

## ‡3 Crawling Towards Integrity

### A Historical

**A1** The 1995 May issue of the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* contains (at p.164) a historic item: the *JHA* has there actually (for the first time ever) cited *DIO*. Moreover, the 1991 May author, Muffia-protégé Alex Jones, has explicitly stated that there were three errors in his 1991 May *JHA* lead paper and that the correct math was first published in *DIO* 1.2-3's "Muffia Orbituary".<sup>1</sup>

**A2** Whatever the shortcomings of this *JHA* notice, it is nonetheless an event which (we are obliged & glad to acknowledge) *DIO* predicted would not happen at all.

**A3** However, what *JHA* Ed. Michael Hoskin has done so far is depressingly minimal<sup>2</sup> — and even this only occurred after Eliot Marshall of *Science* (Amer Assoc Adv Sci) placed a phonecall to Jones' home and another to the Cambridge Univ-trained mathematician Hugh Thurston (who had directly informed the *JHA* of its blunders) — a phonecall also known to Muffiosi (notice at *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B38).

**A4** So, it has taken [a] years, [b] independent-method Cambridge-math-verification, & [c] two AAAS phonecalls even to get the *JHA* to own up to errors of elementary arithmetic. And there has not been the slightest indication of Muffia-*JHA* interest in going beyond this slim concession. (To the contrary: §D6, §E3, §G, §H, & *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §F4.) The consistent, regrettable suggestion is: for *JHA* & Muffia finally to acknowledge their manifold errors of post-highschool math will presumably require even greater stimulation than that cited in §A3. Well, we at *DIO* will do what we can, to provide what is needed.

**A5** But one must crawl before walking. So this *JHA* correcting-note is encouraging; and we must cheer&chide the Muffia along, as it snails down the long road towards integrity.

### B Three Muffs Down, Three Dozen Retractions to Go

**B1** But, besides the Muffia Orbituary affair, there have been several other *JHA* disasters. Like forty-odd. (See, e.g., fn 1, reminder at *DIO* 2.1 ¶2 §M, & compact itemization of Muffia muffs at §A of "Casting Pearls Before Pyglets", *DIO* 4.1 ¶4.) There has been no Hist.sci notice of any of these miscues, though officers of all the erring journals are now aware of them. Evidently, simply not reading (or acknowledging or citing) the corrections is considered acceptable behavior in Hist.sci (§B2 & fn 3): a curiously dishonest way of protecting one's reputation for honesty.

<sup>1</sup> I gather that *JHA* requested [& received] the article's title, for the Jones note's bibliography — but then broke the journal's own hitherto-sacredly-rigid style-rule by omitting this title, since Hoskin personally disapproved of its mention of "Muffia". (He has printed [& never apologized for] highly insulting Muffia charges against R.Newton's competence [*DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §C7], which was of the highest order; but *JHA* cannot print DR's use of the word "Muffia" for the Neugebauer clique, which actually has published dozens of muffs: forty-five cataloged at *DIO* 4.1 ¶4 §A; more here at ¶1 fn 1. Enjoy also the Muffia's inadvertent gross slander of its own godpop: *DIO* 1.1 ¶5 fn 15.) This censorial comedy recommends the approach announced in *DIO*'s inside-back-cover publisher's statement: *DIO* authors can use any style they like. Their choice, not *DIO*'s.

<sup>2</sup> Are Muffiosi hoping onlookers will conclude that DR is as Impossible as pre-labelled (Rawlins 1991W §B1), from his failure instantly to assume the proper footkissing-gratitude prostrate-position [§C5], at the *JHA*'s amazingly small&muddy concession? (Compare fn 7 [1995/3/14 letter] vs. §§D6, G, & H.) Note: the Muffia's utter inability to understand DR will continue so long as Muffiosi insist (§C5, §E, fn 15, §H4) upon noncommunication.

