

# DIO

The Kane Mutiny  
Greenland 1854  
US Navy's Only Mutiny

Arctic Polecats'  
Farcest Norths  
Kane & Hayes & Byrd

## Table of Contents

### DIO & The Journal for Hysterical Astronomy Page:

- ‡1 Ulysses of the Polar Seas: The Only<sup>1</sup> Mutiny in US Navy History, Greenland 1854 3  
 ‡2 Isaac Israel Hayes. Digit-Flip Fakery. Memoryholed Mestabishment Mendacity. 23  
 ‡3 Morality&Fraud: National Geographic's Dick Byrd Steals Amundsen Life's-Goal 34

### Why Has Microscopic *DIO* Become the Target of Repeated Mega-Institution Attempts to Kill It?

Upon its 1991/1/14 debut, *DIO* was welcomed by some sectors of academe. But in the 30<sup>y</sup> since, it has become the target of one failed attempt after another to extinguish it: smears, American Astronomical Society bannings, plagiarism, data-tampering, shrinking societal toleration of dissent, astronomical-history field-domination by a single journal which has staunchly maintained its essential dishonesty (e.g., fake-refereeing, refusal to acknowledge errors) for 1/2 century, Johns Hopkins University 5<sup>y</sup>-library-removal of *DIO* (1992-1997) & 2018 colloquium-riddance-shriek; plus repeated fiscal probes (2019), thefts — even home-invasion-burglary and attempted blackmail: [www.dioi.org/tar.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/tar.pdf).

*DIO* has been the subject of various intentionally-damaging falsehoods. Silly fantasies, such as that we are “impossible to deal with” ([www.dioi.org/j129.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/j129.pdf) §B1). Serious impedimenta, e.g., Harvard-ADS-ABS's perversely slanderous (and pathetically-projective) lie that that we are unrefereed, though no one has found bad science or math anywhere in *DIO*'s 30 volumes, published for over 30<sup>y</sup>, while we have easily cataloged ([www.dioi.org/jha.htm](http://www.dioi.org/jha.htm)) *literally SCORES* of examples of unrefereed nonsense in astronomy-historians' “premier” & advertisedly-refereed (see, e.g., Wikipedia entry) *Journal for the History of Astronomy*.

Obvious conclusion: certain enterprises are afraid even of a small-circulation journal such as *DIO* when it documents their dishonesty and incompetence — a fear which reveals that their pretenses are so fragile that ANY leakage of truth is seen as potentially lethal. Like that traditional image of the elephant cowering before the mouse.

Outside the magnificent mathematical sciences, academe is infused with corruption: pseudo-refereeing, threat-backed banishment of dissent, job-advancement heavily based on sycophancy, arrogant & boldly dishonest refusal to correct errors ([www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf)). Thus, politically useful myths persist for decades: astonishing — even hilarious — historical & present cases provided in overlapping [www.dioi.org/jL07.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jL07.pdf) & [www.dioi.org/jw11.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jw11.pdf).

Widely-read independent media no longer exist — for a logical reason examined at [www.dioi.org/mot.htm#mwti](http://www.dioi.org/mot.htm#mwti). Virtually all persons appearing on network panel-discussions must belong to a sponsoring party or something like, so neutral commentary has been replaced by intellectual prostitution. Mass-market journalism has devolved into munificently-salaried propaganda. Every department of the US' vaunted Free Press exists to serve its particular establishment, a reality once deftly summarized by describing journalists as mere “secretaries to power”. So thinking individuals now seek ever more intently for trustworthy, balanced sources of information. Ever-more vainly.

All *DIO* can do is resist the trend by remaining as independent&incorruptible as always.

<sup>1</sup> See below, ‡1 fn 9. A “NOTE” prefatory to the Herman Wouk best-selling novel, *The Caine Mutiny* (1951, p.iv of the 1954 Doubleday edition) states: “No ship named the *U. S. S. Caine* exists or ever existed. The records of thirty years show no instance of a court-martial resulting from the relief of a captain at sea under Article 184, 185, and 186 of the Naval Regulations.” Less cautiously, the film *The Caine Mutiny* (©1954) states, immediately after the opening credits (during Max Steiner's rousing musical score): “There has never been a mutiny in a ship of the United States Navy.” Just 11 years later appeared the remarkable book of Dr. Oscar Villarejo, which revealed (to the horror and ultimate scholarly embarrassment of Dr. George Washington Corner, head of the *American Philosophical Society*, US equivalent of England's Royal Society) that there had indeed been one such mutiny: in the Arctic in 1854. Incredibly (despite the difference in spelling), the name of the *APS-backed* 19<sup>th</sup> century captain whose over-ambition caused rebellion is pronounced identically to the name of Wouk's decrepit ship. Whether this is coincidence or reflects rumors that came to Wouk's attention isn't known.

## ‡1 Ulysses of the Polar Seas: the Kane Mutiny

### The Only Mutiny in US Navy History: Greenland 1854 Oscar Villarejo<sup>1</sup> Reveals the Long-Suppressed Truth

#### A Crystal Vases as Secret Toad Halls

From a letter (FL 204-205) by Dr. Elisha Kent Kane, the famous polar explorer, to his secret lover, Margaret Fox, the equally-famous charlatan “Spiritualist”<sup>2</sup> (who used bone-cracking in her joints<sup>3</sup> to generate fake-otherworldly “rappings” at psychic séances), written shortly after his return from the Arctic and the submission of his report to the Secretary of the Navy, over-claiming amazing exploration achievements for his 1853-1855 *Advance* expedition to Greenland:

. . . how worthy I am of the title of brother.

**A1** Once upon a time there were certain crystal vases in Fairy Land, kept bright by the hands of “little spirits”. When burnished they shone like the stars of heaven, and served as beacon lights to weary pilgrims afar off; but when soiled they lost their lustre and never knew brightness more.

**A2** You would suppose that each of these fairy crystals contained some pure and beautiful object, such as young flowers kissed by dewdrops, or golden fruit just ripened on the bough. But this was not the case. In the centre of each vase, surrounded by mould and rust and mildew, was a *loathsome toad*.<sup>4</sup>

**A3** Yet in spite of this forbidding interior, so long as the “little spirits” kept up their daily polish, so long they [the vases] shone on as before; and to the weary pilgrims from afar [they] lost none of their brightness.

**A4** My fairy tale — for I tell beautiful stories — would go on to say how very long, by constant labor and striving, these vases beamed; but I think you see the moral of my story, and I pause.

**A5** Neither you nor myself give a single regretting thought to what we may carry in our own hearts. The world knows nothing of that which we all carry in our own vases; but we go on with the daily brightening, and trust to the “little spirits” that we may always shine as beacon lights to weary pilgrims.

<sup>1</sup> This paper gauges the validity of the two valuable university books on Elisha Kent Kane, those of Oscar Villarejo (1965) and George Corner (1972). Both men were remarkably versatile — coming to the Kane history from seemingly inappropriate backgrounds, yet doing well with it. Corner was atop the establishment. Being lesser-known, Oscar Villarejo will receive more remembrance here. Polymath Villarejo was a rarity among scholars for the breadth of the pursuits he excelled in. A gifted linguist, his career encompassed professorial posts in the US Navy and Geo. Washington Univ, as well as stints as diplomatic courier all over the world. He was mainly known as an authority on early Spanish theatre, esp. Iberian literature related to “Shakespeare” (i.e., Christopher Marlowe: [www.dioi.org/sha.htm](http://www.dioi.org/sha.htm)). And it was naval historian Villarejo's staid university book that blew the lid off the Kane mutiny.

<sup>2</sup> The Spiritualist movement, begun (by Maggie and her sisters) in upper New York State in the 1840s, was sufficiently known world-wide that it is cited on the opening page of Chas. Dickens' finest novel, *Tale of Two Cities*.

<sup>3</sup> A contributing factor to the Fox sisters getting away with the bone-cracking-trick for so long: in the Victorian era, skeptics would be reluctant to request examination of teenage girls' bodies. (Actually, there was at least one such exam, evidently based upon the suspicion that the trick was hidden in clothes — whose removal of course didn't for a moment deter the kids from cracking right ahead: BG 238.)

<sup>4</sup> Thus the reference to vased toad at DR's *Pearly* . . . *Fiction* 1973 p.84.

**A6** There are few crystals, dear Maggie, even in fairy land — no matter how bright or how pure they may seem to you and me — who do not carry in their centres toads more loathsome than those of my fable.

## B Apotheosis

**B1** American Philosophical Society Executive Officer Dr. George Washington Corner's near-definitive biography, *Doctor Kane of the Arctic Seas* (Temple Univ Press, 1972) represents the labor of a decade but is in fact the ripe late fruit of a lifetime of Corner's infatuation with childhood (CK ix) impressions of the US' first polar hero, who died prematurely to a nation's grief.

**B2** Elisha Kent Kane, M.D., U.S.N., was an explorer of rare drive & varied talents. His well-written northern adventure-tales provided ante-bellum US readers their most romantic military idol, and provided initial inspiration for many later professional arctic explorers, among them the country's worst, Doctor Frederick Cook (FC 17-20), and greatest, Robert Peary (CK 270).

**B3** Kane's popularly-written (CK 23) and *superbly* illustrated<sup>5</sup> book, *Arctic Explorations in the Years 1853, '54, '55* (Philadelphia 1856), was a sensation,<sup>6</sup> with both public and critics. His death the following year at age 37 triggered a period of national mourning comparable to that accorded fallen Presidents: a railway crosscountry last journey (CK 254): "a veritable flood of secular and religious declamation, solemn, high-flown, and monotonously alike from the first salutation to the last Amen. . . . the funerary oratory of a young and striving nation." (A sample of Corner's elegant writing style & rationalist bent.)

**B4** "His Memory Shall Be Immortal" read Cincinnati's typical Obsequies-Committee-Badges (CK 253). Yet today, Kane is less remembered than his contemporary Millard Fillmore (who helped Kane: CK 106) — for reasons both flukish and solid. Of course, the War Between the States soon abruptly recast the hero-mold; but, more important: it was later found that Dr. Kane was not all he had seemed. As previous Kane-biographer Jeanette Mirsky concluded, more rightly than she knew (MK 190): Kane "was fortunate in dying in the high noon of his glory."

## C Kane's Arctic Expedition

**C1** Not that Kane was an explorer who timidly balked at an adventure which he then invented wholecloth. To the contrary, on all his northern sledge-journeys, he went on 'til he dropped — quite literally — in his poleward track (e.g., CK 162, VK 83 n.25). And his courage matched his patriotism: super.

**C2** From a wealthy, old-line Philadelphia family, Kane developed into a learned and earnest version of a dare-devil playboy — tragically crippled and perhaps pre-doomed by a heart malady. To the Kanes' dismay, Elisha's notion of achievement was braving (CK 38-40) the core of a Phillipine volcano and seeking the equally brimstone heart of the era's version of Miss Teenage America: the charming virtuoso spirit-rapper, Maggie Fox.

<sup>5</sup>E.g., KA 2:57 opp. Reproduced at CK 134 and F30.

<sup>6</sup>Harper's would have got Kane's book but did not — due to having cheated (CK 231) Kane on his first opus' finances. Childs & Peterson of Philadelphia not only turned out the two-volume set handsomely but engaged (CK 237, KA 2:297) in effective and imaginative promotion. To appreciate why the work sold nearly 20,000 copies even before publication (CK 237), realize that Kane's men were the astronauts of their day, and he a highly articulate instigator and explorer: Wernher von Braun and Neil Armstrong in one.

**C3** In 1850, Kane shipped out (KG, CK 81f) as surgeon on the American Geographical Society's 1<sup>st</sup> Grinnell Expedition (funded by wealthy New York merchant Henry Grinnell of the American Geographical Society) in search of Sir John Franklin, leader of an ill-fated but genuinely immortal British search for the Northwest Passage — the Franklin ships having disappeared into the American Arctic in 1845, without a word since. Kane was actually present (KG 162) on 1850/8/27 at Beechey Island (74° 2/3 N latitude, 92° W longitude) when British Captain William Penny's men discovered the first three dead of Franklin's force of over 100 (later found to have died to the man, from cold and scurvy, and possibly other factors).

**C4** By 1853, Kane had parlayed this experience into an official US Navy command: his own leadership of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Grinnell Expedition, to seek (CK 105f) simultaneously: [a] Franklin, [b] the mythical "Open Polar Sea" supposedly (§H1) surrounding the Pole, and [c] the North Pole itself. (It is a credit to the Kane family's connexions, that a US Navy expedition could be sent to a region of the Earth where a degree of longitude is less than 20% the size of a degree of latitude, led by a glory&thrill-seeking playboy capable of writing [KA 2:305] the following sentence (which exceeds even Dr. Cook [CM 580, & 573 vs 279] in navigational naïvete): "The position of our observatory may be stated as in latitude 78° 37' N., longitude<sup>7</sup> 70° 40' 6'' W.") It is also a measure of Kane's ill-informedness<sup>8</sup> about previous arctic work that he could state (KA 1:79) that his 1853/8/23 latitude-estimate (78° 41' N) put him "further north . . . than any of our predecessors, except Parry".

**C5** Among Kane's men was a Dane, Johan Carl Christian Petersen, an established expert (CK 132) in every art essential to arctic survival: dogdriving, hunting, etc.

**C6** Kane forthwith drove his ship *Advance* far into the sea ice off northwest Greenland (at the inlet he dubbed "Rensselaer Harbor" [now Rensselaer Bay], at 78°.6 N, 71° W) — indeed, the ship got so far into the ice that later extrication was to prove impossible. Next year, in a frenzy to exceed the British-held Farthest-North latitude record (82° 3/4 N, Parry, 1827), he drove his poorly-clad men north too early in the season. Both these rash decisions were over Petersen's protests (VK 63-64, 77-78, 84-85, & below at §G3), and the predictable results were deaths and permanent crippings by frostbite and scurvy.

**C7** Spring exploration by William Morton (Kane's confidante, expedition steward, and masseur: CK 119-120, 122) and surgeon Isaac Hayes led to some geographical discoveries (KA 2:342f; SK; VK 158) in the Kane Basin area (between Greenland and Canada's Ellesmere Island, in the stretch sometimes called "the American route to the Pole", as the Arctic Ocean at 82° +N is sometimes accessible through it).

**C8** However, appalled at Kane's stubbornness & amateurishness, a faction under Petersen attempted a desperate, abortive 1854 Autumn open-boat escape-journey south (once it was clear that the ship wasn't going to be freed from the ice holding it to shore: VK 84f, HA). The entire company fled similarly next Spring, successfully organized by a mentally-chastened (VK 174-182) and physically-revived Kane — who was now himself singularly scurvy-free due to his resourceful diet (KA 1:393f, VK 175, CK 185, 195): rat-soup, enlivened on occasion with boiled puppy. The southbound company was fed somewhat more tastily: on seal, through Petersen's riflemanship (CK 217-218), thanks to which they barely survived.

**C9** Kane made distinct and now-undoubted contributions to human knowledge, e.g.: [a] discovery (KA 1:101, 225f, 2:145f; CK 143, 162) of the lofty Humboldt Glacier; [b] pioneering — somewhat against his will (KA 2:179, CK 263), unlike Hall (LW 87f) and Peary (SPH 313) — civilized explorers' adoption of native modes of survival and travel; [c] discovery of (really *by*: KA 1:201) the northernmost tribe of men on Earth. However, he reported a few "sensational and tantalizing" (CK 167) extras which were not true, in

<sup>7</sup> The precision imbalance is more than 300-to-1 in favor of longitude. And, of course, the latitude is correct to the 1' precision given. But the actual longitude was almost exactly 71° W, thus, the longitude accuracy is over 1000 times worse than the explicit precision.

<sup>8</sup>See also §G3.

particular: [1] his stew Morton's attaining of the Farthest North land ever trod (KA 1:298), Cape Independence (one of a contiguous pair of promontories: Cape Independence and [sometimes confused with the former] Cape Constitution), supposedly at 81°22'N (JRG 26:9); also, [2] the finding (KA 1:305f, 2:309-310) of an open polar sea in that region.

**C10** Though the discoveries by Morton were exaggerated by Kane, we argue elsewhere here that Morton's false farthest-north latitude (long the subject of suspicion: fn 33) was not faked. (Note: Morton's compass variation was 108° [e.g., KA 2:374], a value accurate to ordmag 1°.) After accounting for a tens-place slip (§K2) and an illness (fn 44), we conclude that the discrepancy was probably an accident.

## D Corner vs. Villarejo

**D1** Though it contains scant scientific information which will be novel to specialists, Corner's Kane-biography is a vast improvement over previous efforts, especially the literally obsequious (EK 285-416) instant-Parson-Weems job of Wm. Elder (1858) — which is redeemed only by being the sole surviving source for some of Kane's early life (CK 35). Unlike J.Mirsky's (1954) rehash, Corner's *Doctor Kane . . .* draws heavily on primary sources (many of them in the fine American Philosophical Society archival collection), and, for example, the reality of Kane's daring affair with Maggie Fox is faced (vs. MK 192) — indeed, gloried in: the book's title is taken from a Kane love-letter to her (CK 234, FL 49, BG 239).

**D2** The notes (in the book's back) are made easily correlatable with the text. (Though the source-referencing, like the index, is erratic and confusingly incomplete: CK 5-6, 131, 141, & 278.) Corner's breadth of research, interests, and knowledge is obvious. And, as an M.D. himself, his practical medical expertise is felicitously apt to the story of a Mickey-Mantle sort of hobbled hero. He writes sensitively, even affectionately, and well uses (CK 1, 161-162) evocative quotes from Tennyson's *Ulysses* (a Kane favorite: CK 70, 161-162).

**D3** However, whether from hero-worship, from the author's friendship (CK x-xi) with the Kane-Cope-Dupont family (the book's first chapter, "A Hero's Lineage", has a lengthy admiration for Kane's Good-Breeding: CK 6f), or from Corner's long term (from 1960) as head of the US' most venerable academic society, the American Philosophical Society (which so helped to send Kane north: e.g., CK 109, 120, & below at §N1) — regardless, the book is flawed by its essential advocacy for Kane.

**D4** Its author is certainly not incapable of printing negative judgements (e.g., CK 113, 233, 288 n.2) on his subject: the facts (e.g., CK 193f) of Kane's censorship, threats, and brutality are in the main not hidden from readers — but these and other misdeeds are treated with such sympathy and discretion that one may easily fail to appreciate their seriousness and their sometimes gruesome consequences. Obversely, the biographer exhibits some loyal hostility (vs. CK 288 n.2) towards his hero's critics: Petersen's sage caution is depicted (CK 5, 132 n.10: see context, HA 206) as cowardice (though Corner fairly credits his wisdom's redemption by events: CK 149); justly incredulous Greenland authority Henry Rink is seen as jealously acid (CK 261); and a London "armchair" critic is deemed (CK 262) "official". Key Kane-chronicler Oscar Villarejo — whose book published for the first time inside accounts by Petersen and Sonntag — is dismissed with the curt and inexplicable accusation (CK 178) of having raised false suspicions that Kane faced mutiny from his men in 1854 August — though it is obvious (VK 160f, CK 174f) from either writer's book that the situation was such.<sup>9</sup> (Not rare on this expedition: also CK 165, 200, VK 150.)

<sup>9</sup> As to whether the 1854 defections constituted a mutiny, see Villarejo's frank and judicious remarks (VK 24). Kane denied (VK 160) in his private journal that it was a mutiny and said he agreed to the separation for selfless reasons. But Kane had good reason to fear for himself: he was more outnumbered than Bligh, in a climate of dangerous friction that had gotten to the point that the members of the crew

In particular, Corner chides (CK 290) his predecessor Villarejo for erroneously charging that the official *USS Advance* ship's "log" (Hist. Soc. Pa. archives) of the expedition was mutilated (to hide the Kane mutiny) — declaring instead (CK 278, 290 vs. VK 25f, 172f) that the supposedly destroyed section is simply part one of the Kane "journal" (second part at Stanford Univ archives). But it is Corner who has erred. (I thank Stanford archivist Patricia Palmer for verifying this by direct examination, and for sending photocopies of the disputed records.)

## E Villarejo's Vindication

A close comparison leaves no doubt that Villarejo was correct, and that the chief of the most venerable US academic institution was wrong. Not that Corner had the integrity<sup>10</sup> to publicly admit it.

**E1** There is chronological overlap in the "log" (HSP) and the "journal" (Stanford) for 1855/5/1. This is not acknowledged by Corner — nor (CK 207, 290) is the entire 1855/5/1-22 section of the log at HSP; nor, the cover to the 2<sup>nd</sup> section of the journal at Stanford, reading "con'd from April 10 to May 15<sup>th</sup> 1855" — section stops (KJS 44) mid-sentence during the entry of 1855/5/1. (The rest of this volume is lost.)

**E2** Kane himself distinguishes the "Official" (VK 29) and the "Private" (KJS cover, 1:383) records in his own hand: the log and the journal, respectively.<sup>11</sup>

**E3** The Kane 1856 book's quotes<sup>12</sup> draw from the journal. Corner's statement (CK 231) that the HSP document has (like Stanford's) Kane's pencilled editorial notes for the printer is untrue. As Villarejo has privately stressed (in shocked disbelief at Corner's invertedly-erroneous surprise-attack criticism of *Dr. Kane's Voyage to the Polar Lands*): the entries of the log are usually far shorter and less personal than those of the journal, a contrast which evidently puzzles Corner at CK 132-134 — who incidentally at this point calls the journal the "narrative" [CK 134 vs. KA 1:5] and calls the log the "journal" (CK 135) — and misdates them (CK 134 vs. KA 1:35).

