

DIO

Tel: 410-889-1414

<http://www.dioi.org>

The International Journal of Scientific History

Box 19935, Baltimore, MD 21211-0935

dioi@mail.com

From: Dennis Rawlins, Publisher

isb 2017/4/1

To: *Isis* Advisory Editors

April 1st seems an apt day to stand up to a lordly joker and to remind you that we have no acknowledgement of receipt of our 2017/3/20 letter, www.dioi.org/isa.pdf, to the *Isis* board of 30 Advisory Editors, informing that *Isis* Editor H.F.Cohen is unsubtly dodging reckoning for [a] what the dodging itself will unambiguously establish as deliberate, citationless *Isis* pretense to originating another's creativity; [b] unengagedly suppressing extensive evidence for high ancient Greek empiricism, not only previously overlooked by the dominant historian clique but actively opposed by it, most recently in your double-miscomputed, ironically-backfired denigration of ancient geographical accuracy in last December's *Isis* (echoing James Evans' mis-signed 1987 *JHA* demo of Greek inaccuracy, his own 1981 data-record of which he's been hiding ever since). Even worse than *Isis*' mismath is the paper's glaring innocence of the entire vast context of Greek astronomy's accuracy (overkill-itemized in attached www.dioi.org/islg.doc, §[B]), which *Isis* author Shcheglov & 6 readers would've known of, had *DIO* not been shunned. Which undoes the referee's objection to re-publication, quoted [at www.dioi.org/islg.doc, by] showing key data-dearth in those proudly unaware of what *DIO* has unearthed over the last 26^y, seemingly ready to follow-the-leader for another 1/4 century of obediently averted brains. Cohen's ethical obligation to deal honestly with *Isis*' offenses [a]&[b] has nothing to do with his Displeasure over *an entirely separate paper* [www.dioi.org/qjo.doc] & at my refusal to submit to his obvious desire for our self-censorship of it. (We invited him to delete anything he didn't like and promised to abide by it. Is your Editor too busy to edit?)

Does the History of Science Society's ethic allow it to steal a discovery from a scholar just because its Editor (hurriedly-retroactively) has *shunned* him for an article on *shunning* (as specifically predicted 2017/2/28), imperially ordering him out of the royal presence? Is this a journal historians of SCIENCE are proud to be part of?

Regarding the weighty 2016-2017-submitted 15000-word paper, in which Cohen (& his referee) never detected the slightest mis-statement, but was determined from day-one to reject anyway: check our 1st letter, 2016/8/29, www.dioi.org/isw8t.htm, proposing 10 hopefully neutral referees. (Supercompetent Standish & Stephenson are on our board, but I'm not close to the others.) Instead of these *or any of you*, Cohen instead chose a well-known fanatic (*predictably angered by photo-documented exposures of his dishonesty, in the very paper he's asked to neutrally referee*), whose complaint, that the point of the paper is unclear & obscured by insult, will evaporate upon the slightest perusal of it at www.dioi.org/qjo.doc, starting with its concise and extremely muted opening Summary. If Cohen weren't departing anyway, this betrayal of neutrality would by itself constitute sufficient grounds for canning his can.

There was a day when scientists and historians mingled in History of Science, and when *Isis* entertained vigorous debates (e.g., Noel Swerdlow, Ed Rosen, Thos.Africa). Currently, demonstrating flawed scholarship or refereeing is, in itself, deemed too impolite to publish. Your field knows it's in a downward spiral. Fearing to openly criticize your infirmities (see large paper's nn.5-6), pols like Cohen try to hide them by censorship, referee-neutrality-abuse, running&shunning, and by decades of shrinking the field's minority of genuine scientific experts (in mathematical areas especially, e.g., van der Waerden, R.Newton), whose evaluations render the majority so nervous. But such group behavior is not containable. The more evidence-detached & dishonest it becomes, the more widely degeneracy is perceived, so there's ever more to suppress (e.g., Gingerich's & now Cohen's scheming, plus Shcheglov's messups, as the Ptolemy scandal keeps accreting, now eating *Isis*). I.e., a spiral.

Let me know NOW if you are going to referee *DIO*'s Letter-to-the-Editor, sent 2017/3/20, to which I have today added a paragraph and some diplomacy, creating the present co-attached version, www.dioi.org/islg.doc, to encourage communication while correcting the unfortunate December misinformation, unwary *Isis* publication of which might have been avoided, had Cohen possessed the humility to recognize he didn't understand Shcheglov's paper *except that it enticingly attacked one who was upsetting Cohen by asking Isis to publish too-accurate criticisms of his fellow pols*. For Shcheglov, Cohen should've sought refereeing from not just the usual suspects but from *DIO* (re, after all, a huge attack on *DIO*&*DR*) during a period when Cohen was actually exchanging emails with *DIO*, but preferred secrecy. Now, instead of owning to errors, he's coverupping for not just Ptolemy but Cohen, taking you all into hiding with him.

The *Isis* board's non-reply so far risks being interpreted as strategically keeping open the option of (continuing) doing nothing — about mere plagiarism, and miscomputed demeaning of accurate *and scientifically refereed* Greenwich-Centenary scholarship — hoping no-one notices, even while keeping alive the option to claim you were all-along-actually-considering-getting-around-to-it, in case someone does inquire. Less speculatively, we know exactly what Cohen was up to, when he did not tell us he was sending the large paper [www.dioi.org/qjo.doc] to a referee *until he got a negative report safely in hand*. Does he imagine such transparent tactics are not noticed by serious academe?

Truthseeking institutions communicate. And will not hide their demonstrated miscalculations. And don't doubly (2015/3 & 2016/12 n.14), knowingly appropriate credit for a (needlessly) rival journal's discovery.

If *Isis* does not acknowledge receipt of this letter (let's allow to Apr.5th), it will be reasonable for previously unenlightened observers to conclude that your society is unprincipled, and you will not hear directly from *DIO* again.