Which most US geographical organizations dutifully did, the Geographical Society of Philadelphia the welcome exception (F270) when years later it gave the post-NGS bowdlerized 1926/11/24 version to the US National Archives (NARA), whose Polar Archives Director, ever helpful&honest Herman Friis, led DR to a copy a 1/2 century ago. Byrd sent that version (having removed various giveaway slips residing in the original 1926/6/22 version, which was hidden until 1996!: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §§F&G, Fig.7), accompanied by a 1926/11/24 letter (Bart *op cit* p.367; www.dioi.org/by.pdf) to Bowman:

Do you not think that perhaps it would be better for me to preserve to myself the privilege of giving out the data . . . ? Should I not [ignore] applications from enquirers from certain European countries who have already shown themselves to be ill-wishers; and certain would-be explorers (whom we know) who have already declared themselves very much on the other side of the fence? Should I not protect myself from academic discussions with such people. . . ?

E11 We can see why Peary's daughter "Snowbaby"¹¹ Marie knew to whom to go for help (§G7 below) when Henshaw Ward wanted to interview her as part of the research for a book he was writing, *The Peary Myth* (www.dioi.org/ph.pdf).

F Explain Yourself, Sirrah! Ed&Marie as GoodCop-BadCop

F1 But the Snowbaby-Bowman romance had a rocky initiation, when her 1st reaction to dawning serious doubts of dad's success, was to berate Bowman for AGS' outrageous oversight — or consummate nerve — in not having bemedalled Peary's 1909 excursion (or his 1906 one) after having awarded him recognition so thoroughly for his 1898-1902 expedition, during which he and Matt Henson had on 1900/5/13 truly discovered and 1st set foot on the northernmost land in the world, Cape Jesup at 83°38'N.

F2 At Marie's request Bowman visited her Washington home on 1935/2/5; his later memo follows, describing the (near?) hysterics of Peary's adored daughter, who'd been too spoiled all her life to even comprehend noncompliance:

On February 5 I called on Marie Peary Stafford at her home in Washington and her husband [lawyer Ed Stafford] joined us throughout all but the first few moments of the conversation, which lasted from about 8:15 until 11

¹⁰Cook did try to copy info from Peary's data but early in the controversy [F86-88] was exposed at botching his copying; so, by the 1930s, this was not a valid excuse for secreting anything of Peary's.

¹¹ Marie started life as a press darling: "Snowbaby" — billed as the 1st caucasian born north of the Arctic Circle in 1894. Understandably spoiled by a genuinely adoring dad whom she truly worshipped, she was (according to what in-laws imparted to DR) used to getting her way. When DR asked her a 1/2-century ago for a skeptic's access to Peary's records, she refused, even while granting same to declared-believer J.E.Weems. She also (1971/6/7 letter to DR) referred to NGS as merely publisher of a "deluxe travel magazine", mis-asserting that more-serious RGS had delivered the Peary-approval that mattered.

o'clock. Mrs.Stafford quickly brought the conversation around to the point of mentioning that the [American Geographical] Society had not given her father a medal for his attainment of the Pole. She said rather spiritedly that the society had not taken a definite stand on the matter and that this fact called for an explanation. Her attitude was rather belligerent.

I explained that there had been a difference¹² between her father and the Society [see F74] which I thought might account for the non-recognition; with that I and the present members of the Council had nothing to do; all of the persons at the Society with whom her father and mother had dealt were now dead; we of this generation would probably find it profitless to go back and dig up reasons for this and that; wouldn't it be well to forget that whole business and look present facts in the face? An outstanding fact is this, we cannot now, after twenty-six years, grant a medal posthumously nor can we now announce that we believe that Peary reached the Pole for we have no more evidence now than we had in 1909, which is exactly no evidence except what is available to the man in the street.

To this Mrs.Stafford replied even more spiritedly to ask if the decision of the National Geographic Society did not count with us. I replied, absolutely not. [A reaction which will interest all those who — contra Ward's position — have expected the public to take NGS' certification seriously.] She then wished to know if a committee of the [US] Coast and Geodetic Survey carried no weight, and I replied again in the most vigorous manner, absolutely not. I then mentioned the report of the C. and G.S. on Byrd's having attained the South Pole, saying that it was a specious report and they practically took back with their left hand what they had given with their right. I continued that the Society had a right to be silent, whatever question might be fired at it or whatever position outsiders might take if the Society chose to do so rather than enter a controversy that consists of nine parts of dialectic and one part of fact and reason; it was for us alone to say what we were going to do, if anything.

It was fortunate for me that her husband was there, in the face of Mrs.Stafford's strong emotionalism and her continuous mixture of sentiment and sense. He supported my position every time I appealed to him for confirmation. At last he was reasoning with his wife and getting her to see that the position of the Society was exactly the position of a court of justice, there was an issue before us and we were asking for the facts. I stated that there was only one record of facts that we desired, the notebooks of Peary himself, the originals, the day-by-day log of his journey from Cape Columbia to the Pole, and back.

I then presented the proposition of the Society, namely, that if the family would turn over to us every bit of evidence which they possess bearing on the polar controversy, making a clean job of it, the Society was ready to examine the records in the greatest detail and issue a statement, provided that the Society should be free to publish its findings, regardless of their nature. [This reads ironically in the light of AGS' eventual non-publication.] We could

¹²After the AGS medal-award for Peary's 1898-1902 expedition, when Peary hid his records of the disastrous 1905-1906 effort, NGS didn't care. But it seems likely AGS asked to see data. Which could explain why "soon after his return from the Arctic in the autumn of 1906, [Peary] resigned as [AGS] President and also declined election to membership in the Council." (John Kirkland Wright *Geography in the Making: The American Geographical Society 1851-1951*, AGS 1952 p.138.) Despite such a suspiciously-timed huff, no one at AGS pressed Peary for evidence supporting his various loud public claims of 1906 achievements. The 1909 scandal that followed such dereliction suggests possible naïveté in Ward&DR proposals hereabouts (e.g., §C5), of mere no-comment on unproven claims.

accept the task only if we had complete liberty of action to announce our findings. She seemed to think that this was possible and said that she would soon ask her mother's consent. More important than this was the consent of her brother, Robert. In a will Admiral Peary had stipulated that all of his records were to be sealed and were to remain intact until such time as Robert, after he came of age, should decide to examine them and make out of them as he chose. It was Admiral Peary's expectation that his son would follow in his footsteps and be an explorer. Robert has taken an engineering course has married and moved to the West and has no interest whatsoever in exploration or in vindicating his father. The whole controversy bores him. According to Marie, the whole burden has fallen upon her of defending her father. Pending Robert's decision on the matter, Mrs.[Josephine] Peary was to have charge of the records. It is therefore necessary for Marie to see her mother and then get Robert's consent. Bearing on the first stage of this is her letter of February 14 saying that she had seen her mother (apparently with success) and that as soon as she could copy some original documents she was going to write to Robert and lay her troubles before him. Presumably if he agrees to let her handle the matter the Society will be asked to re-examine the records.

G Mogul Proudly Deceives Ward. Lapdog Press Betrays Amundsen.

G1 The confrontational 1935/2/5 Marie now becomes adoring Marie, sensing Bowman is getting excitedly ambitious, understanding the academic potential of being the 1st to see all (almost: §§E7&J2) the Peary records, realizing he's getting into such material that powerful persons&institutions will be materially thankful (§M11) for help in muting scandal.

G2 Ward had already (1935/5/18) interviewed Bowman, who'd dealt with him utterly deceitfully (as we will see in detail), saying no records were available *even while* (F290) he was since 1935/2/5 (§F2) in steadily-progressing (see immediately below) mutual-admiration negotiations with the Peary family (e.g., 1935/4/20) for access to such. All this though Ward was a person of integrity and the most temperate of the Peary-doubters. Bowman seemed downright proud of having helped conceal data from Ward, boasting (§M2) to Keller that he felt no duty to tell or show Ward anything, even though the mantra of his 1935/10/20 killer Report (§O) to Yale Press will be that Ward has seen no records.

G3 Did the public-guardian Mainstream Press call for the records' unsealing? No. Silence. But it wasn't silent when in 1926 January Amundsen was so unreasonable as to indicate he couldn't accept either Cook's or Peary's North Pole claims until their records were examined (§B18 above). NGS uninvited his upcoming lecture (*idem*) and the press unanimously condemned him. Amundsen was bankrupt, but the establishment thought that wasn't enough and encouraged even further impoverishment by lack of lecture fees that were his main income (F251-252, 260, & 292). [See current replay below at §W6 [6].]

G4 On 1935/6/6, Bowman wrote Marie he'd visit Eagle Island, ME, where the Peary diaries then resided. Meantime, bubbly Marie has devised a handy comic-foil¹³ to exploit by encouraging competition: Peary-hagiographer, Ann Arbor geologist, hyperpatriot, & Hun-hater William Herbert Hobbs, who had just visited Eagle Island (Peary's longtime

¹³Before Bowman aced out Hobbs, Marie was close enough to Hobbs that his Confidential 1931/7/8 letter to Mark Sullivan claims that Marie had offered Sullivan's ass't Will Shea a look at the diary. Hobbs: "at my suggestion she called at your office in an effort to show the diary to you. Instead of meeting you she met Mr.Shea, who told her he was not interested in seeing it" Assuming the account has any truth: one can be sure that Marie didn't have the diary with her. And considering that it was hidden for the next 50^y and her refusal (fn 11) to show it to DR because he was skeptical, Hobbs' tale sounds incomplete at best. Cook's daughter Helene, too, used to woo writers with the lure of seeing his diaries but never came through. As Marie eventually did. (EXCEPT 1906 Spring: §J2.)

home away from the world, 3 miles from the mainland, now Marie's summer home) in vain hopes of seeing the holy Peary records. Marie (1935/7/25):

. . . Hobbs was here last week . . . and though he made eyes at the safe [containing Peary's original material], he never saw records or diaries, except a copy of one for 1899. I will have some amusing things to tell you. . . .

G5 Bowman spent 1935/7/29-31 at Eagle Island. Dinner was his 1st uplifting experience of the wealthy lifestyle Peary's hoax had made possible for his heirs. The next day, he industriously examined & extensively transcribed sextant data (real&forged), as well as diary passages (all day 7/30). Comments:

[1] Bowman was an amazingly hard worker. (Which brought on his sudden¹⁴ fatal heart-attack in 1950.) Most striking re the amount of intense, careful labor which Bowman devoted to Peary researches: [a] How could the President of Johns Hopkins find — or want to find — the time to explore this specialized historical point? A side-question: Bowman had worked hard and long at delicate, discriminating, systematic archon-pleasing: the path required to become academe's Grand Mogul. Why would he then risk and ultimately (as we see here) squander such grandeur by deliberately getting secretly&deviously involved in espionage and (§§C&M10) bookburning, all to throttle a decent man's just research-goal of finding out the truth? (Answer: The issue was big. And so were the stakes for Reputable Academe.) For an even more unbalanced and persistent contemporary analogy, examine the 1/2-century war, to which US science pol Owen Gingerich of Harvard — *and Bowman's fellow Mennonite*¹⁵ — has committed¹⁶ himself (in service to deadwood archons), all to crush Johns Hopkins physicist R.Newton's Hist.sci-cult-hated findings re Ptolemy's criminality: Gingerich's rep-risks & immunity to mega-evidence of fraud (as knowledgeable astronomers have known for centuries) SEEM to an outsider a ludicrously disproportionate gamble on a "mere" historical dispute: www.dioi.org/fff.htm#qcn. His Ptolemy-Greatness crackpottery persists *since the US' unfree press sucks up to moguls promoting this grantcow hoax by refusing to enlighten the public re exactly how Ptolemy faked all his solar "observations" indoors by elementary-school math from 280^y-old Hipparchan numbers*: fn 16. [b] In both cases, an obsession which superficially looks ridiculous begins to make sense when one accounts for the import US academe places upon the ever-more-laborious&credit-risky crusade of trying&smearing&conspiring to prove that its approval-consensus had NOT-EITHER *connived-in an insistent, prominent, & laughably indefensible hoax upon the public trust*.

[2] Bowman is enjoying reliving his early years as a research-scholar, after decades of getting ever more deeply mired into duties primarily administrative. Note: the reader

¹⁴ If Bowman planned to burn his secret home file of Peary correspondence, his unexpected death prevented loss of much of the basis of the present history. And the sudden 1998 death of Olin Eggen, former Chief Ass't to Astronomer Royal R.Woolley, luckily preserved for us the long-secreted inside details of the infamous Neptune Conspiracy by a clique of Cantabs (*DIO 9.1* †1 = www.dioi.org911.pdf, §§B11&I1; & see *Scientific American* 2004 Dec p.98 for the circular-orbit key to exposing the sham of Britain's priority-grab), who were just as non-collegially secretive (fn 28 below) as Bowman (§M1). Another deliciously ironic parallel: in both the Neptune&polar cases, the sneaks' elaborate schemes improbably backfired, so priority has ultimately gone to the honest parties: Leverrier&Amundsen.

¹⁵Cult-anthropologists take note: same tiny odd religion produced academe's 2 most backstabbing (§P2 & fn 53) hitmen. (And do not miss Gingerich's secret deeply-Bowmanian [§§P2&P4] concern for DR's welfare, at fn 53 below.)

¹⁶ See Gingerich's 1976/8/6 establishment-kissup, in *Science* 193:476 (**American Association for the ADVANCEMENT of Science**, of which Bowman was once Pres), "On Ptolemy as the Greatest Astronomer of Antiquity", precisely echoing p.943 of Princeton Ptolemy-salesman O.Neugebauer's 1975 book, valuable but blind to the long-recognized reality that **astrologer** Ptolemy had faked all his alleged outdoor observations, as proven (too competently for Hist.sci to follow) by JHU physicist R.Newton's *Crime of Claudius Ptolemy* (JHU 1977). Ptolemy's hilariously dumb Almajests: www.dioi.org/pg.pdf, or mathematician H.Thurston's clear summary at www.dioi.org/j801.pdf.

should keep in mind that all of this activity was hidden¹⁷ from public view — as is ever the case when institutions are keeping open all options (e.g., §E8 above).

[3] As he goes through the Peary diary, Bowman commendably notices twice that it provides no mention of data at the northernmost camp. Then — presumably remembering his mission to protect U.S. science’s reputation — he *scratches out both passages*, leaving only: “The last [diary] notice of a determination of latitude is at 89°25’ ” *without ever remarking the oddity* that there are no data anywhere supporting this lone (F150 and §N3 below) Peary zeroing-in alleged observation. In his 1911 Congressional hearing, Peary denied its existence (F144). Likewise (F150) Henson and computers Hugh Mitchell & Charles Duvall. Alleged shot’s record still missing today (since it never existed): *idem*; www.dioi.org/j114.pdf, §D5. The diary-note recalling this alleged 89°25’ April 5 shot is a suspiciously caret-ed-in afterthought, written perpendicularly to the main entry in the left margin of the April 6 diary entry, and continued on the *previous* leaf’s left margin, though the next leaf (microfilm frame 0063) in the diary in its present state is blank. Was the original next leaf removed and later replaced by the loose “Pole-at-Last” 1909/4/6 page? We know that as late as 1910/4/1, there was no diary entry for the “Pole” camp (§O3 below).

[4] F229 notes that the diary’s cover reads: “*Roosevelt* to _____ and return February 22 to April 27 [28 crossed out], R.E.Peary, United States Navy.” Herbert 1989 *Noose of Laurels* bears a photo of Peary’s list of expedition members’ highest latitudes, ending: “Captain [Bartlett] came in from 87°47’ in 24 days. Self came in from _____ in 20 days (18 marches).” Weeks after the 1909/4/6 “discovery”, Peary isn’t sure where he got to! [Did the belated loose leaf’s “The-Pole-at-Last” really mean: at-last-I-made-up-my-mind?] Bowman goes on in another scratched-out comment: “It appears as if several pages are missing. [Marie] will look for these. They were no doubt [!] consulted often and may¹⁸ have been torn out for convenience in handling. Also she will look for loose-leaf sheets containing the rounds of observations near the Pole of which he speaks in the account in *Hampton’s Magazine*.” So Bowman isn’t even disturbed at finding the original record mutilated & is ready to alibi even that?! Could Marie desire a more flexibly imaginative & loyal defense lawyer? A continuous, pre-paginated diary is the best record of data for a real trip. Peary met no such requirements after 1909 April 1, but we find Izzy busy excusing all.

G6 The efficacy of Marie’s lure-tactics are also evident in his grateful letter of 1935/8/3 (emph added): “I had a thrilling time looking at the *priceless* records! And I cannot thank you enough for the privilege and for your hospitality.” He’s hooked. From the fact that Bowman’s originally & properly stated (but now rapidly melting) 1935/2/5 *neutral* purpose (§F2) was to test for whether Peary’s data were genuine or fake, we see he’s already on-board the Peary team — though (despite pretense) he’s an amateur in the relevant science, as shown by, e.g., his then-innocence that solar sextant data are trivially easy to fake. But: he’s wallowing in hitherto-sealed records of a sensational controversy; they sorta look real (to him); and Marie is inspiring him onward. (His repeated use of “we” in his 1937/11/22 letter to Marie [§M14 below] signals vanishment of the last shred of reality behind his (never-vanished) neutrality-pretense.)

G7 Soon after (1935/8/12), Marie begins reeling in Captain Hooked:

Dear Doctor Bowman:

¹⁷A little 1935 October note [Bowman Papers] from AGS Editor Gladys Wrigley [“W”] incidentally reveals that his whole Marie file was kept at his home, not at AGS. See also, e.g., K8 & §§S3. Any attempt to pretend that this separates Bowman’s institutional posts from his espionage fails due to his knowing exploitation of his institutionally-derived influence (which he realized in even trivial matters, e.g., fn 8 above), that was critical to maintaining omertà by all, throughout the multi-layered but hermetic assassination of Ward’s book.

¹⁸If Peary was so protective of his 1909 diary that he never let it out of his possession (§E4), why is Bowman so undisturbed at pages being torn out and moved around?

. . . I am enclosing a communication¹⁹ received today from Hugh Mitchell which please return. I think he has behaved with great discretion.

DR translation of “discretion”: computer Mitchell had testified for Peary at the 1911 Peary hearings, without mentioning he was in Peary’s pay. Said artful Discretion (continuing in his 1935 letter) had later earned him (1926/6/23-28) a place on the National Geographic subcommittee 3some which 9^y ago had rubberstamped NGS’ other polar fake: Byrd’s 1926/5/9 North Pole flight. Marie now shifts to the rôle of frail damsel-in-distress:

Please advise me, in the remote possibility that Henshaw Ward does write me. I would be completely stumped.

Yours, the clinging vine, / Marie

H Izzy’s Mantra Gutted: Peary 1909 Vise Forces “Incredible” Tale

H1 The same day, AGS’ own mathematician O.M.Miller tries to wise up Bowman re the records that had so impressed him, writing (1935/8/12 emph&caps added):

. . . the type of observations presumably made by Peary at the Pole was sufficient to prove that he was close to the Pole provided the observations were not faked. . . . Peary’s observations even if he was hours out in his estimation of time would still indicate that he was close to the Pole. However, one evidence that he was not much out in his estimation of time is when one examines the Camp Jesup [“pole camp”] observations together with the observations taken ten miles on the other side of the Pole. As these observations were 12 hours apart the position [Summer] lines regardless of absolute time should plot approximately parallel straight lines ten miles apart and they do. Any error in time would only alter the perpendicular distance between the two position lines. For instance, if the observations had been made on the 5th and 6th instead of the 6th and 7th, these two position lines would have plotted approximately 58 [nautical] miles apart instead of 10.

Notwithstanding the above argument the observations could have been easily faked.

It does seem INCREDIBLE that with the limited number of astronomical checks [none longitudinal *for steering*] on the dead reckoning & no determination of compass error during the trip [admitted by Peary, F136-137&227-231] that he could have hit the position off so precisely **BEFORE he took the observations** [compare to Rawlins at §H5 below], especially as *the ice must have been in constant motion*.

In short, we KNOW ENOUGH ALREADY to condemn the Peary claim as INCREDIBLE, which vaporizes uncomprehending-amateur Bowman’s dominant misperception that his access to the Peary records gave him the power to make or break the claim’s validity.

¹⁹Mitchell sent Marie copies of an exchange between Ward&himself: Ward 1935/8/7: “. . . National Geographic Society . . . handed me a copy of “To Students of Arctic Exploration”. Do you mind telling me about the form of the observations on which your computations are based? Are they recorded on pages of a bound book, or in some of these “loose slips of paper” on which Mr.Tittmann [USC&GS, 1910 Peary Hearing] saw the original observations? Where are these original observations now preserved? Would it be possible for a properly accredited geographer to have sight of them?” Mitchell 8/10: “. . . the computations in the paper . . . were based on copies made by me directly from the original observations . . . on sheets of paper, separate pages of what had apparently been an ordinary notebook from which they had been removed, I imagine, to enable Peary to carry them in greater security upon his person. . . . I am sure you can secure an authoritative answer . . . from Admiral Peary’s daughter, Mrs.Edward Stafford . . . at Eagle Island. (Address: South Harpswell, Maine).”

H2 The 1906 Peary diary is filled with references to ice-motion; less so in 1909. But the 1909 expedition's Donald MacMillan noted "the very apparent rapid motion of the ice" [F101] early in the trip, likely the main pack's motion relative to the land-ice. This is supported by the Bowman-Stefansson 1926/6/11 interview with Henson (filed at Dartmouth) who recalled that, for all but one of the leads crossed on the 1909 return, the trail was re-kitted by searching for it in the same direction transversely [F144]. It's obvious that Miller saw right through Peary's answers to rebellious Arkansas Congressman Robert Macon's good questions to Peary (for which *Scientific American* sneeringly attacked Macon: F234) on his utter lack of 1909 celestial observations for steering **which are far harder to fake since spherical trig and logs were required for the methods of that day**, while all the data Peary offered can be swiftly faked by simple arithmetic. (It's worth noting in-passing that Macon, though semi-pseudoscientist-amateur, brought out more truth at that time than the entire cowed scientific community. One can gauge the depths to which Bowman had brought that community by asking: when else has *Congress* been more honest than scientists?!) The Macon-Peary exchange (F230-231) follows. Macon: "... you took no longitude observations at all?" Peary: "I took no observations for longitude at any time on the trip." Macon: "... without that you managed to make a straight course to the Pole without anything except conjecture or estimate to guide you. Is that it?" No distance-data for 135 mi (and a series of inconsistent estimates of the marches' lengths: F144-145); no steering data for 413 mi! (See §N4 below.) Peary: "I leave the [April 6th-7th] observations to answer that question. . . ." Since those data are fakable in minutes, they are not even evidence and thus cannot answer Peary's steering-data blank, as AGS' Miller realizes — which backs Ward's temperate central contention: **PEARY BROUGHT BACK NO PROOF.**

H3 F132 (emph&caps added):

Since these [sextant solar-altitude shots] are the *only* specific data presented by Peary as being from the North Pole, it is of interest that **solar altitudes are also the ONLY such data observable at the Pole that could just as well have been faked without making the trip at all**, a fact agreed to by every knowledgeable scientist, even Cook and Peary. Since Peary was never able to explain [despite repeated opportunities, as AGS' Miller pointed out: §H6 below] how he aimed at the Pole to get himself there, his possession of such figures is as suspicious as, for example, a politician's sudden accumulation of wealth he cannot account for.

We already saw at §C how elementary it would have been to acquire REAL proofs. Since Peary took no observations (longitude *or latitude*: F144) from Bartlett Camp to his terminus, and since Henson (& the Eskimos: fn 35) said Peary rode most of the way on sledges (*idem*; F111-112; Dartmouth Library ms 1926/6/11: §H1), and since Peary steered by compass (§C1 above) without ever determining the compass' huge variation from true north (F227), DR in 1973 summed up the oft-unappreciated humor of his claim (F145) thusly:

. . . the navigational story finally amounts to this: Peary sped over the ice for 27 marches without knowing which way was north, pacing the distance of the last 130 miles from a sitting position. On April 6-7, opining he was at his goal, he chanced solar observations that showed him to be only a mile and a half short and four miles to the left, the straightest, best-gauged dead-reckoning feat of all time — a veritable 413-mile Pole-in-one!