**B2** From DR's 1995/3/14 letter to a Hoskin-circle Hist.sci figure (footnotes in orig):

Why is it that I want refereeing of the ancient astronomy controversy — while, by contrast, the Muffia has fled it for decades? (Why has Hist.sci condoned this?) . . . *JHA*'s Hoskin will not [even] look at *DIO* (see *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B6) . . . Perhaps some think that this ploy will help excuse a deliberate policy of nonciting<sup>3</sup> *DIO*. Moesgaard has told<sup>4</sup> DR directly (1994/5/6) that he swore over 10 years ago to have nothing to do with DR, so his noncitation-policy [see bizarre instance remarked parenthetically at *DIO* 1.2 fn 56] is deliberate by his own account. Is this honest scholarship? Is it considered ethical in Hist.sci [a] to fake the nonexistence of *existing* discoveries by Unapproved scholars, and [b] to fake the nonexistence of *existing* ironclad<sup>5</sup> refutations of Approved scholars' attacks on heresy?<sup>6</sup> — attacks which are then cited [e.g., *Centaurus* 37:97, p.149 n.1] . . . without informing the reader of *DIO*'s demonstration of these attacks' fatal blunders. . . .

**B3** [In the ancient astronomy controversy, one] side (*DIO*) is citing all parties, frequently praising<sup>7</sup> hateful enemies, publishing papers from both sides (even if attacking *DIO*), promptly & frankly admitting its own errors,<sup>8</sup> and insisting on maintaining the substance (if not always the appearance!) of high scholarly standards. As regards both competence & ethics. (So: Hist.sci hates the free-speech practitioner, and kisses up to the suppressors.)

**B4** Why would a cult insist upon going right on evading honest parties in such a haughty fashion, thereby inviting the continuation of a running-sore disgrace to academe? Well, if you want to know, you'll have to ask the cultists themselves.

### C Thurston's Proof

**C1** In the summer of 1994, Hugh Thurston (Prof. Emeritus, Univ Brit. Columbia Math Dep't) found, by geometric (ancient) means, the orbit which fits the *Almajest* 5.3&5 threesome of Hipparchan solar positions: "trio C". Used to Keplerian orbits (where direct solution is impossible), DR had unthinkingly presumed that the solution would be iterative.

**C2** Thurston quickly solved the problem — noniteratively. He sent his result to the *JHA*, adding a note which pointed out that it confirmed the (iteratively-derived) DR results published at *DIO* 1.1 ¶6 §eqs.17-18.

<sup>3</sup> See *DIO* 1.2 §C11 [d] end, *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fn 15, *DIO* 4.1 ¶4 fn 1, & *DIO* 4.2 p.57 top & ¶7 fn 12.

<sup>4</sup> Most bizarre: Moesgaard's words showed anger at DR! So did an unexplained crack by OG (also 1994/5/6). Is this the 1st case in history where the muggers affected haughty moral outrage at the muggee's choice to resist?

<sup>5</sup> The papers Evans 1987 & Swerdlow 1992 (both *JHA*) were direct assaults on DR's ancient star catalog paper (*PASP* 1982). Both were riddled with (and destroyed by) several entertainingly elementary blunders, as pointed out at *DIO* 1.2 fn 288; *DIO* 2.1 ¶4 §§F2-F3, fn 18, & fnn 65-66; *DIO* 2.3 ¶8 fn 25, fnn 31-32, & §§C8-C15. All this *DIO* material was sent to the Muffia. No reply.

<sup>6</sup> Heresy may not be published or cited until proper refutation has been concocted [even if this takes many years (e.g., *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §I3), and the eventual "refutation" collapses from freshman-math botchery (e.g., *DIO* 2.3 ¶8 fnn 24&31); thus, the citation can (& must)] be immediately followed by counter-citation of an anti-thoughtcrime source. [E.g., van Dalen 1994: see here at ¶1 fn 31.] See also [*DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §H1 and] *DIO* 1.2 fn 15.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., lists of examples at *DIO* 1.2 fn 16 & fn 174. I am also preparing to publish an exceedingly generous note if the *JHA* openly admits (what it now knows, to its chagrin) that the 3 Hipparchan Greek-style orbits, which its lead 1991/5 paper decreed unfindable, have been found & published by *DIO* 1.1-3 — where all 3 orbits have been related to Hipparchan data. (This doesn't mean *DIO* will cease criticizing the Muffia & others. But, the more Muffia credits we can admire, the better.) [Note added 1995/12: This message (& *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B42) towards *JHA*'s incommunicado commandante had no effect upon the 1995/5&8 mini-retraction — one more measure of *JHA* educability & remorse-depth.]