**E4** Corner makes no mention (CK 159-165) of a break in all extant records (1854/4/13-6/4) starting the very day rebellion first surfaces, which renders doubly curious his judgement (CK 159 vs. VK 25f) on the trouble: "nothing more came of this . . ."

---

(that he hadn't yet maimed or killed by his rash northward sledge-journeys) were "furtively" (CK 174) engaged in out-of-earshot "meetings . . . together with whispering and grouping, as if some topic of excitement was afloat. . . . an agitation to quit" the ship (Kane's unexpurgated journal, VK 160). A seething party seceded from & abandoned a US Navy ship against the wishes of the captain. (If this isn't mutiny then Galileo wasn't a heliocentrist because he was forced to say that the Earth was the universe's center.)

<sup>10</sup> *DIO's* publisher was told several falsehoods by Corner in connexion with his suppression (§F6; F294) of a paper which he felt would upset the National Geographic Society.

<sup>11</sup> See also the knowledgeable commentary of Goodfellow (KLP [1862/7/20 — quoted at VK 30-31], EK 282) and of Elder (KLP [1857/12/23 — following 1854/4/13, quoted at VK 29]).

<sup>12</sup> KA 1:5. And compare KLP vs. KA journal-quotes: no resemblance. This test was successfully applied in 1959 by the late, unpublished Kane-biographer, Mrs. Fayette B. Dow. All of her papers on the subject were (CK xi) made available to Dr. Corner, who describes her at *idem* as simply: "an enterprising collector of materials but not a talented writer." Corner seems to have mistakenly regarded Villarejo with the same elitist contempt, which could help explain his inexcusable behavior (§§D4&F1-F4) with respect to an honest scholar he perceived as a competitor — for reasons that may be related to the instincts of one who knows how to scale the heights of academe.

## F Cornered. (Is Dishonesty a Requirement for Archonship?)

**F1** As chief of the top oldboyperson academic society in the United States, George Washington Corner did the reputation of US academe little benefit by his bungled attack upon Villarejo. But the details of the matter make this episode even more shocking.

**F2** When Villarejo's book appeared in 1965, Corner & he corresponded briefly and amiably, but then Corner soon suddenly went silent. For 6 years, Villarejo heard nothing until Corner publicly launched his 1972 book's botched sneak attack upon the Villarejo book.

**F3** Corner's error and his spotlight-hog slighting of Villarejo's book (which he evidently saw — mistakenly — as competition) has misled much subsequent scholarship. And Corner thought the risk of self-embarrassment (by admission of noninfallibility) to be a more compelling consideration than the minor matter of correcting the historical record in favor of truth, so he simply let his errors stand — and let his submersion of Villarejo's work have its effect. Some results:

[a] In the world's largest astronomical magazine, *Sky & Telescope*, Editor Joe Ashbrook's 1974 Nov error-riddled article on Kane & Hayes' astronomer August Sonntag depended heavily upon "George W. Corner's excellent" book — concluding: "It would be fascinating if letters and perhaps a diary could be found to bring [Sonntag's] personality into sharp focus." Hmm. Over 50pp. of Villarejo's book are straight out of Sonntag's diary (VK 87-146) for 1854/8/26-11/28, the most honest first-hand history of the mutineers' failed journey. Ashbrook was promptly informed of this, but he followed Corner's example of [i] non-reply, and [ii] no effort to correct the record. (*Sky&Tel's* integrity has not improved since.)<sup>13</sup>

[b] Even so fine a book as *The Arctic Grail* by Pierre Berton (a scholar of integrity, and a far more able historian than Corner or Ashbrook — or DR) has been misled (BG 650) by Corner's misidentification (§D4) of the log as the journal.

**F4** Moreover, when DR sent the above facts to the American Philosophical Society's Publications Committee on 1973/1/23 — and to the book's publisher, Temple University Press — Corner never replied, and never acknowledged the slightest mistake.

**F5** Temple Univ Press corrected none of its false advertising — and its only response was an o-so-innocent request that DR tell it where he intended to publish this embarrassing review! That was the only interest Corner (through TUP) showed in the matter. Which especially amused DR because he used to be naïvely open about his intended polar publications — until an experience with no other than George Washington Corner! — DR then found that friends of the National Geographic Society were trying to kill his publications. And Corner was helping the censors.

**F6** Some of these incidents are mentioned in DR's 1973 book (F293-294). Briefly: After a DR manuscript on censorship in the Peary case was *refereed and accepted* by the APS Publ Committee, Corner made it his personal business to hinder publication and censor sections offensive to the National Geographic Society circle (with whom he fumblingly admitted contact when DR surprise-questioned him by phone — his reaction being: a request that DR not phone him again). Corner systematically pretended that his personal decisions had been made in consultation with his APS Publications Committee, a hoax DR was amazed to learn the truth about from a member of that committee (Alfred Romer). Protests and extensive details of his high-handed actions were sent to the APS 1975/1/29, but Corner was so determined to cut out anything offensive to National Geographic that it eventually proved impossible to publish the paper. For American Philosophic Society support of other hoaxers, see the current paper (on both Kane and Hayes), as well as both of Peary's professorial biographers — both caught at fraud, the former by the Royal Geographical Society and the latter by DR. (Details in 1975/1/29 letter. See also F293 and here at §M5 & fn 60.) DR emphasizes that the Amer Philos Soc is the stuffiest US academic organization, and no other is more establishment. Such particulars are provided here partly because they are the sort of history that usually never gets to the public, and because this provides a

<sup>13</sup>See *DIO* 4.3 †15 fn 12 & §§D1-D4.

glimpse of why *DIO* had to be started, and why it shows so little respect for organized academe, despite its largely positive contributions (mostly scientific) to mankind, but whose rulership seems to house a discouragingly large fraction of not overly honest scholars.

## G The Truth About Kane's Explorations

**G1** All too little noted (in the US, anyway [vs. LOT 1966/12/29]), Villarejo's brief, scholarly analysis of the Kane expedition (Univ Pennsylvania Press, 1965; Oxford Univ, 1966) forestalled Corner's then-crystallizing (CK xi, RPP 1966/1/21) Kane biography by being the first book in English to draw from the original accounts of expedition-members Petersen, Sonntag, and Henry Goodfellow (the last through a typescript provided by the National Geographic Society's Adolphus Greely archives: VK 170, 195, RPP 1966/1/21, CK xi see also CK 289 n.7) — as well as from the remains of Kane's private journal and his official log of the expedition. Thus, Villarejo's *Dr. Kane's Voyage to the Polar Lands* first revealed to US readers the true nature of the 1854 rebellions, hitherto deliberately hidden (by Kane and his family, also Hayes, and perhaps Elder: VK 174, 173, 32-33; CK 131).

**G2** Anyone reading Corner's book certainly should, for balance, consult Villarejo's, which, though more temporally restricted and less scientifically<sup>14</sup> sophisticated, is nonetheless more analytic and objective<sup>15</sup> about the critical incidents in the North, inspiring the most prominent of modern pro-Kane scholars to admire its "thorough content and fair judgement" (RPP 1966/1/21). It is also — for a staid exercise in scholarship — refreshingly blunt when necessary (e.g., VK 24, 49-50, 173-174). Among other original documents salvaged in the book is Petersen's complete account (printed in entirety: VK 57-156), preserved at Glassboro State College Library (where Villarejo found it) — which "reveals . . . the high drama of the clash between the two strongest . . . personalities . . . aboard" (VK 176): Kane and Petersen. While Kane (in his 1856 book) made "an elaborate attempt to suppress" (VK 174) such matters as the 1854 August mutiny, Petersen and Sonntag give the actual story (VK 86f) — the truth of which we may now confirm (VK 160f, CK 174f) independently, from Kane's own private journal.

**G3** Petersen also includes several important revelations not quoted by Corner; the latter says that "British geographers considered Kane one of their own" (CK 292; PRG 2:359), which, if so, only makes the more ironic the remarks of Petersen (VK 77-78: see rest of paragraph for fine understated humor). Though a native of neutral Denmark, he admired England's able Capt. Wm. Penny (with whom he had sailed). Petersen:

I have already mentioned that the North American expedition in no respect was so well-equipped or manned as were the British expeditions with which I formerly had become connected. Dr. Kane was no Capt. Penny! Nor could his crew be compared to that on the ships of Capt. Penny either with regard to their number or their ability. In the same manner as we most rashly and inconsiderately had gone into winter harbor, all of the arrangement of Dr. Kane bore witness to his want of practical skill when compared to the English; and yet his task was, as it appeared, to surpass these. For this purpose he went so far North. . . . The English had sent forth ice-expeditions in April. Therefore, it was proper that the Americans should do the same in March.<sup>16</sup> Both Olsen [also Danish] and I often felt vexed at the boasting of Dr. Kane. We found his sarcastic remarks on the English both unjust and unseemly; for . . . Capt. Penny had commanded his ships like a distinguished navigator . . . as brave a mariner as ever set foot on a deck . . . .

<sup>14</sup>E.g., VK 58 n.4 [vs. CK 120], VK 159, 202; likewise LW 26. But Villarejo has a better set of maps (VK 128-129) than CK.

<sup>15</sup>E.g., VK 157, 173-177, 182.

<sup>16</sup>*DIO* comment: Peary was later to prove that Kane was prescient on this point.

Corner (CK 132): Petersen was “likely to be overcritical of . . . his commander . . . .” (Adding that Petersen “had served Penny well” is fortunate but not retractive.)

**G4** All of this may make distressing reading for the Kane family, but it is a valuable contribution to the psychology of the explorer, who — like many another — tended to paint his true well-springs in idealistic gilt.

## H The Open-Polar-Sea Imposition & Its Pseudoscientific Wellspring

**H1** Again, not in Corner’s account, Petersen comments quite accurately (on the same information Kane had) upon the supposed discovery of the preconceived (CK 108-109) Open Polar Sea (VK 149): it is “nothing but a *passage* [consistently narrow Kennedy Channel]<sup>17</sup> and none of us has seen any Polar Ocean.” [Kennedy Channel barely separates Canada and Greenland at their nearest approach to each other.] But Kane promoted it, in support of a durable<sup>18</sup> crank notion (KA 1:307-308, emph added): “It is impossible . . . not to be struck with [such facts’] bearing on the question of a **milder climate near the Pole.**” (An intellectual ancestor to the 1922 “Friendly Arctic” of Stefansson-Grosvenor 1.) The open sea to the Pole was in those days promoted (CK 167) by a powerful world authority in the geographical community (A. Petermann of Germany). Hayes later took the notion a notch further into kookland by proposing that the *magnetic* pole was the cold one! — and the Royal Geographical Society actually printed this stuff (PRG 3:148; see also PRG 4:239), while the US scientific<sup>19</sup> and geographical community was backing its writer to the hilt (‡2 §A1) to fund his 1860-1861 arctic expedition, which ended up clumsily faking (‡2 §C2) its northernmost latitude.

**H2** The Kane exaggerations (§H1) bring us right up against the uncomfortable question: was Kane, like the mythic Ulysses of his dreams of immortality, a deliberate creator of attractive but rather tall tales? (Before the trip, Maggie Fox evidently became so uncertain of Kane’s honesty that he felt compelled [1853 Feb] to protest that he was not, as she thought [CK 117]: “nothing but a cute, cunning dissembler, a sort of smart gentleman hypocrite, never really sincere, and merely amusing himself with a pretty face. . . .”) On his return, he might be found regaling a post-dinner group; as an observer recalled (CK 232): “The party listened like schoolboys might listen to Sinbad the Sailor. The tale was marvellous, but [they] believed it.”

**H3** It must be said that — at least regarding such saleably cruel spectacles as the slaughter of a bear and her clinging cub (KA 1:293-296) — Kane could be so honest that some thought this could “hurt the cause of polar exploring” (CK 235), a longstanding institutional alibi (‡3 §H1) for obscuring uncomfortable historical data. Regarding his own misreportage, Kane himself would probably plead as he did after the 1<sup>st</sup> Grinnell Expedition: “My apology must be, that I not profess to be accurate, but truthful” (KG16) — an alleged distinction that

<sup>17</sup> VK 149 notes that the original Danish ms says *Strömsund*. A slim ice-free strait (or fjord) was hardly a remarkable find. For Morton, hundreds of feet above sea-level at Cape Independence, to see far up (KA 1:299&2:309) Kennedy Channel’s west side without seeing (§H1) up its closely facing east side (on which he stood, unable to round the cape) is unlikely. (The azimuth difference is not large.) However, nothing of the latter is shown beyond Capes Independence-Constitution on Kane’s final map — allowing readers the speculation (even suggesting it: KA 1:299) that his Open Polar Sea spread far to the east. (Error infectious: ‡2 fn 9.) However, Kane’s little-remembered first printed chart (published abroad: JRG 26:1 opp) indicates Morton saw around the cape into what Kane there calls “Constitution Bay”, on the east coast, running roughly parallel to the west coast, though no east coast is shown beyond Capes Independence & Constitution. (Another question: how did Morton know that this is a double cape [shown on JRG 26:1 opp] unless he got enough around it to see the east side of the channel?) Irony: Kennedy Channel was named so by Kane: CK 167.

<sup>18</sup>Found in, e.g., Poe’s writings.

<sup>19</sup>But some prominent misgivings are noted by LW 181.

appealed to Elder (EK 201), but which non-Muffia<sup>20</sup> science historians cannot encourage. **H4** Corner excuses the misreport of an open sea and (CK 168) quotes Kane (KA 1:306) as avoiding theoretical speculation:<sup>21</sup> “Mine has been the . . . humble duty of recording what we saw.” However, the biographer has evidently not seen Kane’s original report (VK 187-194), which he did not publish (1855/10/11 to SecNavy; see also his 1855/9/12 letter to a backer: LOT 1855/10/26:7:6) until it was substantially altered — though the misleading title “Preliminary Report” was attached.<sup>22</sup>

**H5** In the unpublished ms, his passage to the Open Polar Sea is (VK 189) instead described as a *gulf* (110 nmi long — i.e., up to 82°30’N)<sup>23</sup> vs. his book (KA 1:306): “How far it may extend . . . may be questions for men skilled in scientific deductions. Mine has been the more humble duty [etc as above at §H4] . . . .” And the Kane 1856 book’s illustration of Morton’s view of the Open Polar Sea clearly shows a land-free northeastern horizon — by an expedient which requires an astronomical impossibility.<sup>24</sup>

## I The Exaggerated Farthest-North

**I1** A number of prominent ads (and Temple Press circular and book’s flyleaf) for the Corner biography stated (until advised of the truth by DR)<sup>25</sup> that Kane reached a new farthest north record. However, Britain’s Edward Parry (82°44’N)<sup>26</sup> had in 1827 gone

<sup>20</sup>For those scholars who are unfamiliar with the overly-proprietary if underly-gifted Muffia cult: see [www.dioi.org/j111.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/j111.pdf) §C5.

<sup>21</sup>Turning about in an attempt to give Kane credit for finding “the American route to the Pole”, Corner says: “A strong southward drift [vs. KA 1:405, 2:376&377] of pack ice through [Kennedy] channel virtually assured Kane that it must communicate, at its **unseen** northern end, with the Arctic Ocean.” (CK 258; emph added. For Kane as current-theorist, see APS 5:284 [1852].) However, such a conclusion does not necessarily follow from the observed data. (And the criterion could make a prior discoverer of Baffin, 1616, or of Edw. Inglefield, R.N., the true and — despite longitude error (from chronometer c.10<sup>m</sup> fast: JRG 23:136-137 or VK 128-129 vs. reality latitude OK) — essentially accurate 1852 discoverer of what is now called Kane Basin, which he, with Kane’s hopefulness, believed to be The Polar Sea [JRG 23:141-142; & VK 52-53]): “A strong head wind . . . now poured out upon us from the *Polar Sea* . . . the Polar Basin [actually modest-sized Kane Basin] was now open [north vista from Smith Sound] seven points of the compass [nearly 80° of azimuth . . . . stopped from entering by] conflicting wind and northerly current . . . .”) More important: Kane reported that Morton *saw* the Open Polar Sea — the area of which Kane inflates by 40%, incidentally, between reports: VK 190 & LOT 1855/10/26:7:6 (3000 sq.mi.) vs. KA 2:310 (4200 sq.mi.; also JRG 26:10 & KA 1:302); seen from height of 500 ft or more (KA 2:309, 378) vs. 240 ft (JRG 26:9).

<sup>22</sup>KA 2:300-317 (undated). Virtual copy (changes: pp.308-310) at JRG 26:1-17 (read 1856/1/14). See fn 21.

<sup>23</sup>Kane’s later attempt (KA 1:460 [225]) to explain similar expressions he had grown accustomed to, is interesting but forced. The Kane report’s original language is quite unambiguous, especially in the statement that Humboldt Glacier is (VK 189) “probably the only obstacle to the insularity of Greenland.” The “hurried outline” of the original Kane report to SecNavy appears (VK 187 [speculative]) to have been written upon or before reaching civilization (Upernavik, Greenland) — thus evidently without knowledge of the discovery (during Kane’s absence) of the Northwest Passage separating Ellesmere Island (which Kane imagined might be attached to Greenland by the Humboldt Glacier) from the American landmass: Canada, etc. (Ellesmere Island, incidentally, has suffered a confusing variety of honorary subdivisions, now mercifully obsolete, e.g., Grinnell Land, Grant Land, Garfield Coast, Arthur Land, Schley Land, King Oscar Land.)

<sup>24</sup>A lovely scene, “The Open Water at Cape Jefferson” (KA 1:307 opp.), not yet at Morton’s farthest north, with the Sun partially below a flat sea-horizon. However, at Cape Jefferson, in late June, the Sun is well over 10° above the horizon *all day*. (It is good to see that this was noted as long ago as Rink: JRG 28:285.) Kane disowns (KA 1:464) some nearby illustrations’ accuracy, but not this one. Corner reproduces it (CK 166) without technical comment.

<sup>25</sup>Telephone, 1972/12/28. Corner had corrected the ad elsewhere, but not on this point.

<sup>26</sup>PP 115: midnight observation. Also VM 75: 81°1/2 N, Wm. Scoresby, 1806. And see MT 64: in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, ships frequently reached as far north as 80°1/2.

130 nautical miles (nmi) beyond the Kane expedition's farthest. It is general knowledge that even non-Arctic hero Horatio Nelson had been farther.<sup>27</sup> Nelson Island is at 80°36'N (MT 74-75).

**I2** The Kane group's 1854 sledge journeys never got beyond 80°31'N, a figure which long has been approximately known<sup>28</sup> though not given<sup>29</sup> by Corner. (This region was, incidentally, pre-explored by Eskimos,<sup>30</sup> and their reports were known to Kane [VK 84] — though he does not mention this in his writings.) However, Kane's 1856 book (KA 2:309) said 81°22'N (and he was ready to say c.81°2/3 N, before presumably being restrained by aghast scientists,<sup>31</sup> e.g., JRG 26:1 opp or 1961 *Encycl Brit* 13:255).

**I3** Thus, Kane's 81°22'N claim (§I2) was an exaggeration of over 50nmi! Sixteenth century sailors, using the naked-eye cross-staff on a rough sea, would have been disgraced by such gross mismapping (HN cxlviii). Finding latitude is the sailor's most elementary task — simple arithmetic. Ancient Greek astronomers, long before the telescope, knew their latitude to 1' = 1 nmi: see, www.dioi.org/j129.pdf (*DIO* 1.2) fn 69; www.dioi.org/j413.pdf (*DIO* 4.1 †3) Table 3; or www.dioi.org/jm04.pdf (*DIO* 22 †4) Table 1. (The Kane expedition was equipped with telescopic sextants.)

**I4** But, despite all, the admiring biographer is unfazed. He regards such matters as not serious (CK 262-263) — assisted (CK xii) in the effort by former Presidents of the American Philosophical Society (Henry Moe) and the Explorers Club (Ed Weyer<sup>32</sup> — who once rightly approved [AGR 43:129] the consigning of his predecessor at that distinguished post, Dr. Frederick Cook, to the “depths of infamy [for] . . . committing the explorer's unpardonable sin, of saying he had been where he had not.”)

**I5** All of Kane's exaggerations are blithely explained away (CK 260) as due merely to crude equipment and low temperatures, and gradual solar culmination. However, none

<sup>27</sup>PV 64, 76. Land reached at 80° .8 N; see, e.g., JRG 23:130 opp, or even VM 104.

<sup>28</sup>NN map (1875-1876 British expedition) correctly charts Cape Constitution (which Kane's men could not quite reach) at 80°34'N. See also GT 1:7. Its correct longitude is 66°2/3 W.

<sup>29</sup>However, CK 262 does note that Rink, at an 1858/4/12 meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, had charged (while also hinting at some Kane plagiarism [JRG 28:279-280 vs. KA 2:148]) that the Kane-Morton farthest was much exaggerated. (Rink had interviewed countryman Petersen, whom he admired — JRG 28:274 note; VK 84 n.28.) At this meeting, the Royal Navy's Richard Collinson (a highly capable contemporary arctic explorer, for whom an Ellesmere Land cape was later named: †2 §A2) estimated [PRG 3:200] that Kane's farthest was too high by 30 [*sic*, actually 35] to 45 miles — a pretty good guess: §I3. (Rink's useful paper was printed at JRG 28:272f; comments-after, printed at PRG 2:195f. Rink was wrong in his belief [JRG 28:274] that Kane's Humboldt Glacier was not extraordinary, but correct in criticizing [JRG 28:279] Kane's suggestion that his “Washington Land” [including Cape Independence], just north of the glacier, was part of North America not Greenland. Rink & Petersen were from Denmark, which then ruled Greenland; so this question bore on sovereignty.)