So just from the 1911 Macon cross-exam, navigators readily discern that Peary's steering-data zero is fatal to his claim's credibility — **WITHOUT EVEN NEEDING TO SEE the "priceless" Peary records, which ambitious Bowman keeps ignorantly dreaming are determinative — repeatedly insisting so to fellow conspirators** (e.g., §V7 below). Bowman simply lacked the instinct, but navigationally-expert critics (§N3 below) — from Clements

& Albert Markham (the latter an 1876 veteran of the ice north of Ellesmere Land, achieving a new Farthest North at 83°20', 400 miles from the Pole: F27), to Miller (whose expert evaluations were deepsixed by Bowman & himself), to DR to Sir Wally Herbert — all instantly realized that **this alone** proved Peary's story made no navigational sense. DR's 1970 papers (*U.S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Dartmouth's *Polar Notes*) & 1973 book's Chap.10 "Quiver in the Arrow" (F135-145) all centrally used this line of reasoning (without access to the then-still-sealed Peary records).

Since Bowman wouldn't publish his own expert Miller's analysis, DR didn't see his wisdom until 1977. I.e., it's an independently arrived-at agreement of experts (Miller at §H5 below equals Rawlins at §C1 above), adding to its force.

H4 Even Peary's variously invaluable exploring companion Matt Henson realized — though less formally tutored in navigation than Bowman — there'd been no data taken for steering on the 1909 trip & commented to Peary on arrival at their northernmost camp that they should immediately head for home, having (as he either hoped or prudently pseudo-argued) accidentally gone far-enough to be at the Pole since Peary had (F150-151) underestimated their speed, so they had hit the Pole only (*idem*) "by an oversight", adding crucially (F137): "If we have not traveled in the right direction then it is your own fault."

H5 In 1973, F113-114 analysed the details of Peary's vise-on-the-ice that forced him into having to settle for a steering-data vacuum:

A glance at the [multi-staged] expedition's marching schedule within Peary's narrative reveals that its basic unit beyond 84°1/2 N. latitude was five marches. . . . MacMillan returned from Camp #7. Borup from #12. Marvin from #17. Bartlett from #22. Observations had been made from the last two, so Camp #27 (Camp Jesup) was the next camp for observations, five marches after Camp #22. April 1 + 5 = 6: thus was history [the once-nationally-sacred Date-of-Discovery April 6] actually determined! . . . obviously Peary had intended to go the five-march run, the established unit, and then take [zeroing-in] observations for forward [latitude] **and** transverse [longitude] position — well short of the Pole.

But after these (obviously later-destroyed observations) showed Peary he was unreachable far from the Pole (& likely off his meridian), he found himself in a vise (F150: caps added):

The wise April 6-7 decision to speed back for land naturally made Camp Jesup the "Pole Camp," perforce, in his eventual story. This, unfortunately, also would put the actual April 6-7 zeroing-in observations, performed in order to find his way **TO** the Pole, right at the camp (Jesup) he'd had to tell Henson was virtually **AT** the Pole! [Compare to Miller at §H1 above.] But Henson and those [four] Eskimos might remember that there were no observations anywhere else after April 1 [until Camp Jesup]. A ghastly dilemma. But a contrary witness was more to be feared (back in the U.S.) than the common-sense of societies. So what was Peary to do in his tale **but** find his way right to the Pole by course-setting from the hip, and distance-gauging literally by the seat of his pants? — marvels which need not be stated explicitly unless squeezed out by cross-examination, a societal indignity no geographical institution would dare inflict on him, if precedent meant anything.

H6 We now return to Miller's 1935/8/12 report to Bowman:

The individual observations according to the published accounts look a little too good to be true. Observations with an artificial horizon and sextant when the sun is low are, contrary to Peary's statement [Peary *The North Pole* 1910 p.288n] more difficult than with a transit. . . .

... provided Peary kept approximately on his meridian his compass variation would vary very little but would vary very rapidly if he got off his meridian²⁰
 ...

These facts were not brought out by Peary *when he had the opportunity of stating them* at the Congressional investigation. . . .

Institutional scientific evaluation at its best — but none of it was seen by the public until decades after all the principals were deceased. The most confidential Bowman papers (e.g., The Report) were sealed for at least a 1/4 century after his death. DR 1st explored them in 1977 late Spring.

In conclusion [Miller continues], it is remarkable that the arguments for and against Peary are given in all printed publications with such venom and prejudice. No one has yet seemed capable of studying the matter without bias. His principal critics, [Thomas] Hall and Hayes, shamefully confuse the issue as regards the astronomical and magnetic observations in order to bolster up their arguments. Hobbs does the same in the opposite direction.

H7 While admiring Miller's science&reserve, DR feels his evaluation of the admittedly-untutored early critics fails to recognize that they broke the trail for all investigators to come, and occasionally produced gems of perception, albeit too often nestled among too many nuggets of fool's gold [F234]. As for alleged harshness: hey, is there a nice word for fraud?

H8 Miller's main point is that the Cook fanatics were (and still are, though far smaller in numbers) so zany that for decades following 1909, they convinced most onlookers that questioning Peary was crank *per se*. As late as the 1960s-1970s, DR had to break through plenty of such preconception to get a hearing at all. (The Earl-of-Oxford contingent has created like notoriety for doubt of Shakespeare's authorship, unfortunately inhibiting reception of solid skeptical scholarship [which hopefully includes www.dioi.org/ji00.pdf].) The US Naval Institute's expertise was 1st to see DR's work was rational&competent, which set the ball rolling (1970 June) all the way to the hoax's utter demise²¹ nearly 40^y later: <http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/07/who-was-first-at-the-north-pole>.

H9 But there's an awful irony in this connexion: *just what Miller was asking for* finally appeared in the genially skeptical person of Henshaw Ward, who is so temperate in his criticisms of Peary that Bowman has to nimbly, conveniently concoct a new criterion to continue to oppose ALL criticism of the Peary Myth so dear to the establishment which The Mogul slavishly serves — he will now (below at §O2) condemn temperateness as DECEIT which merely pretends to neutrality. This ploy is such a pretzel, one is compelled to wonder: did Bowman miss his true calling? As a corporation lawyer. Or: one could argue he hit it.

I Excellenz Dissembles: Dodging the Devil

II The geographical corporation was starting to tremble (§M2), as a prominent skeptic, Henshaw Ward — public defender of Darwin in the Monkey Trial era — loomed

²⁰F138: "the transverse instability associated with the diverging of the terrestrial magnetic field in Peary's general direction. . . ."

²¹The main holdouts for Peary are the TV-program *Jeopardy* & Wikipedia's *North Pole* page. (Which, as for Wikipedia on all controversies, is ruled by the biggest & most aggressive edit-army.) The latter cites seriously the Peary-puffery of Tom Avery who (officially funded by a bank) had no more visible connexion to the Peary family than Bowman. Avery recently (almost) duplicated (some of) Peary's speeds but not Peary's steering data (there weren't any) or toes (there were hardly any) or age (near 53^y). Avery's measure is easily found from his attendant gush about the great hero, doing a superb imitation of a p.r. man. (See Bryce's review of Avery's book: *Polar Record* 46.4:378-380; 2010.) He ought to stick to sledging (not theatre) where he's genuinely terrific. (AND he really got to the N.Pole.)

on the horizon. He wrote 1935/8/7 to Hugh Mitchell, the computer who'd testified to get Peary his 1911 Naval committee recognition (falsely assuring the congressmen such data couldn't be faked [vs W94-96]), submitting way-needlessly over-ornate math which he & C.Duvall presented to the 1913 International Geographical Congress. (Mitchell's work was privately paid for [W185; \$280: RB522&1050] by Peary, as came out in 1914.) Mitchell&Duvall's work (fully provided in Hobbs' *Peary* 1936 pp.466-475) requires pages of fancy-looking spherical-trigonometric and logarithmic math to find Camp Jesup's position as indicated by Peary's alleged sextant shots. (Consultants are commonly hired today to snow doubters, and for cash will defend anything you want.) But at www.dioi.org/pn.pdf, *Polar Notes* 10:35 (1970 Oct), DR showed how several lines of simple elementary-school additions&subtractions produce the same position within a few feet! A.Hinks & J.Wordie of RGS did a similar simple analysis of Peary's "Pole" sights at p.258 of the 1937 *Geographical Journal* (RGS): problem trivialized by the fact that *the easiest places on Earth for which to fake sextant observations are the vicinities of the North&South Poles* [F154].
I2 Bowman to Marie 1935/8/29 (an exercise in smug snobbery):

... Just a few days ago I finished going over the controversial books which are about as cheap and loosely written as could be. Taken by themselves they sound plausible enough. When analysed they fall apart in all but a few respects. What the "residual"²² points are, about which future discussion may rage, I can best relate when I see you.

Bowman then reveals what point worries him most, and for good reason: Peary's 1906 claims. (For what the 1906 diaries devastatingly reveal — though not to Bowman — see www.dioi.org/cot.htm#ypcx and www.dioi.org/cot.htm#ppts.)

There is one thing of importance which you will have time to do — look for the 1906 diary. Can it be copied? If you think it safe, can it be brought to Baltimore for study?

... Ward is a funny little devil. Please convey my compliments to your mother [Jo Peary] . . .

J Interlude: The Surprising Things Discriminating Mil-Dew Can-Do

J1 On 2004/6/25, DR realized that in the case of the diary record supporting Peary's 1906/4/21 Farthest, we have a revealing double-disappearance-coincidence, of a type which ought by now to be familiar to our readers. (See www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf [co-published with UnivCambridge] ☉1 & fn 183.) Peary's 1906 claimed "Farthest-North" at 87°06'N has (since at least the books of Thomas Hall & J. Gordon Hayes) long been known to have been far fishier than even his transparent 1909 N.Pole sham. As noted above (§B12), the long-hidden typescript of Peary's 1906 Spring diary (found by Sir Wally Herbert, who'd been deputized in the 1980s by National Geographic to search the Peary records), the verbatim diary-record of his 1906 April drive at the Pole *coincidentally is missing the part following 1906/4/20 — one day* (and an impossible 36 mi beeline) short of his 1906/4/21 "Farthest". This typescript²³ revealed that his 1906/4/20 entry placed him no²⁴ further north than

²²I.e., the skeptics' strongest points, which Bowman still fears.

²³The typescript was not typed by Peary but by someone unfamiliar with his script. (At least some typescripts were done after his death.) At 1906/4/14 (typescript p.2) appears the header, "First day of 'dark'." This is just the typist's misreading Peary's penmanship, which makes the word "dash" look like "dark". Wally Herbert has this confusion in his book, a slip which was unfairly over-criticized to devalue it — without mentioning that the error originated decades before Herbert.

²⁴Diary transcript (sent DR 1987/12/28 courtesy Alison Wilson NARA). Its pp.1&5 refers to using the transit, the sextant being damaged (typescript p.2; §B13 above). Entry for 1906/4/20 (emph added

86°30'N — a datum **NOT** in his 1907 book (*Nearest the Pole* pp.133-134) — putting him 5 mi short of Cagni's alleged Farthest. The book is based on the diary up until 1906/4/19-20, when we start finding at its pp.132-135 an important "forced march" not in the diary which instead describes being stopped, "backing", camping on April 20 (after just 2^h3/4 travel) when unable to cross leads, incl. a large one "trending N.E. & S.W." (typescript p.6) conveniently misreported at *Nearest* p.133 instead as "trending nearly north and south". After flags at his April 21 farthest (*ibid* p.135: "making no camp here"), he reports an immediate return from 87°06'N to 86°30'N (*ibid* p.139): "We had already made a good day's march [north]. Now we had to duplicate it [southward] without food or rest." That is: he round-tripped at least 72 bee-line miles (!) crossing (*ibid* p.134) each way: "fourteen cracks and narrow leads, which almost without exception were in motion." — i.e., all the way to his purported Farthest & back to 86° 1/2 *without making camp* (*ibid* p.135).

J2 And if we seek the original 1906 diary to verify this, we find that it's oops—"missing". Marie, as she was filing dad's papers, imparted the family's secret alibi for this, to her equally secret pal Bowman (1935/9/9 her emph, emph added): "This is just a note to remind you that the 1906 [Spring] diary is the **one** diary which we do not have. It is the one from which **those few pages** that I showed you, came; the rest was destroyed by mildew." If this 1906 "coincidence" — *at the very year critics had long neon-highlighted* (and which Bowman had just specially inquired about as a "thing of importance": §I2) — couldn't jostle Bowman into suspicion, what would?

[1] Did this thoughtfully selective breed of mildew also eat the post-1906/4/20 part of the diary-**typescript**, too?! [2] An obvious question Bowman didn't ask: whatever the 1906 April record's condition, is it credible that a Peary-worshipping daughter would simply **throw out** one of his most precious diaries? (As DR commented on a similar hole in F.Cook's evidence: the Cook Society would preserve a wad of gum if Cook had chewed it.)

J3 Marie's 1935/9/9 letter proves that the original 1906 April diary did exist (it doesn't now), and that the family hid or destroyed²⁵ it — a scenario obviously suggesting to all but Bowman that she **could have selected from it those pages undamaging to dad's Farthest and let the damaging ones go**. (Luckily, Marie thought that the also-mildewed 1906 June diary was harmless or in hopeless shape, so it ended up at the National Archives — whose experts restored it, exposing her father's Crocker Land fraud: §§B12&E7 above).

J4 So both of **two** 1906 April records (diary AND typescript) of the SAME event happen to be: [i] initially sealed for decades, then [ii] turn up so mutilated that checking the claim based upon these records is conveniently inhibited. (Meanwhile, the mutilation and Marie's excuse for it were kept hidden for decades more [evidently only now made known here], and all independent researchers were barred from all Peary evidence for the same decades.)²⁶

& mis-spellings etc righted in brackets): "Have [reduced] yesterday's and to-day's [transit] sights and they give very similar results, the mean of which is 86°30' (*the places are in the same lat.* only yesterday's position was east of to-day's [i.e., zero latitude advance from the April 20 "forced march"]) but I fear that both [altitudes] are a little low, one before [meridian], the other after it. Since the observation, we have come about two miles. We are in a perfect mesh of leads the understream from which keeps the sun obscured and doubtless has much to do with this incessant wind." Due to cloudiness, the unsatisfactory (poor solar image) transit sun-shots' time-differences vs Local Apparent Noon were ordmag 1^h (which would cause about a 10th of a degree latitude over-estimate if the sights were arithmetically treated as noon-sights).

²⁵ Shades of the Cook cult, which hid his 1906 McKinley "peak" original print of his photo for decades before evidently destroying it. [We owe to Bryce that an alternate print survived the destroyers.]

²⁶ Again: **keep in mind** that these literally incredible alibis are coincidentally found at what all critics for a century have regarded (long before they knew of the peculiar concentration of 1906 "losses") the most incredible part of Peary's northward record, his 1906 Farthest North.

These revelations from the Bowman papers thus represent a clear triumph for Hall, Hayes, and Ward, the very investigators whose analyses mogul&bowdler Bowman had proclaimed (1935/11/5 *before even seeing Ward's book*: §M5 below), with atypically transparent anger & triteness, "are going to look like thirty cents — and I don't mean maybe!" upon the eventual release of the hard evidence.

Just **how** cooperatively gullible, tractable, and-or eye-averting do the above-appreciated Farces of Dorkness expect the scholarly community to be?

J5 As if to emphasize his inertness to the 1906 blank's correlation to the Peary 1906 tale's incredibility, Bowman's 1935/9/14 reply to Marie's 9/9 notices nothing peculiar, instead not only buying Marie's alleged 1906 lacunae, but gladdening Marie by declaring Peary's North Pole tale a **model of genuineness**:

Those few pages from the 1906 diary that you showed me — are they decipherable? They might have some very important material. I am looking forward to seeing the other material to which you refer. During the last week of October I shall have meetings of the various Advisory Boards of the Schools of the University. My best guess is that sometime between the 5th and 10th of October would give us the best chance to have a leisurely talk about the new material that you are bringing and the "spread" that I have now recopied on a large chart. There are many things to discuss and some rather thrilling points in connection with the whole business. It seems to me more than ever to be a thoroughly honest and convincing story. The one fine point which requires much thinking and many preliminary judgements (to test it and play with) relates to what others may do to the material when and if it is published. However, the time has not come for a decision on that question.

More when you return to Washington, / Sincerely,

I.e., his only worry (which even causes a break in his usually flawless grammar) is that less perceptive souls may not agree, protectively *and non-neutrally hinting he won't publish if testing shows it's a danger* (as the advice of O.M.Miller may have warned). JHU's secrecy had no ethical, scientific, or historical positives whatever.

K US Science's #1 Power Operator CELEBRATES Skeptics' Deaths

K1 Marie, now back in Washington, writes Bowman 1935/10/3 (emph added):

Here we are at last, and I am writing to ask you to name any day next week . . . when it would be convenient for you to see me. I want you to have lunch with me as [a young chemist] is visiting us and wants very much to meet you. After lunch he can explore the university [i.e., get-lost] while you and I talk **privately**.

Affectionately / Marie

Marie felt empowered to keep postponing the meeting, repeatedly inconveniencing Bowman, who adjusted dutifully, docilely writing 1935/10/15:

. . . I only hope that you can come on Saturday of this week. . . . we could then have a couple of hours' chat in the afternoon. . . .

. . . I am not clear whether the young man is coming with you . . . just let us know that we are to expect you.

(We again remind the reader that Bowman, even as he writes, is secretly conniving in hiding it.) Given what the ultimate verdict on Peary turned out to be, it's hard for history to get more ironic. Or more instructive to the public on *EVER* trusting big-institution academic archons who're posing as judicious neutrals. Respectability — i.e., power — in an academic is not only no guarantor of dealing fairly with dissent, it is commonly obtained through decades of its opposite: conformity.

In this connexion, a university president is unexceedable.

K2 A healthy, classy lady of 41^y, Marie on 1935/10/16 flirts with 56^y-old Bowman, “one of the world’s huskiest persons” (as he described himself to Marie in a 1938/7/1 letter), by enticingly misquoting his yesterday-letter’s reference to her young companion:

. . . I will . . . reach your house between half past one and two. “My young man” as you so scandalously call him was all set to start for New York tomorrow. But when he found he would have a chance to meet you he postponed his going until Sunday and will accompany me to Baltimore. . . . he has no axe to grind or favor to ask, he has just always admired you and wanted to meet you. He is a classmate of Robert [Peary 3rd’s at Bowdoin [College] It is rather forward of me to push an extra guest on you! . . .

Did the Yale Press know how chummy the home-secreted Marie-Bowman correspondence was getting? (Anyway, it was crucially turned over to the JHU library after his death.)

K3 Bowman 1935/10/17:

We shall expect you at your convenience on Saturday afternoon. . . .

You will find a welcome awaiting you from the entire family and I know that we shall have a good discussion of the material. I am not so much interested in showing you the little that I have done on it, as in seeing what additional information you were able to get from the diaries and other records.

K4 Peary-skeptics General Greely and J.Gordon Hayes died in 1935 & 1936, resp. Greely’s death occurred the same year as Ward’s death of pneumonia, 1935/10/8, and Hayes was near death from cancer (§K10 below). So an ecstatic Marie wrote Bowman 1935/10/24 inviting him to a special joy-join (emph added):

Won’t you and Mrs.Bowman give us the pleasure of having dinner with us the evening of November 8th at seven thirty? *I am so very anxious to celebrate with you the demise of Henshaw Ward et al!* . . . If you give your consent, I’ll write Mrs.Bowman, of course, but I knew you were the Grand Mogul and I thought it best to approach you first. If [Bowman’s daughter] Olive wouldn’t be too bored I would love to have her, too and see if I can’t find an interesting man for a dinner partner. Please.

K5 Bowman’s reply 1935/10/28 (DR’s caps), which should be forever etched upon the memory of anyone who (like DR, once upon a time) too trustingly and too unexceptionally assumes the genuineness of high institutional chiefs’ projected veracity and judiciousness, in controversial matters:

Too bad! . . . but for [two prior engagements] the Bowman family would be on your doorstep. We enjoyed so much your visit and share your sentiments **TO THE NEED OF THE OCCASION FOR CELEBRATION!**

Again: this is THE top academic power-broker of that era, and perhaps for all time.

K6 Marie keeps on cheerleading her new hero (1936/1/2 emph added), ever-so-casually reminding him of her shapeliness:

Hooray for *our side*! Ain’t it a grand way to start the new year? Mother & I are deeply grateful to you.

But what a shame you’ve been under the weather! Most of my family folded up on me the day after Christmas and I’ve been rushing trays up and down stairs ever since — grand for the figure but rough on the disposition!

I do hope you’ll soon be fine again! With affectionate greetings and best wishes for the new year to you all. I am,

Sincerely, / Marie

K7 On 1938/10/5 the *NYTimes* ran the following story:

Belief that the Arctic Crockerland named by the late Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary, discoverer of the North Pole, does not exist was expressed by Commander Isaac Schlossbach, navigator and pilot of the MacGregor expedition, which returned to Port Newark after a fifteen and one-half months’ trip to the Far North.

Commander Schlossbach . . . reported that he had made more than twenty flights over the Arctic region, including several in search of the Russian aviators who disappeared on a transpolar flight. He said he had satisfied himself that Crockerland did not exist.

K8 Bowman told Marie 1938/10/26 of 10/5’s bad-news in a letter (typically tagged by his sec’y: “For Mr.Bowman’s home files”), resisting the obvious (Crocker Land’s non-existence), as he continues privately to lose the very neutrality he’s telling others is why he’s THE man to judge the Peary matter (§V7). But he then went on (2nd paragraph) to describe his productive and intelligent labor on another point

I thought of you on October 5th when the New York TIMES carried an item entitled, “Land Peary Named Held Nonexistent”. . . . It was a misleading headline, but then most headlines are misleading.

In August, I was at Cambridge, England, for a week and visited the Scott Polar Institute. In the Institute’s library are the original notebooks of a number of polar explorers from 1876 [George Nares & Albert Markham] down to the present time. I went through most of them in order to see their condition. One of the criticisms of the Admiral’s record, which was made, I believe by a member [Roberts] of the Congressional Committee, was that the pages were too neat and fresh in appearance to have been written on the trail. The result of my examination of the Cambridge material is surprising. In general, the naval officers kept their records most neatly. Curiously enough, Scott himself is an exception. His diary is quite badly damaged in places. [Albert] Markham’s records are as neat as if written yesterday, though they are now sixty years old or more. Skipping details, one may say that no conclusion whatsoever can be drawn from relative neatness and cleanness. I thought you would like to know this. . . .

This may be Bowman’s greatest evidential contribution to the Controversy, eliminating a false objection to Peary’s claim that was long taken seriously by many. (Incl. DR, until he examined for himself the newly-unsecreted Peary diary in the 1980s. Alternate view: RB878-879&1098-1099.)

K9 Marie wrote Bowman 1938/11/20 (emph & caps added):

Stop picking on your secretary! I know just how she felt when you fixed that half stern, half twinkling look on her and dictated: “She will not make that mistake again.” That particular look always makes me want to squirm! And you know it!

Having finished being saucy, let me thank you very deeply for your thoughtfulness in sending me the copy of your Scott Polar Institute notes [on diaries’ cleanliness]. I read them with the keenest interest and am delighted to have them for the record. *Little by little, WE’ll get them in the end.* . . .

K10 When Bowman 1939/11/15 told Marie of publication of a revised edition of Hayes’ Peary-doubting *Conquest of the North Pole*, she (1939/11/16) replied — with typical sympathy for dad’s doubters — unsure Hayes was gone (he’d actually been dead 3^y):

You have ruined the day for me! I thought that old devil Hayes was dead — that he had cancer or something! Seriously, I am tremendously obliged to you for your constant interest which nothing escapes, and for keeping me posted on your findings. . . .

L Webs of Tractable Careerists: The Grovels of Academe

L1 When Ward died suddenly of pneumonia 1935/10/8, Myth-defender Marie knew the Mogul to contact to kill Ward's book, and her remark urging telephoning makes it clear she knew the murder-project was a Top-Secret crime. Her letter 1935/10/29 (emph added):

. . . it seems that Hobbs was misinformed when he told me that Ward had died with his book unfinished. It is done and Professor Keller, Ward's executor is to have it published by the Yale University Press. This seems to me a terrible thing and I wondered if you could make any suggestions by which it might be prevented. *If you don't want to go on record in writing — I can easily understand that you might not*, call me any evening after the rates go down — Adams 2447 — reverse the charges and give me the benefit of your friendly advice. It seems so awful, and how it would make [1909 Peary-expedition member, the late] George Borup writhe!