<sup>8</sup> E.g., *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §C3, ¶6 fn 35, *DIO* 2.2 fn 98, and more to come in upcoming issues, e.g., [here at §C1 & p.2]. [Note added 1995/12: See also §§C1-C2, ¶4 §C5, & *DIO* 4.3 ¶12 fn 2.]

**C3** While DR was glad that the *JHA* replied at all to Thurston, it must be said that *JHA*'s reception of the Thurston note was atypical from the start: Hoskin did not acknowledge receipt until *after* refereeing. At that point, Hoskin said that the *JHA* would publish a version *that was agreeable to Jones*. (Note that, had Jones been a completely dishonest scholar, this policy could have given him the power to squelch the note. It's happened.) No thought of checking with *JHA*-shunned DR, who had caused the entire proceedings — not to mention having indisputably first arrived at (& published: *DIO 1.1* ¶6) the orbit which fit trio C.

**C4** Now, when a journal has published an erroneous paper by scholar *J*, whose errors are corrected by scholar *x*, it might seem to you and me that the party whose advice should be sought is the latter. But that is not the way the *JHA* operates, since this journal's prime measure of authors is personal rather than substantial. Despite the strong hint at *DIO 4.2* (p.54 News Note C), neither Hoskin nor the Muffia communicated with DR during the refereeing, composition, & publishing of the *JHA* correction.

**C5** I quote further from the 1995/3/14 DR letter excerpted at §B2:

What kind of journal publishes a correcting note based on scholar *x*'s revelation of . . . errors in a lead paper in the journal, illustrating the journal's refereeing derelictions, but refuses to seek refereeing by *or even [communication] with scholar x*? (Hoskin's condition for publishing the correction was that the note must be approved *by the [erroneous author], not the corrector*. Do you seriously regard *DIO* as over-reacting, when we treat the Hist.sci community as a zany cult?) It seems that DR is the only party who [*DIO 2.3* ¶6 §F3] doesn't want the Muffia-*DIO* war to continue. (I prefer concentrating on historical discoveries, not modern flubbadubs.) However, the Muffia insists on keeping its lordly nose in the air (see *Black Affidavit, DIO 1.3* ¶10, end of ¶4 [also at *DIO 4.3* ¶15 §I2]), and its critics are delighted to watch *DIO* keep bloodying that nose.

**C6** If a cult keeps cheating scholars, some naïve souls may object. A few extreme-nonrealists (*DIO 4.3* ¶15 §C11) may even do so out in public.

## D Secrecy's Costs, or: How Not to Publish a Retraction

**D1** Though the main initial referee report on Thurston's paper was something of a credit to the *JHA*, Hoskin's close-to-the-vest approach then undermined the opportunity for progress — and even (§D8) needlessly degraded accuracy a bit.

**D2** The *JHA*'s referee report on Thurston's note commented:

Are the parameters for the eccentricity and apogee historically supported? . . . some verification of any historical use of these parameters apart from this derivation would be necessary in order to reach any conclusions.

**D3** Can this theory [the DR&Thurston Greek-trig solution of trio C] explain the discrepancies between Hipparchus and Ptolemy in the eclipse trio observations? [I.e., trios A&B of Jones 1991 & *DIO 1.2-3*.] If the author can explain these as well, then the case for Hipparchus using a "Ptolemaic" solar motion will be much stronger, since it is the eclipse trios that led Jones to the Babylonian model [as an explanation for Hipparchus' solar positions].

**D4** Had the *JHA* merely possessed the emotional calmness to seek input from an exiled (§I & *DIO 1.2* §B3) party, Hoskin would've had the answers to these comments.