<sup>30</sup>KA 2:377. Likewise, MP 1905/8/18, and HO 341.

<sup>31</sup>The unrestrained Kane would have placed the expedition's farthest-north (Cape Independence) about 20 mi (KA 2:378, 381) or 17 nmi beyond 81°17'N (VK 190), at 81°34'N; or, perhaps, 22 nmi beyond the eventual compromise position (81°22'N: KA 2:309, 384), at 81°44'N. (The difference of measured [KA 2:383, 388, SK 43] vs. dead-reckoned [KA 2:383, 388] latitudes of Cape Jefferson is 81°25'N — 80°41'N = 44'. Half of this is 22'.) Thus: *DIO*'s estimate of about 81°2/3 N for the unvarnished latitude Kane originally intended to put over as his claim of farthest-north-point-reached. The error would have exceeded an entire *degree* of latitude. (Some remarks on details: [a] Cape Madison's latitude in Kane's table [KA 2:384] is a slip — ultra-obvious when compared to same table's latitude of more southerly Cape Jackson! [b] There is a nontrivial difference [post-compromise] between Kane's stated and mapped latitudes for Cape Independence: 81°22'N [KA 2:309, 384] vs. 81°16' N [KA 1:4-5, CK 262].)

<sup>32</sup>Ed Weyer was notably the lone honest society figure fighting the conspiracy that led to threat-backed 1935 suppression of Henshaw Ward's projected Yale Univ Press book (*The Peary Myth* — ms now posted at www.dioi.org/ph.pdf) skeptical of Peary's N.Pole hoax: www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §S1.

of these ritual apologia has any major relevance here.<sup>33</sup> By contrast, the most important problem goes entirely unmentioned, namely, what we will diplomatically call “the compromise”: Kane computed his published latitudes by taking his always-over-optimistic<sup>34</sup> “dead-reckoning” position-*estimates* and (KA 2:388, SK 45) **averaging** these with the (astronomically-determined measurements! (And: he was originally prepared [fn 31] to ignore the measurements altogether.) The eventual compromise brought down his attained-latitude claims c.20 nmi — but, curiously, he did not<sup>35</sup> budge the obviously-contingent latitude of his farthest north land seen “Mt. Parry”, from its pre-announced place,<sup>36</sup> 82°30'N. Indefensible. (From Kane's 1855/10/11 report to SecNavy [VK 191]: “82°30' . . . the nearest land to the Pole yet discovered. It bears the honoured name of Mr. Grinnell.”)

**I6** This is akin to a fisherman guessing his biggest catch's weight, then weighing it — and finally reporting the average of both numbers as the true weight. (Such a ploy is hopefully unique in the history of modern exploration.) To allow such procedure (and nothing was done about it until after Kane's death: PRG 2:359-360, SK 45, CK 262) is simply begging for a fish story. It is also asking alot of credulity to argue that this was done innocently<sup>37</sup> — when the difference was the basis of Kane's claim to have reached (Corner: CK 167 [KA 1:298]) “the northernmost land ever trodden by a white man.” In fact, that Kane really knew the true northern limit of his work (just a western hemisphere farthest-north) is a matter of explicit record (NYT 1856/3/17:2:3), though not previously noticed.

## J Morton's Latitude Sextant Data

**J1** William Morton and a skilled Eskimo hunter, Hans Hendrik, achieved the expedition's much-disputed farthest-north on 1854/6/24. The supporting navigational records are printed at KA 2:381-383. In this region, Morton produced (KA 2:383) three “noon” double-altitude sextant observations: 1854/6/21 (Cape Andrew Jackson), 6/24 (Cape Jefferson), and 6/26 (just south of the Morton farthest-north at Cape Independence).

**J2** The first observation (6/21) creates no problem: the noon true solar altitude made the latitude 80°02'N (KA 2:383&388). The actual latitude: 80°03'N — and Morton was travelling on the ice a little south<sup>38</sup> of the cape. This is strong indication that the sextant was indeed good to 1', as it should have been (fn 33).

**J3** The last meridian observation, 1854/6/26, puts Cape Jefferson at 80°20'N (KA 2:383 & 388). Actual latitude of the tip of Cape Jefferson: 80°20'N — again, a virtually perfect hit by Morton.

<sup>33</sup>The pocket-sextant was (§J4) good to ordmag 1'. Note solar-diameter consistency: KA 2:383f. See note CK 260. (Hayes is confused: Morton's sextant-derived latitudes were upper not lower limits on his actual latitudes.) And the oft-suspect (VK 21, CK 262) Morton read it honestly and largely well. (Remember that Morton — able to visually identify sites — was on the very expedition [Hall 1871] that finally fixed Cape Independence at about 80°1/2 N: BH map.) Though Morton's 1854 longitude data (see §K1) were scrapped (SK 43) by the US Coast Survey's Charles A. Schott, they are (§K) in fact more useful (because accompanied by specific chronometer times: KA 2:383) than his final “noon” latitude sight. The temperatures were not a problem (c.0°C) when and where all the badly-mismapped positions were explored. And the Sun's slow variation of altitude near the Poles actually helps [grid] positional accuracy by diminishing deduced positions' sensitivity to chronometer-error. True for both latitude and longitude observations.

<sup>34</sup>E.g., Morton says the distance north from Cape A.Jackson to Cape Jefferson is 45 mi; but, in truth, it's just 17 nmi (or 20 mi) of latitude — a clearly-definable error by a factor of more than two.

<sup>35</sup>KA 2:309 (2°30' is misprint for 82°30'N), 384.

<sup>36</sup>LOT 1855/10/26:7:6; NYT 1855/10/12:1:1, 2 (CK 226); VK 191.

<sup>37</sup>The cleverest defense might be to charge Kane with such (fn 7) technical incompetence (of the sort R.Hyman uses to try excusing P.Kurtz' *sTARBABY* deceptions) that he didn't know right from wrong.

<sup>38</sup>KA 2:377. And shown on map at JRG 26:1 opp.

**J4** Note: when encountering the touching alibis ritualistically offered up in defense of the dishonest claims of such explorers as Peary, one frequently encounters pleas that their equipment was primitive. (Even though most [including Peary] carried excellent, large-arc sextants.) But the foregoing shows that mid-19<sup>th</sup> century explorers could find their latitude to within about 1 mile<sup>39</sup> even with a little *pocket* sextant. (See fn 33. The KA 2:383 data page explicitly states that a pocket sextant was used; but the fact is self-evident anyway, because [KA 2:377] Morton had left the sledge near Cape Jefferson — thus, all equipment carried from there had to be pocket-portable.)<sup>40</sup> Isaac Hayes' 1854 pocket-sextant surveying of Ellesmere (under Kane) is similarly accurate (KA 2:389 vs. ‡2 fn 19), despite snowblindness problems and the potentially lethal rebellion (CK 164) of a companion. (Wm. Godfrey, who — after being driven out of the exploring community — later applied his travelling talents to driving Philadelphia buses: CK 274.)

**J5** From Morton's verbal account (KA 2:377-378 [retold KA 1:281f-& 2:309]), it's obvious that his 6/24 "noon" observation was taken (at least roughly) half-way<sup>41</sup> between Cape Jefferson (80°20'N, 67°.5 W — and Cape Independence (80°31'N, 66°2/3 W). He started out from the former at 3 AM local time, traveling in a direction 148° east of magnetic north, or c.40° east of true north: KA 2:381), and reached the latter place (fn 33), where he and Hans attained their farthest north just before 9 PM local civil time. (KA 2:381. They started back southward from there at midnight.) So noon was about half-way through the day's march. Thus (note fn 41), the 6/24 "noon" position — which we will call "Far-Sight" (to distinguish this farthest-north sextant-shot place from the 80°31'N farthest-north position *reached*) — would have been at longitude about 67°W, and latitude<sup>42</sup> about 80°.4 N. Below (§K4), we will test this theory quantitatively, completely restoring the precious longitude data that enable us to place Morton's northernmost sextant-sighting position to the satisfying accuracy of 1 mile.

<sup>39</sup>This should be no surprise, since even the naked eye can easily see to 1', which corresponds to 1 nmi on the Earth's surface. A telescopic sextant, observing double altitudes, is highly reliable for such accuracy.

<sup>40</sup>There is the question of carrying the artificial horizon for taking double altitudes. Kane's expedition resourcefully took to using food (molasses) for an artificial horizon. Still, this remains a possible contributing factor in the poor 1854/6/24 meridian observation — though the accuracy of the implicit 6/24 measure of the solar diameter is strongly in favor of systematic (§§J6-J7) not random error being the culprit.

<sup>41</sup>The full distance travelled to the farthest was estimated as 20 mi (though see fn 34), while the distance to the place where Hans killed a bear and cub (fn 44, KA 1:293-296, 2:377, VK 83-84) was estimated as 9 mi, a little under half the full distance. (There was obviously a long delay at this position, due to chase, cooking, eating, & illness; thus, it was probably the place of both meridian altitude and longitude sextant shots.) Morton claimed he couldn't (KA 1:297-298, 2:378) get around Cape Independence. That would place the farthest-north at 80°31'N — and, indeed, the expedition map (KA 1:4-5) puts the farthest at about the same latitude as the north end of Crozier Island, which is also at 80°31'N.

<sup>42</sup>About 1/3 of a day passed after the last ("noon") observations at Far-Sight, before the 9 PM arrival at 80°31'N. (Incidentally, it is possible that the two sets of 6/24 observations were not taken at the same spot. But the difficulty of However, all indications are that they were in fact all taken at virtually if not exactly the same place.)

**J6** By contrast, the 6/24 latitude sight is valueless, since the "noon" observation of 6/24 (KA 2:383, 388) puts the observer at latitude 80°41'N. Probable explanation (assuming the sight wasn't faked):<sup>43</sup> whether from illness (Vitamin A poisoning<sup>44</sup> from eating bear-liver: fn 44), cloudy<sup>45</sup> weather, or whatever, the "noon" observation was actually taken almost an hour after culmination. For Morton's latitude at the observation-site (80°25'N: §K4), the recorded solar altitude would occur 53<sup>m</sup> after — or before — local apparent noon.

**J7** In further extenuation: note that Morton's local time was ship's time, but he was now 15<sup>m</sup>1/2 east of the ship, with a chronometer slow (vs GMT) by 6<sup>m</sup>1/2 — so when Morton thought it was noon, the local time was really 12:22 PM. Thus, when his "meridian" sight was taken, his chronometer effectively told him that local time was not 12:53 PM but 12:31 PM — and a half-hour error in making a noon observation in his situation would throw his deduced latitude artificially upward by less than 6'. However, the actual error (53<sup>m</sup>) threw his computed latitude falsely high by about three times as much, namely, 17' — a serious misreportage.

## K Morton's Longitude Sextant Data

**K1** But, fortunately, Morton left us the means to find out exactly where he got to. Besides the latitude data, there are also Morton sextant data (solar double altitudes) taken to determine longitude (KA 2:383): for 1854/6/24, 60°18' (lower limb) at 7:11:12 Greenwich Mean Time,<sup>46</sup> and 59°35' (upper limb) at 7:37:35 GMT. For 1854/6/26, the double altitudes were 55°40'.7 (lower limb) at 0:30:05 GMT, and 67°26'.8 (upper limb) at 0:39:32 GMT. One can use these longitude observations to find latitude.

**K2** For the 1854/6/26 longitude data, we start by correcting (F295) a lamentable misprint<sup>47</sup> (which probably influenced Schott's decision to ignore the longitude sights, fn 33): at KA 2:383, for double altitude 67°26'.8 (§K1), read 57°26'.8. Next, we notice that the interval between the two shots is short (9<sup>m</sup>27<sup>s</sup>); thus, we can expect sensitivity<sup>48</sup> to small

<sup>43</sup>We cannot prove it was not, though the findings here are consistently in favor of the data's genuineness. The main factor encouraging suspicion is that the only bad Morton reading happened to be the one that was the partial basis for the expedition's farthest-claim. (Also: Morton doesn't mention leaving a cairn-record.) Similarly for Hayes in 1861: most of his sextant data were bad, but that for his farthest (the most important to his high-latitude-record purpose) was several *times* worse (‡ §A11) than any of the others.

<sup>44</sup>If this is the key to Morton's false latitude, we owe knowledge of the truth to Villarejo, who brought us Petersen's account, which reports (VK 84 [& see n.27 & CK 286 n.9 on Vitamin A]) that Morton was severely affected with illness (which lingered long after: *idem* [& perhaps CK 195]), following the eating of bear-liver — very near the time and place of the hour-late 1854/6/24 latitude observation.

<sup>45</sup>Mentioned frequently in Morton's account, e.g., KA 2:378. Note also that the only data in the entire Morton record at KA 2:383 which are not given to arcmin tenths are the two longitude data of 6/24 (given only to whole arcmin) — which, along with the fortunate (§K2) large interval between observations, suggests that the seeing was spotty.

<sup>46</sup>The chronometers were set as near as possible to Greenwich Mean Time (though Morton's verbal report uses local times). Remember that, in 1854, astronomers' & navigators' GMT day began at noon. So, for c.4<sup>h</sup>1/2 of longitude west of Greenwich 7:11&38 GMT = c.3 PM local mean time, and 0:30&40 GMT = c.8 AM local mean time. (Note: Morton conventionally writes [6/26] 12:30:05 & 12:39:32 where he really means 0:30:05 & 0:39:32, respectively — i.e., early afternoon, by the old GMT system.)

<sup>47</sup>See *DIO 10* for a later famous US explorer's penchant for tens-place errors. [And see in *DIO 7.1* indication of a unit tens-place error by astronomer A.Robertson.]

<sup>48</sup>There are certainly errors enough in this record. See, e.g., fn 31's parenthetical conclusion. Also: the map at KA 1:4-5 and the table at KA 2:384 both call Cape Jefferson "LI" and Cape Constitution (next to Cape Independence "LIV". But KA 2:388 puts Morton at LI on 6/24 and at LIV on 6/26 — nearly the reverse. (This mixup later [PRG 3:147] deluded Hayes into a false clever-retort to H.Rink's criticism of Kane.)



errors. The actual position of Cape Jefferson is  $80^{\circ}20'N$ ,  $67^{\circ}.5W$  — and the 6/26 longitude data agrees with that to ordmag 1' for chronometer error  $-6^m/2$ .

**K3** The 6/26 data are from a known location (Cape Jefferson), so they can be used to check the chronometer error: we find (§K2) that it was merely  $-6^m/2$ . An error so small as  $-6^m/2$ , after weeks away from the ship<sup>49</sup> (since 1854/6/4 — KA 2:373), evidences such gradual variation in the chronometer-rate that it is not credible that a large shift occurred in five days. (Even less likely that a big chronometer error would appear on 6/21 — and then virtually disappear by 6/24.)

**K4** Now to find longitude: knowing that Morton had rounded Cape Jefferson and was proceeding (along Lafayette Bay, towards Capes Independence & Constitution) on the course he described (§J5), we can find his position to high precision because the course was roughly perpendicular to the 2 Sumner lines (themselves virtually parallel to each other and so nearly coincident that we will refer to them below as one) fixed by the 6/24 longitude-determination sextant sightings. (I.e., his course was almost directly away from the Sun, so his coastal motion over the Earth's curve was precisely measured by these data.) The intersection of shore-line and Sumner line tells us the position:  $80^{\circ}25'N$ ,  $67^{\circ}.1W$ . (Both coordinates are uncertain to ordmag one nmi: 1' latitude,  $0^{\circ}.1$  longitude.) This solution fits both 6/24 longitude-determination solar altitudes (§K1), as they stand, to ordmag 1'.

**K5** The place (§K4) where Morton shot the 6/24 sextant data is about 1 mi offshore<sup>50</sup> in Lafayette Bay. And that accords with Morton's report which said (KA 2:378) "we went [directly towards Capes Independence-Constitution] without following the curve of the bay". And the path shown on the expedition map (JRG 26:1 opp) is indeed so.

**K6** This completes our reconstruction of Morton's flawed, long-misunderstood, but generally able navigation — and caps our vindication of its reality and its honesty.

## L A Foxy-Kaney Couple

**L1** But expedition-leader Kane is quite another matter. Armed with knowledge of the exaggerations pointed out at §I (and more to come at †2 §A), we may now penetrate over a century of heroic and haloic haze — and see that, though Wayne County's Maggie Fox was a peasant in the eyes of the highborn Kanes and the biographer, the pseudo-psychic vixen was an apt (FL 204) mate to the explorer-pretender. Indeed, the pair's very liason — an odd mix of purple passion and cunning conning<sup>51</sup> — was cloaked in the guise of "philanthropy" (CK 112, 253 [like 52]; 234) with the cooperation of the families of Kane (CK 233) and two Presidents (CK 122-124, BG 304; and, e.g., FL 111, 155; 161) of the American Geographical Society. (And Kane's original arctic proposal had been similarly presented: as essentially a merciful search [CK 103f, 124] for the lost Franklin, though Kane's northward course to high-latitude glory was away from the known graves and obvious path of Franklin's expedition.)

**L2** Despite Corner's commendable (and today lamentably rare) distaste for the anti-rational, he fails to depict fully the sleaziness of the occultist character Kane was putting up — e.g.: Maggie herself ultimately confessed (before reverting to deceit and fatal alcoholism: HE 208, WS 42-43, FU 178-181) that Spiritualism — which the Fox sisters founded (SS 5, HE 204) in the 1840s — was a conscious fraud. (On 1888/10/21, she gave a public demonstration on the mechanics of the "rappings".) Corner at least provides the explorer's private remonstrances against her dishonest<sup>52</sup> and "sinful" life — though whether his sniffing at this commoner communer's "entertaining strangers at a dollar a head" (CK 122 [also

<sup>49</sup>Though, Morton had companions (against whose chronometers he might have checked his own) until 1854/6/18 (KA 2:373-374).

<sup>50</sup>Where "Lafayette Bay" is printed on map GSC 120, the position found here is at the first "e".

<sup>51</sup>CK 113, 117, 227, 229 (and FL 48).

<sup>52</sup>CK 112 (e.g.: FL 105, 201-212, 239).

FL 107]) is an ethical or class putdown (or both) is a moot point. (His books also entertained strangers, but more antiseptically and profitably — roughly \$100,000, according to Maggie: FL ix note.) Corner does not quote an 1853 Kane note (FL 106 [201f] emph in orig): "You know I am nervous about the 'rappings'. I believe the only thing I ever was afraid of was, *this confounded thing being found out.*"

**L3** Guided by his own priorities, Kane did nothing to enlighten the victims of Maggie's thievery (FL 105, 106, 201-202) — with the poetically-just result that, after his death, she tried to blackmail<sup>53</sup> the Kane family with his love-letters. (Corner calls this "litigation": CK 244 & n.39.) But he is on the whole finely judicious [CK 113-114, 227, 244] in evaluating the trustworthiness of Miss Fox's mostly-true book, *The Love-Life of Dr. Kane*, published in 1866 when Kane's brother couldn't keep up payments to her.

(Incidentally, it may be that the biography takes Maggie more seriously than Kane did — evidently, the only fox mentioned<sup>54</sup> affectionately in his arctic journal is a rat-catching pet.)

## M Hayes vs. Hall: Two Ways to Forge a Northward Path

**M1** Less understandable is Corner's taking seriously almost everything (CK 159, 168, 258, 273 [vs. 165]) about Kane's surgeon, Isaac Israel Hayes, who later — in order to lead his own 1860-1861 arctic expedition — baldly deceived (VK 173&196 [CK x]) regarding the mutiny he joined against Kane in 1854 and so was able, via two-faced politicking (a pro at this part of the work, Hayes later was elected a member of the New York State Assembly), to scuttle (LW 58-59 [vs. LW 44], BG 347) the alternate arctic plans of the honest and creative (and fanatical) US explorer Charles Francis Hall.

**M2** Thus, a decade (and another [LW 239] attempted support-grab by I.I.Hayes) passed ere the AGS-backed Hall's pioneer touching (1871/8/30)<sup>55</sup> of the Arctic Ocean via the "American route" — the feat to which Kane and Hayes had falsely laid claim, but which, ironically, poor Hall was unaware he had genuinely performed (LW 275 [vs. 279?]). He was anyway soon thereafter arsenic-murdered by a colleague (though some still think he could have overdosed on arsenic-based medication) — a fact suspected (e.g., NYH 1873/5/21) at the time and continually rumored later (e.g., SG 267-268), but effectively hushed up (LW 307, 310-311, 338, 349), despite a later investigation<sup>56</sup> by the Navy, until Chauncey Loomis' 1968 exhumation and positive arsenic-test (LW 340-342, 344f).

**M3** Relative to accurate placement of land reached, the expedition map (BH) was a credit<sup>57</sup> to US polar exploring, though it was in truth published under the direction

<sup>53</sup> Self-evident from FL viii-x (193f, 210-213, 262, 274-275).

<sup>54</sup>KA 1:395 (CK 186 — vs. 244?).

<sup>55</sup> See first four references in fn 57. Also: DP 84-86 ( $82^{\circ}11'N$  official farthest) vs. DP 165, TD 150 ( $82^{\circ}29'N$ ), BH map ( $82^{\circ}21'N$ , 1871/8/31).

<sup>56</sup> As pointed out by Robert Bryce: *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy on the Operations of the Department for the Year 1873*.