Always sincerely / Marie

No mention of who told Marie that Keller was the executor.

L2 Just as Marie knows the best gofer to contact to pull rank on Yale Press, so Bowman knows who is vulnerable to being recruited as a secret agent, to keep an eye out, inside Yale Press doings. The perfectly natural chains of eager careerists, by which establishments create reliable webs that typically fix things to their advantage, was forming, link by link: the fabled if oft-mispronounced Grovels of Academe.

M “I TREMBLE”: NEUTRAL Gofer Kills a Book While He Orders the Post Office to Recognize Peary Discovered the North Pole

M1 Bowman writes a biased, condescending, heavy-handed, devious, and almost laughably apocalyptic *confidential* letter to Ward's best friend, Yale Social Sciences prof Albert Keller, urging the death of a book he hadn't even seen (*making no mention of his close palship with the Peary family*) and also urging that *the name of the spyder at the center of the web be kept secret* — which it was for decades. (Yale Press' Davidson [with Keller's initial connivance] hid it from Ward's widow in 1935 [§S1] & 1945 [§P5], and he hid it from DR in 1971 until DR *told him* who was behind the hit-job [§O5].) Bowman's original idea was to murder the book and sneak away undetected, with the nearly-justified *confidence that a mob of fellow maid-academics would maintain omertà*.

Is academe a Church? A club? Cosa Nostra?

M2 The letter to Keller (1935/10/30 emph&caps added):

Personal and Confidential

Dear Bert:

About a year ago [actually 5 months], if I remember correctly, Henshaw Ward came to see me about the Peary matter. He said that he was writing a book and asked me a number of questions designed to elicit my views.

Just recently I have heard [hiding from Keller that the source was Marie Peary] of his death and of his appointment of yourself as his literary executor. *For the*

good of your soul and your future peace of mind you should know that Ward was exceedingly ill informed about the so-called Peary-Cook controversy and about Peary's achievements, especially his journey *to the Pole*. An article written by him several years ago bristles with inaccuracies.

Naturally, it was not my job to act as a bright little guardian angel and protect and educate him. Nevertheless *I TREMBLE OVER THE CONSEQUENCES* of the production of this book by a reputable publisher in view of the fact that neither Ward nor anyone else *who has published on the subject* has had access to the original records.

Bowman deftly includes the italicized 6 words to TECHNICALLY duck telling a lie, allowing him to seem to say no one has seen the records. Certainly, if Bowman intended to be square with Yale Press about his relation to Marie and about his access to the records 1935/7/30 & thereafter, this was the time to tell what was going on in Washington, Baltimore, & Eagle Island.

All of this [Bowman goes on] is by way of personal counsel *and I wish you to keep this letter strictly confidential*, since I do not want to be mixed up with the question in any degree in its present posture so far as concerns publications and discussions that are not based upon the original records.

M3 Keller wrote Bowman a 1935/10/31 letter starting with transparent glee that he had hit the academic-influence-jackpot, then prostrating himself at the Mogul's feet & starts explicitly offering, as one who has the widow's ear, to secretly join the conspiracy to kill the book and act as a surreptitious spy-for-Bowman within the Yale Press circle of friends, that was to suppress his old friend's final work (emph added), *even though* he suspects that Ward's skepticism re Peary is warranted and that the book is good but says he won't anymore if *Illustrissime* disapproves! He then confesses he doesn't even care about the truth. Understand: geographical-exploration fakery has real-world consequences. Nansen in Franz-Josef Land could have died from exaggerated Austrian mapping, and Denmark believed that Mylius-Eriksen died from erroneously-extrapolated Peary charting of northeastern Greenland (RB335-336). Keller→Bowman 1935/10/31 (emph added):

“Illustrissime!”²⁷

I take it mighty friendly in you to write me about Ward's book. *I will keep it all under the chapeau*.

I am not exactly Ward's executor. Mrs. Ward asked me to act as adviser on questions that rose. I do not love the job but Ward was for 38 years a close friend, so what will you?

I do not give a damn whether Peary got there or not. I do not believe he did, and haven't since read Hall's book. The ms Ward left presents the whole incident, in an objective way and unmistakably, as shot through with evasion, secretiveness, and other elements **conspicuously absent in, say, all Darwinian, Huxleyian, and like stuff**. I am constrained to believe Ward. There was certainly a lot of what Bishop used to call “Shenanigans” . . . in it.

The whole trouble seems to hinge on those original records. Where are they? How is it that — Peary did not write — Peary's [book]? The whole thing looks mighty fishy to me — though, as I told you, my interest is small, consisting of the hope that all imposters are eventually shown up.

²⁷Later, Keller wrote Bowman a letter in German (1936/1/7) starting “Lieber Excellenz”. He had similar names for other college presidents: *idem*.

I am in a hard position. Your letter might well justify saying things cautionary that I can't say auf eigener Hand? Your word alone weighs heavily with me. But I can't mention it and shall not. Can you hear me mutter: to hell with it all! . . .

I wish you had seen Ward's ms. unbeknownst to yourself. I cannot imagine that you could ignore it. They [at Yale Press] have talked of asking you to read it. I have told them that they'd better not; you'd have no time, &c. Really I imagined I was serving you a good turn by steering the idea off. If I am not so doing, correct me, for, of course, your opinion would be decisive with me, if this [ms'] evidence were to be rejected by you.

Anyway, I appreciate your friendship . . . I think we are both honest men, I've no doubt Gott likes to consort with birds of His own Feather.

Always truly yrs. / A.G.Keller

Ironic that Keller's reasons for suspecting Peary include "secretiveness"; yet he is joining more of same to hide what will ultimately bury for decades what he believes is probably the truth of Peary's suspicious claim.

M4 Next day, Keller refined his secret-agent deviousness (1935/11/1 emph added):

Several weeks ago there was some talk [at Yale Press] about asking you to read the Ward ms. I demurred, though I thought you would be the best possible, on the ground that it would not do to ask you, especially at this busy time. Today the idea hit the Press people again. I repeated my demurring. But, while I could not tell them anything [of Iz' §M2 lethal aim], I had *meanwhile secured a postponement of presentation of the case to the Univ. Council on Publication* — and that led them to think that they could give you lots of time. It looks as if they would write you. If so, you are to know that *they know nothing whatever about your writing me. It will be as if the whole thing is new to you*, if you want to take it that way. Anyhow, I thought I had better warn you how the thing stands. The idea of asking you is of long standing.

You see, while we were all friends of Ward, an exceedingly scrupulous and honest soul, the only issue that [matters] is whether his ms. is copperfastened [vs Pref.[1]]. That it should be so [vs §S2] is to the interest of Ward's memory, as well as to that of the Press. I do not count myself as I stand only in an advisory capacity — and don't care, anyhow, what may be said about me. . . .

M5 Good. Keller had no qualms about keeping from Yale Press that it was going to trust as a neutral referee a man Keller privately knew (§M2) wanted to destroy the book. And Bowman certainly had no (private) shame about either the concealment or his misleading of Ward. Recall his Personal and Confidential 1935/10/30 letter (§M1), excusing his not collegially²⁸ offering corrective advice to Ward (as Stef had: §E2 above), on what he felt were flaws in Ward's 1934 *Mercury* article: "it was not my job [!] to act as a bright little guardian angel and protect and educate [Ward]." Meanwhile, the very same letter slyly deceived Keller, too. (Yes, you're indeed learning what it takes to become a potent academic institutional figure.) And Bowman tells how, in a 1935/11/12 letter to Marie — who was herself a bow playing Bowman like a vile'un (recall her Clinging-Vine letter: §G7), cooing

²⁸ With like competitive non-collegiality (fn 14 above) to a Frenchman, Astronomer Royal George Airy in an 1846/6/26 letter to Leverrier didn't tell him (www.dioi.org/j911.pdf, §§B11&H5) of fellow Cantab J.C.Adams' work during 1846's Neptune affair (fn 14 above), keeping the Britain-vs-France race-to-find-Neptune (and the general similarity of the two astronomers' solutions in celestial longitude) an entirely Brit secret until after the planet's 1846/9/23 Berlin capture, done strictly on Leverrier's instructions.

that (competing Pearyite) William Herbert Hobbs — superpatriot & Ann Arbor geology prof — had visited her and was virtually drooling over the Peary records (1935/7/25 letter), which were however reserved only-for-Izzy. Bowman's top-secret visit to her home to see these records occurred 1935/7/29-31, but it never stopped his key premis-mantra that the skeptics were to be ignored — contemptuously ignored (e.g., §I2) — *because they didn't have access*, access to the very records he was helping keep hidden from every scholar but himself. Bowman (1935/11/5), preparing to kill — *rather than publicly refute* (as Ward suggested re Stef: §E2) — the recently-deceased Henshaw Ward skeptical book's publication by Yale University Press: "Some day much more will be known about the whole Peary case and when it becomes known, such writings as those of [T.] Hall, [J. G.] Hayes, and Ward [all skeptics] are going to look like thirty cents — and I don't mean maybe!" (See fn 26.) The desperation in his insistence that the book-murder be carried out is too obvious — as if his service to wealthy National Geographic was an osculation which he fervently did not wish to fail: too much hung in the balance for US science's prestige. And his own.

M6 Interjection: Since geography is one of the least scientific of sciences, semi-fringe among universities at this time (§B16), HOW did *geographer* Bowman end up 1935-1948 at the political & financial (like there's a difference?) pinnacle of US science? Fact: at the time, the National *Geographic* Society's wealth exceeded that of all other (!) scientific societies put together. And when we find the same geographer ultra-secretly doing NGS' dirty-work (and being rewarded for it: §M11), the connexion is no longer purely speculative.

M7 Secret-Marie-Peary-buddy Bowman's contemptible, long, and long-topsecret²⁹ 4pp 1935/12/20 referee Report to Yale Univ Press either didn't understand Ward's greatest find or didn't know of it: *Peary had secreted a math expert in his home for October before he submitted his "observations" to NGS' judges* — meaning that he had pre-tested the faked numbers, to ensure he hadn't slipped up. Ward's diary 1935/6/13, on his 6/11 interview of Peary's secret 1909 October Eagle Island live-in Bowdoin-trained math-advisor Hudson B. Hastings, who "happened to slip into a statement of this sort: 'P often put questions to me. He asked me about his two observations near the pole; and I computed and charted for him what they showed.' On my soul, I believe P was pumping him to find out whether the [hitherto-unreviewed] observations assumed would show a position near the pole."

M8 Hastings, a Peary-cultist who had up to 1935 *kept secret* for over 1/4-century his private 1909 work for Peary (while living *secretly at Peary's residence*) boasted of it; but then, after realizing the danger he'd unleashed, soon resorted to information-blocking threat, thereby adding yet another chapter to the suppressions that characterize the Ward book's history. The full Ward account of his subtle but dynamite interview of Hastings was 1st published in the Appendix to DR's *Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction?* (Washington, DC 1973) pp.285-288. Here it is in full:³⁰

THE TALK WITH HASTINGS:

This is my recollection of a talk with Hudson Bridge Hastings on Tuesday, June 11, 1935, typed on June 14. About June 1 or earlier I had written a note asking if he would appoint a time to see me and tell me the story of his visit to Eagle Island in the fall of 1909. This story he had told at a dinner in Loomis Havemeyer's house some time in April (?); McDonough told me about it when he called shortly after we returned from [North Carolina] on the

²⁹ After a copy of the Bowman killer-Report disappeared from Yale Press' files, the Press' Ass't Editor Roberta Yerkes requested and received a copy from Johns Hopkins on 1945/7/28, yet by the time the Press' Anne Wilde looked for it in 1971, it had AGAIN disappeared. (Who was Yale Press' Rosemary Woods for 1/4-century? It certainly wasn't Roberta Yerkes or Anne Wilde.) This history helps give one some idea of the number&variety of careerists who found it personally advantageous to volunteer for assisting the coveruppers, throughout the Peary-Pole saga.

³⁰ Except for eliminating most of the concluding paragraph (in which Ward imagined a timeline-problem that did not exist, as explained at F289).

first of May. Several days after I wrote to Hastings he called me on the phone and said he was very busy, but would see me some time and would call me up and let me know when. On Tuesday, the 11th, I called [phoned] him about 10 a.m. because I wanted to go to Washington, had been postponing the trip on his account, and needed to know whether I should go before or after a talk with him. He replied that he could see me that morning at 11. I was in his office on the dot; he greeted me with the utmost cordiality, had to take some papers to the registrar, returned, gave me a cigarette, lit a pipe, and began to talk within five minutes. I think the talk lasted about half an hour.

He told a narrative:

Some time in the early part of October, 1909, probably during the first or second week of October, Peary called the president of Bowdoin and asked if there was some instructor who was proficient in navigation. Other instructors declined for one reason or another, and Hastings was asked to go and see if he would do. Peary put him through a quiz for an hour and a half. At the end of the time he said, "You'll do. You have given the right answers to two questions that Bob Bartlett answered wrong."

Hastings was in Peary's home about a month and saw Peary every day. (I feel sure that "every day" was emphasized; probably it was repeated.) Hastings's business was to keep tab on all that the newspapers printed of Cook's statements. He computed for the observations that Cook said he had made and fitted together (I think he said something like "charted") Cook's outgivings to see what he was claiming and what his lies were. The idea was to be prepared to confute Cook if he should submit his data to the N.G.S.

I can't recall at what part of the conversation I asked the following question, but I think it was at about this point, when we had been talking for, say, ten minutes: "Is anything that you say to me confidential?" Hastings answered, "That would depend on what use you intend to make of it." I can't recall the reply I made, but think it was like this: "Well, it's understood that I will not quote anything you say until I have submitted the quotation to you and have your permission." I feel sure that I said such words, but am not sure that they fitted in as a reply at this point.

At any rate, he went on with his narrative, smiling and in the best of humor. He wrote out for Peary a connected account of the Cook material that he collected, and he kept a carbon of this. Peary, he said, was always magnanimous³¹ in his talk about Cook, speaking thus: "The poor fellow seems to have gone off his head. I doubt that he is deliberately lying. He seems to have got twisted, so that he really believes he did reach the Pole. He has hung himself. I don't want to publish anything against him unless I am forced to. He is down and out. I don't want to hurt him." Some two years later Peary asked Hastings to give back the carbon of his report, and Hastings did so.

Hastings said (I think in reply to a question of mine) that he never saw the Peary record. Said that he had always been glad that he had not seen it. For if he had and the fact had become known, people would have suspected that Hastings had helped to doctor Peary's record. He launched into a description of how Peary would put queries to him: "For instance, he once showed me a copy of the observations he made near the pole and asked me what positions these would show. I explained that an observation of the sun's altitude would

³¹Magnanimous? Like when Peary justly called Cook (Weems *op cit* p.284) "a cowardly cur of a sordid imposter"? The gentle-hero pose was a private theatrical performance for Hastings' benefit.

not prove a certain position, but would only determine a circle, a great circle — no, not a great circle, but a circle around the earth — on some point of which the observer must have stood." Here Hastings began to sketch on a piece of white paper to show what he meant. His talk was rapid and technical. Of course I was lost in the details. But it flashed across me that Hastings had led me right up to the door of the only "proof" Peary offered — his two sets of observations near the pole; I was much excited at the thought that Peary could have been fishing for information from this hero-worshipping young Bowdoin instructor as to whether his observations would prove the position he wanted to prove. If this had been the case, Peary's claim of "observations" would have collapsed completely — and I had come to realize during the previous two weeks that he had absolutely no other proof.

I suppose my excitement showed in my voice when I asked: "Will you dictate to your stenographer what you have just said to me, and let me have it in writing, so that I can be sure of not misunderstanding and not misrepresenting what you have said?"

Then came the angry change in the conversation. It was as if (I am only guessing) the thought in my mind had occurred to him also. It is incredible that it should not have occurred to him; it is so simple and obvious. As I remember it — I am none too sure of the sequence here — he answered abruptly to this effect: "No, I will not do any such thing. For it could be twisted into a misrepresentation of what Peary was doing."

At some time — I think just about now — Hastings made some remark about "trying to show that Peary's proof was unreliable." It was in such a form that a reply was expected from me, and I thought I had best not conceal my purpose if he had not understood it. I remember clearly saying, "But that's my business" — meaning "my business to show that Peary's proofs are unreliable."

From this point on Hastings two or three times spoke of my "attacking Peary's veracity." I replied (I think twice) that I was not attacking his veracity, because that cannot yet be disproved; but that I was only trying to show the insufficiency of the proofs, I made no impression. He had firmly lodged in his mind the belief that I was trying to prove Peary untruthful.

"Why, Mr. Ward, I am as convinced of Peary's veracity as I am that the sun will rise tomorrow morning. If you put into print anything that throws suspicion on Peary, I will fight you as hard as I can." [Doesn't exactly sound like a scientist contemplating gentlemanly rational refutation.] My reply was,³² "Go to it. The harder the better." He was grieved and angered, as if he had heard blasphemy, and said, "Why, what you are doing seems to me the very worst form of muckraking."

Hastings is speaking as derogatorily as Bowman (§O3 below), typifying why too much of academe is uncritical: *the very ACT of criticism can be deemed too impolite to publish, especially*³³ if the critic is an outlander.

³²Florence Ward added a handwritten footnote to the copy she sent to DR (underlinings in orig): "Dennis: This is the only way Ward, being Ward, could have answered. He has told me that he thought he didn't know the sensation of fear."

³³In 2017-2018, DR tested this observation on *Isis*' non-editing "Editor" H.F.Cohen, by agreeing to any style-muting Cohen desired for an article he hated but could find no scientific error in. It was never enough, since all Cohen wanted all-along was the elimination of DR's unanswerable demonstrations that *Isis* had in 2016 published *fake-refereed* (by no less than *seven* obvious indicia:

The last minute of our talk I was standing up before his desk, trying to think of some way of concluding that would not be angry. There were silences. No [further] hot words were exchanged. I walked out while he sat behind his desk, and I think not looking at me.

. . . [Soon after], I wrote [Hastings] a brief note of inquiry When I returned from Washington, his Jeremiad was on my desk.

DR's 1973 comment [F289]:

The significance of Ward's discovery of Hastings' rôle cannot be overestimated. Hastings' advice to engineer Peary was indeed not — like Loose's [§U20 below] to the incompetent Cook — a direct invention of observations, since Peary's technical background rendered such gross assistance unnecessary. But the insurance of showing copies of his own inventions to Hastings was just as valuable for Peary's purposes in that it privately assured him in advance that his data were as consistent with his story [§H1] as they needed to be for the upcoming November 1 National Geographic review (where the "original" records were first seen [by institutional judges]). He would thus have learned of any problems that needed ironing out well before they could cause embarrassment in Washington. As Ward rightly divined, this sneak preview renders worthless the purported value (on Nov.1) of the "observations" [Peary's sole scientific "proof" as Ward had come to realize] as virgin corroborating evidence of claimed position.

M9 Bowman's neutrality-faking 4pp referee Report (§O below) also twisted the book's equanimity, to slander **WARD** as the neutrality-faker. *Can the irony be topped?* (Or the ethics bottomed?) In a 1935/11/5 letter, Bowman actually asserts: "I never was and am not now an emotional Peary booster." (Inadvertent admission of cold&calculated motives beneath all? Ambitious men do not become moguls by random chance.) Sample of booster Bowman regularly to Marie (e.g., 1943/2/10): "I have a deep and abiding interest in the vindication of your father's work. . . . Our best to you and yours, as always . . ." Bowman in public speech to NAS 1935 *Science* 82:532, 1935/12/6; F292) is all for neutral integrity but when describing dangers is almost autobiographical!

we can bring united wisdom through consultation and unflinching devotion to the ideals that should animate science with respect to responsibility for public enlightenment. To-day the threat to freedom in scientific inquiry takes on a new a guise. Government has taken advantage of our perilous need to give direction to the education of youth through the expenditure of public funds administered by men who are but sounding boards for political leaders. These men are not being trained as interpreters of science. Politics is training them. Let this menacing movement grow and the scientific approach is gone and scientific ideals will be not merely weakened but lost.

M10 Throughout, Bowman's attitude towards Ward is condescending. And ironic: "amateur" Ward understood the case, and the truth of Peary's claim, far better without the records than did academe's-pinnacle Bowman, who was wallowing in them — and wallowing even deeper in the archonal pride that convinced him that he was qualified to judge the Peary case. His uneven math ability is discussed below (§N5). He also had difficulty in accepting Einstein's relativity. Did he cover for Peary&Byrd partly because

www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, p.8) embarrassingly incompetent scholarship attacking two centuries of able mathematicians, and in 2015 had stolen another's 2008 discovery. *Isis* refuses to correct anything, just counting on your not caring and/or on the cooperation of leashed "journalists" who'll say nothing about such ongoing scandals until everyone to whom they matter is dead: §W8 item [5] below.

they were WASP? Bowman was so deeply anti-Jewish that his decade-long AGS sec'y Mabel H. Ward³⁴ told DR (1971/4/2) that receipt of a letter addressed to anything like "Isadore Berman" would funk him for the day. (Which may have helped inspire DR's sometime abbreviation [§D3] of "Isaiah" to "Izzy".) Bowman decided not to consult Harlow Shapley on the Peary document probably because Shapley was a "pink". (Later a HUAC target.) Izzy was ever-alert to keep Johns Hopkins as *rotfrei* as Germany. And because Harry Raymond was a more trustworthy-confidential buddy. Bowman's idea of a close pal can be gauged from a 1936/9/12 Raymond letter to him complaining of people with funny foreign names entering astronomy and referring to the mate of Harvard's first female full Professor as her "wop husband". (When we rightly deplore the excesses of today's PC, it's worth recalling the conditions in the-good-old-days of academe that necessitated a reaction.) Most prominent world scientists of the 1930s who publicly³⁵ accepted the Peary N.Pole myth (e.g., Raymond Priestley & Larry Gould, though both were private agnostics) said they did so because of Bowman's re-assurances (on no substantial basis beyond Marie's secret affection and fondable silver service) that Peary might be sloppy but was no hoaxer: Bowman could just tell. [B&D Rawlins personally interviewed Priestley on the point, 1970/8/11.] (The Godfather hath seen the records and spoken, so no one else need see them. Bowman's correspondence steadily reeks of such presumption, e.g., letters to H.Raymond; letter to A.Keller 1935/11/5; 12/20 ref report to Yale Press.) But geographers didn't know of Bowman's extremely close Peary-family-connection, his scientific amateurishness, his judgement's unreliability — and his attitude towards heresy, which DR learned through his AGS sec'y and through elders at the Baltimore *Sun*. Rawlins *Peary Fiction* [1973] p.289: Bowman was "a man who could boast of burning a book³⁶ and who was to lead a notorious witch-hunt for Bolshevikiki" while President of Johns Hopkins

³⁴Bowman 1940/3/27: "swiftest and most accurate secretary that I ever had". Her relay-assistance is cited in an 1936/2/20 letter of R.R.Platt (AGS) on how to be canny in handling Cook's latest try at getting AGS involved in evaluation of his claim.

³⁵ Institutional chiefs J.Wordie, & R.Priestley were private skeptics on the Peary-Pole myth, but were all under obligation to boost geographical-society international amity by not publicly doubting it. E.g., Bowman was able to point Marie (1940/ 3/29) to a 1940 March *Geographical Journal* review by Priestley (an Antarctic not Arctic explorer), citing one of Peary's four "North Pole" Eskimos:

Again, Ootah's story that the Arctic pack surface improved as the Pole was approached, and that Peary rode a great deal of the way upon his sledge, is independent evidence that helps to make the great feat more credible.

Bowman is also delighted (1948/7/15) at a current *Geographical Journal* article by RGS chief Arthur Hinks, of which Bowman says, "It has been spoken of very highly as the best analysis of Peary's astronomical data and the best evidence of Peary's attainment of the Pole." This, despite Hinks' awareness that these data are simple to fabricate. (Hinks' opinion may have been colored by the fact that he and Bowman each awarded the other with his society's gold medal.) The societal-cohesiveness factor helped maintain the Peary myth. Which is why DR so severely blames the lie's durability on the very institutions that are held in the public's mind to be responsible for maintaining integrity.