**D5** As to ref-comment §D3: *DIO 1.3* §§M4&K9 contained (fn 21) the very Greek-trig solutions, for both trio A & trio B, which the *JHA*'s *own referee recommended be brought to bear on the issue*. (Not only solar orbits but *lunar* orbits as well: *ibid* eqs.6, 8, 9, 19, & 20.) However, *JHA* readers are not informed of that — i.e., of the cohesive breadth of the *DIO*

achievement, which used the same Greek-trig-orbit idea to solve **all three** of Hipparchos' eclipse trios.

**D6** Regarding ref-comment §D2, on historical support of Greek-trig solar solutions: [i] All three orbits (fitting trios A, B, & C) are shown to be founded upon seasonlength data which are historically connected to Hipparchos. See *ibid* §M5 (trio A), §§K4-K9 (trio B), & *DIO 1.1* ¶6 §§C6f (trio C). [ii] Moreover, the long-mysterious amplitude of the error curve of the zodiacal stars of the (*late Hipparchos*) Ancient Star Catalog is perfectly matched by the amplitude of the error curve of the (*late Hipparchos*) trio C orbit. (See *ibid* §§F3-F5.) [iii] Finally, the *Almajest* 5.5 mean longitude of the uncomputed 2<sup>nd</sup> position of trio C agrees on the nose with the *DIO* solution for trio C. (See the astonishing match at *ibid* §H5.) Again, *JHA* readers are not informed of any of this — *despite the urging of Hoskin's chosen referee that such material be brought in*.

**D7** Evidently fearing that further interaction might produce requests for adding such — which would reveal just how powerfully & consistently the historical & mathematical evidence favors the DR solutions — Hoskin instead: [a] continued the *JHA*'s immature refusal to communicate with DR (whose corrections were, after all, the cause of the entire Thurston article & Jones retraction!), and [b] failed (uncharacteristically) to send Thurston the article's proofs.

**D8** The results of Hoskin's behavior (which placed accuracy not quite atop the *JHA*'s list of priorities [§I]): [a] A potentially confusing slip<sup>9</sup> never got corrected. [b] An astronomical immortal's name was mis-spelled. [c] The 2<sup>nd</sup> observation's time of day was 5 2/3 hours, but the *JHA* printed it as 5 hours. (Such errors will create problems for any *JHA* reader who tries to check the math of the situation. But, then, as Thurston has often pointed out, Hist.sci readers seem to be an amazingly trusting lot: whereas he instinctively checks out numbers in papers [including DR's] while reading them, this appears to be a rare trait — which Alex Jones & DR are one in admiring Thurston for.) [d] An erroneous attribution was inserted (§D9).

**D9** In Thurston's ms as submitted, the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph begins: "There is in fact a simple eccentric solar motion . . . that accounts for [the trio C observations]." However, in an attempt to save Muffia face, Hoskin made an astounding, uncomprehending, and invertedly<sup>10</sup> false insertion — without even asking the author's (or Jones') permission! — and altered the above passage to read (insertion italicized): "*As Jones shows*, there is in fact a simple eccentric solar motion . . . that accounts for [the trio C observations]."

**D10** The foregoing details are provided partly as a warning to those scholars who are trusting enough to send material to the *JHA*. Lesson: you never know how it's going to come out. . . . (It's an Art Levine satire-fantasy,<sup>11</sup> come to life.)

<sup>9</sup> Thurston trustingly took the year-numbers of the three observations from p.415 of O.Pedersen's valuable (as Thurston rightly notes) but error-riddled (*DIO 1.1* ¶5 fn 6) 1974 *Survey of the Alm*; however, all these numbers are low by unity. Thurston intended to make such corrections when the proofs arrived. Which they never did. Fortunately, Pedersen's flub has no effect upon deduction of eccentricity & apogee (which are the only elements Thurston treats).

<sup>10</sup> The whole point of the 1991/5 *JHA* paper (which the Thurston note undoes) is the claim that Greek eccentric motion will NOT account for the data.