<sup>57</sup> Hall, too, stretched his farthest latitude a bit, at least temporarily ( $82^{\circ}29'N$  believed [DP 165, TD 150] vs.  $82^{\circ}11'N$  now official [DP 86]). However, he was hampered by being on a moving ship, in fog & snow (LW 275, DP 85 [ $82^{\circ}26'N$  misprint]) — no sextant readings possible. And we cannot know what he would have claimed when all data were in — his scientists only got a firm latitude-estimate (TD 166 [vs. fn 55]) a few days after his death. As for land not reached but *seen* (fortunately mapped with dashed lines): this is certainly exaggerated, e.g., Hall's "Cape Sherman" (BH map), put at  $83^{\circ}05'N$  (DP 165, TD 161), is probably Cape May ( $82^{\circ}1/2'N$ ); the short straight coast mapped from Cape Union to Black Cape is extrapolated by an entire ordmag (nearly to  $84^{\circ}N$ : BH map) — Cape Union to "Cape Joseph Henry" (in a nonexistent position). Incidentally, as anyone attempting to follow this analysis with maps in hand will quickly discover, unraveling the truth of these expeditions is not aided by the old polite practice among geographers (e.g., NN 1:101) of retaining explorers' appellations in areas they have badly mischarted, simply by drastically shifting or flexing the original maps' contours. For example, Hayes' Capes Lieber & Cape Union (†2 fn 7 & §A2, resp; HO 72 opp &

of Heidelberg Emil Bessels (expedition Chief Scientist, highly recommended by the famous German geographer Petermann: LW 251) — and now generally regarded as the #1 suspect (LW 347f) in Hall's murder by poisoning. The list of suspects should also include Hall's alcoholic successor as captain (Budington, whose first order was let's-go-home), and [LW 347] Morton, Kane's ex-steward, who'd lent his experience to Hall's effort (fn 33).

**M4** All considered, it is perhaps remarkable that a writer of Dr. Corner's sensitivity and propriety reveals as much as he does from the veiled depths of the Kane saga. Still, there are some problems of general concern illustrated by his omissions & errors. And his tendency to euphemism: mutiny = "secession" (CK 169 [Kane less circumspect, e.g., CK 146]), censorship = "pruning" (CK 231), alcoholism = "decline" or "intemperance" (CK 276), and (§L3) blackmail = "litigation". Question: was a major academic society's Executive Officer, necessarily a booster (e.g., member of APS's Commission on the Bicentennial Congress of Liberty, 1976: APY 1971:8), the ideal scholar to recount a tale which honestly requires so much negative criticism? Likewise, were his two unexceptionally eminent advisors (§I4) the wisest choice for a tough exam of Kane's suspect cartographical work? — i.e., even leaving aside the question of competence) are institution-chiefs temperamentally the sort from which to seek frank judgement regarding such an ugly matter as possible fraud?

**M5** There is also a difficulty (with no simple solution) common to scholarly biographical research on men with loyal surviving heirs who possess original documents, namely: how to obtain the precious information necessary to the work (CK xi: "essential"), without thereby sacrificing one's objectivity in natural gratitude.<sup>58</sup> A similar case in point (a book in the same general field — and supported<sup>59</sup> by an Amer Philos Soc research grant: WP viii) is John Edward Weems' *Peary, the Explorer and the Man* (Houghton, 1967), which was made possible by first access (family permission: WP vii-viii) to Peary's long-restricted papers (opened up to other researchers only long after). While commendably open regarding Peary's mixed (largely positive) character, Weems obligingly protects the family's most cherished tenet (the Pole claim), largely by protecting<sup>60</sup> his readers from certain revealing documents, in whole or in part. Adding to his integrity-record: when DR's book appeared in 1973, Weems faked 3 reviews of it; tragicomic details at [www.dioi.org/hoa.htm#fwvf](http://www.dioi.org/hoa.htm#fwvf).

**M6** As with Corner's biography: it is slightly unsettling to one familiar with the subject, to realize how completely accurate and objective the Weems book must seem to the novices who habitually review books for the public — with their wonted easy confusion of style with substance. (Regarding the present review, which has more negative bulk than positive, though much about a book [Corner's] with far more virtues than faults — DR's approach:

---

374) were certainly not the capes now so named; the same is true of Hall's Cape Jos. Henry (BH map). (This habitual injustice is not restricted to US exploring: see the gross Austrian case of Cape Fligely, cited at F296.) Not only were they mapped in very different spots (e.g., modern maps' Cape Lieber is 6° of longitude east of the inland place where Hayes said [HO 351] he "discovered" it in 1861) but, in each case: the explorer never even *saw*, much less explored, the place which history has somehow permitted him to name.

<sup>58</sup>See WPP 1931/7/8, 1935/3/30:4-5 (RPP 1972/12/27).

<sup>59</sup>This despite the fact that, as a journalist, Weems suffers from an obvious lack of expertise in arctic science (F234), and even history (confusing explorer Albert Markham and geographer Clements Markham: WP 117) — a disability shared with Kane (§C4). Also with Corner, who, while wonderfully competent on the medical aspects of Kane (& others, e.g., CK 170), is not conversant with navigational math — and, virtually throughout his book, calls major US polar explorer and authority *Adolphus W. Greely* by British explorer Edward Augustus Ingfield's middle name. Especially ironic, since Greely (and some other top US explorers — all born before the War Between the States, e.g., Geo. W. DeLong & Geo. W. Melville) shares the same middle name with Corner: Washington.)

<sup>60</sup>See *DIO 1.1* †4 vs. WP 290-293 (viii; RPP 1968/8/29, 10/14). WP 276 n.84 (& WR 130) vs. NYT 1909/9/7:3:6. WR 222 (vs. HRR 22, multiqualfied) vs. WPP (SPC) 1927/2/5: ironic! WP 271-272 n.66 (not from mss, yet WP 210 opp) vs. C53A:1628 (document disappeared from Library of Congress by the 1930s). For Parson Weems' most blatantly deceitful omissions, see comparisons presented in *DIO 1.1* †4 §D1.

the rôle of a review is not merely to advertise, but to inform the reader, e.g., in relevant areas slighted or misrendered by the author, and to indicate paths towards possible improvements, to assist a future revised edition of the opus.)

**M7** One need not have overwhelming admiration for a hero, to write an intensively researched, sensitive biography — a truism that is well illustrated by Chauncey Loomis' frank, yet haunting study of Hall's life (*Weird & Tragic Shores* Knopf 1971), which concludes with a detective case (LW 297f): attempting to solve the Hall murder mystery.

**M8** Note in passing: as a physicist-astronomer, DR finds it curious to see the most objective polar writing being done not by scientists but by writers with English backgrounds, such as Loomis and Villarejo. Even Weems' flawed *Peary* . . . <sup>61</sup> is far more balanced than that of the two earlier, eulogistic Peary biographies — one by a physicist (GP), the other by a geologist-geographer (HP). The most revealing early analysis (WPM: [www.dioi.org/ph.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/ph.pdf)) of Peary's final claim was written by secondary-school English teacher and textbook writer Henshaw Ward in 1935 — and was then suppressed (fn 32; WPP 1935/12/23, 26; F292; [www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf)) via threat of suit (*ibid* §O5: BPJ 1935/12/20) by the National Geographic Soc, delivered by Izzy Bowman, President of Johns Hopkins Univ, Amer Philos Soc Councillor & recent Amer Geogr Soc Director, whose careerist vita also includes VP National Academy of Sciences & Pres Amer Assoc for the *Advancement* of Science.

## N Pretense's Cost: Killer Kane

**N1** The glorification of Kane may appear superficially to be an innocuous enterprise, but it does raise (for one thing) a substantial question of fair play. The process puts in (relative) shade such truly capable and praiseworthy "underlings" as Petersen, who was surpassed by Kane in just two Arctic-exploring essentials: youth and money. Which incidentally suggests part of the answer to an intriguing question that illustrates in a general way how some people get ahead (while others get filtered out) in all climes, on ships of sea and state: how did one so dangerously ill-fitted for leadership as Kane ever obtain the powers of a Capt. Bligh (§N7) over a score of unfortunate fellow human beings? The rest of the explanation (none of it having any necessary relation to exploring competence): fanatical tenacity, skill (CK 88, 102f, 230f) with the available communication media, and connexions (e.g., CK 57) with "the great men" (CK 116) in Washington. The inequity of the latter factor was perhaps not so obvious to an officer of the socially-prominent Amer Philos Soc, into which eminent body Kane was elected (to his great advantage in upcoming funds-solicitation: e.g., CK 120, and above at §D3) in 1851 "on the nomination of five distinguished Philadelphians" (CK 104) — no sweat, since his wealthy and cultured father, Judge John Kane, was Amer Philos Soc Vice-President, later President (CK x, 12).

**N2** Kane's theoretical musings (CK 128, 130, 177, 179) on discipline and leadership seem enlightened, but Corner is somewhat naïve to accept Kane's expressions of "sincere respect for [the men's] individual rights" (CK 178) — which read like sarcasm when set beside his actual desperate reactions while faced with actual Disobedience in the actual Arctic: threats to defame (VK 164) and-or kill (VK 86, 150, 153, 168, 177), bribery (VK 167), beatings<sup>62</sup> (CK 193-194, 199; antecedents at §N3), an attempted (CK 200, 291 n.4) shot in the back for a "deserter". All of this administered under the legal protection of the Navy code — i.e., resistance punishable by execution upon the ship's return to the US.

**N3** Of course, there was no necessity to wait, and the pugnacious (e.g., CK 55) Kane, indeed, enlivened the wintery situation by threatening (VK 150) summary executions of

---

<sup>61</sup>Basis of the "documentary", first aired on 1973/3/28 CBS-TV, "Cook & Peary, The Race to the Pole".

<sup>62</sup>Perhaps it should be mentioned here, for contextual empathy: formal flogging had been outlawed (LN 192 [see also 172, 203]) by Congress less than 3 years before Kane sailed north. It had been perfectly legal when the 1<sup>st</sup> Grinnell expedition embarked in the Spring of 1850.

those insufficiently zealous to elevate their latitudes. A wryly ironic Petersen used the very disaster Kane had brought upon the ship (§C6) as a loophole to evade the Navy law with which Kane was menacing his life (VK 150-151): “I took the liberty to make the remark to him, that since the ship might now be considered as a *wreck*, his power as our Captain was at an end, and that if I still thought it proper to obey his orders from a mere feeling of duty, it would hardly be advisable for him to attempt the execution of any Yankee Laws on a subject of Denmark, in particular if the question were about capital punishment!”

**N4** Nowadays, we may be amused by the 1855 United States’ shock at learning that high-born Kane had performed “menial” (NYT 1855/10/12:1:2) tasks (such as cooking: VK 177) in the Far North. But we forget that the most rigid class-split of them all, literal slavery, was at this time very real in the “classless” US (and elsewhere: [www.dioi.org/jp02.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jp02.pdf)) — and this Peculiar Institution was so accepted in the southern US that it didn’t seem peculiar at all, even in most of the North. (The wives of slavery’s prime killers, Lincoln & Grant, had owned slaves.) E.g., slavery’s legitimacy was upheld (CK 225) by Southern-sympathizer (CK 53-54) father Judge Kane on the Philadelphia bench (though Kane’s brother Thomas was actively anti-slavery: *idem*), and by the US Supreme Court. Kane named Cape Taney (78°48’N, 70°20’W) for the Chief Justice of the Court whose infamous Dred Scott decision declared in effect that a human being could be treated as a piece of property under US law. (Kane also [map at KA 1:4-5] named Cape John C. Calhoun [80°05’N, 67°2’W] for the recently-lamented chief public defender of US slavery.)

**N5** To pose a question not to be found in the chapter on Kane’s breeding (Chap. 1: “A Hero’s Lineage”): was Amer Philos Soc-VP Judge Kane’s “insulting inhuman persistence” (abolitionist *NY Herald*: CK 225) replicated in his son? Regardless of one’s views on genetics, the plain fact is that Kane’s superpatriotic 1854 March poleward sledge-drive *commanded* (against expert advice)<sup>63</sup> ill-equipped men out into temperatures (KA 2:353) of about  $-40^{\circ}$ .<sup>64</sup> Miserable death was perhaps the lesser of the resulting (KA 2:354-356, VK 80) evils; the grisly plight of the “survivors” (one of whom died in the US four years later as a result: CK 274) is best revealed in Kane’s own astonishingly brusque record of the outcome (KA 1:199): “two [men] underwent amputation of parts of the foot, without unpleasant consequences.” (Rereading it won’t change the words. That is what it says.) Over 2 months later, his “health-roll” includes (KA 1:256-257):

Mr. Brooks	Unhealed stump.
Mr. Wilson	do.

The “do” is shorthand for: “ditto”.

**N6** There is nothing glorious in this. Its only heroism lies in its remarkable and barely successful achievement, in being even more pointless than like sufferings multiply-dittoed in equally patriotic wartime slaughter. (Soon to follow, much thanks to such men as Taney and Judge Kane.) Under the circumstances, it is little wonder Kane’s men finally rebelled and fled south even when it was hopelessly late in the Summer of 1854 — in preference (e.g., VK 171 [150]) to remaining in Kane’s servitude. (Regarding Hall’s 1871 murder [§M2], one may speculate: was it partly stimulated by knowledge — perhaps from Morton? — of the horrors a fanatically pole-obsessed commander can visit upon his men in the brutal Arctic? As one of Hall’s bravest men, George Tyson, told (TD 150 [& 165, & note

<sup>63</sup>In fairness to Kane, we must point out that while Kane fatefully ignored Petersen’s advice on this occasion, the rôles were reversed when the Petersen-Sonntag mutiny ignored Kane’s prescient warnings (see, e.g., CK 175) that it was far too late in the season to attempt escape from their entrapment. The difference, of course, is that the latter folly was voluntary — and was triggered in part by horror at the prospect of continuing under the tyranny that had caused the former.

<sup>64</sup>Scientists will not ask whether this is Celsius or Fahrenheit, because they already know that  $-40^{\circ}$  is the temperature where the two scales intersect. I.e.,  $-40^{\circ}\text{F} = -40^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

CK 133, FL 48]) Hall, regarding sailing further north: “I should gain nothing by it, but . . . it would be a great credit to *him* [Hall] to go two or three degrees [of latitude] farther.”<sup>65</sup>

**N7** Much as Kane and his kind merit an unflinching criticism, their lives and personalities are at least far from ordinary. And, like Capt. Bligh<sup>66</sup> (an earlier [1789] object of a naval mutiny),<sup>67</sup> Kane became the ultimate hero of the expedition — welcoming the failed-mutiny party upon their return, paternally caring for his lost sheep (including Petersen and the astronomer August Sonntag),<sup>68</sup> eventually leading the entire remaining party to safety.

**N8** Despite its faults, Corner’s book is, like Villarejo’s, a stimulating experience for the reader. With a certain amount of revision & supplementation, it could take its place as the standard source on a meteoric legend — and an instructive dash of USiana.

## Bibliography & Reference-Key

The source-abbreviations used above are listed at Rawlins *Fiction* ([www.dioi.org/rp.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/rp.pdf)) pp.308-313; several of these are also listed below, with additional sources:

- AGR *Geographical Review* American Geographical Society, NYC.
- APS American Philosophical Society *Proceedings* Philadelphia.
- APY American Philosophical Society *Yearbook* Philadelphia.
- BD Bartlett 1909 Diary, Amer Geogr Soc ms collection.
- BG Pierre Berton *The Arctic Grail* NYC 1988.
- BH Emil Bessels *Physical Observations . . .* (Hall *Polaris*) Wash DC 1876.
- BPJ Bowman Papers, Johns Hopkins University Library, Special Collections.
- BR Robert Bryce *Cook&Peary . . . Polar Controversy Resolved* Mechanicsburg, PA, 1997.
- CM F.Cook *My Attainment of the Pole* NYC 1911, 1912, 1913.
- CK Geo. W. Corner *Doctor Kane of the Arctic Seas* Temple Univ, Philadelphia 1972.
- CS Nellis Crouse *Search for the North Pole* NYC 1947.
- DP Charles Davis, ed. . . . *North Pole Expedition . . . Polaris . . .* Wash DC 1876.
- FU Earl Fornell *The Unhappy Medium* Univ.Texas Austin 1964.
- FL Margaret Fox *Love-Life of Dr. Kane* Carleton, NY 1866.
- FC Andrew Freeman *The Case for Doctor Cook* NYC 1893.
- GT A.Greely *Three Years of Arctic Service* NYC 1885.
- GE A.Greely *Explorers & Travelers* NYC 1893.
- GP Fitzhugh Green *Peary, the Man Who Refused to Fail* NYC 1926.
- GSC Geological Survey of Canada topographical maps ©1987.
- HE C.Hansel *ESP — a Scientific Evaluation* NYC 1966.
- HA Isaac Israel Hayes *Arctic Boat Journey . . . 1854* Brown, Boston 1860.
- HB8 Isaac Israel Hayes *Bearings* Vol.8 1861 AGS ms collection .
- HI Isaac Israel Hayes SAR 1861: 149-160.
- HO Isaac Israel Hayes *The Open Polar Sea* NYC 1867.
- HC James Gordon Hayes *Conquest of the North Pole* London 1934.
- HP Wm. H. Hobbs *Peary* NYC 1936.
- HRR House of Representatives Report #1961 61<sup>st</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Session.
- HN G.Asher, ed. *Henry Hudson the Navigator* Hakluyt Soc. ser.1 vol.27.

<sup>65</sup>Note the obvious 1909 Henson-Peary analogy: Henson gained little by continuing north beyond the final camp. (But risked much: his life.) And he carried the 1909 party’s rifle.

<sup>66</sup>For the great navigator (& James Cook-protégé) Ned Bligh at his finest, see C.Nordhoff & J.Hall *Men Against the Sea* NYC 1934.

<sup>67</sup>Coincidence dep’t: both mutinies took place shortly after seamen encountered simple peoples with looser, more hedonistic mores than those of WASP civilization. (DR’s 1996 March visit to Tahiti impressed upon him the unlikelihood of anyone achieving much, who has long lived amongst the natives there. Paul Gauguin is not an exception but indeed the perfect example.)

<sup>68</sup>Sonntag — an astronomer of high qualifications (like Schott) — was later to die in the field during Hayes’ expedition.

- JRG *Geographical Journal*, Royal Geographical Society.  
 KG Elisha K. Kane . . . *Grinnell Expedition* . . . NYC 1853.  
 KA Elisha K. Kane *Arctic Explorations 1853, 1854, 1855* Philadelphia 1856.  
 KLP Elisha K. Kane *Advance* log 1853/5/31-1854/4/1n3 & 1855/5/1-22 Hist.Soc.Phila.  
 KJS Elisha K. Kane private journal 1854/6/4-1855/5/1 ms collection Stanford Univ.  
 LN Harold Langley *Social Reform in the U.S.Navy 1798-1862* Univ.Illinois 1967.  
 LOT London *Times*.  
 LW Chauncey Loomis *Weird and Tragic Shores* NYC 1971.  
 MT Clements Markham *Threshold of the Unknown Regions* London 1873.  
 MG Clements Markham *The Fifty Years Work of the RGS* London 1881.  
 ML Clements Markham *The Lands of Silence* Cambridge Univ 1921.  
 MR Hugh Mill *The Record of the RGS 1830-1930* London 1930.  
 MK Jeanette Mirsky *Elisha Kent Kane* . . . Boston 1954.  
 NN George Nares *Narrative* . . . *Polar Sea* London 1878.  
 NavFou Navigation Foundation Report to NatGeogrSoc 1989/12/11.  
 NYT *New York Times*.  
 PP Anne Parry *Parry of the Arctic* London 1963.  
 PV Constantine Phipps & Skeffington Lutwidge *Journal* . . . London 1773.  
 PM US National Archives' 1971 microfilm: Peary 1909 records (numbered by frame).  
 PZ Peary *North Pole* 1910.  
 RR Dennis Rawlins *Polar Notes 10:24* Dartmouth College 1970.  
 F Dennis Rawlins *Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction?* Wash DC 1973.  
 RT Dennis Rawlins *DIO 2.2* (www.dioi.org/j225.pdf) 1992.  
 RU Dennis Rawlins *Polar Record 36:25-50* [Univ Cambridge] 2000.  
 RX Dennis Rawlins *DIO 10:2-106* (www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf) 2000.  
 RPP Rawlins Papers U. S. National Archives.  
 RH David Roberts *Great Exploration Hoaxes* Sierra Club, San Francisco 1982.  
 SS Wm.Salter *Society for Psychological Research* . . . *History* SPR, London, 1970.  
 SK Chas. A. Schott *Phys. Obs. . . Kane Astronomy (Smiths. Contrib. #129)*<sup>69</sup> 1860.  
 SH Chas. A. Schott *Phys. Obs. . . Hayes (Smiths. Contrib. #196)* 1867.  
 SAR Smithsonian Inst. *Annual Reports*, GPO, Wash, DC.  
 SPH "Statement . . . Peary" Peary Hearings 1910-11. Congressnl Rec App 53:293-327.  
 SG Vilhjalmur Steffanson *Greenland* NYC 1943.  
 SPC Steffanson Collection Polar Controversy File (Cook-Peary) Dartmouth College.  
 TD George Tyson & Euphenus Vale Blake . . . *Tyson's . . . Drift* . . . NYC 1874.  
 VM P.-E. Victor *Man and the Conquest of the Poles* NYC 1963.  
 VK Oscar Villarejo *Dr. Kane's Voyage to the Polar Lands* U.Pa 1965.  
 WS James Walsh *Spiritualism a Fake* Stratford, Boston 1925.  
 WPP Ward Papers U.S. National Archives (Charles Henshaw Ward).  
 WR John Edward Weems *Race for the Pole* NYC 1960.  
 WP John Edward Weems *Peary, the Explorer and the Man* Boston 1967.  
 WA John K. Wright *Geography in the Making, the AGS 1851-1951* AGS, NYC 1952.