³⁶ Bowman burned Rabelais on his home hearth as a dirty book, according to (1971/4/2) his longtime AGS sec'y Mabel Ward. Similar sensitivity is found in his 1949/6/22 letter to Finn Ronne (whom Bowman rightly backed, above Byrd in Antarctica), while writing a preface to Ronne's upcoming book (for balance, we include the very creditable opening, which is Bowman at his best): "I have read your manuscript and here is the introduction. You must tell me if it is not satisfactory. I would be glad to re-write it, including other features that may occur to you. In replying please do not try to be complimentary, but tell me instead how I can improve the introduction. And if it is no damn good tell me and I will try and write another. . . . you refer to your crew or expedition members as 'gang.' I realize that a good many people use this phrase now but I dislike it and wish that you could refer to your group in some other way. At one point you speak of having 'fired' a member Here again I would prefer 'dismissed.' That is a thrilling story about the drop into the crevass and the rescue. But you want your book to be read by boys and young men [no mention of women] and many people will be deeply offended by the expression of the victim, 'Jesus Christ, it hurts.' Why not just leave out

University 1935-1948. This perceptive judge of men died in early 1950 soon after leaving the post having (according to fading *Baltimore Sun* legend) suggested as successor his idea of an ideally respectable Marylander & JHU-grad WASP-Gentile: Alger Hiss.³⁷

M11 After Ward died of pneumonia (he was a smoker, which may have contributed) on 1935/10/8, Marie on 10/29 asked Bowman to help kill Ward's book (then on its way to be published by Yale University Press); she suggested (§L1) that if he didn't want to put anything in writing, he could phone her collect! The very next day, Bowman wrote his Confidential 1935/10/30 "**I-TREMBLE**" letter (§M2) that launched his plot to kill a book — before he'd even seen it — [a] by simultaneously faking neutrality! (§V7), and [b] by explicitly threatening the Yale Press with a libel suit (§O5 below) by National Geographic. Historical-item-in-passing: Bowman ended up on the Board of Directors of AT&T (American Telephone & Telegraph), whose largest stockholder was National Geographic's chief, Gilbert Grosvenor (son-in-law of AT&T founder Alexander Graham Bell). Classic money-versus-truth confrontation, and secret conflict-of-interest.

M12 On 1937/11/21, Marie wraps Bowman so tightly around her finger that his becomes hers, yet again:

The Post Office department is contemplating a new series of stamps honoring American educators, scientists, explorers, et cetera and I am extremely anxious to have Dad included. If you did not think it undignified to write to Mr. Guy M. North, 3rd Assistant Postmaster General, suggesting Dad for the series, I would appreciate it very much and am certain that such a letter from you, would carry great weight. Did you see where Cook's suit against the Britannica [*sic*] had been thrown out?

As always, / Marie

M13 The very next day Bowman dutifully writes (copy to Marie) to the Post Office's Guy North, recommending Peary be on a U.S. postage stamp (did the trusting scientific community & Yale Press know of such robo-teamplying?). [How significant was all this? Even Disney-dog Goofy has his own postage stamp.] And, as with his Report to Yale Press (§O11), Bowman persists enough to reveal he's leaving nothing to chance since, like Marie, he's used to getting his way if he clarifies his desire to those in his path (emph added):

I should like very much to see the Post Office Department include in its new series of stamps honoring American educators, scientists, explorers, etc. the name of Robert E. Peary, *the discoverer of the North Pole*.

I should like the privilege of submitting a longer statement on the subject *if there is any question whatever* about the inclusion of Admiral Peary's name.

this sentence and let the second sentence remain that he asked for relief from his pain. [Bowman's use above of "damn" is OK because not being read by young boys?] These may be small matters, but a good many people attach importance to them." Will some future historian claim that Boy-Scout Bowman covered up exploration-fraud as an immorality that shouldn't foul young boys' minds? (Or that his involvement with Peary's daughter was a het variant of hero-worship? [Bowman attended Peary's 1920/2/23 Arlington National Cemetery funeral: BR617.]) Can we temper our revulsion at Bowman's hypocrisy by seeing him as a moralist who used dishonest means to inspire honesty & hard work in youngsters? Given the history of religion: he wouldn't be the 1st.

³⁷Lucky for Bowman (assuming the legend's truth), Hiss was outted by Whittaker Chambers as a Soviet spy before the proposal became public. Just coincidence: Hiss' prime years as a spy, for Russia and his dream of mankind's peace, were the same years Bowman worked as a spy to protect US science's reputation for wisdom and double-WASP-hero manliness. Hiss was JHU class of 1926, as was his then-close friend and later DR's Gilman School mentor, Ludlow Baldwin. (Whose crafty wisdom is sampled at *DIO I.I*: www.dioi.org/j112.pdf, §B.) Even Ludlow finally concluded that Hiss was indeed a Soviet spy. DR's father Lou knew both, being JHU class of 1927. DR's prime junior-year girlfriend at Harvard (daughter of a senior law-partner of DR's stepfather, John Avirett), waited 50^y before imparting to DR the secret that her godfather had all along been no other than Alger Hiss.

I am assuming, however, that his name will probably be on the list and has already been considered and approved . . . Will you be good enough to let me know if anything further needs to be done to assure the inclusion of his name?

I hope very much to hear that the matter has already been approved.

M14 He writes her of his gofer-compliance, 1937/11/22 (emph&caps added):

I am very glad to respond to the suggestion that you have made and enclose a letter to Mr.North which I hope may accomplish the result that **WE** desire.

But for the thought that I might be interrupting your Sunday peace, I would have telephoned you yesterday after reading the Cook item in the New York TIMES. This will most certainly discourage his backers and probably put the seal of silence upon him for the rest of his life.

[Bowman's math on the Schmidt-Papanin 1937 polar ice-drift follows here. (Analysed below at §N5.) He continues, eventually getting around to knifing Hobbs, his competitor for access to the Peary records:]

. . . This [ice-drift analysis] illustrates a point which I have emphasizing to a degree no doubt tiresome: time helps the man who tells the truth. As more facts accumulate, unexpected support is derived. This Soviet drift is an admirable new point which occurs right at the place *where WE could most wish to have it*, for it crossed Peary's meridian.

I feel that the [Cook-Peary] case is drawing to a close [a not-overly-prescient Bowman vision] and that *we need* only one really important piece of information, namely, the actual observations from the air of the site of Bradley Land. While *we* feel quite certain that no such land exists, *we ought to have even the remotest possibility of anything near that site eliminated*. The temptation is to take each new point and enter the fray. Far better is it in my judgment to let others come to the *defense and when time has done its work to close the story with the record*. The thing is too important to be spoiled by haste [!!] or by needless controversy. I still feel that if Hobbs had the records and published them *it would hurt the case*. *It seems to me that the records want completely non-partisan treatment*. [We know who's ready to render that!] One need only couple with them facts and more facts such as the Soviet drift, the Soviet sound[ing]s at the Pole, the absence of land so far as aerial work has made it possible to check the point up to now, etc.

Bowman is ready to use the then-probable non-existence of Cook's Bradley Land to demean his claim, while never applying the even-more probable non-existence of Peary's Crocker Land to weigh *his* reliability. (Recall, e.g., his unbalanced comment at §K8 above, on the final proof that Crocker Land did not exist.)

M15 On 1937/11/28, Marie thanks Bowman for acting so assertively as the team-player he's become (emph added):

That was a grand letter you wrote Mr.North and I am very, very grateful to you. It certainly ought to do the trick if anything can³⁸ and if the matter is really non-political, as I have been assured it is.

Your own letter to me is naturally extremely interesting and I am filing it carefully for future reference. Hobbs seems to be lying low. Not a word

³⁸The letter to Guy M. North was replied to noncommittally 1937/12/6 by **Roy** M. North, Acting 3rd Ass't Postmaster General who didn't seem to appreciate being pressured. The obeisance Bowman got in his academic fiefdom didn't always work outside it.

have I heard from him since the dedication of the monument in Cresson [Pennsylvania, Peary's birthplace], although I understand that he has been in Washington recently. Please let me say that it is a source of constant amazement and gratification to me, the way you manage to keep your finger on the pulse of Dad's affairs and unerringly pick out the important points for "*our side*". Considering the multitude of pressing demands upon you, it is astonishing and gives me the warm feeling that *I am not fighting alone*. With much affection to you and Mrs. Bowman, I am,

As always, / Marie

N How Expert Was the Archon That Careerists Kissed-Up To?

N1 When Bowman invokes his experience "in the field" he's implying (§O7 below) an expertise (vs mere-amateur Ward) which DR, a specialist in this area, doesn't find in his Peary analyses.

N2 Though ultimately&credibly realizing (§V9) how easy it is to fake sextant data, his vaunted experience-in-the-field decades ago (in South America) hadn't enlightened him on that *central evidential point of the Controversy* — until (§H1 above) Miller did so in the 1930s. NGS' H.Gannett (§U20 below) & even Cook's August Loose had said same decades earlier.

N3 His incuriosity re Peary's lack of any data justifying how he steered — a point sparking (§H1) the antennae of the Markhams (F253-254) & AGS' own O.M. Miller, not to mention Sir Wally Herbert & DR — tells one worlds re Bowman's lack of instinct for navigation. Quoting from *DIO 1.1* ¶4, www.dioi.org/j114.pdf, §D5 (emph added): "Peary in 1911 [Congressional hearing] renounced³⁹ his most crucial 1909 sight (April 5 [§G5 item [3] above: allegedly at 89°25'N]), his only zeroing-in navigational datum. [DR's] *Fiction* found [F150] that as early as 1913, this sunshot alone was missing from the Peary records. It still is. . . . Again, crucially, *veering to aim at the Pole is never mentioned by Peary.*" How could Bowman miss something that obvious? Sir Wally Herbert (who genuinely found the North Pole travelling by sledge) certainly didn't.

N4 DR [F140]: ". . . to try hitting the Pole without determining transverse position [longitude: §H1] en route makes about as much sense (even less in fact) as to expect a rocket aimed from Cape [Canaveral] to hit the Moon without any in-flight guidance system." Longitude-uncertainty also rendered Peary's few soundings' positions uncertain.

N5 Bowman's 1937/11/22 letter to Marie flubs some simple math. Analysing the recent Russian ice-drift at one point he estimates "385 miles in a straight line in 150 days or less than 3 miles a day. Moreover the drift coincides in a rough way both in direction and speed with the last part of the drift of the Fram. Since half of the Soviet drift is easterly and half southerly, we divide less than 3 miles a day in half and obtain about 1 1/4 miles a day toward the east on the line of Peary's march. [On the evidence, it's doubtful Bowman was familiar with vector analysis.] (If drift were 1/2 north & 1/2 south how would he have expressed zero drift?) Highschoolers know his math is like miscalculating $\cos 45^\circ$ to 1/2. (One is reminded of fellow careerist Noel Swerdlow, history-of-science's MacArthur Genius, who actually

³⁹ The reason Peary abandoned his own diary's 89°25'N sextant shot has never previously been discussed. Theory: if brought forth, judges might've wondered whether or not it was a culmination observation, which would raise the issue of whether the allegedly nearby Pole (maybe just a few dozen miles distant) was slightly to leftward or rightward of the current path: *steering*. Peary avoided explaining his zeroing-in by — as usual [F158] — keeping his story as simple as possible: he just said nothing about it, counting on friendly NGS to do likewise. Peary's previous 1902&1906 excursions onto the Arctic Ocean had suffered huge wanderings from ice-drift [F136; see Weems' *op cit* endpaper-map], but this time his advocates demand we accept that the ice stood still. [See Bowman trying to slow it at §N5.]

ADDS standard deviations — see www.dioi.org/det.htm#fst for the 3-4-7 right triangle implicit in both men's math.) Seems Bowman wouldn't have appreciated Einstein's 1905 Brownian Motion paper. Bowman also thought he knew better than Einstein about relativity, which he doubted well after its truth was a non-issue.

N6 Bowman's 1937/11/22 letter is correct in finding an instance of slow Arctic drift, but his conclusion, while intelligently citing a correct theory on fruitfulness, misapplies it by ignoring cumulative effect (fn 39) over a month of travel [F138] & Peary's unwarranted lack of aiming-data, not to mention directly-observed 1909 drift (see DR comments at §H1); and he of the "impersonal and objective attitude" (§V7) is again caught taking sides, both in his science and by his recommendation of the Peary postage stamp, yet again (as at §M1) acting as an agent-fixer-messengerboy for Marie. But the Big Fix was yet to come, once Yale Press' Eugene Davidson & Norman Donaldson successfully begged the favors of a 1935/12/18 Baltimore audience with the Mogul & of his Report on the Ward book.

O THE REPORT: Mogul as Truth-Snuffer

Hidden by himself & Yale Press *for over 40*^y, what follows is Bowman's long-elusive (fn 29 above; §O5 below), **ULTRA**-secret 4-page 1935/10/20 referee Report⁴⁰ [a] deliberately&aggressively slanderous overkill, [b] aimed at 100%-positively ensuring the burial of Ward's final opus, and [c] a paragon of perversion of purported academic freedom, which universities profess devotion to. The Report's 9 points will be so partitioned, and signified by section number & point-number, successively — and block-quoted (narrowed by the usual expanded margins) while intermittent DR commentary will be bracketed if inserted into Bowman's text, or will use normal margins (except for block-quoting non-Bowman documents) for interspersed passages of extended analysis. (All emphases and/or caps in quoted material are added, while underlining is always in the original.) Those who object to so many DR intrusions might consider that the root cause is the shameless frequency of Bowman's deceptions, omissions, and hypocrisies.

My natural interest, as well as my crowded calendar later, tempted me to read the Ward manuscript at once. It would take much too long to present a complete argument documented in detail from the manuscript. You will therefore find the following remarks distinctly uneven.

[Handwritten by Bowman: "Figures in parentheses refer to page nos. in MS."]

O1 1. (5) "The only evidence of Peary's reaching the Pole is his statement that he reached it." [Quotation marks adjusted.] Assuming this [Ward judgement (also at his W173)] to be correct [ironically, **this VERY judgement was precisely but secretly agreed-to on 1937/2/27 by no other than Bowman**: here at §V9 below], one can also say with reference to [Valentine] Wood's letter [§E4] to Ward (143ff.) of September 12, 1934 that the only evidence of Wood's having examined the dirty note-book handed him by his father is his statement that he had it. Following Wood's statement is Ward's report of an interview with Congressman Dawson [of the Peary-examining 1910-1911 Congressional Naval Affairs subcommittee] in Cincinnati which is vague and dull and has little or no bearing on the case.

Bowman is justified⁴¹ in questioning V. Wood's account, which uniquely conflicts with other reports. There is not the slightest independent evidence he was ever connected to anyone in

⁴⁰ The Report begins "Dear [Yale Press Editor Norman] Donaldson", with a hand-printed note (perhaps denoting speed-panic, as if in-case the squelch didn't arrive in time, heresy might actually leak out): "This is a hastily dictated letter with no time for revision of retyping."

⁴¹ V. Wood may have been affected by a medical problem. At F282, DR over-readily followed Ward in taking too seriously Wood's account (F283) of access to Peary's allegedly greasy, smudgy data-

the case, and his account conflicts with others, including what Ward got from Hastings (the alleged erroneous Peary sightings reported by V. Wood would've been pre-apprehended by Hastings), who *IS* connectable⁴² to principals, as is Lilian [as she spelled it: W109] E. Kiel via, e.g., her Congressional testimony.⁴³ Unfortunately, for whatever reason (no HBH approval?: §M8), Ward chose⁴⁴ not to include Hastings' account in his book. (And we only know of this key evidence because Florence Ward preserved it in her garage for 35'!) This is perhaps in part because, besides Ed Weyer alone (who on 1935/10/11 sent Davidson pages of suggested edits — and later tried to help Ward's widow find a publisher: §V3), none of the geographers or scientists (e.g., Bowman, Miller, Hastings) that knew of Ward's research offered to help him with the technical issues; *all they did was try to suppress his findings or acquiesce in the process*. Hastings even sent a 1935/10/26 letter to Yale Press' Davidson threatening to call in the Yale University administration if the Press went ahead with plans to publish the Ward book.

O2 2. Closely related to this general tendency in the book is Ward's *pretense* that he is cutting through his own shell of indifference and taking up the Peary question as a puzzle (4). He says on this page that he has not proved that Peary was dishonest. He tries to show that the notion that the attainment of the Pole was proved by Peary is a myth. I wish I could go on and present a statement in full on this point of Ward's assumption of a judicial attitude toward the whole question, a disinterested approach, a weighing of evidence. It is one of the most unjudicial books that I have read on the subject.

No-time to "go on" to back up his slander with sample quotations?? Or: are there perhaps few or no unjudicial quotes in the book to justify it? In fact, Ward tries everywhere in the ms to balance his tentative suspicions with other viewpoints, and repeatedly claims that NGS folk are honest and that it is impossible to prove Peary was dishonest. But Bowman's insistent lie here proves HE was dishonest, counting on his Authority alone to put it across.

O3 3. The high point of the story is the report of the stenographer, Miss Kiel [stenographer to spiritualist (W116) Elsa Barker, prime ghostwriter (W112) for Peary's 1910 book, *The North Pole*, whose notes show Peary's 1909 diary contained no entries at all at "the Pole": F284]. This whole story is a sensation of the type that one occasionally finds in the Hearst papers. I know the inner workings of the New York Times fairly well and I can assure you that that paper would not publish the Kiel story without a pretty thorough investigation. [Which would have found it to be true. (In fear of such an awful result, Bowman doesn't investigate.)] Though it is the high point of Ward's story, the Yale University Press cannot afford to publish a book in which this unconfirmed story appears. By this I do not mean that the story is untrue. I should be entirely willing as a basis of argument to accept Miss Kiel's story at its full value. The one essential thing about the story from

notebook full of unreliable sightings. But that is because DR was (like Ward) at the time barred from access to Peary's fairly clean diary.

⁴²See F288&289; at *Appendix to the Congressional Record* Vol.52 p.40, Hastings in 1914 artfully tried (in response to inquiry) to imply denying he worked with the original documents: "I beg to state that I did not examine or check Admiral Peary's original astronomical observations." The key word is "original": see §M8 above.

⁴³*Congressional Record* 52.6:670-677, 1915/3/4, 63rd Congress 3rd Session.

⁴⁴Ward interviewed Hastings 1935/6/11, Dawson in Sept. But the ms includes the latter material while skipping the former. The explanation might be (if not that at F289) that he believed citing Hastings would risk interference by him with Yale publication, which is credible given Hastings' 6/11 promise to Ward [F288] "I will fight you as hard as I can". Like NGS "would fight to the last ditch to prevent publication of the book" (§O5 below). So: yet another scientist threatening, to suppress — in this case, the truth of his presence in Peary's home throughout 1909 October).

the standpoint of the book and the Yale University Press is not its truth or falsity, but rather what were the data that Peary supplied Miss Barker. [No, the high&essential point is the diary's blank at "the pole".] Ward does not go into this point but assumes that Barker wrote the Hampton [*Hampton's Magazine*] articles and the book [which was mostly Barker's version polished by playwright A.E.Thomas] on the merest scraps of information supplied by Peary. Now the essential point is that Peary did have a diary and the diary was exhibited to the Congressional Committee, to the Committee of the National Geographical Society, and to Miss Barker. You may take that statement as true. How much of the diary was put into the articles and the book? If all of it was put in, or substantially all of it, then the additional information which Peary supplied plus his reading of manuscript or proof or both may have supplied Miss Barker with all of the essentials, thus leaving to her the development of descriptive passages which may be sheer rhetoric and imagination but which may have absolutely nothing to do with the part of the report that enters into proof. [Having seen the diary, Bowman's pretense that we don't know what part of Barker's account is based on it is dishonest in both that statement and in his not informing Yale Press of his access to the diary and that the key pages contain no data.] In short, no matter what a ghost writer may say in a book that a careless explorer may hire done, it is still true that the explorer may have accomplished everything that he says he accomplished. Because he is slipshod in producing his book *does not necessarily mean* that he was slipshod when he looked through his sextant and reported his observations.

The concluding transparently coulda-succeeded-anyway far-fetched⁴⁵ alibifest is reminiscent of what Cook Society Editor Russ Gibbons said (*N.Y.Times* 1998/11/26), when the *NYT* went page-one with Cook's Bryce-recovered (*DIO* 7.2: www.dioi.org/j737.pdf, Fig.18) Mt.McKinley "summit" photo *uncropped*, thus revealing it was taken on Fake Peak, 19 mi from the real summit. Gibbons: well, even if the photo was taken at Fake Peak, that doesn't prove Cook didn't climb McKinley!

Bowman's *transparently-selective* hyperskepticism here, re the original records connected to Kiel&Barker, is never applied by him to the NGS Peary-certifiers' casual exam of Peary's 1909 expedition records, as came out at the 1910-1911 Peary Hearings (thanks to Congressman Ernest Roberts) and was laid embarrassingly bare by Ward [W91&149].

That Barker was the actual writer of *The North Pole* was not Ward's "assumption" but one of his book's numerous provocative discoveries (enumerated at §U below) which would've enlightened the public and put such pressure, on US science's Peary-data concealments, that they might finally have been ended — as eventually occurred in the 1980s due to successive 1970-1988 batterings (by DR, Frank Rasky, William Hunt, *Enc. Americana*, David Roberts, Pierre Berton) against US science's elitist & contra-scientific dictatorship of accessibility. (All writings before the records' release had flaws due to their authors having to grope too often in the dark — in the very dark created by records' being hidden. Despite that disability, they cumulatively made enough sense as to cause the reasonable public doubt which ultimately forced the records' release.)

Bowman's remark re Hearst is pure smear, valueless but to show the fraudulence of his neutrality-pose. He says the *NYT* would investigate — but does not suggest anyone actually do so, now that Ward's silence is secured by death. Bowman instead locks up everything. **He of all people** knows — as we see from his (*CROSSED-OUT*) record of his own 1935/7/30

⁴⁵ From long experience with the most Respectable elements of academe, *DIO* has observed: one of the clearest indications, that a scholar is getting too deeply into defending a weak or kook theory, is his uncontrollable preference for the *least probable* of available explanations if it helps that pet theory: www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf, §B3 & fnn 11&37.

exam of the diary itself (above at §G5 item [3]) — that the diary has no comment or data at “the Pole”. (In contrast to Peary’s habit of entering latitude results into the diary, throughout his career up to this point: §O7 below.) Yet Bowman’s killer-Report says *nothing of that*. He deliberately refuses to confirm the Kiel account which he knows is true (while artfully “willing . . . to accept [it] at its full value”), and then diverts to irrelevancies & oddly *improbable* (fn 45) defense-lawyerisms. Which helps explain why Yale Press’ comments both then and in 1971 indicate that it saw through these flimsy pleadings: all Yale memos (*other than to Florence Ward*: §S2) are clear: libel-threat alone — not Bowman’s try at scholarly refutation — convinced them not to publish. Exploring every unobvious, far-fetched (www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §A1 item [B]) alibi he can conjure ([a] falsely deeming Kiel unverified §G5; [b] conveniently-assumed Peary-sloppiness [contra diary-neatness!] which somehow *doesn’t affect his perfect navigation to the Pole*; etc), Bowman’s Report naturally doesn’t mention the obvious reason for diary-blanks: given Peary’s horrid dilemma-vice on 1909/4/6-7 (give up — or suicidally go on), he doesn’t yet want to commit to a story on the pages of his diary which he may have to adjust later. Like his 1935 institutional partners in guile (§E8 above), he’s keeping open his options as widely and as long as possible. (“I left some days open to fill in if I had the time afterwards.” [W145]) Using the notebook and carbon which Cookite Kiel preserved from her time as Barker’s sec’y, Kiel produced Barker letters to Peary. (For subsequent Kiel-Barker interplay, see Robert Bryce’s careful account in his preface to the 2001 Cooper Square reprint of Peary’s *The North Pole* pp.xxii etc.) The Barker-to-Peary letter of 1909/3/26 [W118]:

I shall have to depend on you to give me a little more help this month than heretofore. So far, I have never put any burden upon you that I could possibly bear myself; but it seems that I have over-estimated my strength. As you may imagine, I have many anxieties and responsibilities in regard to this enterprise of the magazine, and I have tried to keep an eye on everything — even the advertising department — in accordance with my promise to you last November.

Barker’s letter of 1910/4/1 [RB486; W118-119]:

I hope you will have sent me before this reaches you more of the data which I need for April 6th and 7th [days at the “Pole” camp]. That is the climax of the story, and the possibility is very great. If we do not have an article which will make everybody sit up and take notice, it is our own fault. I hope you will have found time to dictate two or three thousand words relative to those two days. Your eyes being so tired from the observations [an alibi which brought a snicker from Miss Kiel, W119], there are no entries in the journal. The whole world is intensely interested in what you did during those two days, even to minute details. . . . Even my associates on the magazine are as curious as are the little boys on the street.