<sup>11</sup> A.Levine (ContribEd, *WM*) "Have You Got What It Takes to Write for the *Washington Monthly*?", *WM 21.1:54*. (Editor Chas. Peters not only had the integrity and self-critical humor to run this in 1979 — he then *re-ran* it in the 1989/2 issue). "Writers for *The Washington Monthly* sometimes complain that we're a little too, shall we say, uninhibited, about urging our point of view upon them — and their manuscripts. . . . [Are you sitting at home wondering:] How can I become a *Washington Monthly* writer? . . . Could I get published in your magazine? Welcome aboard! Our top-notch editors will be glad to add [to your ms] . . . loads of *thought-provoking opinions* without troubling you with the dreary task of doing it yourself. Many contented writers have said that there's no surprise quite like seeing a manuscript of theirs end up as an article in *The Washington Monthly*. Often they find themselves espousing ideas they've never even heard of, much less agree with."

## E How to Throw Away a Chance for Progress

In addition to Hoskin's continuing silence towards DR:

**E1** At the 1994/5/6-8 Dibner Inst conference (M.I.T.), DR spoke amiably to a number of Muffia scholars. But no communication has come from any since. (To the contrary, no untenured Hist.sci scholar dares submit papers to *DIO*, for fear of cult ostracism.)

**E2** We understand that K.Moesgaard (Univ Aarhus, Denmark) is reluctant<sup>12</sup> even to review our Tycho star catalog (*DIO* 3, 1993) — which he privately deems valuable — so long as it contains anything<sup>13</sup> displeasing to the Muffia. (Some Hist.sci scholars — even Danes — regard political game-playing as more important than doing justice to Denmark's Tycho and to accurate history.) However, *Annals of Science* and *Isis* have recently requested & received review copies of the *DIO* Tycho catalog. (Predictably, the *J.Hist. Astronomy* has not been heard from.) Good to see; however, in an ongoing context of archonal aloofness & conference-exclusion (and years of Hist.sci's total-blackout-contitation of the DR discovery [*DIO* 2.1 ¶4 Tables 1&2] that Tycho faked 10 stars), *DIO* will, until the reviews appear, maintain a skeptical wait&see attitude: reasonable in light of the boilerplate<sup>14</sup> negative 1995/6 *Isis* 86:309 Muffia review of the work of H.Thurston, who'd disobeyed Muffia orders not to support or even cite DR: *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §E3.

**E3** As I have made known to several scholars recently, the Muffia&clo seem to have no wish (fnn 7&22, ¶1 §I2) to make any essential change in their habits. (All right, all right, so We made a few technical slips, but nothing here upsets orthodoxy or hegemony.) A unilateral refusal to communicate is an obvious sign of this. (E.g., §I, ¶1 fn 31.) As also is the very recent *Isis*-Muffia attempt (§E2) to harm a *DIO* sympathizer. (DR has written and/or phoned several Neugebauer-clan-Muffiosi over the years. [See, e.g., *DIO* 1.3 fn 280.] Nothing<sup>15</sup> has come back. After two decades of such, I'm catching a trend here.)

**E4** By this time, Muffiosi know just as well as DR that: [a] their horrid behavior will be embarrassingly repulsive<sup>16</sup> to future historians & [b] Muffia-proscribed RN-DR work will be regarded as of value (as will some Muffia work). Question: knowing that, sooner or later, we're going to end up at [b] (probably sooner — *unless recent Hist.sci gesturelets are just cynical pretenses*), what sort of scholars need to be tediously dragged, kicking & snarling, millimeter by millimeter, to our presumed eventual state of fairness & tolerance? Why not just go straight there without more decades of bloodletting?

**E5** Otherwise, it's going to be a gradual incremental series of Muffia acknowledgements, each step usually separated by (strife-filled) years: [a] DR exists (1992). [b] *DIO* exists