Source-references in the body of the text of the foregoing and following articles are typically of the form: cited work's code (see Bibliography) followed by the relevant page-number, e.g., reference to Corner *Doctor Kane of the Arctic Seas* page 134 is expressed as: (CK 134).

## †2 Hayes: Memoryholed Mestablishment Mendacity

### A Isaac Hayes' Kane-Follow-Up Misgeography: A Fateful Blot on Arctic Exploration Integrity

**A1** Mismappings of new land may seem minor compared to Kane's grislier †1 §N accomplishments, but they are not considered trivial by scientists (HC 68). Here, too, Kane's unfortunate legacy lingered — even aside from his own geographical exaggerations. To wit, his failure to unmask the duplicity of fellow Pennsylvanian & fellow pseudoscientist (§H1) Isaac Israel Hayes, who pretended to the Amer Philos Soc and other sponsoring institutions he was the martyred hero's unblemished arctic heir. (The funniest thing mutineer Hayes ever said [HO 318, 1861/4/27], fully worthy of our Doubletakes column: "My men have failed me . . . as those of Dr. Kane did before me.") Thus, Hayes (by now on the Council of the Amer Geogr Soc: WA 52) was enabled to lead his 1860-1861 expedition back to the Kane Basin with the unique distinction of being sponsored (HA 355f, HO iii-xvi) by virtually every major relevant scientific body in the United States, including the American Geographical Society, the American Philosophical Society (§B22), the American Academy of Arts & Sciences (Boston), the American Association for the Advancement of Science (HI 149), the Smithsonian Institution (Washington). (The only part of the story more incredible than Hayes' sextant data was their publication by the Smithsonian Institution.)<sup>1</sup> Hayes' fantastic 1867 book lists (HO xi-xvi) these and **hundreds** of other toppe-citizen subscribers, to a partly<sup>2</sup> crank expedition ("Open Polar Sea") that turned into a hoax of these societies, publishers, companies, as well as trusting, well-intentioned science-supporting individuals, incl. Chas. Daly (AGS), AGS' #1 polar funder Henry Grinnell (AGS Treasurer), US-top-biologist Harvard's Louis Agassiz,<sup>3</sup> Edward Everett,<sup>4</sup> the Bible Society, Harpers Bros, Lippincott, Putnam's, plus leading astronomers Benjamin Gould & Ormsby Mitchell. **A2** The pupil outdid the master. To barely top Kane-Morton-Hans' latitude (†1 §J5), the result was an even taller tale than Kane's: 81°35'N claimed as his New&Improved farthest-north land, "Cape Lieber", named for "my very kind friend, Prof. Francis Lieber" (HI 157-158). Hayes to the AGS audience that greeted his return, as reported<sup>5</sup> in the press (NYT 1861/11/15:3:1): "The land was taken possession of in the name of the United States [DIO: though the states were rather less than "united" at the time], and the flag which was used on the occasion has covered the most northern<sup>6</sup> known land upon the globe.

<sup>1</sup>DR has examined all the Hayes correspondence in the Smithsonian archives and (up into the 1870s) the C.Schott correspondence kept there and in the US Coast Survey files (NARA), finding nothing betraying suspicion of any of Hayes' claims. (Perhaps the later Schott correspondence will yield something to a future researcher.)

<sup>2</sup>[a] Some well-known scientists believed the poles were warmer than the surrounding regions. (See, e.g., §H1, HO 354-355 n.1.) [b] Some worthwhile scientific work (e.g., gravity, glacial) was done by the expedition, unrelated to the claimed farthest-north. (More might have been done had the chief scientist [Sonntag] not died, early in the expedition.)

<sup>3</sup>A learned, massively productive professor and religious opponent of Darwin's discovery, Agassiz was to evolution of species what modern Harvard's 0 Gingerich is to evolution of ancient astronomy: www.dioi.org/jb36.pdf = DIO 11.3 †6 fn 11.

<sup>4</sup>Everett was toppe US academic of the day, i.e., automatically doomed to be as forgotten as 1940s academic mogul Izzy Bowman. Everett was supposed to be the Truly Important speaker at Gettysburg in 1863, with Lincoln saying just a few words . . . . But if for nothing else, Everett deserves to be remembered as having the modesty, honesty, and wisdom to be the first to recognize the grandness of the speech by Lincoln, who (whatever one may think of his tyrannical policies towards dissenters and secessionists) was by far the best humorist, speaker, & poet that ever lived in the White House.

<sup>5</sup>Nearly verbatim from Hayes, it would seem. His own exact later rendition (HO 375): "I have planted the American flag further north upon the land [than] any flag has been planted before."

<sup>6</sup>Hayes claimed that Morton did not in 1854 get past 80°56'N. (See PRG 3:147 [1858/5/23 letter] and NYT 1861/11/15:3:1.) But Hayes reported his own claimed 1861 latitude just high enough that

[Prolonged applause.]” But Hayes’ fraud gained him little, since the War Between the States had severely redefined drama since the time of Kane’s glorious 1855 return. If Hayes had imagined public celebrations along the line of “When Izzy comes marching home again”, he instead found wartime distraction — except for the same loyally credulous academic societies who’d blessed his venture back in 1860.

**A3** Some readers may object to the charge of fraud against Hayes, especially if they have read the standard polar survey-histories — all of which (without exception) say that we cannot know whether Hayes lied or not. Well, they’re wrong. We can. The reason the standard histories say this is twofold: [a] They repeat each other. [b] None has consulted Hayes’ original navigational notebook, as DR did a half-century ago — and cited it in his *Peary at the North Pole, Fact or Fiction?* (F24-25). Though this has become a standard reference-work (cited even in *EncAmer*), again: not one historian since has consulted Hayes’ notebook. So it will be up to *DIO* to show (partly on the basis of an astounding new finding in the notebook: §B10) that Hayes’ misgeography was a deliberate and elaborate fraud, even if very clumsily executed.

**A4** It’s long been known that Hayes got nowhere near his claimed latitude. General Adolphus W. Greely supposed<sup>7</sup> Hayes stopped at Cape Jos.Good, 80° 12’N, the nearest thing to an orthodox guess on the question (e.g., CS 77). But the AGS archives contain the original of Hayes’ navigational records (*Bearings* [HB]), vol.8 [HB8] of which contains the records relevant to this analysis. His sketch-maps<sup>8</sup> (HB8:23-31) show he crossed only one (HB8:27 [HO 343, 366]) major bay (now Scoresby Bay) after passing Cape Frazer, so he was stopped by John Richardson Bay (HB8:31), at Cape Collinson’s NE point, 80° 05’N, 70° .5 W, having made camp & a sextant Sun-shot at the cape’s SE corner, 80° 02’N, 70° .5 W.

**A5** This identification can be made positive by examination of the northernmost surviving drawing made by Hayes (HB8:28 = [www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB28](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB28)), just south of (and showing on the left side of the drawing) the farthest-north cape he reached.

[All relevant Hayes drawings (with detailed modern maps provided for comparison) are available at [www.dioi.org/hay.htm](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm) — these should be consulted occasionally by the reader as he moves along this text.] In said drawing: beyond the farthest-attained cape (Hayes’ cape#11) are two flat capes (his capes #12&#13 = Capes Wilkes & J.Good) of very similar azimuth, with a third (#14 = Cape Lawrence) well to the right. This is the view from atop a point at the SE tip (cape#10) of Cape Collinson. (See the Geological Survey of Canada topographical maps linked at [www.dioi.org/hay.htm](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm) — including the long slanted coastal splice [linked at [www.dioi.org/hay.htm#msgm](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm#msgm)] arranged by the scrupulous, dedicated efforts of the late Keith Pickering, *DIO*’s longtime Editor.) It doesn’t fit the view from any other location in the region. (NE tip of C.Collinson [John Richardson Bay’s south shore] is the very-near-left cape#11 [mismarked “10”] in the same scene-sketch. He mentions at HB8:28 nothing visible except “Three very low headlands”: §B3.) In addition, we have Hayes’ own seen-from-above hand-drawn coastal-map of capes#10&#11 at HB8:31 ([www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB31](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB31)) — again, it fits the Collinson hypothesis and no other.

**A6** As experienced polar explorer Greely notes,<sup>9</sup> it is impossible for Hayes to have gotten past Cape J.Good (80° .2 N) and not have seen Greenland to the east (HO 339). But Hayes reports no land. Near 81° 1/2 N latitude (his approximate alleged Farthest North),

it was #1, no matter what was the prevailing opinion on Kane-Morton’s false latitude. See below at §B18 under leap-frauding.

<sup>7</sup> GT 1:10, 2:95. Partly on the basis of comparing Hayes’ illustration (fn 31) to Cape J.Good. But if Hayes was fantasizing the scene, this is not necessarily the best way to locate him.

<sup>8</sup> Hayes’ *Bearings* are kept at the American Geographical Society, which found (1971/9/20) that Hayes’ diaries are missing for the suspect period. We thank the AGS library’s Lynn S. Mullins for informed and completely open assistance, examination, and photocopying.

<sup>9</sup> GH 201. (However, the reference to HO 339 is somewhat inconclusive, since Hayes’ story has here not yet crossed 80°N.) But see below at §B3.

a traveler along the west (Canadian) side of Kennedy Channel will easily see<sup>10</sup> the other (Greenland) side, which is only 20 nmi away. But Hayes concludes his Open Polar Sea argument by proposing<sup>11</sup> that Kennedy Channel cannot “be less than fifty miles wide”.

**A7** Hayes claimed (HO 351) to have left, at his farthest, a written record (“in proof of our presence”) in a glass vial beneath a cairn overlooking the nonexistent Open Polar Sea. The Hayes cairn-record was just as nonexistent — a factor which may have something to do with why it’s never been found.<sup>12</sup> (Most arctic cairn-records were later recovered and returned to civilization.) The place of the farthest-north 1861 astronomical observation (“Furthest camp”) was allegedly at 81° 32’N (SH 20, HB8:31) — a camp allegedly consecrated by solemn unfurlings (*idem*; HO 351 n.1) of a spectrum of sacred flags.

**A8** This reminds one of Peary’s unbestable flag-wrapture act (F192). But more substantial analogies to Peary [PZ 294] are also striking (and see more at §B2 & fn 37):

[a] Astonishing final-leg speeds [F25 & 158-159], especially by an explorer with missing toes [fn 19, WP 180]. (The greatest sustained-speed-claims in dogsledge-exploring history were those of toeless Hayes & Peary in the first marches when returning from their claimed farthest-norths of 1861 & 1909. It would seem that losing part of your feet is a prerequisite for high arctic speed. Must be it saves weight.)<sup>13</sup> [b] The claim of making a written record at the spot giving both its position coordinates to within about a mile but based on *one* Sumner line [see RT fn 13 on this canard], itself founded upon a single observation of one solar limb<sup>14</sup> though the alleged record refers to “observations”. (See WP 210 opp; F12,

<sup>10</sup> At his cape#9 (well north of 81°N by his account), he claims he can see 70 miles (HB8:28).

<sup>11</sup> HO 375. See fn 17.

<sup>12</sup> Even if it were at Cape Collinson, no one has looked for it there.

<sup>13</sup> *DIO* 4.2 ‡8 fn 5. This piece of science is as serious as A.A.Milne’s suggestion (*Winnie-the-Pooh* 1926 Chap.8) that explorers embarking on a swift polar dash should eat all their food at the start of the journey, so they won’t have so much to carry. (Note the date of Milne’s book: Chap.8 was obviously inspired by then-current polar activities, primarily of Byrd — as well as of Amundsen, Wilkins, and others.)

<sup>14</sup> Even so eminent and able an explorer as Bob Bartlett, in his famous 1909 April Fool’s Day sight, wrongly applied his refraction & semidiameter *before* dividing his double altitude by two. (By good fortune, the effects virtually cancelled out in his case.) Navigators are referred to the details of his curious observation (PM 0313, PZ 359, RR 29), needlessly single-limb, and the comments on it at RR note d and RT §A4. This historic purportedly-meridian [§A11] observation is supposed to be the last independent verification of Peary’s position before the Pole was allegedly reached a few days later. But, just as Hayes in 1861 had done, Bartlett on 1909/4/1 inexplicably (F87-88, 116, 136) claimed to be near the 70° longitude while taking no data to support that claim — determining not position but merely one Sumner line, based upon just one single-limb observation (§A8). Bartlett’s odd behavior & varied whereabouts around this time have been elaborately explained (e.g., PZ 266-268, F104f). Even the official story is weird enough: that he left camp alone & without sledge and dangerously walked far out of sight for hours — and then returned allegedly just-in-time to make the meridian sight & do some sloppy arithmetic. (Both these last tasks he said took but “a few minutes” in all [F142] — thus, contra the protests of Bartlett & NGS’ NavFou pp.56-57, he did not take the time required to confirm culmination — i.e., the sight did not find longitude. It is entertaining to watch the NavFou scorn Willis’ method of finding full position — while trusting meridian sights to do so! This is the NavFou’s central navigational argument explaining Peary’s aim at the Pole, even though [a] No explorer whom we know got to the Pole has ever even *claimed* he got to the Pole by the NavFou’s amusingly tedious method. [b] The NavFou’s clincher-example — that Amundsen in 1911 reached the S.Pole the NavFou way — has been shattered by Ted Heckathorn at RT. [c] Peary’s diary states only one [very different] method, which was so crude that he later suppressed mention of it. (See likewise at HCD.) After this, Bartlett had tea and was photographed and then departed southward for land by dog-sledge at 3 PM. (BD 1909/4/1. Bartlett’s diary, AGS: copy relayed here thanks to Ted Heckathorn. The sledge was pre-packed: *idem*. The expedition carried Atlantic Standard Time [AST]: 60°W.) But RT §A3 noted that Peary said (SPH 305) Bartlett’s departure was immediately after the sight, which makes sense. (Unless tea & a photo took well over 2 hours.) Which puts the sight either long after local noon (which may explain his §A11 Hayesian affinity for the lone single-limb sight — odd in so crucial a situation), or far west of the claimed meridian. If Bartlett really took a meridian sight around 12:40 PM AST

24-25 [& notes], 49, 285.)

**A9** And both men represent a common tragedy: despite excellent early work, bought with enormous sacrifice of pieces of their lives and (literally) of their bodies, the need for continual backing led to exaggeration and corruption. There are, however, two major differences between Hayes and Peary.

[a] Peary was one of the great explorers of history. Hayes, no.<sup>15</sup>

[b] Peary had the good luck to have his 2 farthest north frauds (1906/4/21, 1909/4/6-7) occur on sea-ice without recognizable landmarks and where no cairn-record could be left to mark the actual spot of attainment. Hayes was not so fortunate.

**A10** The alleged Hayes farthest-north cairn-record (text at HO 351) stated he was at the *coastal* position 81°35'N, 70°30'W. Three nmi north<sup>16</sup> of his last astronomical sight allegedly at 81°32'N. However, this point is actually way inland (Ellesmere Island). Except on<sup>17</sup> Kane-Morton's erroneous 1854 map! — and Hayes' suspiciously similar 1867 one.

**A11** Despite the fact that full position-determination (latitude & longitude) requires multiple sights, Hayes produced only a (lone) single-limb latitude “observation” (HB8:31, SH 20) within a latitude-degree of his claimed farthest-north latitude. Indeed, all of his most northern 1861 latitude-claims are supported by (flawed) single-limb sextant observations (HB8:23, 31, 35, 36, 38; SH 20-21), which is odd since: [a] All his longitude observations for the same period use both limbs. (The reverse procedure makes more sense.) [b] All his (mostly excellent: §J4) 1854 sextant data *for latitude*, taken in the same east Ellesmere region, are double-limb. The obvious suggestion here is that the other limb was tried in 1861 but (due to nonconstancy of solar altitude so far from culmination) did not exhibit the correct implicit solar diameter — and so the upper-limb data were not recorded.<sup>18</sup> The implied reason for the proposed anomaly: Hayes' chronometer had stopped (SH 22) on or before 1861/5/13, and it was now over an hour slow. Observations attempted at chronometer-noon would thus produce a false latitude,<sup>19</sup> high by roughly 1/2 a degree, which is about what we find for all these latitudes, depending on how far before chronometer noon he started observing. The sole, glaring exception is the farthest-north site, which is off<sup>20</sup> by 1° 1/2.

(*though no chronometer time is written on his record of it*) and was still in camp as late as 3 PM (as all testimony agrees he was), then there is no excuse for his not taking an observation for longitude at that time. (Peary tried to mislead Congress by indicating that the Sun was too low for longitude shots: SPH 317, F231. [See [www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf) §H6.] But see RT fn 3 on the surprising ability, of sun-shots on bearings c.30° apart, to give accurate position.)

<sup>15</sup>But are we being circular here? Suppose Hayes' fraud had been on water and thus not detected, and suppose the War Between the States had not come on, would hero Hayes have returned with now-gloriously-massive backing to open up the Arctic? The exaggerations of Peary & Byrd both helped lay the fiscal basis for later legitimate and (esp. in Byrd's case) epochally pioneer geographical work.

<sup>16</sup>Just the difference between 81°35'N (HO 351) & 81°32'N (SH 20). And see HB8:31 & HO 346.

<sup>17</sup>KA 1:4-5 (photocopy VK 128-129 plate #10).

<sup>18</sup>See similar case (1909) at fn 14.

<sup>19</sup>Thus, Hayes' new chart (HO 72 opp, SH i opp) destroyed all his own genuine and accurate 1854 pioneer cartography (§J4) in the same region — done as part of a brave and productive trip, capped by an admirably swift desperate light-sledge final dash across smooth bay ice (HO 325) from Cape Frazer back to the ship 1854/5/28-6/1. (Hayes lost his toes later that year, due to frostbite incurred [KA 1:440, 444] during his mutinous trip.)

<sup>20</sup>GE 289: “In justice to Hayes it should be said that the latitude of his ‘farthest’ depended solely on a single observation with a small field sextant of the meridian altitude of the sun . . . . [The result of such a sight] depends . . . on the honesty of the observer . . . the index of a very small sextant may be misread by a whole degree.” (Which would affect the deduced latitude by but a half-degree, merely 1/3 of the claimed latitude's error.) The difficulties with both these excuses are set out here in the main text (§A11): Hayes' error, if purely on the sextant arc, was three degrees (in double altitude); and his dependence (*for latitude*) upon a lone single-limb reading was his own (evidently deliberate) decision — and was at variance with his own consistent navigational practice (1854 data & 1861 longitude data). These are the traces of deliberate deception, not innocent oversight. It should be added that Greely's remark on honesty may well betray his true private opinion. He later recognized that Cook & Peary

**A12** But Hayes' misreport cannot be innocent. He had to notice something amiss:

[A] His implicit final-leg speeds were absurd.

[B] The Sun was declining unmissably (nearly an arcmin/timemin), not culminating, during his latitude sights. (See similarly at fn 14.)

[C] After his chronometer allegedly stopped for more than an hour, his compass variation would seem to have suddenly shifted<sup>21</sup> by a huge angle.

## B Hoaxery Giveaways & a Peak-Speculation

The signs of deception are too frequent & plain in Hayes' 1861 reports:

**B1** If he'd really believed in his farthest at the time, a cairn-record would probably have turned up.

**B2** Another point with obvious implications: from 1861/4/24 (HO 315) thru 1861/5/11 (HO 332), Hayes' book gives *dated* diary excerpts for every single day of his sledge dash for a farthest: “my last throw” (HO 343). From that point on, he gives only a 5/15 entry (HO 342) — then we are given no dates until he quotes the alleged 5/19 farthest-cairn-record (HO 351), and then no more dates until 6/3 (HO 363), when he's back on board ship! (Yet another [§A8] resemblance to Peary, especially to the latter's ill-thought-out but lately somewhat redeemed<sup>22</sup> 1906 Farthest-North exaggeration: F69.) At HO 365 (1861/6/4), he says he made no entries for the return trip. (Familiarly similar to fakers Peary&Byrd: [www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf) p.105's 2003-added notes.) He there describes his “field-diary”: “That water-soaked and generally delapidated-looking book”. He then quotes from the last entry (at Snow Storm Camp) before he stopped writing in it for awhile — but he does not (as for all other diary excerpts) give us the date of this entry. We'll see below (§§B9-B16) that Snow Storm Camp in particular gave Hayes trouble re getting his story straight.

**B3** Near his farthest, Hayes reported (HO 339) that he observed no land to the east. As we saw above (§A6), Greely took this as evidence of Hayes' failure to get to his claimed latitude since Kennedy Channel narrows so drastically there that Greenland is visible. But the more significant evidence is of deliberate deceit. Hayes says (HO 348) he climbed c.800 ft to view his nearly-Open<sup>23</sup> Polar Sea. In “very clear” (HB8:28) weather just south of his farthest, he could see (& HB8:28 has a *clearly-defined* drawing of) “Three very low headlands”. These are Cape Wilkes (Hayes' cape#12), Cape J.Good (#13), & Cape Lawrence (#14), the last being c.30 nmi away. How could he not then also see the east side of Kane Basin's north end: Cape Madison, 34 nmi away? (C.Madison's sealevel foot would be visible at height 800'.) Or see beyond to the peak (c.550 m high) 43 nmi away just north of Greenland's Wright Bay? (At sealevel, a 550 m peak is visible over Earth-curvature at less than 50 nmi.) There's a curious ending to his comments at HB8:28's bottom: “Cape 14 [Lawrence] was clearly visible from Cape 9 [cape 10 = SE corner Cape Collinson]. It appeared flat as represented in sketch. I estimated its distance from C.9 [Cape 10] at about 70 miles. [Actual distance c.30 nmi.] The atmosphere was very clear” — but there is another

had faked their North Pole attainments, but he never publicly said more than that they had failed. Note: Hayes' pocket sextant's index-error was 1° 1/2, peculiarly high. It is initially tempting to blame the farthest-north mistake (also about 1° 1/2) upon this factor. However: [i] Since a double-altitude was measured, the effect is only 45'. [ii] The 1861/5/14 observation (HB8:23, SH 20) taken near (HB8:23 sketch, HO 336) Cape Frazier would put the Sun higher than it ever gets there on that date.