Is Bowman really willing to urge Yale Press to disregard all this? More to the central point here: why is he unwilling, re continuing academic acceptance of Peary’s claim, to let the public make up its own mind on *the evidence*, preferring instead to make up its mind for it while secreting that evidence?

(See similar arrogance at *DIO 18*: www.dioi.org/vols/wi0.pdf, cover.)

O4 4. Picking out a technical point at random, one observes on page 10 [actually W15] that he [Ward] quotes Nansen as saying “The ice steadily improves the farther north we go”, but he forgets this in all of his subsequent argument and makes much in a number of places of the fact that rough ice with ridges and openings [“leads”] is “always and everywhere” [W10] a characteristic of the Arctic Ocean.

It is obvious all through the [Ward] book that ice is just ice to Ward, wherever that ice may be. I have nearly a page of references from the manuscript to prove this point. [Simple bluff. Did Yale Press ever ask to see Bowman’s alleged page?] The weakest part of the entire [Ward] book from this standpoint is the section from page 10 to page 14. On page 22 the “roughest sort of ice” which MacMillan saw from a single point on his Crocker Land journey and which had a very narrow limit of visibility becomes the ice against which Peary and Nansen and Cagni contended all the way!

Here is the world’s leading geographer knowing less than amateur Ward, who more accurately if imperfectly judges (WP10):

There is good evidence that the Arctic Ocean north of latitude 83° is always and everywhere a region of drifting ice, opening and closing lanes of water, a tumbled chaos of rough ridges. All men who have sledged in the Arctic make uniform reports of conditions. The three aviators [e.g., Amundsen&Nobile] who have flown over the pole report that the ice-fields north of latitude 83° seem everywhere the same.

And Bowman’s use of Nansen’s experience to contradict Ward’s comments distorts them. Ward notes (W16-17) that Nansen’s temporary-luck smooth ice-based optimism was illusory both from the southerly movement of the ice & from its soon-after return to roughness. Nansen’s finale (at 86°N), 1895/4/6 [W17; F113]: “We hardly made 4 miles yesterday. Lanes ridges, and endless rough ice, it looks like an endless moraine of ice-blocks; and this continual lifting of the sledges over every irregularity is enough to tire out giants.” And if Bowman objects to W10’s “always and everywhere” (though Ward follows it with examples from various other explorers), then does he object to Ward’s *application to Peary’s 1902&1906&1909 route north of Ellesmere* of the following unsourced account (*right on the same Ward p.10*) of the horror of fighting pressure-ridges — and steering while detouring transversely-around them (see at F146 Peary’s own impressive *Hampton’s* illustration of his zigzag 1909 path around 100 miles of pressure-ridges):

They may be anywhere from a few rods to a quarter of a mile in width. Going over them, one must pick his trail as best as he can, often hacking his way with pickaxes, encouraging the dogs by whip and voice to follow the leader, lifting the five-hundred-pound loaded sledges over hummocks and up acclivities whose difficulties sometimes seem likely to tear the muscles from one’s shoulder-blades.

Again: did Bowman think that this quote (from the very Ward p.10 which he so specifically scorns) doesn’t apply to Peary’s path? Bowman evidently didn’t recognize that the writer of this passage is Peary himself! — describing at p.194 of *The North Pole* his 1909 trip’s ice [full quote at F112]. Peary backs with photos his experiences with portaging over pressure-ridges, which (as Ward may’ve 1st noted) Cook’s book fatally lacks.

Bowman pretends Ward extrapolates from just one MacMillan sighting. In fact, Ward devotes pages [W9-23] to various explorers’ rough-ice experiences. And (re the Peary-defense idea that ice gets better way out from land) Amundsen’s sensationally famous near-fatal 1925 airplane-setdown experience on horribly rough ice far from land in the central Arctic ocean north of Spitzbergen (c.88° —) was known to Ward & everyone. Bowman ignores it. Byrd surely didn’t: when, on 1926/5/9 a leaky starboard engine faced him with the nightmare-prospect of having to bring his trimotor plane down onto the ice from possibly-upcoming imbalance’s motor-strain and fuel inefficiency, he turned for home early because he knew (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §B5) from, e.g., Amundsen’s 1925 narrow escape, that landing an airplane on the rough ice-pack could be suicide from high risk of — far from help — being stuck at the landing spot, by damage to the plane and/or unsmooth takeoff surface. Indeed, one of Amundsen’s two 1925 planes was unflyable after just such damage.

O5 5. I ought to be flattered by the comparison between the National Geographic Society and the American Geographical which is so complimentary to the latter. Ward's repeated references to the National as a commercial company overstates the case to say the least, and in my opinion his statements would provide a firm basis for legal action.

Seriously?! Can one imagine suing over the "libel" of being called COMMERCIAL?! Especially when one is. In this connexion, Eugene Davidson made up for some past sins with a sentimental 1970/11/17 letter to DR recalling the time when he was at Yale Press:

You call on me to revive faded memories, but I remember the Ward book and Ward too very well; he was such a whimsical, off-beat man I could never forget him or his works. . . . [Ward's book] began with an amusing and valid, I thought, attack on the National Geographic Society for pretending to be any kind of scientific body. Ward said it was a commercial organization, that anyone could join it who paid the price of subscription to the magazine, that even a dog could belong and in fact one dog did belong — his! He had taken out a subscription for the animal, a Great Dane I remember well.

[Cookite Fred High (*Chautauqua*) earlier signed up a dog named Bronte. DR's cat, Admiral Purry, was similarly elected to the Society through the NGS Board of Trustees: 1973/1/1 certificate at www.dioi.org/adu.jpg.] But Davidson doesn't supply Bowman's Report or even name. When DR finally ferreted out that Bowman was the culprit, he wrote Davidson again, who wrote back 1970/12/29: "I'm impressed with all you've found out. Truly. Dimly, I now remember that Isaiah Bowman was a geographer & a most likely reader for the ms. Donaldson & I visited him [§N6 above] once at Hopkins. . . ." On the point regarding libel: though criticizing NGS for being too-much Gilbert Grosvenor's one-man business, English textbook-writer Ward (like DR) admires NGS' contributions, adding [W72]: "Dr. Grosvenor's editorial skill is altogether praiseworthy." And he approvingly quotes [W74] the 1935 *World Almanac*:

The National Geographic Society has played such an important role in exploration and the advancement of science, and has so effectively interpreted and illustrated geography for the layman, that its membership exceeds 950,000, its researches and expeditions range to the ends of the earth, and its dissemination of geographic and other scientific knowledge extends to every community in the world.

Ward comments [W74]: "A satirist could find rich material in Dr. Grosvenor's blurb; yet, as I have indicated in this chapter, the boasting can be pretty much justified." But he then rightly notes [N74-75]: "I have supposed that [by funding expeditions] Dr. Grosvenor is advertising his Society. He seems to be doing for his [*National Geographic*] magazine what the newspapers do for themselves when they finance explorers; they count on making a profit in their business." This accurate observation may be a bit too cynical for NGS' liking, but it is not anywhere near actionable libel! — except in the nightmare-drama which NGS-henchman Bowman strains to near-rupture in conjuring. Bowman's Report does not quote Ward in what (given what Bowman was up to) is eerily ironic naïveté [W76-77]:

It is highly unlikely that the [Nat. Geographic] Society has ever engaged in tricky or dubious business.⁴⁶ This probability needs emphasis, for the

⁴⁶Ward's gentle naïveté, wasted on Bowman, might've appealed to a neutral referee. Ward would have been less trusting of Grosvenor had he known of the stunt he pulled when hiding the fact that NGS had approved Byrd's North Pole claim 5^d BEFORE completing its flawed (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, *DIO 10* p.11) exam of his alleged 1926/5/9 data — and then hid its time-travel feat by *censoring the key dates out of its own report*, when printing it in the 1926 Sept issue of *NGM*. Amusingly clumsy details: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, *DIO 10* pp.55&57.

contrary has been hinted or asserted several times in books. For example, Captain Hall, in *Has the North Pole Been Discovered?*, accused Grosvenor of being "skilfully misleading" when he argued about Peary's speed, and charged him with being a "ringleader in all this villainy." . . . It should be understood, however, that Grosvenor had much to win [shades of RGS' Murchison at §A1 above] by a [National Geographic] verdict in favor of Peary. If Peary was declared by good authority to be the discoverer of the pole, the National Geographic Society could thereafter print in its list of achievements the assistance given to the world's premier explorer. It has advertised that good work for twenty-five years. Open any number of the *Magazine* and you will see on the inside cover:

The Society also had the honor of subscribing a substantial sum [\$1000] to the expedition of Admiral Peary, who discovered the north pole.

Ask any advertising man to estimate how much that announcement is worth every month in a magazine that earns grand profits by interpreting geography for laymen.

Ward's discernment of Grosvenor's ambition was vindicated beyond his wildest implicit predictions when Grosvenor issued his 1957 official bio of NGS (p.51; F190):

The National Geographic Society's championship of this distinguished American naval officer always will be a glorious chapter in the history of the organization. The Committee's careful, scholarly vindication of Peary's claims won world-wide approval and clearly established The Society as a potent force in the fields of exploration and scientific research.

Today, such proud boasting rings hollow, given the rubberstamp reality (§U18) of the actual 1909 NGS exam.

It would [continues Bowman's Report to Yale Press] be risky for the Press to publish the book *without previous consultation with the National*. You may take it as a foregone conclusion that the National would fight to the last ditch to prevent publication of the book. [*Would?* It's obviously doing so *through this very Report*, by proxy, using eagerly-volunteering Bowman as its catspaw.] — not because it is an attempt to destroy Peary's case but because it is an attack upon the National through repeated assertions regarding its EXCLUSIVELY [Bowman again falsely charges Ward with unbalanced but nonexistent uniformity] commercial character. I do not think that the Press can afford to publish a book that is so definitely an attack upon another institution.

Hey let's consult with NGS about exposing the baselessness of its prime (see Grosvenor NGS bio just above) myth, knowing (previous paragraph) that it'll "fight to the last ditch to prevent publication"! On this point: in 1973, when publisher Luce was fretting that it'd be sued if it published DR's much stronger *Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction?*, Luce's Editor Joe Binns had lunch with an NGS friend and casually-innocently-oh-by-the-way asked whether NGS sued over such books. Answer: are-you-daft? — why give an enemy free publicity? An experienced insider like Bowman surely knew all about such realities. And so did Yale Press and all those involved. The libel-suit-threat was simply a means for careerists to kill the book — aiming to please The Mogul for personal advancement.

O6 6. On page 62 [W66] Ward commends Cook as "this American doctor who had [had] such an honorable record with explorers in both the arctic and [the] antarctic". I happen to know that this statement is untrue so far as the antarctic is concerned. I prefer not to report the evidence that I have received.

Bowman is asking trust without providing supporting evidence, which he doesn't allow for anyone less wonderful than he. In fact, Cook was indisputably the most popular explorer on the 1897-1899 Belgian antarctic expedition, his only antarctic experience. Implying Ward backs notorious Cook, Bowman misapplies guilt by association, since Ward's book buys some Cookite alibis at W65-66 but ultimately deemed the Cook claim dubious [W167].

O7 7. Page 66 — The American Geographical Society does not publish "six different journals". [This appears to be an error of the cited *World Almanac*, not Ward.] Page 114 [W119] — "Peary's record of observations at the Pole was not in his journal but was manufactured later." The truth is that it was not in one journal. Because it was not in that it was manufactured, says Ward! I have taken observations for position many times in the field. I have never put the record of these observations nor the calculations based on them in my regular note-book. It is possible to do this but very awkward and unnecessary.

Bowman diverts from: **there are no entries** at the Pole camp, data or otherwise. His point on unremarkability of recording sextant data separately is true, though not so universal. (E.g., Byrd's 1926/5/9 data are in his single diary. And partly because such a record is harder to fake, Byrd didn't get away with his 1926 exaggeration: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf.) And what may be ordinary is not preferable: the best record to back up a real journey is a **continuous** one, with at least the reduced results of observations entered onto the same pages as the narrative, and **as Peary had done in 1902 and 1906 and was doing in 1909 up to April 1** [Bartlett's 87°46'49" 1909/4/1 observation: NARA diary microfilm frame 0048], as inspection of all those diaries reveals. Note the oddity for April 5-7: Peary ultimately rejects the alleged observation (89°25'N) that's **IN** the diary while saying his *real* data are on loose paper-sheets **NOT** in the diary. (Byrd's defenders have been reduced to proposing similarly simian somersaults to alibi *his* problems: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §L7.) Peary's 1909 sextant data on "loose slips" of paper allow tale-flexibility&manipulation by post-insertions, **a practice he is now provably known to have repeatedly engaged-in** even before 1909 (Jesup Land and Crocker Land: see above at §§B8&B12). Peary actually wrote (§U17 below) the "Pole" part of his narrative on loose "memoranda" rather than in the diary! — needlessly creating obvious opportunity for afterwards-rewrite. And the diary's two-page April 2 entry's 2nd page is on a torn-out leaf. Which was misplaced between the April 4 and April 5 entries when the diary was microfilmed by NARA: frame 0056. (His 1st navigator-unwitnessed sudden speed-doubling begins at this very time.) The loose page for "the Pole" needs no further comment. (Note: The diary was recorded in an ordinary cheap plain unprepaginated tablet, 27 lightly printed lines per page; and Peary had other blank notebooks of several types available: Bowman 1935/7/30 record p.5.)

When Bowman again diverts (going on&on re whether it's ordinary to diary-record data), he is conspicuously ignoring his own Eagle Island discovery at §O3 (above). Again: there is not even a **MENTION** of sextant data in the diary at "the Pole", a circumstance so obviously suspicious that, as already there noted, Bowman's own handwritten record (1935/7/30 p.4) of that exam exceptionally **crosses out his notation of its omission** at both the 2 places where he'd noted it. None of this is told to Yale Press *though it utterly verifies the Kiel-Ward key finding* (BR1057n.2), which he's here pretending to the Press is just worthless Hearst-trash. (Nor are his regular trysts with Marie Peary [at their homes, never his office] made known to Yale Press, either, when he delivers his 4 pp kill-Report on Ward's book.) The same Bowman 1935/7/30 p.4 notes that some diary pages are missing at "the pole" but

he crosses that remark out, too. It appears just after Bowman writes (uncrossed-out) "On the sixth [April] march of 12 hours he [Peary] covers 30 miles. Then there is no customary entry but a line beginning 'The Pole at last!!!' " But Bowman doesn't remark that this exclamation is on a loose page. Is there any fishy circumstance he would not let pass?

O8 8. There is a great deal of dialectic in the book. Some of it obviously gave Ward a great deal of fun, but in judging the product one must recognize it for what it is — mere dialectic. One can have a lot of fun of this sort at the expense of anyone who has lived crowded days in the field under extremely difficult conditions. Both the Congressional Committee and Ward (using the committee's testimony) make a good deal of the fact that Peary left the writing of portions of his diary "until later". I would like to know what explorer has ever followed any other practice. There are days when the physical difficulties are extreme and one almost literally falls into bed. Sometimes this happens several days in succession until it become impossible to go on without writing up notes and taking account of situations which require study with a fresh mind. If Peary had insisted that he wrote all of his notes of any given day on that day I think that every man of experience would be justified in cross-examining him severely and in presuming that he was not telling the truth. Only a man who had himself not been in the field could consider this feature of the record as counting against Peary.

Ward's actual book [W29]: "Lord knows I don't blame any man on the polar pack for not writing an entry in a log-book every evening." Bowman's attempts to turn honesty into dishonesty and vice-versa mark what a deliberately-nonexistent Bowman-debater might mock with his own earlier words, designating it the "high point" of his alibi-defiance of the commonest sense.⁴⁷

O9 9. Ward can score⁴⁸ off Peary just as anyone else can. Peary was [so] completely absorbed in the task of driving his organization forward that the record so far as we can judge by the published material was deficient in elements that might silence his critics. But he did not know that such critics would arise. I do not believe that he even dreamed of the possibility. There still remains, however, the alleged [!!!] original records. Everything that Ward says about the writing of the book might be knocked into a cocked hat if one could put the record down beside Ward's argument. The publication of the record might be a first-class contribution, but that would have to be determined after close examination.

One would never know from Bowman's skewed Report that Ward in fact (W28-29) sympathizes with the explorer's strain re diary-writing (§O8 above). But: Peary didn't "dream" he'd face criticism?! The truth is that, before leaving for the north, he [F126]:

⁴⁷If an explorer virtually every day can find time to eat 2 or 3 times for a total of ordmag an hour, and can find time to rest for hours, even whole days (e.g. 1909/3/31-4/2) between marches, then it figures that he can find 5 minutes to write a few words in his journal, especially if he has supposedly attained the goal of centuries and of his life. This issue is an example of what's wrong throughout: if Bowman found his own case convincing *even to himself*, he would welcome the opportunity to vanquish Vile-Doubting-Scum Ward&etc openly either personally or through a real expert colleague. Instead, he sneaks&smears behind the scenes.

⁴⁸Ironically, this might've been inspired by W28's careful approach: "Incredible as Peary's claim for the three days at the pole appears when compared with Nansen's best, I shall beware of basing any argument on it. For a detail of his narrative may not be a fair test of the whole of it. . . . We must not venture to judge Peary by any one part of his testimony, or by any one standard, since arctic data for comparison are sparse and since arctic conditions may, for aught we know, vary in freakish ways. . . . My reasons for distrusting Peary's story are various. Though I shouldn't dare to build an argument on any one of the reasons, I cannot resist the combined force of all of them. I will set forth as descriptions of what influenced my mind, not as arguments that ought to convince somebody else's mind."

requested of the Explorers Club that “in the event of Dr. Cook’s returning and claiming to have found the North Pole, proper proofs would be demanded of him. . . .” [NYT 1909/9/8 p.2] Peary could hardly expect Cook alone to be the object of doubt. With a dispute likely, both men should have sought hard evidence more assiduously than most explorers. Instead, both ended up returning with less proof than any other explorer of the time would have dared to try getting away with.

(Cook faked as if he was totally surprised by skepticism: F83.) Bowman has just seen (1935/7/30 notes p.2) that Peary filled page after page of his diary (at the northernmost dates) with dreams of what success will bring: *riches, profitable rank-advancement, official recognitions, ornate tomb*. (Indeed, Bowman told RGS geographers that one reason for secreting the Peary diaries was to hide the disgrace of such egoism.) Yet Bowman’s desperation to excuse has driven him via no-spare-time argumentation (even though fully aware of Peary’s greedy doodling), to discount the Kiel account’s revelation (known to Bowman as accurate) that Peary didn’t tell his continuous diary — or his 23^y companion Matt Henson [F152], for that matter — that he had succeeded. The famous “Pole at last” exultation (written on a torn-out page) was evidently inserted later and cites no sextant data.

It seems to me [Bowman goes on] that the Press ought definitely to reject the manuscript if only on the single ground that it is a piece of dialectics and not a piece of analysis based upon the [Bowman-sealed] records. It is not a contribution to knowledge [contra *Natural History* Editor Ed Weyer (§S1), and multi-contra §U below] and the high point of it depends upon hearsay which has not been checked even by Ward himself. Ward read Miss Kiel’s transcript. He did not check it against the original stenographic notes. [Does Bowman offer to?] He does not know what Peary supplied Barker. [Bowman conceals that Kiel’s central report — of Barker’s complaint of no 1909/4/6 diary-entry — has just last July been confirmed by his own exam: 1935/7/30 p.4 (see §O7 above). So how could an honest archon call Kiel’s testimony mere “hearsay”. Bowman is here knowingly deceiving Yale Press and all attendant scholars.] He [Ward] is *absolutely prejudiced and one-sided while pretending to be judicial*. [Most exquisite example of psychological projection on record anywhere? And among the most baselessly base?] The qualities he [Ward] has shown in the manuscript would cause me to reject him as a commentator on the records even if [!] they were available. The truth is very hard to get at⁴⁹ [*this* from the PRIMARY person ensuring no-one can get-at the PRIMARY evidence for getting-at the truth!] but surely the man is not looking for truth [a projective smear against Ward’s character]⁵⁰ who is willing to draw severe and definite [Ward is least definite of the Peary critics] conclusions from hearsay evidence when he knows that there exist records which he has never seen [!] but which he is willing to persuade the reader were faked in any event.

Here end the 9 points of academe’s highest bigot, who, despite access to the record, hasn’t caught on — 9 points aimed at smearing & robbing the honest man whose genius *and openmindedness* had perceived the truth *even on limited evidence* — limited precisely because the same bigot robbed him of access, too.

⁴⁹If “the truth is hard to get at”, why does Bowman take the side bearing the burden of proof, refusing to meet it, instead locking up the evidence that offers a means of alleviating said burden?

⁵⁰In fact, Ward judges that, given the ambiguous evidence available due to the Peary records’ concealment, one cannot firmly draw severe and definite conclusions, but must rely on mere “probabilities”. See immediately-following quote from Ward.

O10 Hastings’ testimony hints that Peary’s data were faked, since Peary’s nervous need for checking against the nightmare of giveaway slips would be unnecessary for real data. The Ward book’s actually-OVER-judicial introduction ends by merely saying (W4-6):

I haven’t proved — probably no man can ever prove — that Peary was dishonest. I doubt that the [NGS] men in Washington who accredited him were dishonest. . . . A belief that Peary reached the pole is an act of faith. A conviction that Peary fabricated his account of going to the pole is based on probability. These truths were once put to me very clearly by a man whose profession is to know about exploration, whose name is respected in every American university. He [Bowman] expressed himself thus [1935/5/18]:

As a private citizen, I guess that Peary was close to 90° north latitude. But as a scientist, I have no opinion. There is no evidence on which I could base an opinion. I have not been allowed to see Peary’s record; no proof of his achievement has ever been published. So there is nothing to argue about. Anyone who tries to prove scientifically that Peary succeeded in 1909 is engaged in irrational business.

This man’s statement is my theme. The notion that Peary’s attainment has been proved is a myth.

What honest referee could on 1935 December 20 allow such a May 18 statement to be unrevised when his own July 30 review of the evidence had obsolesced it? Wouldn’t an honest man have told Yale Press that Ward’s statement was false because of his own July privilege of access as friend-of-the-Peary-family?! But: what would that have done to his pose of neutral referee? Would not the merest scintilla of Bowman honesty have endangered his goal of being the Horatian hero in the eyes of wealthy&influential National Geographic? *Thus* Bowman’s requirement for flimsy diversionary arguments — salted with grotesquely perverse and mirrorlessly ironic charges that *Ward* was the non-neutral half of their relationship. The obvious reason Bowman wrote his clumsily over-slanted referee Report is simply his concern that an honest report mightn’t work — and the book could end up published. So he made absolutely certain that if one believed in the authority & neutrality of his Report, publication could not possibly happen.

O11 An appended typed note hammers Bowman’s slack-standards as all-purpose-alibi, forgetting yet again where the burden-of-proof lies (Preface [1]: above, p.3) for a remarkable claim. The add-on reflects his nightmare that his devious Report mightn’t block publication, so he keeps on arguing&arguing. I.e., this means *a lot* to him & US science’s rep.

I ought to add [*ad hoc* speculate non-evidentially; even dialectically?] that Peary was not interested in his own records after he got back from an expedition. He was careless in the use of his records. He lays himself open to attack. But there is a judicial way of handling the bearing of these qualities on the main question. Ward has failed to take that way.

Re fraud: despite Miller’s advice (§H1), Bowman is at this point still (vs later: §V9 below) ignorant of how easy it is to fake sextant data. (And Hastings’ review had ensured that fakes would pass.) But Ward *does* analyse judicially throughout. Early on in his book, he accurately gives Bowman’s opinion (above) from his 1935/5/18 meeting with Bowman — who now, ironically, is the chief academic enemy of its publication. Primarily, Bowman is ignoring the unavoidable issue: he is debating the empty chair which he’s ensured is his opponent, so he Wins by thus cheating. *Obviously, all the points he raises should have been debated in public*. There is no equitable justification for doing otherwise.

P Cavemen at Yale Press

P1 If Yale chose a pol of Bowman's ethical instability&power,⁵¹ it asked for what it got. If Yale Press had merely read the 1st few pages [above §O1: DR comment on §O9] of its own projected book, it would instantly have realized the vastness of the gulf between the actual ms and the straw-man that was mostly Bowman's warped invention. Bottom line: when choosing between an obviously honest, independent man vs an obviously political organization man (the Press saw through his arguments: §O3), Yale opted for the latter.

