

Academe's Sacred PseudoVerities

Astronomy, Geography, Math, & Literature

Revealingly Unmet Challenges to Protected Doctrines

\$100,000 for Alternates to 13th Century BC Eclipses

www.dioi.org/ac.pdf

Sponsored by DIO

dioi@mail.com

Academe projects itself as guided by free speech, fairness to all, scrupulous refereeing, receptivity to new findings, refusal to banish ideas or scholars. Does reality accord with the advertisement? Or is remedying sometime shortfalls just too non-priority for presumed forces of self-correction? Given what follows, may we ask if such forces even exist?

College English Dep'ts swear Shakespeare learned enough at Stratford Grammar School to account for the Shakespeare corpus' high erudition, so our universities are thereby insisting on the unnecessary of a university education. None connect colleague Jonson's witness, that Shakespeare had "small Latin", with Latin having been the language of instruction at British grammar schools (www.dioi.org/ji01.pdf, §I3) — where learning thus required facility with Latin.

Academe regards it as outrageous to assert Shakespeare fronted for another writer. So the issue is (*ibid* §W20) taboo on university campuses, where no one mentions that London's #1 playwright, Cambridge University-educated Christopher Marlowe, vanished in 1593 *less than 2 weeks* ere Shakespeare's 1st work appeared, *in London*, as the top antiMarlovian admits (*ibid* fn 14). Even Westminster Abbey's Marlowe memorial questions his supposed 1593 death.

Professedly-refereed academic journals&books say ancient Greek astronomers' observations were poor since routinely forced to agree with flawed theory by selection or fudgery (www.dioi.org/jl09.pdf, §A1), ignoring that Greeks knew latitudes to 1' accuracy, the Moon's distance to 2%, all 3 monthlengths to *1 timesec or better* (*ibid* §§A2&B).

Astrology-bible-author Ptolemy's 4 "observed" Sun-positions were 50 times nearer 280^y-old indoor tables than to the outdoor sky (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, §G), yet AAAS' *Science* 193:476 calls him "The Greatest Astronomer of Antiquity" & academe funds (www.dioi.org/ns.htm) slanders of his prime exposor, Johns Hopkins physicist R.Newton.

Historians-of-science evidenced good judgement (www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §I38 & fn 110) when realizing Greeks' macrogeographical unit, the pharaonic stade, was 185 meters, but then went shunny in the head when DIO proposed the sole solution now available (www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf, fn 49) for the 185m stade's origin: since Greeks divided numbers and meridians into 60^{ths}, they used Earth's circumference: $4000000\text{m}/60/60/60 = 185\text{m}$ (as moderns invented naut.mile&meter), implying Ptolemy I's surveyors (www.dioi.org/jl09.pdf, §F1) c.300 BC found Earth's size to 1%.

Later Greeks' 2 standard Earth-circumference-estimates hugely disagreed with reality & each other: by 17%-40%. *Isis, J.History of Astron*, AmerAstrSoc's HistAstrDiv, etc, show no ability to check-compute that air-refraction's effect on Alexandria-lighthouse-based data solves both circumferences to within 1% (*Griffith Observer* 82.8 pp.9-16, 2018).

In 2016 Dec, History of science Society's purportedly-refereed *Isis* deemed "delusional" scientists' perception of accurate eclipse-based ancient longitudes: [a] haplessly-maplessly calling Kleomedes' Spain-vs-Persia 4^h = 60° "badly overestimated"; [b] mistreating a 59 AD solar eclipse as lunar, to imagine Pliny's 3^h Naples-vs-Armenia eclipse-time gap was too big (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, pp.4-5; *Griffith Observer* 82.8 p.16, 2018). *Isis* hides from retracting.

Aristarchos-Archimedes' *Sandreckoner* ratio-equation, $\text{SunDistance}/\text{EarthDiameter} = \text{SunDistance}/\text{StarsDistance}$, has never been explained by academe. Yet man's vision-limit predicts just such equality from invisible diurnal-solar & annual-stellar parallax. *Sandreckoner* has each ratio > 1/10000. As it happens, man's visual acuity = 1/10000th radians.

In 2018, DIO sent to 1000 leading scholars our offer that, until 2020/1/1, we would award \$100,000 for eclipses no earlier than academe's 721 BC limit, alternatively explaining 3 anciently-adopted lunisolar speed-ratios newly solved by DIO via 13th century BC eclipses. These&offer posted at www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §§I36-I38. Not a cent has even been claimed, thus confirming Greeks used 13th century BC (Babylon) eclipse data, a discovery anathema to archonal historians-of-astronomy, who've never solved any of the 3 ratios. Our \$100,000 challenge still stands, until 2019's end.

Academe teaches that spherical trig originated c.100 AD & that no ancient correctly gauged the Earth's obliquity. Yet in 1934 the eminent philologist Aubrey Diller, neither mathematician nor historian, showed that sphtrig calculations using correct obliquity nearly fit Strabo-preserved latitude data of Hipparchos, c.135 BC. DIO later showed the theory fruitfully fit further such data Diller didn't even know of — ultimately satisfying all 14 Hipparchos-Strabo data, on-the-nose every time. For 85^y since 1934 historians-of-science, finding no mismath in Diller's key double-discovery, typically (www.dioi.org/sti56.htm) resort to smear, calling it "absurd", pushing their own people's 2 theories, neither of which fit even half the same 14 data (www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, fn 14 — and Table 1 where non-fit data are in italics). (Universities' hermit history-of-science dep'ts' colloquia contain no scientists or mathematicians — and vice-versa.)

Consider the context of academe's collapsed past false orthodoxies and contingent unjust, often cruel shunnings, as conventional forces suppressed the following truths for decades, even centuries in some cases: 1. Heliocentricity. 2. Meteors' non-atmospheric origin. 3. France not Britain discovered planet Neptune. 4. Darwin's Natural Selection. 5. Continental Drift. 6. Peary North Pole claim's falsity. 7. Byrd N.Pole claim's falsity. 8. Freud-fad's baselessness. (DIO contributed to establishing Truths 3&6&7: *SciAmer* 2004 Dec p.98; *NYTimes* 2009/9/8 Science; 1996/5/9 p.1.) Can we academics commit henceforth to being less politically inertial and more fairminded than indicated by our past? What would we lose? Other than persistently-earned&re-earned mistrust. Even academe's harshest critics know academe creates far more than it destroys but (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, p.9) that's no excuse for fleeing selfexamination.