<sup>21</sup>During observations for magnetic variation (SH 84-85), the effect (a shift of almost 20° in the relation of compass to naively timed solar azimuth) could not be missed.

<sup>22</sup>Though Peary padded his latitude by 36 nmi, he really achieved on 1906/4/21 a Farthest North at 86° 1/2 N: see [www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf) §B10.

<sup>23</sup>At HI 158 (1861), Hayes admits he didn't actually *see* the massive open water he believed was there. (Though all the evidence he saw proved [he said: HO 349-350] that the Open Polar Sea was real and imminent in space & time.) Despite this trifling point, he eventually sold a whole book entitled *The Open Polar Sea* (1867).

word following which is heavily scratched-out. Assuming this passage was copied from the eliminated p.29, one wonders — did the continuation of the original passage mention what was on the eastern horizon? Note: the Hayes book's repeated, specific, explicit<sup>24</sup> reports (§B3) of nought visible to the east aren't found in HB8. In HB8's mutilated remains there's no comment on the point. Is his persistent avoidance of admitting seeing Greenland just protecting the myth of the Open Polar Sea?

**B4** A “hill-side” view at latitude 79° 8' N, between Capes Frazer & Knorr (HO 338-339): “The air was quite clear, and I commanded an uninterrupted view to the eastward. . . . I was struck with the circumstance that no land was visible to the eastward, as it would not have been difficult through such an atmosphere to distinguish land at the distance of fifty or sixty miles. It would appear, therefore, that Kennedy Channel is something wider than hitherto supposed.” And he returns to the matter (HO 375): “In plotting my survey I have been a little puzzled with the Washington Land [the westernmost part of Greenland north of the Kane Basin, and bounded on the west by Capes Jackson, Madison, & Jefferson] of Dr. Kane's map, and I am much tempted to switch it off twenty miles to the eastward; for it is not possible that Kennedy Channel can be less than fifty miles wide; and, since I believe that Smith Sound expands into the Polar Basin, I must look upon Washington Land merely as an island in its centre, — [punctuation *sic*] Kennedy Channel lying between it and Grinnell [Ellesmere] Land on the west, and Humboldt Glacier filling up what was once a channel on the right.” Yet the fact is that: *for a week*, Hayes was less than 50 miles from the Greenland coast he claims never to have seen. (An upside-down explorer: denying lands he really saw, while pretending to have been places he hasn't. Prototype for Doc Cook: F91-92.)

**B5** At his farthest, Hayes speaks of a sharp peak atop the scene, and he illustrates it with a looming high conical peak in his picture of the scene (HO 346 opp). The catch? There's a detailed Hayes drawing (HB8:28) of the scene from nearby, also a coastal-map (HB8:31), but no such striking conical mountain is shown or mapped. (One exists at 2500' on Cape Collinson's NE tip, but dwarfed by a nearer over-3500' nonconical mountain.) Nor is such mentioned or depicted anywhere else in HB8's contemporary record. Instead, just south of the farthest, he speaks only of “very low headlands visible” (§B3). One can speculate he used his glimpse of distant Cape J.Good (cape#13 in HB8:28's drawing) to build a story that got him there and, seeing a bit of a 3000'-plus high mountain peaking-out from behind cape#12 at about cape#13's distance (visible in HB8:28's drawing), he arranged his story to accord with that, figuring later explorers would think he got at least to that point. Which at last explains why he left no cairn-record there — he couldn't throw that far.

**B6** Unlike honest Morton (fn 33), neither Hayes (who did early polar photography & later visited other, lower-latitude parts of the Arctic) nor fellow Philadelphian George Knorr ever returned to the scene of their false farthest. With Hayes' reputation under attack, the most telling rejoinder would've been to join a later expedition & help find the alleged cairn.

**B7** Hayes' original story<sup>25</sup> was that his farthest-north of 81° 35' N occurred on 1861/5/18. However, he alters<sup>26</sup> a number of dates in his records (e.g., fn 40), and when the official (SH 20: Smithsonian Institution) version of the supporting solar datum appeared, the

<sup>24</sup> At HB8:25 (1861/5/15), Hayes' sketch from “on hillside about 200 feet elevation” shows the coastal lands (which he is heading for) and says at the drawing's farthest visible part: “Last visible land from Friday's camp [1861/5/17 camp].” Written over Cape 14 (C.Lawrence) on the view-sketch at HB8:28 is “furthest visible land”. From such labels, some may see an implication that no land was visible to the east. From the 5/15 location, which is well to the south of the 5/17 farthest, it may indeed be that he saw no land to the east — where the nearest, Greenland's Cape Madison, is almost 50 nmi distant. But Cape Madison is only 34 nmi from 5/17's Cape Collinson, nearly the same as that of distinctly-visible (and clearly drawn: HB8:28) Cape Lawrence.

<sup>25</sup> E.g., HI 157; NYT 1861/11/15:3:1 (AGS); APS 8:388; original: NYT 1861/10/10:5:3.

<sup>26</sup> See hoaxer Frederick Cook at work similarly, e.g., BR 808, 899.

farthest-sight date had become<sup>27</sup> 1861/5/17. Slight problem: the solar declination (additive during the datum's §C1 computational reduction) increased 13' between the noons of those two dates. Thus, the solar altitude “datum” that had put him at 81° 32' N for 1861/5/17 would instead for 1861/5/18 (the date Hayes never deviated from)<sup>28</sup> put Cape#10 at 81° 45' N, though his alleged Cape#11 cairn-record said (HO 351) after traveling north from there he was at 81° 35' N. Re-read the previous sentence and you'll see why Schott altered the Cape#10 date to 1861/5/17 and ultimately abandoned acceptance of Hayes' reports.

**B8** Simple explanation: it is obvious that Hayes altered dates & cape-numbers extensively in HB8 near (& after) the farthest. (Reason: §B25.) But in this instance, he got majorly-careless and — believing it was simply a matter of forgery-by-pen to move a 5/17 observation to 5/18 (as part of stretching his story's timeline: fn 37) — he forgot that the Sun moves! Thus, the 5/17 solar double-altitude would not put him at the same place on 5/18. Hayes' stubborn insistence *even 5 years* later (fn 27) on the validity of his date, latitude, and data — though they **cannot** be reconciled — proves that this golden boy of the academic societies was either incompetent, demented, or dishonestly stonewalling. (All of the above? Perhaps not probable. But possible — after all, DIO readers are familiar with modern society-sweethearts who fill all three categories simultaneously.)

**B9** As if the foregoing were not enough, AGS archivist Lynn Mullins found in 1971 (F25) that a leaf has been *scissored*<sup>29</sup> out of Hayes' navigational journal at the farthest-north. I.e., HB8:29-30 are missing. (Also notable: there is another leaf cut out between pp.26&27 — but in the earlier case, the pagination [in Hayes' hand] does not break.)

**B10** It would be pleasant to suppose that this is the page Hayes mentions (HO 351) tearing out of his notebook for his 1861/5/18-19 cairn-record. But this is demonstrably untrue. As discovered 1996/12/10 (subsequent to *Peary . . . Fiction*): on HB8:31 (the page containing the sextant data allegedly from the farthest north), there is a bit of mirror-image writing visible about 30% of the way down the page at HB8:31 (the reader can view it for himself at: [www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB31](http://www.dioi.org/hay.htm#HB31)) — a tell-tale item that was inadvertently printed onto p.31 when Hayes hastily closed his record-book HB8 too-immediately after writing upon p.30 — so that p.31 (HB8:31) *accidentally became the blotter for the still-wet portion of the ink*<sup>30</sup> on now-missing p.30. The revealing words are “Snow Storm Camp”, the next-northernmost camp, thus dubbed during the return south when hit by a blizzard. It's Hayes' cape#7 on HB8:28's coastal-map, becoming cape#9 on HB8:31's. Same page: camp 2nmi north of that, “Furthest camp” (cape#10), & “Highest point reached” (cape#11) 3nmi north of it. Hayes later gave the name “Cape Lieber” to this pseudo-sacred pseudo-

<sup>27</sup> There is simply no denying a contradiction here: [a] Hayes' handwritten record dates the farthest to 1861/5/18, and his book (HO 351) makes it 5/18-19 and the alleged cairn-record is (*idem*) dated 1861/5/19; yet [b] at SH 20, Hayes' computer Chas. Schott reduces the observation for 1861/5/17. There are several places in the observation-book (e.g., HB8:36f) indicating that Hayes later altered some dates by a day. (On HB8:32, he had two midnights on 5/19 — and one of the midnight events had been 10 AM at the top of this page, until he scratched it out and — at the end of the same page — rewrote the 14<sup>h</sup>-later report of the same event's occurring: fn 39.) And, while HB8:32 has Hayes reaching Snow Storm Camp (well on the way home) at midnight of 1861/5/18-19, the cairn-record allegedly deposited at the *previous* camp was (HO 351) dated 1861/5/19. (HI 157 reports he went northward 3 days after reaching “Carl Ritter Bay” [now called Scoresby Bay] on 1861/5/16, which is consistent with the farthest being 5/19. But HB8:25 & HO 342 has him reaching this bay on 5/15.)

<sup>28</sup> In an 1866 preface to his book, Hayes complains (HO viii) about a little 2' difference for his claimed farthest latitude (Schott's map disagreeing with Hayes' alleged latitude by this slight amount) — oblivious to the glaring 13' contradiction cited here & at §B25. I cannot imagine that Schott would have overruled Hayes on this key matter unless he had seen enough even by 1866 (published in 1867: SH) to convince him the farthest was not well-founded. He later openly disbelieved it: fn 43.

<sup>29</sup> The cut edge has a tiny jagged place. (On the same line as the double-altitude on HB8:31.)

<sup>30</sup> Odd that an explorer in the field would use ink instead of pencil, in a region where a rise in winter temperature above freezing is unusual. At HO 323 (1861/4/28), Hayes remarks that the temperature is —12°F outside, +22°F inside, therefore still 10°F below freezing.

point (fn 57), of which he provides (opp HO 346) his own science-fiction drawing-rendition: “The Shores of the Polar Sea” — a scene that to this day has eluded a firm<sup>31</sup> match — for reasons discussed elsewhere here: §B5.)

**B11** “Snow Storm Camp” must have been the last words written in an entry on p.30, which is why the previous words were too dry to register on the opposite page — when the book was closed and the ink (that remained wet) soaked onto p.31. But p.31’s cape#9 (Cape McClintock, p.28’s cape#7) *only became known as Snow Storm Camp* at the bottom of p.31 because of a terrible storm occurring there (HB8:31-32) during the southward<sup>32</sup> return.

**B12** Hayes obviously destroyed a pp.29-30 account that took him north and back to Cape McClintock — “Snow Storm Camp” — and revised that account on p.31 where he re-lives and writes “Snow Storm Camp” again. That’s fraud. Note: it could’ve been detected in 1861 or 1973 had societies or DR closely examined p.31.

**B13** On p.28 of HB8, Hayes is at camp#7, and obviously had returned to it by p.30 (since he there gives it the southward name, “Snow Storm Camp”: §B11) but, after pp.29-30 was removed, our academic-society gold-medal hero re-lives<sup>33</sup> the adventure all over again!<sup>34</sup> — crowding his arrival at cape#10<sup>35</sup> (farthest-north alleged sextant sight) and camp#11 (farthest-north reached) and back to camp#10 and to #7 all on this one page, HB8:31 . . .

**B14** The alleged Furthest-Camp sextant lower-limb double altitude, 56°52’ (HB8:31 & SH 20), is the only sextant observation in the Hayes records that does not have lines (in the notebook) all to itself — in this case, it is crowded into an odd blank upper-left corner in Hayes’ large sketch-map of the region. Was it placed there after removal of HB8:29-30, to help fill in the lacunae thus created? By Hayes’ own account, there are no other observations anywhere near the farthest sight (camp#10) — the closest he (inadequately) puts 85 nmi to the south (SH 20). Thus, this one lone<sup>36</sup> sight is the entire case for Hayes’ farthest.

**B15** HB8:31 says: “Returned to Cape 10 and lunched. Displayed flags.”<sup>37</sup> Returned to Cape 9 [Cape#7] for observations.” Next line (end of p.31): “Snow Storm Camp”. (The very words that ended the original of this entry when it existed on HB8:30.) But no observations were made on the return at cape#7 (HB8:32). “Thick snow falling and blowing a gale from the north. No chance for observations. Started south, 10 o'clock A.M. Snow deep. Dogs exhausted & starved. Reached Jensen’s Camp at midnight.”

**B16** Possibly the §B15 stress on wanting observations at cape#9 [#7] would be slightly superfluous if Hayes had already taken sights at cape#10, as later alleged. (At the top of

<sup>31</sup> But see fn 7. The Hayes “sketch” that is said to have formed the basis for this (artist’s) drawing isn’t in HB8. There’s some slight resemblance to the scene Hayes depicts south of Cape Knorr (1861/5/15, HB8:25), but there are likely many similar vistas in the region.

<sup>32</sup> See HO 365, or compare HB8:28 vs. HB8:31.

<sup>33</sup> Victor Borge (*My Favorite Intervals* 1971 Chap.11) on the musical genius Modest Moussorgsky (an alcoholic credited by Borge with diminishing more fifths than any composer in history): he “left bits & pieces of a dozen unfinished operas. . . . Another famous Moussorgsky piece was *Night on Bald Mountain*. He managed to not finish that one four times. Moussorgsky’s greatest achievement was his opera *Boris Godonov*, and one of the remarkable things about it is that he really did finish it himself. It made him feel so good that two years later he finished it all over again. [Rimsky Korsakov couldn’t believe it, so he finished it a third time, just to make sure.]”

<sup>34</sup> Bryce notes that Cook relived parts of his 1908 trip, too, creating similar problems for his account: DIO 21 ‡4 [www.dioi.org/JL04.pdf].

<sup>35</sup> Originally described (§B16) as cape #9. (He later wrote “10” over it.)

<sup>36</sup> On 5/19, which is the day he is supposed [fn 27] to be leaving his cairn record at his farthest [81°1/2 N], he is privately attempting to get observations (perhaps the most northern ones he actually ever attempted) at Jensen’s Camp, just south of 80°N fn 37, and writes up an entry-form (HB8:33) for the data — even preparing it for a double altitude (“Meridian Al. double”: HB8:33). But nothing is entered. Cloudy? Or depressing results?

<sup>37</sup> These two words jammed-in (small script) at end of line. Note another (§A8) parallel to Peary, who had to belatedly carat-in a reference to his crucial but nonexistent 1909/4/5 alleged observation. See DIO 1.1 ‡4 fn 17.

HB8:31, Hayes writes “10” over “9” to correct<sup>38</sup> the number of the cape he reached at 2 AM on 1861/5/18<sup>39</sup> and his final story (HB8:31 & SH 20) has his northernmost observations performed at cape#10. Given the weather (HB8:33) and the foregoing (§B16), one wonders: were there any sextant observations at all in this region?

**B17** But, if Hayes took too few (if any) observations near his farthest, he certainly made up for the deficit in a big way on 1861/5/21-22, when he became the first explorer in history to make three noon sights<sup>40</sup> in two days. (Which perhaps implies he went over the Pole and back, though he forgot to say so.)

**B18** The difference between 81°32’N (claimed as farthest sextant sight latitude: §A10) & 80°02’N (real: §A4) is 90 nmi. Understand: the top latitude had to be extra-stretched<sup>41</sup> this time to *barely* beat the **previous** exaggeration, Kane’s 81°22’N — a leap-frauding<sup>42</sup> fabrication-farce finally cut short by the accurate 1871-1882 work of C.Hall, G.Nares-A.Markham-L.Beaumont, and A.Greely-J.Lockwood-D.Brainard.

**B19** Besides mismapping<sup>43</sup> Kennedy Channel through his wild guesses (HO 72 opp & SH i opp vs. GSC 120) about shores he had not been near, Hayes capped his 1861 May fantasy by claiming his (HO 349, 351, 359f) *own* verifying look onto Kane’s non-existent Open Polar Sea! (For a brief summary of Hayes’ claims & evidential lacunae, see F24-26.

<sup>38</sup> Similarly, at p.28 (top), cape#8 is twice renumbered, once to cape#9, once to cape#10. When an explorer is padding his distance, it is tempting to pad his number of marches. Even the great Peary tried in 1909 to pull the very same trick: F284-285.

<sup>39</sup> One can speculate that this HB8:31 entry (top of page) originally recorded arrival at cape#9 [#7] going southward, and that the rest of the text on this page is a pastiche of later insertions. The recording of his return to cape#9 [#7] appears instead at the top of the next page (HB8:32) for 5/19: “Reached Snow Storm Camp about midnight”. But the next line (“Reached Jensen’s Camp. 10 ock A.M.”) has been heavily scratched out. (Jensen’s Camp was near Cape Knorr [Hayes’ cape#6, later named for his sole companion on the most northern marches — with whom he did not share the sextant: SH 20], as shown in his sketch on HB8:27.) At the bottom of this page, he rearranges things by now saying: “Reached Jensen’s Camp at midnight.” (Such an item would normally go in the next day’s record.) It is not possible that Hayes confused camps here, since Jensen was waiting for him at Camp Jensen. The 14<sup>h</sup> difference here (scratched-out 10 A.M. vs final version midnight) suggests Hayes inserted an extra day’s worth of pseudo-activity to leave time for the great distance needed to explain his recent claimed farthest, but the ploy then led to calendaric foulups — later necessitating this padding’s removal by Schott: fn 27.

<sup>40</sup> HB8:35-38. Hayes’ allegedly-meridian lower-limb double-altitudes are: 61°14’ for 5/21 (HB8:35), 61°48’ for 5/22 (HB8:36), and 62°34’ for 5/22 (HB8:38). See SH 20-21. Hayes reduced the middle one for 5/22, getting latitude 80°05’N (HB8:35) — which is almost exactly his actual farthest north — but then alters the date by scratching a “1” over the latter “2” to convert 5/22 to 5/21 — evidently forgetting that HB8:35 had already recorded a quite different value for 5/21. (We understand why one of Hayes’ stops was called Bewildered Camp: 1861/5/16 [HB8:27], not long before the farthest.)

<sup>41</sup> Keep in mind that Hayes’ 1861 arctic base was far south of Kane’s base, from which Hayes had failed even to cross 80°N in his 1854 thrust into the same region he was exploring in 1861 — which made it all the more incredible on its face that he could substantially better his previous latitude record. But, due to desperate effort, he did in fact manage to go about 20 nmi further in 1861.

<sup>42</sup> See later repeat when Peary exaggerates his genuine 1906 86°30’N Farthest by 36 nmi (fn 22 above) to convincingly best Cagni’s 1900 fake farthest claim of 86°34’N.

<sup>43</sup> South of Cape Frazer (79°43’N), Hayes 1861 mapping errors were modest & accidental. (I.e., problems arise just in the mostly-fantasized 112 nmi of grossly stretched coast from there to the claimed farthest: SH 19-22.) Chas. Schott (USCS: fn 33) in 1867 officially altered (for Smithsonian publication) the dates of Hayes’ observations (SH 20-22 vs. HB8); and his revised calendar can be confirmed as being correct for 1861/5/13&22, by comparison of the longitude observations of those dates (SH 22) to the later-known chronometer error (*idem*). (Schott may have used this approach to check the dates; or, he could have sought the testimony of Hayes’ companion Knorr.) GE 289 reports that Schott later rejected Hayes’ latitude claims. (See also fn 27.) Schott may have held off from public comment as long as he did in part because during the 1860s, he became a member of the Amer Philos Soc, presumably through Hayes’ intercession.



And note VK 173 on Hayes' proven deceit about the Kane mutiny.)

**B20** It was only years later that the truth was learned; Tyson's diary 1871/8/28 (in Kennedy Channel, moving northward on Hall's ship *USS Polaris*, into the unknown — TD 148 [NN 1:101]): "We have now gained [Hayes' claimed farthest north] lat.  $81^{\circ}35'N$ . *Can't make any thing out of the charts.*" (Based upon the maps of Kane and Hayes.) Later in the day (TD 148): "*Here should be the open sea*, but there is land on both sides of us!" — the ship now well into Kennedy Channel.

**B21** Nonetheless, as late as 1867 June, Smithsonian Institution Sec'y, admirably idealistic Jos. Henry, was taking Hayes' claims seriously, extensively publishing Hayes' fake astronomical data in the Smithsonian Contributions #196, prefacing these with his (Henry's) detailed recounting of Hayes' phony geography and crediting him with a farthest of  $81^{\circ}37'N$  on 1861 May *eighteenth* (see SH x) — this, we again emphasize, prefatory to a volume in which the farthest sextant-sight is reduced (SH 20) for May *seventeenth*. (See §B7 above.)

**B22** Hayes' 1867 book on his 1860-1861 expedition was capped with a finale which not even a university president could excel: a plea for the marriage of Christianity ("the one true religion") and science — to dispel superstition forever (HO 454). The book's title? — *The Open Polar Sea*. Hayes, like Kane a Philadelphian, dedicated (HO iii) the volume to the memory of William Parker Foulke, chairman (APS 8:382) of the American Philosophical Society committee whose "influences" (APS 8:383) were so critical in turning Hayes' 1860 dreams into his 1861 dreams.