P2 As for a libel action: Bowman repeated this ludicrous [§O5 above] threat yet again to Bert Keller (letter of 1936/1/2), even falsely and ghoulishly saying in it that the late Ward had been too ill to think clearly. (Akin to the History-of-science cult's standard smear-response to its critics: fn 53.) Keller was advising Ward's widow on what to do.

P3 Bowman's 1935/12/30 gofer-report to Marie proudly quotes a 12/23 Yale Press letter: "On the basis of your report, we have given up the idea of publishing the book." So Bowman's scheme worked. Or, likely more accurately: his power to advance or retard careers worked magic on such as Keller&Davidson&Donaldson. Though a Peary-doubter, Keller's priority was sucking up to the Ultimate Fixer. (Fellow Yalies Keller&Bowman had corresponded at least since 1918/2/14; Keller was discussing his financial squeeze due to kids' education in a 1918/11/11 letter to Bowman.) He ultimately, naïvely (?) thanked Bowman for his HELP on the Ward ms (as did Yale Press — as if Bowman's warning was for their benefit).

P4 Keller argued for suppression not only at the time, but a decade later, when the widow, Florence, wrote him that publisher William P. Wreden of San Francisco (quoting from her 1971/4/4 letter to DR) "happened to see the MS of *The Peary Myth* which I had lent to Norm [Norman Hall, co-author of 1935's bestseller, *Mutiny on the Bounty*]. Wreden wanted to publish it. Norm was a college classmate of my sister's and a dear friend of mine." In response, Keller wrote Florence (1945/7/21, underlining in orig; boldface added):

The matter of the Peary claim to fame remains in my mind, just where it was left. The sea captain's book [T.Hall's 1917 *Has the North Pole Been Discovered?*] persuaded me, and set Henshaw going. Then came the question of the book.

Ed Weyer reported that Bob Bartlett had no doubt. [!! See §S1 below.]

Then **I**⁵² put it up to Bowman now Pres. of Johns Hopkins; and he advised me [the widow's advisor] to do nothing about it, *hinting that he knew some things that settled it and that it couldn't⁵³ contribute to Henshaw's reputation*

⁵¹ Was asking an archon of Bowman's eminence done in naïve innocence of what his priorities would inevitably be? The sequence of Yale Press events: Davidson asks Ward to write a book showing Peary's evidential defenselessness. Then Davidson dangles said book before US science's top power operator, establishing a relationship, and gratitude for the favor of killing the book. How accidental was all this? For a semi-similar incident in DR's experience, re Johns Hopkins→Princetintute mogul Harry Woolf (virtually a Bowman-come-back-to-life): www.dioi.org/j129.pdf, fn 172.

⁵² Keller now at last *ten years later* reveals himself as the operator who led (§M4) Yale Press to seek Bowman's pre-known (§M1) opinion, following *trembling* Bowman's 1935/10/30 Marie-instigated (§L1) hiring of Keller as an eye on Yale Press (§M1). And this is perhaps the 1st Florence ever heard that Bowman was author of the death-sentence referee Report.

⁵³ JHU Pres. Bowman's coverups were always for the good of the deceived: see §D5 above, and www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, n.84. (Where we see a reliably establishment-protective *NYTimes* reporter, Walter Sullivan, was actually ON AGS' Board, symbolizing the marriage of too many science "journalists" — esp. the most prominent — to the very entities they are supposed to be monitoring.) Compare Bowman-Keller's tactic to the equally sincere concern for DR professed by Harvard's Hist.sci Dep't head Gingerich (www.dioi.org/det.htm#gsss) at www.dioi.org/j43f.pdf, §H5: "it would be a disservice to his own attack on Ptolemy to publish arguments so obscurely framed." This cult referee report, *which OG was sure would be secreted, also accused DR of insanity*. (Same cult accused Johns Hopkins physi-

to push the book. [No such factor in Keller's 1st letter to Bowman: §M3. Just obeisance. It took him a day to conjure it up: §M4.] So far as I was concerned, Bowman's counsel settled it; though I remain highly skeptical of the validity of Peary's claim. I haven't thought about the case since. You see I can't furnish my new evidence at all.

I am sorry not to be able to contribute anything of value. I can have no personal right to an opinion, myself; but Weyer [contra §S1] and especially Bowman certainly have, and I shall not risk, *for Henshaw's sake*, rejecting their advice. . . .

Regretting my inability to assist you.

P5 A few days later, the like comes from Davidson to Florence (1945/7/24):

. . . Our decision against publishing your husband's manuscript was based on a long report from a reader of exceptional competence who thought that it should not be issued because parts of it were doubtful and its publication might lead to a libel suit on the part of the National Geographic Society. I should think all these reasons still hold, and I should therefore be doubtful of your authorizing its publication with at best so little probable return to you. . . . I believe you would be best advised to leave the manuscript unpublished.

Q Trust-Me for Keeping Secrets From You

Q1 In the 1930s, Bowman told the same I-know-critical-secrets-I-can't-tell-mere-you line we saw above even to skeptical BAAS sometime-*head* Raymond Priestley, chief scientist of the Shackleton 1908-1909 and Scott 1910-1913 expeditions — Bowman acting for decades as **THE** *international pump-prime* for Peary-alibis, to keep convincing the world's *insufficiently-curious* scientists to go on accepting the Peary Myth. (None of them saw Peary's records or read Ward's ms: it made for less trouble to just take the Bowman circle's word.) Bill Stevenson (V.Stefansson) told everyone the same thing. Indeed Stef invented the I-know-secrets-you-don't technique of disparagement even before Bowman, as typified by his 1927/2/5 letter to Peary-doubter J.Gordon Hayes: "Concluding I want to say that that so far as the published evidence goes you have the best of the Peary argument. That I do not follow you to the final conclusion is only because I know much evidence that has not been published." One of Ward's key finds was that Stef was pushing the excuse that ghostwriter A.E.Thomas was the cause of all imperfections (as Thos. Jefferson blamed all Jesus' imperfections on the gospel writers), an alibi with the additional benefit of drawing attention away from the REAL ghost-writer, beautiful Elsa Barker, object of Jo Peary's jealous wrath (fn 59) [according to Cook-aide T.E.Harré, associated with *Hampton's*].

Q2 At the least: inexcusably arrogant. Ever in service of the powerful. I.e., the Stef&Bowman Showmen had but one aim: keep from the public the fact that organized US geography had *made a mistake it didn't want to admit*.⁵⁴ (The mistake of certifying Peary originated in 1909 geography's panic that after Cook fell: if Peary fell too, funding for exploration would vanish.) Iz&Stef were pretending to In-Circle Wisdom, which was

cist R.Newton of insanity, e.g., www.dioi.org/j129.pdf, fn 171. Convenient that ALL Ptolemy critics are smearably crazy: www.dioi.org/jm04.pdf fn 18. By the very act of criticism. No other business allows dissension. Why should academe be different?) This accusation was secretly transmitted *even while* its writer was engaging in the very surreptitious practice it accused DR of insanely imagining: www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf, fn 5. OG's report was seen as sham by *PASP's* honest astronomer-editor, so the paper was printed (*PASP* 94:359-373; 1982) despite OG's libel & is now an unanswerable part of the by-now-massive&laughably-obvious (www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf) evidence indicting Ptolemy.

⁵⁴*DIO* freely admits all its errors. In analytic detail. See www.dioi.org/vols/wb2.pdf, cover & §G; and www.dioi.org/err.htm.

actually its embarrassing opposite: *simply ponder §V5's point*. Did either ever privately face the obvious truth: that Peary's claim was a lie? If not, both "Experts" proved, ironically, to be naïve, hero-dazzled suckers, even by the most generously fantastic view (contra §V9).

Q3 The answer to §Q1's bluff is simple and already proposed by DR in response to the same act when it was put on by Brit astronomers to maintain their 150^y pretense that their man, Cantab John Couch Adams, was the true predictor of the location of planet Neptune, ahead of the actual 1846/9/23 discoverer, Frenchman Urbain Leverrier (Paris Observatory): *believe us — even while we hide our evidence for a century & a half*.

DR's 1994 public proposals (www.dioi.org/j42a.pdf, DIO 4.2 ¶10 §14, emph added):

[a] Acknowledge Leverrier's primacy in the discovery of the planet Neptune.

[b] Unshelve the deliberately-suppressed RGO Neptune Papers.

[c] Determine whether the RGO is permitted to confer an amnesty upon itself.

[d] *Cease repeating the Adams legend until item [b] is accomplished*.

When the Neptune file was finally recovered, it destroyed the British Neptune claimjump (DIO 9.1 ¶1, www.dioi.org/j911.pdf, 1999 June; *Scientific American* 291.6:98, 2004 Dec) as thoroughly as investigation of the long-secreted Bowman file has here finally ended the Peary North Pole sham, too.

R Ward Warns Academe from the Grave

R1 Near his book's end, Ward reasonably asked why the Peary records were still sealed over a 1/4-century after the event, adding a comment (W173) that, incredibly, *accurately predicts secretive Bowman's policy of trust-me pseudo-certification* — which lingered decades after Ward's death. And Bowman's.

R2 Ward presciently sees that such is just what the fixers will aim at designing (emph added): "When I speak of 'showing' the record, I don't mean letting some friend of Peary see it and give *assurance* that it is what it ought to be. I mean submitting it to a board of five men who are eminent, are competent, and have nothing to lose by making an adverse report." (Today, all five would HAVE to be retirees. See this article's Preface.)

S Not Even OTHER Publishers? Organized Swindling of the Widow.

S1 To continue suppressing the book in 1945 is worse than the 1935 original act, an episode we now return to complete. Worst of all is the lie (§§P4&S2) that the rejection was unanimous, for *Natural History* (AMNH) Editor Weyer's 1935/10/24 referee report actually said, "... Mr.Ward has produced information which persons who consider themselves well informed, do not know about . . . He is honest in his presentation of his facts." Moreover, from pencil-marks on the MS, we know Weyer was actively helping (with the assistance of Percy Marks) edit the book (see §O1) preparing it for publication (§S2). And Weyer directly informed DR 1970/11/12 that he had supported publishing it, a recollection which is backed by §V3 below and by a 1935/12/26 letter to Weyer (which tries hard to explain abandoning a book he'd been working hard on), from Yale Press' Eugene Davidson (later Al Speer's showbiz-bud), copy to Yale Press' Norman V. Donaldson:

We've had a long five-page communication from our second reader [Weyer being the 1st — who'd recommended the book] which is a pretty convincing document. He's against publishing, and when I say it's convincing I don't mean that it throws out any of Ward's facts, but that it does point out that we might run into a couple of libel suits and all in all raise a rumpus that we shouldn't be in a very good position to quiet. If Ward had lived of course he could have fought his own battle, but the way matters stand there's only his widow, and we can't involve her in any controversy that might cost her some money. [A concern which reads ironically vs Yale Press at §S2!]

None of us likes to give the thing up. I certainly feel that there are a good many reasons for publishing, but the outs in a thing of this kind always weigh heavily, probably too heavily.

Thank you for all your work. I hope that you've entirely recovered your health by now, and please accept my very best New Year's wishes for you and Mrs.Weyer.

S2 Then Davidson wrote to Ward's widow, Florence Ward (copy to Karl Llewellyn: on whom see §T2). Notice the dishonesties in his "prayerful" letter: [1] contradicting the foregoing key admission to Weyer *made the very same day*: 1935/12/26) that Bowman doesn't overturn Ward's facts (Weyer knew too much science to even try deceiving him so, and he'd have offered to patch up any such problems rather than killing the whole ms), while [2] pretending he's not sending The Ultra-Report only because it would be a "bother" to her, when his real reason is that Bowman is insisting that his own feeble and censorial responses to evidence be hidden; [3] Davidson debuts the *Total-Coverup Strategy* of those (incl. former-friend, now turncoat Keller) trying to please Bowman&NGS by talking the widow into *not even seeking other publishers*, concluding by [4] threatening to fine her one-hundred 1935 dollars if she finds such! (See §T2 below for her chuckle at that one.) The letter (emph & caps added):

After long and prayerful consideration of your husband's manuscript, we've just had word from a very competent critic that it had better not be published. He gives four or five typewritten pages of reasons for his judgment, but I won't bother you by going into any detail. The upshot is that *certain parts of the manuscript are doubtful* and others like that on the National Geographic Society might lead to a libel suit.

We are *all* [untrue, given Weyer's dissent] convinced that it would be best not to issue the book, and we feel that way not only in regard to the Yale University Press' publishing it *but also any house's bringing it out*. [Is this unique in publishing history? What business is it of Davidson to relay advice generated from the fears of Bowman-NGS, that the truth may leak?] If you should, however, disagree with our view of the matter, I could understand that, and you might want to try someone else. In that event we'd be very glad to forward the manuscript for you to any publisher you wanted. [Ever-so-considerately saving you the trouble of sending it yourself. And, by-the-way, tracking who that next publisher might be — so Bowman&co could threaten IT!] And if it were eventually brought out, we should like to be reimbursed out of royalties [out of FLORENCE's pocket] for the \$100 we paid to Mr.Weyer for his revision. [Since she was later tricked (§P4 above) into the impression that Weyer was against publishing the book, she is ultimately in-effect being told that she should pay Weyer \$100 for rejecting it.] Meanwhile we'll hold the manuscript here. [What safer place? — as fn 29 assures us!] I am SORRY that the project hasn't gone through. It's a good job in so many ways, and indicates so many spots of probable error in Peary that it seems a shame to let it go. On the other hand, it's apparently not watertight in every detail [the details Weyer had been busy fixing — his reworking is noted in pencil on the 1st text-page (W3) of the Ward ms], and that we think would be fatal in a manuscript of this kind. [Bowman excuses every Peary sloppiness (§O3), but even a single Ward imperfection kills the book. Likewise by Keller at §P5.]

I hope that you are having a good rest, and I'll look forward to seeing you and telling you more about the whole situation when you return. Louise and I send our very best wishes to you for the New Year.

Very SINCERELY yours / Eugene Davidson

The conspiracy to suppress the book by threatening Florence Ward lacks only the stage-obligatory mustache-twirl — but nonetheless radiates a classic swindling-the-widow plot, as she is robbed of the glow of seeing her late husband's most significant and memorable labor credited, not to mention loss of the royalties such a public-controversy book might've gleaned, authored by a then-well-known writer.

S3 Yale Press out-grovelled Keller, displaying the backbone of the soufflé it caved like.⁵⁵ A case-study in the lowest sort of science-society coverup, it shows exactly why (despite the valued and admirable exceptions, e.g., fn 55) *institutional officers should never be taken at their word*. Bowman insisted upon secrecy all the way. In Bowman's papers, notes are found repeatedly in which his secretaries refer to correspondence with Marie as for his home file. See, e.g., §K8. Even years later, e.g., 1938/10/26: "For Mr. Bowman's home files." And 1939/2/16: "For your Peary file at home.")

S4 The threat to Ward's book leaked. Will Shea, a Cook-circle student of The Controversy, wrote Keller 1935/11/13, warning of trouble from Elsa Barker. Keller relayed the letter to Bowman, adding "Then I wrote to Mrs. Ward, offering to help. . . . There are some things you should see. I thanked Shea for the letter, adding that I should be more cautious of risks to Ward's reputation than if the case were mine. I am, in fact, getting more cautious daily." Shea wrote Cook on 1935/12/23, 3^d after Bowman's kill-Report (RB725-726):

After Henshaw died I had some correspondence with a professor at Yale who is acting as a sort of literary executor to Henshaw. I get the impression from this that the book might be suppressed. He said that he thought it should not be published and I gathered that he was hopeful that that would be the verdict of the Yale Press. I wrote them urging as strongly as I could that the book be brought out and I offered, as an old friend of Henshaw's, to read the manuscript. He replied saying that the publishers were getting opinions from geographers [the TRUSTWORTHY EXPERTS] and that he would leave the decision to them.

T Widow Recalls Swindle: Expanding the Circle of Suppressors

T1 There was nothing random about academe's coordinated effort to convince the trust-ign widow to bury the ms. Her fascinating 1970/11/6 letter to DR [emph added]:

The Kellers and Ward were dear friends (and neighbors in Boothbay Harbor, Maine). It seems to me that Gene Davidson came to visit [the] Kellers and became interested in Ward's Peary article in the American Mercury. I think it may have been through Gene that the Yale Press became interested and finally made arrangements⁵⁶ to publish a book that Ward should write. . . .

T2 I am enclosing Davidson's [1935/12/26] letter to me If we could see those [quoting Davidson] "four or five typewritten pages of reasons for his judgment!" [Keller (§P4) had drawn Florence into thinking maybe the

⁵⁵ DIO is extremely grateful that 1971 Yale Press Editor Mrs. Anne Wilde behaved admirably otherwise, both in copying the file and in owning explicitly that the Bowman Report's scholarship had not refuted Ward's book, so the libel threat was what killed it. Likewise, the late Wilma Fairchild (longtime Editor of the AGS' *Geographical Review*), eschewing Bowman's perversion of AGS' ideals, helped as much as she could (considering her position) to bring out the truth [F294], and later edited DR's 1982 paper on Eratosthenes for *Isis* 73.2:259-265.

⁵⁶ On 1970/12/2, Yale Press' Anne Wilde, who hugely helped these researches as a matter of principle, wrote DR that there might not have been a contract but that there was "every expectation" that the book would be published until Bowman's Report intervened, claiming that "some of Ward's statements were libellous and could result in a suit."

referee was Weyer (though her letter wonders whether it might have been Bowman), perversely fingering as suppressor the one honest man in the entire mix of advisors! — a deceit presumably born of the need to blame anyone but invisible Bowman] I remember distinctly an afternoon at the Kellers when there was quite an air of tension, before Keller told us the Yale Press's decision not to publish. It was as if I might not agree and there'd be trouble. Now Bert Keller was Henshaw's dearest and oldest friend. They'd been together in Yale when Ward was doing graduate work, and they'd been friends though all the years — good friends and trusted. I was sure that Keller had nothing but Ward's good in mind when he told me the decision of the Press and advised me to take their word for it. I trusted his integrity absolutely and was far too stunned and sad to do anything that even looked like effort. I said very well; let it be so.

Now what caused the tension I never knew. . . . However that may be, I always felt that there was more here than meets the eye; that there was some reason other than faults in the MS; other than fears of libel suits, etc; and that these were reasons I'd be happier not to know.

For instance, . . . the brilliant (and lamented) Karl Llewellyn, whom Ward loved and respected. He was my friend also, and he would not have been easily convinced that the Press should not fulfill its obligations without good and sufficient reasons. [Llewellyn was the only cited recipient of a copy of Davidson's suppressive 1935/12/26 letter.] Karl was less conservative than Keller and wouldn't have minded a fight if necessary. That he was so easily persuaded — apparently by a phone conversation [recall §E3: "not a thing that can be written"] — did much to make me content to let sleeping dogs lie." [So add Llewellyn to the widening cast of Illustrissime's puppet show.]

Please notice (and smile) at the Press's wish to be reimbursed for Weyer's "revision." Keller, Ward's oldest and dearest friend I am enclosing two of his letters which answered, apparently, mine, asking about some other publishers who had asked to see the MS. Furman was one and there were some others. . . .

As for Florence's trust in Ward's close friend Llewellyn — Davidson wrote her a brief 1936/1/13 note: "Mr. Llewellyn called the other day from New York, and I gave him what information I could on the whole situation. He seemed to agree too that it would probably be best not to go ahead with publication. . . ."

U 24 Ward FACTS Izzy Hid, For the Public's Own Good. Why Else?

Bowman denigrates the book as primarily "dialectic" but it actually contains numerous key **FACTS** that he is also suppressing along with the dialectic. If he were on the level in his denigration, he could have suggested the book be trimmed to raw facts. But he didn't. Bowman's known (§D5 above) paternalistic excuse for upholding useful popular lies was that truth could be a downer, for those less able than himself to handle it. *So let's see just how many truths he kept from the public*, truths which would've become widely known (not just known to specialists in The Controversy), had Ward's book been published by Yale University Press. Many had been originally unearthed by super-researchers Ernest & Etta Rost (RB594-595&600-601&791). With the usual "W" we will source-cite the upper-right pagenummer in the ms, www.dioi.org/ph.pdf:

U1 W3&146: During Peary's 1909 trip he never sought his longitude.

U2 W3. After Peary at Bartlett Camp left behind his last companion-navigator-witness, Bob Bartlett, his reported speeds increased remarkably. [See §O7 & F142-143.]

- U3** W3: Peary did not write *The North Pole*. (Details: RB722.)
- U4** W4: It was compiled with his input by a ghostwriter.
- U5** W4&88-89: Peary's 1910-1911 Naval Affairs subcommittee hearings' text was effectively suppressed.
- U6** W4: "... no scientific society ever so much as saw⁵⁷ any Peary proofs".
- U7** W28: Peary claims he returned from the Pole to Bartlett Camp at an effectively unverifiable 50 mi/day, far higher than he or other central Arctic travelers ever made.
- U8** N74: NGS is a knowledge-contributing business, not a geographical society.
- U9** W78: The eminent National Academy of Sciences was prepared to evaluate Peary's claim. Henry Osborn, Pres. American Museum of Natural History: "suggested a list of eighteen eminent scientists from whom a selection might be made." Ward doesn't criticize Grosvenor's 1909/10/12 trip to Baltimore to talk NAS Pres. Ira Rensen into transferring the judging-honor to NGS (as announced 1909/10/15 [W79]). [The same day (1909/10/12), Grosvenor privately invited Peary's address: §B16.] W82: "If [NGS' officials' 1909/11/1 approval of Peary's claim was] mistaken, as I believe they were, their error was in trusting Peary instead of investigating him." Hardly a malicious libel.
- U10** W82: "National" Geographic is not "an official part of our government. . . . The Society in 1909 was made up of 50,000 Americans who were not scientists, but who paid their three dollars a year to look at the pretty pictures." Embarrassingly true — but not libel.
- U11** W83: "There is no evidence that the committee of the National Geographical Society acted scientifically.⁵⁸ There is no evidence that they examined anything."
- U12** W87: Peary was "in the corps of civil engineers of the Navy . . . he was given the rank of commander and rear-admiral. Hence . . . Naval officers have never regarded Peary as a member of their tribe."
- U13** W100: All geographical societies' acceptances of Peary's success depend on NGS.
- U14** W113: Whoever wrote Peary's *Hampton's Magazine* series on the 1909 trip created the book, *The North Pole* because the essentials are the same (RB1070). That person was Elsa Barker. Indeed, Kiel was told [W117] the authoress of the former was simultaneously working on the latter. Ward [W122]: "Whoever wrote the Hampton articles wrote The North Pole."
- U15** W109-110: NGS-pawn Stefansson imitated Bowman in alibiing ANY flaw in Peary's account, but did so by blaming errors on dramatist-ghostwriter A.E.Thomas (who actually just polished *The North Pole*, and padded it with accounts from other expedition-members). Stef "seems to act as a pump to keep the [Thomas] story in circulation" (not knowing who the ultimate Peary-alibi pump was! — §Q1), a diversion Ward found was a cover for *the book's* [W117] secret [W116] ghost, spooky&lovely Elsa Barker, described by Lilian Kiel as "tall, rosycheeked, with exuberant health and a glorious physique"⁵⁹ [W115], a floor-pacing smoker near "nervous prostration" [W116]. Kiel [W117] "continued to admire the strength and resourcefulness of this woman who was often sorely perplexed between the rushing editors and a dilatory explorer."

⁵⁷In 1910 Peary gave RGS (copies of) his records, AFTER he [F224&237, RB488&1051] got his RGS medal (photo opp. p.365 of *The North Pole*) for "ARCTIC EXPLORATION 1886-1909" bearing a map of N.America showing his 1909 path toward the Pole. The RGS Council's vote on the records was 8-to-7 in favor out of 35 members, with 18 absent & 2 abstaining: F237, RB1051.

⁵⁸It's obvious (from §B16 above & §U24 below) that NGS was aiming to certify Peary before seeing any evidence. The best proof NGS ran a science-free exam is that, had it done otherwise, the Peary claim's inadequacies (here *passim*) would have caused non-certification.