**B23** Some questions remain: When did Hayes decide to hoax the world? A clue comes from the fact that (since he did not prepaginate his navigation notebook: §B9) he must have eliminated pp.29-30 after pagination.

**B24** This suggests a late decision to commit fraud. Why such a delay? Simple explanation: on 1861/5/17, Hayes expected (HO 351) that next season would see his ship attain to a new farthest — so there was as yet no need to fake a farthest. But, when the ship turned out to be so leaky that he had to head for home, the pressure was on: how to justify his disastrous expedition? A fake farthest was just what the Doctor ordered.

**B25** The theory that Hayes decided to invent his farthest only late-in-the-game also explains the clumsy nature of the fake: the rearranging of dates, camp-numbers, cutting out a key page, jamming out-of-place fake-data (and fantasy drawn-capes) onto already-filled pages. All of which led Hayes into his most transparent blunder: having already announced his farthest as  $81^{\circ}35'N$  (no later than 1861/11/14 [§B7], perhaps alot earlier, to his associates), he moved his northernmost observation from 1861/5/17 to 5/18 to add to his story the time necessary to get so far north from Cape Frazer — and (after destroying HB8:30) thus the alleged latitude observation originally faked for 1861/5/17 was crammed onto HB8:31 (§B8) — ultimately leading to the astronomically-hilarious spectacle of Hayes trying (fn 27) to insist that an observation of true solar altitude<sup>44</sup>  $H = 27^{\circ}.9$  — faked for<sup>45</sup> a time when the Sun's declination was  $19^{\circ}26'$  (1861/5/17 4:40 GMT) — could still give the same result for a time 24<sup>h</sup> later when the Sun's declination  $\delta = 19^{\circ}39'$  (1861/5/18 4:40 GMT). (After transfer, this would yield  $81^{\circ}45'N$  instead of the official [SH 20] result,  $81^{\circ}32'N$ .)

## C Farcest North: Ethics-Inversion by Digit-Inversion

**C1** Hayes' fraud couldn't have been simpler: his sole double altitude sextant shot of the Sun's lower limb providing the expedition's Farcest North latitude was published by him as  $56^{\circ}52'$  (HB8:31). After correction for I.E.  $1^{\circ}31'$  (*ibid*), this was  $55^{\circ}21'$ , & after standard halving to  $27^{\circ}40'1/2$  and subtracting  $1'.8$  r&p, adding  $15'.8$  sd produces true solar altitude

<sup>44</sup>SH 20. Unavoidably implicit (within  $1'$ ) at HB8:31.

<sup>45</sup>Latitude  $\phi = 90^{\circ} - \delta + H$ . So, for 5/17,  $\phi = 90^{\circ} - 27^{\circ}.9 + 19^{\circ}26' = 81^{\circ}32'N$  (SH 20). Whereas, for 5/18,  $\phi = 90^{\circ} - 27^{\circ}.9 + 19^{\circ}39' = 81^{\circ}45'N$  (F25).

$27^{\circ}.9$ , so subtracting all from solar SPD  $109^{\circ}26'.0$  (declination [SH 20]  $\delta = 29^{\circ}26'.0 + 90^{\circ}$ ), produces latitude  $L = 81^{\circ}32'N$ . Adding 3 miles travel from the place of the sextant sight to the expedition's farthest north gives the latitude claimed by Hayes in his published accounts and allegedly written on the document allegedly left at this place:  $81^{\circ}35'N$ .

**C2** However, by comparing Hayes' HB8:31 coast-sketch of this area to the actual topography — a comparison made exact by an arroyo-valley right next to the spot and recognizably distinct on both HB8:31 and modern maps — we find the farthest's actual latitude was  $80^{\circ}05'N$ , which is what we likely would've found on HB8:29-30, but for the leaf's removal. The exaggeration was  $1^{\circ}30' = 90' = 90$  nmi: enhancing meridian-sight Cape 10's latitude from  $80^{\circ}02'$  to  $81^{\circ}32'$ . To achieve it, all Hayes had to do during his reworking of removed HB8:29-30 was to **INVERT** the "9" in his sextant datum,  $59^{\circ}52'$  to become a "6": the *very same* digit, but just *as-seen-from-a-different-perspective*, after all.

**C3** Re-do the math EXACTLY like §C1 above, but with input  $59^{\circ}52'$  (instead of  $56^{\circ}52'$ ), and it will by simple indoor calculation yield latitude  $L = 80^{\circ}02'N$ ; so, Hayes' outdoor achievement after walking 3 nmi north (from Cape 10 where he took the sextant sight) was  $80^{\circ}05'N$  — which is indeed precisely the real latitude of the NE corner of Cape Collinson. The 160<sup>y</sup>-old mystery of Isaac Israel Hayes' Farcest North is thus finally&exactly resolved.

**C4** In polar history, there has never been anything quite like this prank. Though, more broadly: Corner's non-retraction and the behavior and philosophy (www.dioi.org/jm00.pdf) of the modern Muffia speak eloquently for the enduring vitality of that precious spirit that will resort to any tactic — no matter how low — to hold out for one's position even when the evidential situation is hopeless.

## D Historical Smoothing

**D1** The former head of the chagrined Royal Geographical Society (1867 bestower of its gold medal upon Hayes: JRG 37:cx-cxiv) privately admitted that he "turned out to be a regular imposter"<sup>46</sup> — though, as usual, nothing of the sort was said publicly by the RGS (MG 90, ML 299-300, MR 83f). Despite Markham's blunt private awareness, no official history of the arctic refers to Hayes as anything stronger than: undependable.<sup>47</sup> Typical. Honest Amer Philos Soc chief Corner's account of Hayes' later career mentions none of this, wrongly stating (CK 273) that Hayes got beyond the Kane Basin in 1861; consultation of the *Encycl Brit* (1961 11:286) could have prevented such a mis-statement.

**D2** Incidental note that would hardly gladden Dr. Corner, M.D.: the US' three clumsiest polar storytellers — Kane, Hayes, & Cook — were all M.D.s.<sup>48</sup> (Back in the era<sup>49</sup> when a general practitioner's ministrations were as likely to harm as help his patients, perhaps bedside-manner-bluff was the prime key to success in the field.) It is also enlightening to note that the only one of the three ever attacked (e.g., AGR 5:140-141, 43:129-130) in US geographical journals was also the only one who publicly criticized the societies (e.g., CM 543-544).

The **Bibliography & Reference-Key** for the foregoing is provided at the end of the previous article, at pp.21-22.

<sup>46</sup>Scott Polar Research Institute ms#367/13/2 (1909/9/5). RGS ex-Pres. Clements Markham to RGS Pres. Leonard Darwin.

<sup>47</sup>E.g., *Encycl Brit* 1961 2:300. Part of the problem may be simply this: when the proofs of Hayes' fabricated geography first came out (1871 & 1876), he was still alive and able to sue. So public remarks then were muted — but these softened opinions were the prime basis of later commentary (since most "writers" are merely rehashers). History is full of similar cases, in which those who knew the inside truth were silent on the excuse that truth would eventually out — failing to face the fact that their very silence helped bury the truth.

<sup>48</sup>Hayes directed an army hospital during the War: H0 x.

<sup>49</sup>In fairness to Corner, his era was far different. And his expertise in some medical areas was high.

### ‡3 Peary&Byrd Fakes Still Obscure Amundsen First

# Long Lingered Apologia for Byrd's North Pole Hoax

## Fellow Pocahontas Descendants In-Denial

[See article's end for source-abbreviations.]

### A First Families

**A1** In 2013 appeared a 560pp book by Sheldon Bart, stimulatingly entitled *Race to the Top of the World: Richard Byrd and the First Flight to the North Pole*, with the jacket-juiced aim of rehabbing Adm. Byrd's and co-pilot Floyd Bennett's tattered claim to have been first by air to the North Pole of the Earth, flying from Spitzbergen's KingsBay allegedly to the Pole and back on 1926/5/9 in the Fokker trimotor airplane the *Josephine Ford*. The flight occurred 3<sup>d</sup> prior to the 1926/5/12 arrival at the Pole of the *Norge* dirigible expedition of Norway's Roald Amundsen, Ohio's Lincoln Ellsworth, and Italy's Umberto Nobile (who designed & copiloted the airship). The *Norge* reached the Pole on 1926/5/12, Ellsworth's birthday, and arrived a few days later at Pt.Barrow, Alaska. The shortest distance between KingsBay and Pt.Barrow being virtually over the North Pole, there was no doubt of the *Norge's* success, leaving only the question of whether Byrd's in&out flight had gone far enough to hit the Pole in the short time it was out of sight.

**A2** Defending Byrd's 1926 tale at this point is a Sisyphus errand, given the varied disproofs<sup>1</sup> revealed by *DIO* — primarily huge discrepancies between the Byrd diary's solar sextant data vs his official reports' (RX p.7&§§E-F&M-N).

**A3** None of these easily-indoor-fakable sextant data were shared with a companion, just like the prior polar fakes of Cagni, Cook, and Peary. On Amundsen's expeditions, by contrast, such data were taken by his co-explorers, both at the South Pole in 1911 and the North Pole in 1926. Similarly for Scott's 1912 South Pole data. CalTech's & *DIO's* Myles Standish (prime creator of the world's standard solar, lunar, & planetary tables) stresses that such sextant data are trivially easy to fake. (Used for over 100<sup>y</sup>, the standard Sumner-Line method of *genuine navigation* actually *requires* faking data, to compare to sextant data.) And: **the easiest places on Earth to fake sextant data for are the North&South Poles.**

**A4** Despite the foregoing problems, Bart's book is far from valueless. Same for Byrd himself, a celebrity-dynamo of skill and ambition, magnificently worth chronicling, which Bart does with exceptional readability and flair.

**A5** But the book's try at rehabbing Byrd's North Pole claim dodges the hard evidence. Indeed, the clearer the evidence, the clearer the dodge. Stranger yet is the exhaustive genealogical section's non-mention of what the Byrd family believed was the earliest and most imperial North American ancestor of Richard Evelyn Byrd, Jr.

<sup>1</sup>F263-264; RT ([www.dioi.org/j43b.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/j43b.pdf), *DIO* 4.3); *New York Times* 1996/5/9 p.1 ([www.nytimes.com/1996/05/09/did-byrd-reach-pole-his-diary-hints-no.html](http://www.nytimes.com/1996/05/09/did-byrd-reach-pole-his-diary-hints-no.html)); RU (*Polar Record* 36:25-50 [University of Cambridge] 2000, co-published with RX ([www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf), *DIO* 10).

### B Personal

**B1** From an early age, DR knew of Byrd both as hero and as remote relative, since DR's mother mentioned on occasion that his father Lou Rawlins, Jr. (1906/6/25-1942/10/16) was a distant cousin of the Byrds. As Manager & (1941-1942) Director of Baltimore's airport, Lou knew Byrd, along with other famous flyers of that era: Lindbergh, Balchen, Earhart, Doolittle. The cousinship was through the Bolling family of Virginia. The middle names of DR's 1<sup>st</sup> cousin were Bolling and Avirett (the latter in honor of his stepfather, lawyer John Williams Avirett, 2<sup>nd</sup>: 1902/5/13-1993/10/23).

**B2** So when, at Ohio State University's Byrd Polar Research Center, DR encountered Byrd-daughter Bolling Byrd Clarke for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time in 1997 Oct, DR immediately asked her (what he'd regretted not remembering to inquire about during his more focused 1996 trip to OSU): are you descended from Pocahontas? She replied: yes, how did you know? DR of course explained that, primarily, the very name Bolling had triggered the question.

**B3** Despite DR's doubt of her father's 1926/5/9 claim, she&DR always got along because [1] Bolling was an understanding and classy lady, and for a woman of her era unusually well educated: Swathmore. [2] I emphasized that on 1926/5/9 her father had gone virtually the full distance with respect to the polar air mass (which had betrayed his genuine try by contrarily moving south against him on that day). [3] I genuinely appreciated his considerable positive qualities.

**B4** But her younger sister<sup>2</sup> Kate Breyer (née Katherine Ames Byrd) — and mate Robert Breyer — were determined<sup>3</sup> to join Ohio State University (e.g., G3&57; RX ☉1) in defending the North Pole claim to-the-last. And *Race to the Top of the World IS* The-Last — the predictable fruit of their undeterable commitment.

### C Byrd's Greatness & Otherwise

**C1** *Race* portrays<sup>4</sup> Byrd as courageous, navigationally-expert, proactive, visionary, passionate, generous, a genius, conversant with Einstein's relativity, philosophical-contemplative, deterministic, assertively useful, moral, handsome&manly, and From-Good-Stock. Much of which is justified — but it is obvious that this is not a neutral book.

**C2** One of the less subtle symptoms of sidetaking: despite the book's admirable effort to be fair (compliments at, e.g., fn 6 below & BB3&251&340) to Byrd's chief 1926 PoleRace-competitor, Roald Amundsen — the greatest of all polar explorers (RX p.3) — Amundsen's kindnesses to Byrd are oddly deemed “perfunctory” & “intoned” (BB328&403).

**C3** Byrd genuinely was driven to deeds that contributed to mankind, usually speaking of how one or another of his ventures was for aviation & the future. He combined workaholicity and intelligence<sup>5</sup> to a rare degree and was a leader through those skills, not by oratorical

<sup>2</sup> Byrd had 3 children: Richard the 3<sup>rd</sup>, Bolling, & Katherine. The 1<sup>st</sup> DR never met, and was sad to hear that he lived not successfully & died badly c.1 mile south of where DR lives in Baltimore. Both daughters DR met simultaneously at Ohio State University on 1996/4/10 (one day before finding the diary evidence ending their father's NP claim), and was charmed by both, and especially noted immediately how much Kate looked like her dad.

<sup>3</sup>The analogy to Robert Peary's two acknowledged progeny is striking: Robert Jr. believed his father's 1909 N.Pole claim but didn't argue it. The other side of the family (“Snowbaby” Marie Peary Stafford Kuhne and son Ed Stafford) was adamant: never gave up fighting doubters.

<sup>4</sup>Respective cited Byrd virtues are found at BB 169&178&183-184&237&485, 230, 207, 471, 186&192, 311&448&452, 216, 179&294, 166&421, 148&165, 221, 164&187, 3&154, 151-171.

<sup>5</sup>In addition to his strength in math (BB179) and chess (BB301), Byrd showed mental agility in emergencies — like deftly concocting a fraud on the spur of a “hair-raising moment” (BB398) when in 1926 a motor began leaking (RX§B5), and tossing flares to crucially aid Balchen's perfect water landing of Byrd's airplane *America* in 1927 (BB483). Byrd was also a formidable testifier to Congress (BB257). He enjoyed performing magic tricks (BB301), and he invented imaginative fairytales not just for NGS' ambitions but for his children's happiness (BB35).

gifts (which he definitely lacked). He is now justly most-remembered for opening an entire continent to permanent access: Antarctica.

**C4** But like others he could bend truth for what he thought was a higher purpose. His 1925 encounter with veteran explorer Capt. Joseph Bernier is glossed over at BB147-148; but western Explorers Club chief Richard Finnie recalled that Bernier judged Byrd as deliberately deceiving. Dean Smith (uncited in BB), one of Byrd's top 1929 Antarctic pilots, described a clumsy deception by Byrd, to pretend he'd discovered Marie Byrd Land (F271). Smith and Larry Gould agree that Byrd did no celestial navigation in the Antarctic (RT fn 2). Byrd's good 1926/4/28 letter to his son (BB310) advises honor, even while he is on the verge of a theft of Amundsen's priority — an irony recalling Peary's parallel 1908/8/17 upright advice to his son (WP239, F208), before his own 1909 Pole imposition.

**C5** The spectacle of moralists so readily protecting holy fraud For-a-Higher-Purpose is an apt introduction to citing an astonishing coincidence:

History's two most dedicated protectors of science fraud — Peary's ([www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf)) and Ptolemy's ([www.dioi.org/pg.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/pg.pdf)), resp — were ultra-prominent scientist-politicians Isaiiah Bowman (Pres. Johns Hopkins Univ. & VP NatAcadSci) and Harvard Prof. Owen Gingerich, whom the American Astronomical Society actually advertised as “Mr. History of Astronomy” (AAS' *H.A.D. News* #51 2000 Feb p.2). The coincidence? Both were members of the very same imaginative cult, the Mennonites.

**C6** That Byrd smoked&drank is noted but not emphasized at BB57, yet over-smoking was an integral part of his meteoric personality. His problem with alcohol was so well-known among colleagues that scientist Thomas Poulter told B&D Rawlins that he personally destroyed all available booze during his Byrd Antarctic tenure, to protect against the men's overindulgence — and not just by Byrd. DR is old enough to have heard a Maryland Academy of Sciences recollection from the very early 1930s: when Byrd was to give a lecture locally, on arrival in Baltimore, he asked where there was a barber shop he could get a haircut at. But the MAS was so worried he'd instead go to a bar ere the lecture: they instead specially brought a barber to him.

**C7** But we are only beginning to plumb the extent of the book's omissions, which are key to — among other issues — Bart's case for Byrd's NP claim. Yet, before starting into those related to aviation and polar priority, there is one missing item sufficiently peculiar to justify taking it up first.

## D Blood & Noses

**D1** *Race* so admires Byrd's race that it devotes to his lineage and “illustrious family” (BB154) much of an entire chapter (BB151-171) entitled: “F.F.V.” — First Families of Virginia. (It's not a very shaky speculation that this portion most reflects the book's true intended audience: the family. Specifically Kate's branch.) The section includes a thorough trip through the family tree, e.g., Byrd's mother, alumna of the Episcopal Female Institute (BB162), and his wife, née Marie Ames, descended from the *Mayflower* of course — and, as Bart assures at BB186, possessor of “a straight nose”. (For contrast, rival explorer Amundsen's nose is described as massively “curved”).<sup>6</sup> The book's family-ancestry record starts centuries back — but, once we're past ancestors among the Vikings, the Battle of Hastings, Britain's Edward III, a Continental king & emperor, Charlemagne, etc, and finally get to 1630 and the arrival of Byrd-One-in-Virginia (BB154), we're already past princess Pocahontas (1595-1617) and her father Powhatan. (Who is identified as an “emperor” on

<sup>6</sup> Part of Bart's largely admiring picture of Amundsen at BB314: “His most prominent feature was his nose, a large protuberance as bold and curved as an eagle's beak. The size of Amundsen's nose has actually been recorded. A Seattle sculptor measured the explorer's physiognomy for a bust that was completed after the subject went north in 1926. The nose was three inches long. Amundsen's face, the artist declared, was ‘one of the strongest that I have ever modeled.’ He was a striking figure.”

Pocahontas' portrait.) Yet, despite DR's §B2 face-to-face confirmation of the sisters' belief in their descent from Powhatan and Pocahontas — the remotest recorded First Family of Virginia — this connexion<sup>7</sup> is totally left out of the book's minutely, lovingly detailed Byrd genealogy. The omission only becomes starker when we find that the book says (BB444) boozier and Byrd-transAtlantic-flight companion Bert Acosta's Indian genes help explain his volatility & free spirit. Further, the book mentions (BB36) that Byrd's frequent home-away-from-home in the 1920s was named for his imperial ancestor: the Powhatan Hotel on Pennsylvania Ave in Washington, one block from his workplace at the Old [now Eisenhower] Executive Office Building. On 1996/4/10, both sisters answered DR's query about whether he was a loving dad by laughingly saying [RX p.7]: yes — when he was home! Indeed, any measure of Byrd the man shouldn't miss the book's rich documentation (e.g., BB186-187, 308-310) of his pure and touchingly idealistic love of his wife & family. BB174 notes that he and Marie had known each other as friends since age 7! — and were close to an ideal love-story but for his adventurous absences.

**D2** It should here be added, to the foregoing quaint excesses (e.g., noses), that author Bart&I share the currently-verboten view that genetics matter — obviously along with nurture (incl. inherited connexions&wealth), the issue being only re proportions. Though there are failures (e.g., fn 2) in the Byrd family, success has occurred more than randomly. So, despite mod-orthodoxy's ban on the slightest fleck of common sense re genetics&success, DR shares Bart's and the Byrd family's view: it was not accidental that Byrd was a remarkable achiever from a family of achievers.

## E The Experts

**E1** We precede analysis of the Byrd-defense's omissions regarding aviation by weighing the reliability of author Bart's science and that of the experts he cites, including Byrd.

**E2** The expertise of Byrd is critically discussed at, e.g., RX§§G&P, where it is demonstrated that he knew navigation in theory (RX fn 21) but was prone to several types of serious miscues in practice. These were not responsible for his 1926/5/9 shortfall — but they were critical to undoing his later attempts to hide it: RX§G6.

**E3** BB370 cites such seemingly trustworthy pro-Byrd navigators as J.Portney (late Pres. Emer. Institute of Navigation), experienced longago Air Force navigator W.Molett, and non-positional OSU astronomer G.Newson, though their embarrassingly obvious blindnesses (e.g., not noting his sextant overprecision: §F6) and errors were set forth in detail at RX Figs.11-13 and §§L5-L6. All must resort to the transparent speculation of “confusion” (BB372) or somesuch by Byrd, to explain away the gross disagreements between his diary sextant sightings & those in his report to SecNavy & National Geographic. Well, apologists could line up ten times as many tractable Expert-Certifiers — but such political illusionism can't even dent the devastating evidence. E.g., obviously (RX§L7) a “confused” navigator *won't find the Pole*. Further: for each of the diary sunshots (4:39&7:07) why erase just the observation & contingent calculation *but not erase the corresponding chronometer time & equation of time?* — a distinction plainly indicating that the suppressor was planning (until learning his eraser wasn't sufficiently effective) to not only remove each real observation but to replace it *for the same UNERASED time and right at the same place on the page*, writing (over the real data) a fake “observation” consistent with a higher latitude. Bart's various (sometimes contradictory: RX ☉6) Experts all discount the actual record (Byrd's on-site hand-written diary), preferring to believe his much-later-typed report's figures, allegedly (RX§L11&BB372) written on loose pieces of paper. (Brilliant idea in a sometime-windy airplane!) Which disappeared before anyone ever saw them. (Stolen by Martians?) Obvious fact: in the real world, you will never get stronger evidence of exploring fraud than exists —

<sup>7</sup> *Washington Post* 1995/7/9. Even if Bart has reason to believe that the Byrd-Pocahontas relation is unverified, the family's private acceptance of it is worth mention as a biographical item.

and exists broadly & variously — in the Byrd 1926 North Pole case. Lesson learned: given their customary fiscal and/or careerist priorities, consultants — no matter how eminent — will tell you whatever you pay them to.