⁵⁹Already from Barker's 1st meeting with Peary (Labrador, on his 1909/9/13 [F165] return from the North), charming him into granting his world-sensation story to *Hampton's*, Jo Peary was nervous, given Peary's proven amorous track-record [F199f; and www.dioi.org/sict.pdf, fn 13], and the extra danger that Barker was beautiful, unconventional, and unmarried (a widow) — and admired Peary to the point of publishing a heroic North Pole poem in *Hampton's*. Presumably at Jo's insistence, *Hampton's* agreed that a man be ever present when she was taking Peary's story in person.

- U16** W117: As Barker's sec'y, working at Barker's apartment at 151 W.123rd Str, Kiel preserved her notebook and a carbon of Barker's typed version of the North Pole story.
- U17** W141: There're no diary entries for 1909/4/6 (after arrival at the "Pole") or 4/7. (DR confirmed this by examining the original diary at the National Archives.) So Peary tells the congressmen he wrote loose "memoranda" [W141&142&144], instead (one each for 1909/4/6&7). Obvious question: why not write the memoranda's material in the diary, on the expansive blank pages at April 6&7? (NatArchMicrofilm frames 0063&0065; frame 0064 is a memorandum written on a torn-loose leaf.) There is no utility to this procedure except to allow altering one's story at need. (Note that Byrd also stopped writing on his numbered diary pages as soon as his fraud began, thenceforth writing in the diary's unnumbered back pages: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, §O15, *DIO 10* pp.64-65. For comparison of Peary&Byrd sudden reticences when their frauds began, see *ibid* p.105.)
- U18** W148: NGS examined Peary's instruments in a railway station, obviating testing.
- U19** W149: The Peary diary pages were "weirdly interchangeable⁶⁰ with memorandum entries and torn-out leaves".
- U20** W165: NGS committee chief Henry Gannett believed that sextant data for a trip could be faked; Cook's able hired navigator Capt.August Loose had already done it (faked sextant "observations" fitting Cook's 1908 trip), and then told all to the *NY Times* 1909/12/10:4:2&3:5-6 & 12/9:3:3 when Cook didn't pay him. Loose: "Of course faking can be done. Making fake observations is the easiest thing I do." Little-known fact [F154]: In general, it's easier to fake data than to use real data! For that excellent reason, thoroughly honest navigators commonly used St.Hilaire's method (from 1875) even though it *required* faking data: [1] the navigator draws on a map of his region a test-Summer line through his deadreckoning-presumed position, perpendicular to a chosen star's azimuth (or the Sun's); [2] via simple sph trig (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, *DIO 10* §D3), he computes (fakes) how high his star should be at that presumed location; [3] he sextant-observes the star's actual altitude; [4] if the star's real altitude is observed to be higher than the star's pre-computed altitude, he draws another Summer line parallel to the 1st, but shifted directly away from the star by the two altitudes' difference — or, if lower, he shifts his Summer line directly toward the star; [5] he repeats the [1]-[4] process a 2nd time,⁶¹ using a different star at a distinctly different azimuth, ideally about perpendicular to the 1st azimuth (perhaps just the Sun later in the day if the 1st observation was of the Sun); [6] the intersection of the 2 adjusted Summer lines is the actual deduced position.
- U21** W171-172: Unqualified assurance to the congressmen that Peary's data couldn't be faked came from a consultant who later turned out to have been in Peary's pay.
- U22** W174: D.MacMillan, Peary supporter & 1909 expedition veteran, acknowledged: "An observation for latitude is of no value to the world, for it can easily be falsified". (See RB721 on MacMillan proving this by faking "observations" putting him at the Pole on 1928/5/1, though his actual location then was Labrador.)
- U23** W182: No members of Peary's party but he were called to testify at NGS' exam.
- U24** W183: When asked whether he believed Peary's pole-attainment before seeing evidence, NGS committee chairman Gannett said "I certainly did."
- U25** So the foregoing 24 germane FACTS were kept from almost all of the public for decades beyond even the 1/4 century that had already passed since the hoax — all because the top of organized science used threat to silence a dead man. And, by dishonestly and threateningly persuading his widow to cooperate, swindled her out of the pride her husband's final labor should have produced. Not to mention the royalties that never came.

⁶⁰See Arthur T. Anthony, Georgia Bureau of Investigation, <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13185J>, *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 36.5:1614-1624 [1991]; and Lyle Dick, <https://journals.ku.edu/amerstud/article/download/2999/2958/>, n.42.

⁶¹Before computers, for just taking 2 sextant sights at random times & trying to directly compute position: the method of solution is formidable & quite time-consuming, as one may see by consulting it at Wm.Chauvenet's *Manual of Spherical & Practical Astronomy* (1906) 1:257f.

V THE ULTIMATE SECRET: US Science Mogul Knew Peary's Record Couldn't Stand Exam. Archons' Responsive Game-Plan: Secrete Record While Faking Its Validity. Conspiring as Thrill.

V1 US science's operating principle throughout was that the original records might be misunderstood by the ignorant no-count Unwashed, so they'd best be issued (if at all) only if deeply marinated in apologia. As finally in family-approved Weems *op cit*: 1963 — 54⁷ after the event).

V2 The secret of Bowman's private exam gradually became known among Insiders. But not the Undeserving Public. The famous Brit explorer Raymond Priestley wrote Hobbs about it in 1937 Feb, triggering a 2/18 Hobbs letter to Marie who complains (1937/2/25) to Bowman that Peary-biographer Hobbs keeps "insulting" her about Peary's secreted records, which she is willing to have brought out under Bowman's protective editing but that's ever-delayed since Izzy is ever-busy: "we are only too anxious to have you do it [remember (§F1) her ultimate aim is an AGS gold medal at last] but forebore urging you because of the tremendous pressure of your new [Johns Hopkins President] duties." Bowman's thespianism will put-off Marie until his death. Meanwhile, all US forums that matter will dutifully go on publicly supporting the Peary North Pole myth. Indefinitely. *This is science? At the very top of organized science.*

V3 Keller continues to work for Bowman, writing to Florence regarding her contact with Tom Davis (Editor at publisher Lee Furman,⁶² NYC, who on 1937/1/1 expressed interest in the Ward ms *on the recommendation of Ed Weyer*). Keller to Florence 1937/2/1:

... I would not bother any more over that Peary ms. if I were you. So I should tell this man [Davis] if he wrote me. The same arguments hold that held in the case of the Yale Press. It could do Ward's reputation no good, and might lead to complications. I should do nothing further with it unless someone else takes up the arrangement — then I should present him with Ward's ms — provided he were a thoroughly reliable person with good credentials. ...

Someone reliable & credentialed. Like Bowman and his echo-circle?

Florence evidently responded, perhaps begging that he recommend the book to the publisher, and enclosed some information about Furman's man Davis; so Keller returned it to Florence, with his letter of 1937/2/12:

Regarding the enclosed, I feel just the same as I have done.

- (1) The sales of the book would not be large.
- (2) It could add nothing to, and might well detract from, Ward's reputation.
- (3) No one could put it into shape. In this [Percy] Marks seems to agree. He calls it poorly written — meaning not pointed up in final draft. [On 1935/9/9, Yale Press' Davidson told Yale's Dean that Ward's ms was "very good stuff" & to Ed Weyer 9/12: "a very good job from our publishing point of view. . . ." Weyer (Am.Museum Natural History's Editor) to Davidson 1935/10/11: Ward "has presented his thesis in a most effective manner." Evidently, libel-threat magically transformed Yale-circle consensus.]
- (4) The danger of running afoul of the National Geographic, etc.

I do not see any valid reason for wanting publication, on all these hazards even if a publisher desired the ms. If I were Ward's heir, I should set the ms away for good, at most having in mind the turning of it over, in return for due recognition, to some reliable author desiring to write on the same subject.

⁶²In 1935 Furman knew T.Everett Harré and Mitchell Kennerley. The former helped edit the original edition of Cook's *My Attainment of the Pole* in 1911, and the latter published its final edition in 1913.

Now you know I do not know much about the subject, and am just telling you the way it looks to me, especially in view of the opinions of Bowman and others that have been gathered during preceding negotiations.

Furthermore, I never heard of Furman. If it were Macmillan, the Yale Press, or the Harcourt Co., it would still be doubtful. I cannot advise you to do anything, now or later with this ms. That doesn't mean that I'm right, you know; but, on my information, I do not want to take any part, however shadowy, in publication. [Keller has, however, not been reluctant to take a shadowy part in Bowman's kill — indeed he's been downright eager.]

[Going on, insider Keller flatly refused to help:]

I am not writing Furman, as, after all, I am wholly an outsider [though a Yale circle insider!], & also no expert. . . .

V4 Bowman wrote explorer Raymond Priestley (1936/12/5 emph added):

. . . Through a friend of mine [H.Raymond] who knows navigation and astronomy I am having a very close examination made of some unpublished material.⁶³ This however is highly confidential information. *I do not want it to be known to more than a very few persons that I have any interest in the Peary matter.* In the meantime I am dealing with the family who are most cordial [now, vs §F2] and helpful. The end story may not be published in my lifetime and I imply no lack [handwritten-in after "change" is struck] of vindication when I make that statement. . . . We shall have more than one conversation on this subject when we meet again and I am able to see whether or not new meanings emerge from a study of the records. I think one must conclude from a study of the original material that Peary was an honest man. [A Bowman sales-mantra showing ignorance of §H3's obvious implications.] Whether it can be proved to the hilt, so to speak, that he reached the Pole remains to be seen. . . .

Meanwhile the world's geographical archonal brotherhood, will publicly accept the validity of an evidenceless Grand Geographical Achievement.

V5 The Bowman letter's implication that Peary could be honest but perhaps didn't quite reach the Pole shows again Bowman's lack of scientific sense: the 13 "observations" are either real (and **consistently** put him smack on the spot) or faked. There's no middle ground.

V6 On 1937/2/17, Bowman writes Marie (emph added): "Confidence is the key note of friendship and I always get *a thrill* out of evidence that it still exists in the world. . . ." The same day (1937/2/27), he wrote Priestley — now also head of a university — a letter again typifying the delay-game that'll be perpetrated (against the wishes of Marie and Hobbs!) as long as Bowman can get away with sitting on the Peary scandal in-person *exclusively*, since the case is too vital to US science to allow the slightest deputation. Keep in mind: the public truth-discerners were amateurs. By contrast, organized science cooperated —

⁶³This was the "Betelgeux document" DR misinterpreted in 1988 after the Peary family hid it for decades in an envelope that mis-labelled it his N.Pole data. After pages&pages of labors by Bowman, Raymond, Miller, and T.Davies — that is, by the American Geographical Society, the Carnegie Observatory, going on for years (& NGS' Navigation Foundation more briefly) none of these eminent persons or institutions knew what it was. DR was 1st to induce (1989) that it was a record of transit observations of stars Betelgeux & Vega, taken 1894/12/10 at Anniversary Lodge, Greenland (77°40'N, 68°35'W), with the help of his 14⁷-old Eskimo common-law about-to-be-wife, Ally, evidently preserved as a momento of the night they consummated their relationship — kept with a document of his US wife Jo, presumably reflecting sentiments of deep affection for both. Peary's romantic diary entries are sampled at www.dioi.org/sict.pdf, also providing the math, which Tom Davies' son Doug creditably acknowledges is the astronomically correct solution.

when not actively conspiring — to guard a cartel-enhancing lie, by not publicly challenging either Peary’s claim or his evidence’s lockup. All the Respectable&Responsible parties — universities, societies, journals, and the Free snicker Press — went right along. Which is why Ward’s 1934/10/17 letter (§E2) observes that, 1/4-century after the lie was lodged, there was almost unrippled unanimity (as when DR 1st researched the case 1/3-century after that):

. . . the printed record hardly allows that there is any [dissent]: it is a chorus of “we cannot doubt Peary.”

V7 Bowman→Priestley 1937/2/27’s header emphasizes the secrecy with which the international science community was expected to cooperate — and slavishly did for decades:

Personal & confidential

I have learned [via Marie, which Bowman doesn’t mention] of a letter that you have written to Hobbs expressing the opinion that I would like to bring out the Peary diaries if the family would give me permission, but that Peary’s daughter was unwilling to have me publish the notes.

You may remember that I showed you the chart on which I had plotted the results of Peary’s journey and that I told you of the deep interest I had in discovering from an examination of the original material that in my opinion Peary was an honest man.

In view of the apparent misconception of the case, and as there seems to be some confusion as between my remarks and those of Hobbs to you, I think I ought to clear up the matter in your mind. Neither Mrs. Stafford (Admiral Peary’s daughter) nor any other member of the family has expressed unwillingness to have the original material published. I have never asked permission to publish. My examination of the material was facilitated by the family in every respect.

See Ward above at §R on friendly “certification” — which (NGS 1909 October) is the only 1sthand certification the claim has ever received.

We see eye to eye on the general proposition that the material should be thoroughly examined and every conceivable test made of it before we sit down to consider [underline in orig] the question of publication.

[The obvious implication is that if the case looks weak, there’ll be no publication. Well, since nonpublication IS what ultimately happened, what simple & unambiguous conclusion should inevitably be drawn from that?! *The Bowman evidentiary principle for exploration claims*: let observers guess the truth while the explorer’s family is permitted to hide the evidence as long as it likes (§F2), while we Insider-Elites snicker at the “man in the street” (*idem*) as dumb *because* we keep him ignorant. An oft-unconsidered result: most of the Amateurs — *who detected the truth of Peary’s claim better than the degreed & credentialed Moguls* — died ere well-deserved final public vindication: Macon, Greeley, Hall, Amundsen, Ward, Hayes, Weyer. As with institutional mistreatment of Amundsen: such *never-apologized-for* injustices were and are those of arrogance — rendered even viler by dishonest conniving.]

The decision in the matter will be made entirely by the Peary family, not by me. I have no desire to enter so controversial a field [stated even while he IS involving himself — but (§V4) demands secrecy about that!] and I have no itch for publicity. [Most spies don’t; e.g., Brit master-spy Robert Poley: www.dioi.org/shg.pdf, §A3.] It was knowledge of *MY IMPERSONAL AND OBJECTIVE ATTITUDE* [like §M9!] toward the matter that, **I think I may**

say, led the Peary family to place confidence in me. [A double-whopper that bears re-reading for serial jawdrops. (Bowman has PRECISELY the degree of neutrality the family desires.)] They are unwilling to publish, and I am unwilling to see published, anything that is premature [hey, it’s only been 28^y] and short of a definitive statement. Like myself they take the broad view that it is the long historical record that a publication of the notes should serve rather than the short contemporary purpose.

. . . no new light can be shed upon the question except by an actual examination of the records themselves. [Bowman’s mantra — but long obsolesced by navigators’ analysis of what’s already known: see §H2 above.] *To my mind the matter is so important* that the timing [promptness] of the publication is of no consequence whatever, except that delay in the preparation of the statement should not go beyond the life expectancy of those primarily concerned.

Things are going better this year at the [Johns Hopkins] University, much better. This means no lessening of the task however, since the internal problems of the University are endless in number and limitless in scope. No need to tell you this! You know to what extent the job is an endurance test.

With every good wish, / Sincerely yours

V8 The delay went beyond the lives of virtually all. Way beyond. And no such statement as projected was ever produced. (Nor since, over 110^y later.) Which was inevitable when its production purportedly hinged on the unbusyness of the busiest archon in US science.

V9 Meanwhile, in an epochal 1936/8/25 letter, Bowman *confesses the ultra-secret to his ultra-confidential friend*, Harry Raymond (Carnegie Observatory) *more frankly than anywhere else* that he privately knows the full truth of the claim’s scientific illegitimacy (which becomes a key reason for why Marie’s dream [§F2] of an AGS medal never happened). The letter (emph & caps added):

. . . the diary makes upon me the impression that it was kept by an honest man but . . . *he does not have proof that will ever be acceptable because IT DEPENDS UPON HIS SAY-SO.*

This letter’s publication here marks the 1st time the public has learned of THE bomb of the case: the apex of US science knew the truth — that the Peary claim was scientifically unacceptable — **BUT KEPT THAT FACT SECRET**. Note that Bowman’s behind-the-scenes view *was exactly the Ward book’s position* (W173) — the very position which Bowman’s fatal 4pp 1935/12/20 Killer-Report had 8 months earlier specifically condemned 1st-thing, right off the top (§O1): sentence #1. From this point on (if not from the start), we know Bowman’s boosting of Peary’s claim for the US public’s disenlightenment (e.g., to the Post Office: §M13 and in his Maine memorial: §V13) was not his private position. That is simply deception. Again: AT THE TOP of US science. Did Bowman swiftly apologize to Yale Press for his central mistake and take steps to undo his damage to Mr.&Mrs. Ward, and to genuine 1926 North Pole winners Roald Amundsen, Lincoln Ellsworth, Umberto Nobile, & Hjalmar Riiser-Larsen? He instead kept the truth contained within the highest scientific councils. So the cause of the known truth’s suppression by scientists (Bowman, Priestley, Miller, Raymond) wasn’t scientific but political. **And selfish, vis-à-vis Ward&Amundsen.**

As you [Raymond] remark, all he [Peary] had to do was keep a consistent record with reasonable accuracy along the route and one would not then question the final observations at the pole itself. [See above at AGS’ O.M. Miller at §H1 & Macon at §H2.] As matters stand we can only believe or disbelieve that the obs. at the P. are real and not faked. It is a sad commentary.

To repeat: *the top of US science privately knew Peary’s North Pole claim was indefensible but let it stand (for another 1/2-century) by not saying so.*

V10 Having used Bowman so artfully for so long, Marie evidences some trepidation that she'd overworn her welcome, in her favor-seeking 1938/3/31 plea to him to help dedicate a Peary memorial in Fryeburg, ME, a structure that usefully and aptly doubled as a mountain-finder for its view via Peary's own mountain-identification drawing of the vista:

When you saw the writing on the envelope, I hope you didn't say "Well, here's that chiseller again!" because it's the truth that hurts and this time I have an enormous favor to ask of you. . . . the memorial which Mother and I have had made for Dad to be placed on Jockey Cap in Fryeburg, Maine . . . is a mountain-finder with Dad's own original [drawing's] profile of the White Mountains cast in bronze to enable visitors to identify the various peaks. We are planning to dedicate it on August 17th and Mother and I are both tremendously anxious to have you make the chief address. Please don't say no, right off. . . . you are the one person who can do it, not because you are President of Johns Hopkins University or former Director of the A.G.S. but because of your clear headed feeling about Dad and the fact that you are a swell speaker and an even sweller person. Please say yes. Yours prayerfully,

V11 Bowman replies in kind on April Fool's Day 1938 (emph&caps added):

If I were a woman I would be in tears! I mean that I am so deeply disappointed that I shall not be able to be in Maine this summer. I was ill in February, rather seriously, and had to spend two weeks in Florida getting into shape for the job. The doctor wishes me to go abroad in the summer and I have made plans to attend the International Geographical Congress at Amsterdam in July, spend a couple of weeks in Switzerland, and return via England where I have promised to attend the August meetings of the [BAAS].

But I beg . . . to prepare a little piece to be read on the occasion

EVER YOURS,

V12 The intensity of Marie's 1938/4/2 reply outdid even the previous exchange's:

Your letter came this morning . . . and has practically ruined my day. What am I going to do without you? You are the one perfect person for the occasion and while of course it will be grand to have something from you to read and you are sweet to be willing to do so, it's a far cry from you yourself. Have you any suggestions as to an appropriate person? Not Hobbs. I would like some one simple but impressive, learned but not dull — someone like you, but as I said at the dinner in Philadelphia, there ain't nobody else like you. But could you make a suggestion?

. . . if you have a rope to throw a drowning woman, please sir, throw it! . . . Above all, take care of yourself.

As always / Marie

V13 On 1938/7/1 Bowman came through, sending an admirably erudite, uplifting statement to be read at the Peary memorial's dedication, though it is hardly a model of the "impersonal and objective attitude" he claimed (§V7) was what recommended him as the guy to be 1st into the Peary records, or even the post-exam agnosticism privately reflected (*idem*) in his 1936/8/25 "sad commentary" private letter to astronomer Harry Raymond. From Bowman's 1938/7/1 statement:

In Pericles' well-known panegyric on the Athenian who fell at the first battle of the Peloponnesian [*sic*] War is the striking phrase that the heroic dead

have the whole⁶⁴ world for their home. Such, it was said is the force of a noble example such as the inspiration which great men provide for those who come after. With this sentiment in mind, one is gratified to see the memorial to Admiral Peary placed on a height overlooking the country roundabout and symbolizing in position and outlook the world-wide importance of his heroic example. Those who come here will find their spirits elevated by the physical circumstances surrounding them and thus be prepared to appreciate this memorial to the name and achievements of Peary which stand out as guide and light for future generations as well as our own.

. . . he was willing to accept the hard discipline without which great work is never done. It is enough that we recall their meaning . . . [to elevate] our present-day ideals of work, of discipline, of achievement, and of participation in great causes that cannot win except through continuing sacrifice.

V14 Must we remind the reader that US science's leading eminence's incomparable⁶⁵ modern panegyric was inspiring his statement's hearers by invoking as hero the most successful science-faker of the 20th century? But, then, such incongruity is not unique — not even unusual — for inspirational legends, especially those used by religious leaders. It is safe to wager that Bowman never made such a statement about academe-exiled Roald Amundsen, who genuinely was 1st at the North Pole and 1st at the South Pole.

V15 Later, Bowman just quietly let-lapse Marie's AGS-medal hope (§F2). Again: he'd thought it OK to reassure Priestley (§V7) of his "*impersonal and objective attitude*" even while writing (§M9) Marie (1943/2/10): "I have a deep and abiding interest in the vindication of [your father's] work." On the honesty displayed, no comment is required.

V16 This entire charade all comes down to a deliberately-maintained policy: for over a 1/2-century, *the height of US science* was fine with barring independent researchers from the prime evidential records of an issue of obvious importance [§V7] to *US science, whose leader merely continued to protect the top science hoax of the 20th century*. Organized science allowed (likewise in the Byrd case: www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf, ©20) the explorer's loyal family to exercise total control over records (§E3), when the proper message [see §Q3 above] to the family should have been: cough 'em up — or your hero's achievement is unacceptable to the geographical community. And *promptly* — on all sides — so that no explorer could use another, competing explorer's records-revelation-delay to excuse his own, as both Peary&Byrd used the respective claims of Cook&Amundsen: §E10. Those who, like AGS' Miller, scoff (§H1) at uninformed&overdone attacks on the Peary claim don't note that some uninformedness & enraging frustration were from the sealing itself & that the ultimate unveiling in the 1980s (!) occurred partly because of a crescendo of such "amateur" complaints, without which we might never have known the truth.

V17 We end here with a shocking irony: in the sprawling roster of characters that put over the Peary hoax on the public, there WAS one deeply-involved scientist who we know positively refused to conspire: namely, Peary himself! *He pulled off the science hoax of the century alone. Brilliantly. Bravely. Not confiding in anyone*, for intelligent reasons of keeping-it-simple. (For the 1st non-conspiratorial solution to his coup, see F149-150, 158, 284-285.) This caused problems in his tale, but those were less dangerous than confiding in a companion who might later threaten to turn. The good-luck factor in his favor was Cook's blatant fraud, which inspired organized US science to head off being internationally disgraced by a US geographical double-fake. In his lifetime, Peary triumphed (*DIO 1.1* ‡4, www.dioi.org/j114.pdf, §F2) because he was smarter & was willing to suffer more than anyone else in his enduring saga. The "Peary Conspiracy" was *for* Peary — not *by* Peary.

⁶⁴Does the "whole world" hint that Pericles, the 1st Greek imperialist, was an Alexander-in-the-making? Pericles died 2^y after this oration — of the plague that his war had brought on.

⁶⁵Forgetting the accuracy&applicability to Peary of Bowman's statement: who could write a better eulogy than this glowing, perfectly cut&polished gem?

W CoverupSquared. Stolen Youth: HateCrime. CopState Convent.

W1 The sensational Cook-vs-Peary saga was not a parochial event. The Cook-funding *New York Herald's* disastrous loss of The Polar Controversy to the victorious, Peary-funding *New York Times* triggered the former's long-term fadeout and the latter's ascent to primacy.

W2 The academically-elite Bowman circle's clandestine machinations to crush free men's dissents (Ward&Amundsen) & triumphs (Amundsen, Nobile, Ellsworth, & crew), to hide closeted polar skeletons in service to the world's richest "scientific" organization (§M6), unleashed the fiscal grease that, along with his ambition & truly admirable workhabits, vaulted Bowman to science's top: JHU, Nat.Acad.Sci, AT&T, rendering him the most powerful academic ever, his hand in any affair he wished to enter (oft by servile request, as we've seen: §§N6, O5, P1-P3, fn 51), fully aware (e.g., fn 8 above) of the awe he generated.

W3 Has academe been ever as now? — varying only in the *method* of hiding megascandals, not in the unvaryingly ready resort to censorship, never recking the credibility-risks of having to keep coveringup the coverups (§B18), the cascadingest example being the wringer US geography got into when it kept redoubling its bets *for a century* (1909-2009: §H8) to keep at least a partial lid on the Cook-Peary-Byrd North Pole tri-hoax, ultimately succeeding only in magnifying its profile. Have academic coverups ceased? Or are they going on right now but will only be revealed a century (§W3) hence when none but historians will care? If they're ever revealed at all. Keep in mind our rare good fortune in this particular case: it's likely that only flukes prevented Bowman's ultra-secret Peary file from disappearing down the Memory Hole: [1] an English professor's subscription to a US Navy professional journal because his son happened to be Navy (above Preface), [2] a widow's long survival, [3] her loyal garage-preservation for decades of her husband's mss (*idem* & §O1), and [4] an ultra-archon's unexpected sudden death (fn 14).

W4 Can one seriously expect institutions to alter ever-irresistibly short-term-profitable habits? Or just pretend to? (D.Low's Col.Blimp: "Gad, sir, reforms are all right as long as they don't change anything." Original cartoon viewable via www.dioi.org/j118.pdf, §B6.)

W5 The 20th century's final decades added (to the lure&terror of influence-nexi like Bowman) the extra feature of accelerating dependence upon gov't research-grants controlled by oft-unseen referees. (Ironic that Bowman, decades ago, saw some of this coming: §M9.) Thus, too many scholars' careers are now ever-hanging by a fragile fiscal thread (e.g., §R2). A dissenter who makes waves can never reliably anticipate when or whether an invisible judge will — from offense to himself or a colleague — sever the thread. Such funding has encouraged and sustained the rare geniuses — including some of the Nobelists Johns Hopkins can legitimately and proudly boast of — who've cured diseases, probed the microcosmic and macrocosmic secrets of the universe, thereby vastly and qualitatively improving the human lot, and discerning new wonders in space (www.dioi.org/j211.pdf, §D3). But, though academe is unquestionably an invaluable net-plus for humanity, excrescences such as History-of-science dep'ts remain insufficiently examined embarrassments.

W6 Academe's exile of even the most accomplished scientists for the crime of speaking heresy has a long and seemingly undeterrable history: [1] The proposed execution (www.dioi.org/j117.pdf, §G3) of the greatest ancient scientist (www.dioi.org/au.pdf), pioneer heliocentrist Aristarchos of Samos, in the early 3rd century BC. [2] The West's Dark Ages⁶⁶ for a millennium tried to demonstrate how suppressing heresy was good for civilization (update: Watson at [6] below). [3] The notorious early-17th century AD

⁶⁶Many historians-of-science contend medieval Europe wasn't intellectually dead. Mgr. John Walsh's *Thirteenth Greatest of Centuries* agrees. DR's unreligiosity doesn't prevent him from owing to his huge lifetime debt, to the Jesuit giants, Strassmeier, Epping, & Kugler (who followed in the high tradition blazed by, e.g., C.Clavius' Gregorian calendar, and by H.Grassi's gauging of the distance of the Great Comet of 1618: www.dioi.org/jL06.pdf), on whose shoulders DR stood to solve the sources of the Hipparchan year (www.dioi.org/j116.pdf) and the Aristarchan month (www.dioi.org/au.pdf; www.dioi.org/jb11.pdf) on the ultimate Astronomical Cuneiform Text ACT#210, also known as BM55555. (Both DR-discovered sources are regarded as probable by the British Museum's tag

Galileo affair. [4] The late-17th century credit-theft and submersion⁶⁷ of Robert Hooke, the true discoverer of [a] gravity's universality, [b] its inverse-square distance-dependence, & [c] Newton's First Law. [5] More recently the shunning of ultimate polar explorer Roald Amundsen (www.dioi.org/rf.pdf). [6] Academe's current cruel banishment and mobocratic career-execution — taking humanity lethally full-circle from Aristarchos' time — of DNA codiscoverer James Watson for positing genetics' relation to accelerating societal problems. His exile has caused not an audible syllable of libertarian objection from establishments. Perfectly understandable: after all, what would DNA's codiscoverer know about genetics?

W7 Such injustices narrowly dramatize a reality impacting 1000s of times more non-celeb scholars whose forced silence is noted by no visible fellow scholars, journals, or histories, none of which dare suggest that logical refutation not suppression is more in line with academe's purported ideals. As we'll see (§W10): though Bowman isn't admired now at JHU, we still too often find there the same base scheming&spying&threatening, the same spurning of dissent & idea-debate, the same Bowmanian ranking of truth below ambition.

W8 The need to brainkiss archons (and/or the fear of offending same) who control funds, publication, conferences, has shrunk the scholarly honesty of modern academe, far beyond what would have been thought conceivable just a few years ago — even in areas that would seem too arcane to generate hard passion to crush opposition — and well in excess of what is publicly reported. When advances depend on non-scholarly factors, mean scholarly judgement wanes. DR often sees the effect even in the specialized area of history of ancient astronomy, where industrious historians mine valuable new material (www.dioi.org/sh.pdf, www.dioi.org/ac.pdf), but if missing the science behind such, will exile⁶⁸ those who detect it. Indeed, the lockstep Hist.sci cult has for most of a century 180°-misperceived *THE* two central truths of ancient astronomy, undeterrably teaching: [a] Greek astronomy was non-empirical (vs www.dioi.org/jL09.pdf); [b] Babylon's & Ptolemy's astronomies were primary. (Both unsubtly derivative [Ptolemy's faked *deliberately* (www.dioi.org/j117.pdf, §E2), which Hist.sci can't admit for fear of losing a moneycow]: *Isis* 93.3:500-502, 2003; www.dioi.org/thr.htm#dbbf.) Inevitably-resulting cementalities:

[1] World-respected philologist Aubrey Diller's 1934 solution of Strabo's Hipparchan latitude table was vindicated in 2009 as a perfect fit to long-accepted, unmanipulated data. *Journal for the History of Astronomy* stands by its 2002 solution-try, which fits less than 1/2 the same data, even *despite the author fudging them to help his theory out* and covering failure by non-tabulation. Tabulated theory-comparisons at www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §C.)

[2] DR's new 1991 solution of Hipparchos' eclipse trios precisely recovered all 4 elements he'd deduced, by positing for him [a] solstice-year 158 BC & [b] Kallippic solar motion (365^d1/4 year), neither [a] nor [b] ever previously connected to Hipparchos.

on the tablet: photo of tag&clay at www.dioi.org/cot.htm#xpnd.)

⁶⁷See historian-of-science Nick Kollerstrom's revealing and convincing *The Dark Side of Isaac Newton* 2018 (www.pen-and-sword.co.uk) pp.68-69, 80f, 85, 99, 132f.

⁶⁸When on 1997/4/26 DR silently protested (handout: www.dioi.org/dgs.pdf) at a JHU Hist.sci Galileo symposium, Prof.R.Kargon (JHU Hist.sci) called campus cops on DR. And again 2018/10/18, barring-by-cop DR's terrifying octogenarian presence from JHU's entire Hist.sci area since 2018/11/29 allegedly on the excuse that DR might shoot someone! (*Question: did Kargon bar DIO from JHU's library because the journal might shoot someone?*) This, though DR has never even acted impolitely at a conference much less used physical violence. He stays strictly in the scholarly arena (which Hist.sci avoids) when arguing Hist.sci excesses. Given the record (§W10), one can safely predict that this *DIO* issue will be met by not even a try at refutation but instead (as for *DIO* 22) with standard vengeful *scholarship-irrelevant* espionage & mud (History-of-science's preferred, almost exclusive reaction to external criticism: www.dioi.org/ns.htm). This *DIO* earnestly if quixotically aims at improving academe (& JHU), but DR's intermittent encouragements (§W10) & beneficent intent (www.dioi.org/sh.pdf) have for years been misapprehended by the unhelpedly angry History-of-science community, unable to answer disagreement with aliens but by noncitation, mis-science, or assault on reputation. Re such or P.C.: US universities haven't previously been known for germinating climates of fear&hate. Now it's actually become ordinary.

(Thurston&Britton checked all math.) Then, **a 1-in-a-million miracle**: 14⁹ later a 1900^y old papyrus appeared *explicitly stating both discoveries* [a]&[b] (www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §F4). Yet, in the 15^y since: **Not one Historian-of-science has admitted either vindication.**

[3] Prominent Johns Hopkins physicist Robert Newton in his 1977 book *The Crime of Claudius Ptolemy* (JHU) proved by analysing stellar longitudes' fractional-endings exactly how Ptolemy stole Hipparchos' 1025-star catalog. No Hist.sci journal believes it (though numerous scholars privately do, but keep silent since dependent on publishing in dishonest journals): the committed Editor of the *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, James Evans, insists on continuing cult-shunning Newton's discovery over 1/4-century after his death.

[4] R.Newton proved Ptolemy's "observations" were faked to fit badly false models. So J.Evans took 64(!) *JHA* 1987 pages to push Hist.sci's standard excuse (e.g., Gingerich 1976 p.477) that ancients' primitive means caused big errors in their data, thereby **misadducing random errors to alibi systematic**: www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf fn 47. **Wide range of impressively accurate Greek measures**: www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf §B, incl. **all 3 anciently-adopted monthlengths good to 1 timesec**. **Hist.sci won't face the disjunct**: www.dioi.org/sh.pdf; www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, fn 8. Evans backed the myth of poor ancient accuracy by reporting his very own outdoor 1981/7/16 star-vs-eclipsed-Moon measure (using an ancient-style instrument), finding it was in error by about 2/3 of a degree! He supported this by adding 2 ancient Hipparchos observations (146&135 BC) of the same type, each off by 33' (www.dioi.org/jg01.pdf fn 22), **errors far larger than Hipparchos' otherwise consistent norm** (www.dioi.org/jL09.pdf §I3, **a point entirely unconsidered by Evans**). Note that all 3 errors (Hipparchos&Evans) are **larger than the Moon's diameter** (at each eclipse) and that all 3 of these impossibly outsized errors fall to 1'-2' (near normal naked-eye accuracy, ordmag 1/10th of Evans' sizes) — if we merely realize that Hipparchos' & Evans' parallax-corrections were inadvertently mis-signed (an easy mistake to make). Despite challenges, Evans continues to hide "my notes from that evening" (*JHA* 18 p.275). The history-of-science community took this matter so seriously that it refused to recognize the existence of Evans' bumbles in any way other than by elevating him to Editorship of the *JHA* in 2013. So the most powerful figure in contemporary history-of-astronomy is demonstrating his integrity by staying mum & hiding his own empirical 1981/7/16 record. [For full math details of the 1981 amateurish goof-up & continuing evasion of facing it, by history-of-astronomy's top political figure: see www.dioi.org/jg01.pdf; briefer summations in overlapping discussions at www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf, fn 47; www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §B; www.dioi.org/jm04.pdf, §B6. See also at www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, pp.3&9 for his & *Isis*' 2015 co-theft of a 2008 *DIO* discovery. More serious than the theft is the article's invincible ignorance of *DIO*'s broader discovery that ancients' inevitably-inexact Sun-distance-estimates in Earth-radii were perceptively in powers of ten, which became the historical origin of order-of-magnitude (ordmag): www.dioi.org/jL09.pdf, §J.]

[5] The world's leading history-of-science journal, *History of science Society's Isis*, in 2016 attacked the geographical researches of several able scientists (Pascal Gosselin [1790], Max Planck Institute mathematicians, & physicist DR [whom Hist.sci has blacklisted internationally]: fn 33 above) by confusing addition with subtraction and treating a solar eclipse as lunar! (*Griffith Observer* www.dioi.org/g828.pdf, p.16.) And: making Eratosthenes' Earth-circumference 25 miles; placing 2 Chinese cities into the W.Hemisphere & computing Cadiz into the E.Hemisphere; confusing Pliny's death-date with his *Natural History*'s publication-date. All this got by **SIX** alleged editors&readers&referees **at History-of-science's proudest journal** (see *Isis*' brag: www.dioi.org/j129.pdf, fn 177). As at §B13:

No one had checked anything.

— a perfect 2016 repeat of the slackness of explorer-checking back in 1906&1909, followed by a perfect 2018 repeat of academe's 1906-2009 solution: COVER IT UP (§§A1&D1) and **punish honest protesters** (§B18). *Isis*' Editor will not communicate and *Isis*' board is satisfied with that (**and no correction**) — board-member María Portuondo (Chairperson Johns Hopkins History-of-science Dep't) actually bellowing "YOU ARE NOT WELCOME

HERE" at DR 2018/10/4 when asked (right after a Hist.sci colloquium) why she hadn't answered a DR email re ignoring her *Isis*-board oversight-responsibility. If one is not baptized by a Hist.sci degree, one's works are worthless (e.g., www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, pp.44-45; www.dioi.org/dgs.pdf; www.dioi.org/ns.htm), so noncitation is best; i.e., their nonexistence must be faked, & no one will complain out loud: grovels-you-can-count-on.

W9 Remedy for or even mild concern at such practice now exists nowhere in academe.

W10 Understand: this is what was&is going on at the TOP of the History-of-science field. Don't even ask about the bottom. Is History-of-science typical of academe entire? Not necessarily. But no one in academe is disturbed enough to do anything about the above-cited scandals, ancient or modern (fear&bother, as a century ago: §B10), thus guaranteeing that misbehavior will flourish. Hopkins' President (Bowman's current successor) & Dean show no concern at the spectacle of a scholarship-defenseless Hist.sci field (& JHU dep't) that will STOP AT NOTHING to get rid of DR. By any means **except open scholarly debate**, just as sneaky Bowman acted to get rid of Henshaw Ward. Neither JHU's Pres. nor Dean were concerned that Hist.sci's obsessive hatred of DR was becoming dangerously pathological & 2 enraged profs were disgracing JHU by encouraging students to avoid even discussing scholarly issues with DR. Neither so much as replied when *DIO*'s Editor (www.dioi.org/bryam.doc) & Publisher (www.dioi.org/hj.pdf; www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, p.9) reported to them the JHU History-of-science Dep't's scientific shortcomings, censorings, anger at mere computed&reasoned&unrefuted dissent, its Chair's dereliction (as boardmember) re Hist.sci's #1 journal *Isis*, instead throwing a shrill tantrum (§W8 [5]). Prez&Dean no-commented when *DIO*'s same 2 historical discoverers (published by prominent forums for decades) were threatened with removal by campus police (www.dioi.org/bryam.doc) because DR had been interrupted & screamed-at after sedately, professorially asking a few embarrassingly-unanswered basic-science questions (www.dioi.org/jhya5.pdf) at the Johns Hopkins Convent's History-of-science Dep't 2018/10/4 colloquium, attended by Dep't-Chair & c.25 grad students etc, some seething yet (www.dioi.org/jhyb9.pdf) re DR's desecration of their wanted Safe-Space Privilege. (See www.dioi.org/rfw.pdf for our vain attempted Xmas kindness to the Chairperson, plus her & her superficial *J.Hist.Astr* referee's science-naïveté: both ignorant of the Equation of Time, & even placing **Moonrise in the West**: www.dioi.org/jhb.htm#hjmw! **Key to how academic fields fake expertise**: www.dioi.org/j111.pdf, fn 16.) Despite all, *DIO* keeps on unrequitedly appreciating Hist.sci's merits, e.g., www.dioi.org/sh.pdf; www.dioi.org/vols/wm0.pdf, cover&p.2, *DIO* vol.22: deeply critical of Hist.sci but noting 80+ credits to it. (Why do so? See www.dioi.org/j129.pdf, fn 179.) On 2019/3/14, DR offered the prof doing JHU's 150th anniv. self-history, proofs JHU Prezes Remsen&Bowman guarded a top science hoax, **Bowman via threat**: i.e., giving JHU the present Bowman-Ward history. **No response.**

W11 Kargon's hatred of DR (§W8 & fn 68; www.dioi.org/j427.pdf, §B19) and Portuondo's (§W8) got contagious. Students embarrassed at the 2018/10/4 Hist.sci colloquium (§W10) attained such fury that when one met DR&wife 2018/11/7 in their apt's 1st floor, she [who'd (10/4) rejected a gift *DIO* 22 (www.dioi.org/vols/wm0.pdf) for her to actually read] angrily harangued both (www.dioi.org/jhyb9.pdf), ranking unbaptized (§W8) DR not even a historian-of-science! & **explicitly ascertaining he lived in the building**. By 2018/11/29, DR's home was Watergatischly blackbaggged (& again in Sept), burglary requiring stalking DR&wife to learn&ensure when their home was empty. Among stolen items: a small pistol.⁶⁹ During the interval 2018/11/7-29, JHU began slandering DR to profs in Gilman Hall: **he might shoot someone**. Hmmm: **HOW'D JOHNS HOPKINS LEARN DR OWNED A PISTOL?** Also from home in Nov: info re longtime PNC Bank custody acc't. In Dec, a JHU prof & Kargon lunch-buddy asked DR *where DIO funding came from*. Next April, the IRS suddenly probed DR's finances; by Summer, PNC Bank launched an investigation to learn

⁶⁹Pistol loaded but never fired or even holstered: kept decades at wife's bedside for safety. (Since DR&wife aren't gunfolk, the theft wasn't even noticed 'til 2020/2/25, ordmag a year after.)

DR's income, total wealth, & how he got it! Those who know banks judge this a private favor for a powerful interested party. (Full account of attempts to punish DR for the crime of asking academic questions on an academic campus: **DO NOT MISS www.dioi.org/tar.pdf**.) And stolen *entire* to extort *DIO*'s silence was a sentimental family-history treasure, 60^y old nudes of his Harvard-grad wife Bunny (now frail at 83^y) immortalizing the joyful beauty (**photo-bio: www.dioi.org/bunny.htm, featuring virtues&achievements**) of his life's goddess. Only fearedd hate & acidic personal rage could unleash such a *history*-robbing, cruel, crass, and mean attempt to hold hostage a gentle, kind lady, just to threaten her husband.

The present issue is *DIO*'s defiant reply to this latest desperate try at silencing the journal. [The Duke of Wellington's perfect response to a blackmailer: **Publish and be damned.**]

W12 Thanks to coverups, misbehavior in academe now regularly occurs with impunity. (Perhaps since academe's prime crime of our time is near-exclusively defiance⁷⁰ of P.C.?)

W13 The *institutional* antidote to academe's ongoing censorship (www.dioi.org/ad.pdf): fiscally independent journals. From day-one (www.dioi.org/j111.pdf, p.3, 1991/1/24), *DIO* has looked to pioneer that remedy. Indeed, if present trends hold, you'll likely read of the foregoing centrally revealing&enlightening account only in independent media, given that the Mainstream⁷¹ "science press" has (since the not-so-distant days of Jim Bready, Nick Wade, John Wilford, Boyce Rensberger, John Tierney) been emasculated by job-insecurity, coziness (fn 53), & scientifically-uncertain fear of presuming to judge heterodoxy and/or institutional misbehavior by any other method than resort to relaying evaluations by the very institutions whose natural dictatorial excesses need oversight&opposition, not *servile journalistic acquiescence to Goliath*, such as the disgraces cited at §§B17&B18&G5!

W14 Academe's cold unconcern re growing but routinely-hidden trends, e.g., pseudo-refereeing (fn 33), non-correction (§W8) of errors, *vengeance against critics* (who're seen as no more than: bad-for-business), suggests that the more realistic, non-institutional antidote is *individual*: citizens can feel justified in discriminately distrusting academe — not automatically skeptical but informedly so, according to the case.

The responsibility for arriving at one's beliefs is the individual's, not academic institutions' or other churches'. Which one would have to choose among anyway, so the very choice itself renders those beliefs unequivocally one's own responsibility. In other words:

Don't expect someone else or someuniversity else or somegod else to hand one truth.

Acknowledgements

The letters quoted herein are (unless otherwise indicated) from:

[a] The Bowman Papers (much of them sealed until the 1970s) access thanks to the Johns Hopkins University Eisenhower Library's Special Collections Committee.

[b] Yale Press' files, sympathetically released to DR by then-Editor Anne Wilde in 1971.

[c] Archives of the Explorers Club of NY (much assisted by Mabel H. Ward).

[d] The C. Henshaw Ward Papers, U.S. National Archives, contributed near a 1/2-century ago in 1971 by Mrs.Florence Ward & DR, via NARA's Herman Friis & Alison Wilson.

We are especially grateful to the careful, highly skilled manuscript experts at the U.S.National Archives [NARA], who restored Peary's apparently beyond-hope 1906 Summer diary — so seemingly far-gone that Marie Peary mis-deemed it harmless enough that it could (unlike the also-mildewed 1906 April diary: §J above) be vouchsafed to the Peary Papers at NARA. NARA's restoration revealed Peary's most desperate & most undeniable fraud: details here at §B12 and (with link to photo of key No-Land-Visible diary-page) §E7. Hopefully, it won't be thought inapt to ask here if academe would be more trustworthy if professors could take inspiration from the scholarly ethics of librarians and archivists. *DIO*'s Editor & the wife of *DIO*'s Publisher are both skilled, conscientious retired librarians.

DIO

DIO: The International Journal of Scientific History [www.dioi.org] is published by

DIO, Box 19935, Baltimore, MD 21211-0935, USA.

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

Research & university libraries may request permanent free subscription to *DIO*. Each issue of *DIO* will be printed on paper which is certified acid-free. The ink isn't.

Editor: Robert M. Bryce, beeabo@gmail.com

Publisher: Dennis Rawlins (DR), address above.

DIO is primarily a journal of scientific history & principle. 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 non-DR refereeing occurs, the usual handsome-journal anonymity will not, unless in reverse. No page charges.

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 too original, intelligent, and/or blunt for certain handsome journals. (Dissent & controversy are *per se* obviously no bar to consideration for *DIO* publication; but, please: spare us the creationist-level junk. I.e., non-establishment cranks need not apply.)

Most unattributed text is DR's.

Other journals may reprint excerpts (edited or no) from any issue of *DIO* to date, whether for enlightenment or criticism or both. Indeed, excepting *DIO* vols.3&5, other journals may entirely republish *DIO* articles (preferably after open, nonanonymous refereeing), so long as *DIO*'s name, address, & phone # are printed adjacent to the published material — and to all comments thereon (then *or later*), noting that said commentary may well 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.

Written contributions are especially encouraged for the columns: Unpublished Letters, Referees Refereed, and regular Correspondence (incl. free erftime for opponents). Contributor-anonymity granted on request. Deftly or daftly crafted reports, on apt candidates for recognition in our occasional satirical *Journal for Hysterical Astronomy*, will of course also be considered for publication.

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.

Contributors should send (expendable photocopies of) papers to one of the following *DIO* referees — and then inquire of him by phone in 40 days:

Robert Headland [polar research & exploration], Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1ER, UK; tel (44) 1223-336540.

E. Myles Standish [positional & dynamical astronomy], Jet Propulsion Laboratory 301-150, Cal Tech, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109-8099. Ret. Tel 864-888-1301.

F. Richard Stephenson [ancient eclipses, ΔT secular behavior], Department of Physics, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK; tel (44) 191-374-2153.

©2020 *DIO* Inc.

ISSN 1041-5440.

This printing: 2021\4\13.

⁷⁰See www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, fn 1, on launching mundane ideology into the purity of outer space: the American *Astronomical* Society's new well-meant priorities incidentally demote research ethics.

⁷¹Goliath "Mainstream" press owned by 10⁻⁶ of public; "Fringe" press David, by other 99.9999%.

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

DIO

Tel 410-889-1414

dioi@mail.com

***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 fake [*DIO* vol.7]: cited basis of 1998/11/26 *New York Times* p.1 announcement. *Nature* 2000/11/16 cover article pyramid-orientation theory: *DIO*-corrected-recomputed, *Nature* 2001/8/16. Vindicating DR longtime Neptune-affair charges of planet-theft and file-theft: *Scientific American* 2004 December credits *DIO* [vols.2-9]. *DIO*-opposites mentality explored: *NYTimes* Science 2009/9/8 [nytimes.com/tierneylab].
- 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*." (Explicitly due to this theory, BM 55555 has gone on permanent British Museum display.)

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, [&] 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."