**E4** Sheldon Bart, *Race's* able author, has exploring experience and is on several prominent boards. But he does not help himself with his opening chapter's defense (BB9) of Byrd's fellow National Geographic Society polar hero, Robert Peary, whose faked 1909/4/6 North Pole claim Bart accepts (BB118&355). Bart supports Peary's 1907-reported 1906 distant-double-sighting of non-existent "Crocker Land" by quoting Peary's descriptions of its topography, citing them to the 1906/6/24&28 entries in Peary's on-site diary. But both of these quotes are actually not from the diary but from his 1907 book (*Nearest the Pole* pp.202&207) — as DR's book *Peary . . . Fiction* induced (F73) back in 1973 even *while* I was barred by the Peary family from access to any of his diaries. Bart says (BB368-369) he disbelieves DR's book, yet his Crocker Land fumble shows he never read it — or *DIO*, which quotes (RX§B2) Peary's actual 1906/6/24 entry in his diary (now at National Archives): "No land visible".

**E5** However, none of this should detract from our gratitude to Bart for his book's treasure of intimate facts relating to Byrd's career, challenges, & flying machines — most helpfully Bart's detailed reconstructions (e.g., BB393) of Byrd's 1926 cockpit procedures, along with Bart's own photos of the *Jo Ford's* interior. However, to defend the 1926 claim, Bart goes down a variety of argumentative avenues (e.g., BB356&360) to promote Byrd's arrival at the North Pole, but virtually all of them are timeworn and/or ambiguous, long since obsolesced by the hard-data diary revelations of 1996 (ultimately reported in full by RX). And his book contains several indicia that, though experienced with aircraft, he is less so with navigation and with science in general. E.g., the naïve estimate (BB402) that "From [the airplane's height of] two thousand feet, one distant mile on the surface below looks about six inches long." And, e.g., his BB398-399 discussion of the A.Hinks-G.Littlehales method miscalls solar declination as solar latitude, while misstating that the difference between it and an observed solar altitude produces the observer's distance from the Pole in nautical miles, when that difference is instead the Sumner Line's distance from the Pole. BB400-401 fails to realize that the moment when the *Jo Ford* is aimed at the Sun was no more informative than any other time for using a sun-compass (RX ☉11). BB329 describes a 1926/4/29-30 scene as Byrd's ship *Chantier* anchored "with the sun and moon facing one another across the bowl of the sky". But from the ship's arrival at 1926/4/29 16<sup>h</sup> (BB311), all the way to the morn of 1926/5/7, the Moon never got above the horizon at Kings Bay, Spitzbergen. Two days later when the *Jo Ford* took off, BB2 still has the Sun&Moon on opposite sides of the sky, the latter "a pale and ghostly oval" though in reality it was only 36° of azimuth distant from the Sun and (as just noted) not even visible at all. An astronomer would have easily checked these points. At BB252, we learn that the Ice Pole is "400 miles west of the North Pole" which is patently impossible since all points are south therefrom. (He means that the Ice Pole was 400 mi to the west of Byrd's poleward path.) BB282 weirdly says H.Wilkins "surveyed 100 miles of territory" in 1926. BB361 accepts Byrd's report that the *Jo Ford* got faster as its weight decreased in flight, though (RX fn 48) maximum-fuel-efficiency cruising speed actually decreases as a plane's weight of course diminishes during a flight.

## F Evidential Lacunae

**F1** Let's start with *Race's* simplest evidential dodge (which should have been faced at BB292&350&414). On 1926/5/11 the *NYTimes* reported (F264, RX ☉2) that, though *Jo Ford* had carried "a hundred small and several large American flags" Byrd&Bennett had been "too busy" to remember to drop ANY OF THEM at their turnaround point though not too busy to take movies of the flat colorless ice. Is it credible that publicity-savvy Byrd, in-debt and a professional flagwaver (who in 1927 named his airplane the *America*, and in 1929 re-christened as "Little America" Amundsen's old "Framheim" Antarctic base)

somehow — for 13 consecutive minutes — FORGOT, when filming, to drop their own pre-planned American-flag blizzard at the Pole, for profitable US audience-entrancement? The oddity's actual explanation is obvious: remember that the "Norge" was about to cover the same route, so if the *Jo Ford's* farthest-north actually wasn't 90°, dropped flags might get spotted at an embarrassing latitude. But enjoy the inevitable changing-the-story, later-concocted alibi (MM63&G54n.17&BB292): flags were just brought along as souvenirs for backers. (Would dropping a single flag, thereby diminishing the souvenir-flags-load by less than 1%, have undone Byrd's support?) Which verifies *DIO 22's* test for apologists-when-cornered: their dependable preference for the inherently improbable over the obviously likely (www.dioi.org/jm02 §B3; www.dioi.org/jm03 §A1[B]). DR's 2000 comment (RX *loc cit*): "Just imagine what observers would have thought if Scott found nothing of Amundsen's at the S.Pole in 1912, but Amundsen said: well, actually, we just took our tent and flags home with us — to give to backers as souvenirs. . . ?!"

**F2** BB363 rightly criticizes Balchen's dying exaggeration of what his friend Bennett told him, but ignores Balchen's much more contemporary diary from the 1920s recording his recent chat where Bennett said the truth of the 1926 trip "would shock you through your heels" (RT§A3 & fn 6; RX fn 13).

**F3** Bart argues (BB355f) the case for the Byrd-Bennett flight lasting almost 16<sup>h</sup>, as against his skeptics' and most original reports' contention that it was about 15<sup>h</sup>1/2. This matter is thoroughly analysed at RX§K, based on all reports, as well as the surviving record (G158) of the flight's barograph (manufactured by the family of DR's later-nextdoor-neighbor Lucien Friez), and the truth is much nearer 15<sup>h</sup>1/2. In this connexion, Bart lavishly speculates (BB361f) on *Jo Ford's* speed, to argue that, during his postulated 16<sup>h</sup>, the plane was fast enough to go the full 768 mi or 668 nmi (RX fn 24) to the Pole&back. Yet he ignores — *as do all of Byrd's published reports* — the definitive figures, 8<sup>h</sup>1/2 northward time (from takeoff) and airspeed 85 mi/hr, both written in Byrd's in-flight diary (G79&96, RX§D7 & Fig.3), which are used — *after* turning south (RX§D7) — in Byrd's arithmetic, to compute (on the same diary-page) how far he had gone "before we turned around" (the revealing phrase Byrd tried to erase from his diary; details yet to come at §F5): 8<sup>h</sup>1/2 times 85 mph = 722 1/2 mi, which is about 45 mi short of the 768 mi distance from KingBay to the Pole, not even accounting for the headwind (obvious from both his earlier sextant shots of the Sun: RX§§13-14) which reduced his 85 mph airspeed to 70 mph groundspeed.

**F4** As evidence of Byrd's genuineness and generosity, BB360 says that, after the *Jo Ford's* flight, he gave a magnetic variation chart to Amundsen's co-captain Ellsworth, showing what he had found on the 1926/5/9 trip. But no such chart has ever been found because it never existed. The chart cited was just the 1913 standard U.S.Hydrographic Office chart, printed long before the trip. An identical copy still exists (RX fn 48) in Byrd's National Archives file. Unmentioned in *Race*: Bennett reported that, during *Jo Ford's* flight, the magnetic compasses fluctuated uselessly (RX fn 48).

**F5** *Race* brushes off the glaring reality that Byrd's two surviving 1926/5/9 sextant observations — both of which (on his meridian) put him over 100 mi south of where his report (TA) to SecNavy&NGS claims he was at the two times — are nearly erased. Bart goes with the apologists' speculation that Byrd was just getting rid of bad data. Omitted are the following slightly relevant facts: [1] except for those suspect places, Byrd never erases in the diary, he *writes-over* his miscues (e.g. RX§E1 & Figs.3-5, G84-86&88&96). [2] Each of the two diary pages containing 1926 sextant observations displays plenty of blank space, had Byrd wished to enter a hypothetical corrected observation. He didn't. [3] None of this desperate alibiing explains why Byrd tried erasing not only sextant data but also his question (written to Bennett: since neither could hear in the noisy *Jo Ford*, they communicated in writing): "How long were we gone before we turned around?" Not: how long did it take to get to the Pole? Does this sound like the question of a navigator who's just spent 13<sup>m</sup> circling the Pole (by Byrd's later story)? How would such an erasure relate to any of the apologia for sextant data? Excusing this would require a fresh alibi, but

multiplying theories typically defies Occam's Razor. *Race* doesn't mention the point.

**F6** TA's raw (unreduced) sextant data are all given *to the arcsec*, at least 10 times better precision than possible (RX§G) on Byrd's standard Navy sextant. (When calculating [faking] these "observations" indoors after the flight, Byrd forgot to round them to the 1/2 arcmin precision of all his previous real observations in the diary: *ibid* §G6.) After submitting his 1926/6/22 report (TA), Byrd was horrified to realize this — so he deleted all these giveaway-overprecise TA raw data from his revised report, TD, ere sending TD on 1926/11/24 to ultra-archon Izzy Bowman (head of AGS). BB366 says TD was a "slightly more descriptive version" of TA (1926/6/22 to SecNavy&NGS). To the contrary: TD is a *trimmed* — bowdlerized — version of TA, with not only all raw data excised (RX Fig.7) but also *whole sections removed* (& thus, as noted at *idem*, adjacent sections renumbered), when Byrd realized these could be problematic (as carefully demonstrated at RX ☉7). Byrd does not tell TD's reader of either alteration.

**F7** Byrd sent TD to Isaiah Bowman, the obsessively<sup>8</sup> anti-Boshie & anti-Jewish chief of the American Geographical Society, which kept the report secret (RX fn 83) since Byrd had gotten Pearyishly shy about his records, writing Izzy (BB367): "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<sup>9</sup> themselves to be ill-wishers; and certain would-be explorers (whom we know) who have declared themselves very much on the other side of the fence [BB360]. Should I not protect myself from academic discussions with such people. . . ?" By persistently-to-the-end-of-his-days (esp. 1926&1935) helping NGS hide the Peary 1909 & Byrd 1926 records, Bowman — 1935-1949 president of the US' top *science* university (and a previous JHU Prez, Ira Remsen, also helped the Peary fraud 1909/10/12: F171) — enabled the long survival of the 2 most durable *science* hoaxes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; doubtless such willing aid to establishments helped Bowman onto the board of AT&T (chief stockholder: the Grosvenor family that ran NGS), the sort of connexion that presumably paved the way to his 1935 appointment as Prez of Johns Hopkins U. Don't miss [www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf) §§M9&O2&O10 on Izzy smearing Henshaw Ward as a neutrality-faker! **THIS** from Bowman — himself piously-hypocritically pretending scientific neutrality in public (e.g., *Science* 82:532) and to Yale, even while privately writing buddy Marie Peary 1943/2/10 of his "deep and abiding interest in the vindication of [your father's] work" and hiding the Peary records from all but Izzy (F289-294) — while killing Ward's Yale University Press Peary-doubting book See his repulsive long-hidden 1935/12/20 4pp referee report

<sup>8</sup>A half-century ago, after initial frostiness, DR became friends — due to a burglary, of all things — with Explorers Club archivist Mabel Ward, formerly Bowman's AGS secretary. After Bowman left AGS to become Johns Hopkins University Prez in 1935, he wrote her a 1940/3/27 recommendation of her merits, and this, given Bowman's high eminence, was her most valued document. But shortly after Bowman's death, a burglar got into her apartment and stole her box of private papers. While researching the Bowman Papers at JHU two decades later, DR ran across a copy of the recommendation and made a photocopy, thinking it might have a little sentimental interest for her. During DR's next visit to the Explorers Club, DR slid a copy onto her desk and got more than expected. She dropjaw-exclaimed: *HOW* did you *GET* this?! (Maybe she thought for a moment that DR had been the burglar?) After DR told her it was just a byproduct of research she was so grateful that she recalled plenty about the personality of the highest archon among those "academics" who, for careerist priorities, suppressed for the better part of a century the truth of National Geographic's polar hoaxes. Two oddities among her recollections: he once boasted to her of having just burned a copy of Rabelais on his home hearth as a dirty book. And whenever receiving by mistake a letter addressed to anything like "Isidor Berman" he was farked for the day. Ever since hearing this, DR has tweaked Bowman's shade by calling him Izzy. [For details of Bowman's secret conspiring with Marie Peary to suppress by-threat a too-convincing Yale University Press book skeptical of her father's 1909 N.Pole hoax, see [www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf).]

<sup>9</sup>Though you'd have hardly known of European doubts of Byrd's Pole-attainment from reading the US' Free snicker Press. The *New York Times* even tampered with the text of a 1926/5/28 London *Times* story, to kill verbiage that was insufficiently rock-certain of Byrd's success: RX ☉8.

([www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf](http://www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf) §O), scaring Yale Univ Press with the spectre of NGS libel suit (*ibid* §05): copy in JHU's Eisenhower Library, *quotes & almost incredibly vile context* at *ibid*, *including Izzy explicitly "CELEBRATING" Ward's DEATH* (*ibid* §K4) to Marie, as this mogul-of-science threateningly cheats Ward&Amundsen to protect the top science fraud of the century. (Ah, the ivory tower of academe! Keep in mind: every word of Bowman's document is aimed not at truth but at kissing up to the richest science society in the world, National Geographic.) A doubter-to-the-end re Einstein's relativity, Bowman also suppressed leftist dissent at JHU for a decade and a half before retiring, with the suggestion (reported to DR by old hands at the *Baltimore Sun*) that his ideal successor would be a Baltimorean, a Johns Hopkins graduate (class of 1926, just ahead of Lou Rawlins' class of 1927), and a pure WASP: no other than Alger Hiss! W.Chambers' testimony revealing Hiss as a Soviet spy broke in time to head off potential public announcement, though the private disappointment may've weighed on Bowman, who died early in 1950. But we should note in Bowman's favor that he wasn't without jocular humility: when, after WW2, he was asked to help carve up Europe again, he wondered aloud why anyone would seek wisdom from those who bungled the post-WW1 1919 carving at Versailles.

**F8** RX ☉8 notes that, after the *Jo Ford* returned, Byrd didn't right away say he'd navigated by sunshots via sextant — possibly hoping at first that he might get by with a dead-reckoning location of the North Pole? (Which is how he estimated reaching the vicinity of the South Pole in 1929.) This point connects with another oddity of Byrd's 1926 account: he reported (BB399-401) that his sextant fell and was broken, just after the *Jo Ford* had turned south, thus halving the number of sextant data that he needed to report (i.e., to risk faking). So here we must believe a string of unlikely happenstances: [1] The ever-provident (BB207&229&449) explorer had placed his most precise navigational instrument in a precarious spot, at the moment of his life when he was most dependent on it. [2] The instrument happened to fall. [3] It would happen to hit the floor such that it would break. [4] He never thought to bring along a 2<sup>nd</sup> sextant though (RX ☉5) he had at least two available — and (RX ☉8; BB401) he took off for the Pole with 2 sun-compasses, 3 magnetic compasses, at least that many chronometers. And, after all, 3 engines — precisely because (RX§B4; G55-56; BB218&269&435) he believed in fail-safe backups.

## G TimeTravel: DateDoctoring Covers for DataDoctoring

**G1** BB362 says that, regarding Byrd's 1926 North Pole flight, "The imprimatur of the National Geographic Society ensured the popular acceptance of Byrd's claim" — so we should examine just how careful NGS' examination was. The truth is that NGS never even had a chance to reject Byrd's claim. Before it or anyone had seen a digit of his data, a bigwigs-backed celebration and parade was underway in New York City (RX ☉17), starting the morning of 1926/6/23, honoring Richard Byrd — brother of Virginia's Governor, Harry. (Their parents had three boys: Tom, Dick, & Harry!)

**G2** The NGS report appeared in the 1926 September *National Geographic*, with 2 tiny deletions: *the dates*. Purpose? Simple: to hide the fact that NGS' gold medal was given Byrd by Pres. Coolidge 1926/6/23 (evening) at NGS, while its (rushed thus flawed)<sup>10</sup> alleged verification "in every particular" (RX§M4) of the Byrd report's data wasn't completed (RX§M & ☉17) until 1926/6/28! Indeed, it's unclear (RX§M5) whether ANY meaningful exam occurred ere the medal was given 6/23, since the report was completed late on 6/28 (so signed by NGS' rulers: G141) after "devoting five consecutive days to the work" (G141; RX§M4), but that tells<sup>11</sup> us the real exam started 6/24, the day *after* the medal was awarded. Nothing of NGS' time-travel and document-doctorings appears in *Race*.

<sup>10</sup>Various NGS errors detailed in RX Fig.1's comments & ☉17. The NGS report's main merit: *ibid* ☉4.

<sup>11</sup>Wed (6/23), Thu (6/24), Fri (6/25), Sat (6/26), Sun (6/27), Mon (6/28): six days, not five. G141 displays a photocopy of the NGS report where we can compare the contradictory statements: "five consecutive days" vs "examination began at 10 a.m. on June 23 and ended at 5 p.m. on June 28."

## H How Could Byrd's Soul Steal Credit from Genuine Discoverers Amundsen, Ellsworth, & Nobile?

**H1** How did an ethically-bred gentleman end up hoaxing the world? And stealing honestly-won priority at the North Pole from Roald Amundsen, *whose lifetime dream was that very achievement* (AS2:121). Potential partial answers: a combination of debt (F262; BB278&286&426), ambition (BB195&221), & belief (F270; BB367) that hiding data was justified in the cause of promoting aviation. And Byrd. His conscience might be assuaged by the thought (RX§A9) “that he and the airplane were the scientific future of polar exploration, while the legendary Amundsen (like his dirigible) was the past.”

**H2** Byrd wrote (BB444):  
“the unconquerable spirit of man’s soul . . . will not admit defeat.”

And, sure enough, when the *Jo Ford* fell short of the North Pole, he&NGS wouldn’t.

### Bibliography & Reference-Key

The source-abbreviations used above are listed at Rawlins *Fiction* (www.dioi.org/rp.pdf) pp.308-313; several of these are also listed below, with additional sources:

BB = Sheldon Bart 2013. *Race to the Top of the World* Wash DC.  
Bowditch = *American Practical Navigator* (perennial).  
Rob’t Bryce 1997. *Cook & Peary: the Polar Controversy, Resolved*,<sup>12</sup> Stackpole Books.  
TA, TB, TC, TD = Byrd 1926 Navigation Rept typescript, 4 edits 1926/6/22-1926/11/24.  
BS = Richard E. Byrd, Jr. 1928. *Skyward* [Ghosted by Fitzhugh Green] NYC.  
D = Byrd 1925-1927 Diary (Ohio State U Archives) pre-printed pagination.  
d = same document, but counting pages in reverse from back (no printed pagination).  
HDC = Hanne Christiansen “On the Navigation of . . . Robert Peary” *DIO* 7.1 ‡4 1997.  
G = Raimund Goerler 1998. Ed. *To the Pole*, Ohio State Univ.  
MM = Wm Molett 1998. *Mercator’s World* (Mar-Apr):58.  
MO = Richard Montague 1971. *Oceans, Poles, & Airmen*, NYC.  
NARA = US National Archives & Records Administration, Wash, DC.  
PA = Jos. N. Portney 1973. *Navigation: J. Inst. Nav.* 20.3:208.  
PB = Jos. N. Portney 1992. *Navigation: J. Inst. Nav.* 39.2:255.  
F = D. Rawlins 1973. *Peary at the North Pole, Fact or Fiction?*, Wash, DC.  
RS = D. Rawlins 1991. *DIO* 1.1 ‡4, www.dioi.org/j114.pdf  
RT = D. Rawlins 1994. *DIO* 4.3 ‡12, www.dioi.org/j43b.pdf  
RU = D. Rawlins 2000a. *Polar Record* 36:25-50.  
RX = D. Rawlins 2000b. *DIO* 10:2-106, www.dioi.org/ja00.pdf  
SF = E.M.Standish 2018. www.dioi.org/EMS-facts.pdf

# 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,  $\Delta T$  secular behavior], Department of Physics, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK; tel (44) 191-374-2153.

©2021 *DIO* Inc.

ISSN 1041-5440.

This printing: 2021\12\30.

US Coast&Geodetic Survey Director E.Lester Jones dated the typed report by hand (G141): “June 28 1926”. (Not the 1<sup>st</sup> time USC&GS took pseudo-data too seriously: see www.dioi.org/hay.htm#sctc.)

<sup>12</sup>An admirably super-complete index to *Cook & Peary* is available from Robert Bryce; email beeabo@gmail.com.

## 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 1<sup>st</sup> critical edition of Tycho's legendary 1004-star catalog.
- Investigations of science hoaxes of the –1<sup>st</sup>, +2<sup>nd</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> 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."