<sup>12</sup> This, though he (unofficially) helped inspire a last-minute 1994/6/30 phonecall to DR from the well-intentioned Editor of the eminent (& very high quality) Danish series *Acta Historiae Sci Nat&Med* (which has published Neugebauer & Pedersen), offering to [a] publish the *DIO* Tycho catalog, [b] distribute thousands of advertisements, & [c] make DR famous. [Curious. DR never sought such spectacular intercession. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* Vat City 1948 p.xv: It is the faithful's duty to report dangerous (fn 13) literature.] Contracting for this *Imprimatur* would risk: [i] "editing" at the hands of those who will condone no defilement of Muffia majesty (§E2), & [ii] removing [credit from *DIO* &] control (see *DIO* 2.1 ¶3 fn 8) of the work's date [or even act] of publication into said hands. (DR just went with imminent distribution of the uncensored *DIO* 3 rendition of the Tycho catalog.) DR had already been through this process before (again: *instant* DR-assent requested), with Moesgaard & *JHA*, as regards the latter's written 1981/9/17 acceptance of a paper now known as Rawlins 1999: see *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 25. (On the former, see: *JHA* 1.2 fnn 56&170 & *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 fn 41.) Over 10<sup>7</sup> later, the paper remains unpublished. (General rule: don't rush into publication-offers connected to cliques who've spent years ignoring and/or slandering everything you've *already* published. Approaches are more convincing when they aren't flagrantly cart-before-horse [e.g., *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §A9, *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B42]: i.e., partial-respect citations come *first*, & then *later* we get to publication-cooperation.)

<sup>13</sup> E.g., the upsetting if critical revelations at *DIO* 3 fn 54, fn 141, §§L8-L11, §§M4-M5 (D675-80, 971, 1001-4).

<sup>14</sup> *DIO* 1.2 fn 92. [A Muffia complaint of insufficient notice to *its* literature is funny and/or nutty: *DIO* 1.2 §I14.]

<sup>15</sup> See *DIO* 1.2 fn 25! Near-exceptions (all late 1970s): a return-phonecall monolog from Britton, a too-busy-to-check-anything note from Neugebauer himself, and a contentless note from Swerdlow's secretary. More recently: at the Dibner conference, Alan Bowen creditably attempted (evening of 1994/5/7) to have a leisurely conversational exchange of ideas privately with DR but was swiftly warned by B.Goldstein to cease.

<sup>16</sup> A point of absolutely null weight for scholars [i] primarily interested in present funding, & [ii] having complete [& revealing] trust in a corrupt system's flawless capacity for shrugoff-repelling considerations of reason & equity. Indefinitely (§I).

(1995). [c] Direct communication (199?). [d] Acknowledgement of some heresies' truth (20??). [e] Acknowledgement of their value to the field (2???).

**E6** I remain (as always)<sup>17</sup> prepared to sit down with Muffiosi (not in terrified-Muffie [*DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §§G13-G14] secrecy this time) — as I tried to do at the 1994/5/6-8 Dibner conference — in order to work towards: [i] mutual understanding, [ii] Hist.sci tolerance of heterodox research approaches, & [iii] establishment of safeguards and of equitable procedures for lowering the chances that future academic dissidents will have to endure the sort of dictatorial arrogance that has cursed the Ptolemy controversy. By [i], I do not mean that we will cease disagreeing, and criticizing & improving each others' knowledge & positions. But I would prefer to see this done unreflexively and without cultish belligerence. I.e., why can't both sides confer, face to face, to enjoy the high heritage we share in common — and to see our differences as sources of nourishment, not as heretical sins? (Further: have Hist.sci archons considered the time-factor here? Like any hatred or other narcotic, Muffia loathing of DR is just getting progressively more unrenounceable as the years pass.) One side continues, as ever (for over a decade: fn 17), to be ready for this. Just as one side has for years repeatedly acknowledged the value of some of the other's output (despite receiving largely noncitation and hit&run sniping in return). And too much of the Hist.sci community continues, as ever, to despise-exile the accessible, appreciative, & non-party-line side.

**E7** Indeed, during the 2 decades of the ancient astronomy Controversy, not one Hist.sci scholar has ever once expressed a word of appreciation for DR's consistent policy of praising & encouraging (& pointing out his intellectual debts to) the valid work of snobster-enemies, even those attempting to murder his career (*DIO* 4.1 ¶4 fn 1). If one didn't know better, one might get the idea that maintaining principled, impersonal fairness in the evaluation of academic output, does not concern or so much as interest Hist.sci archons.

## F The Positives

But I'll end on the upbeat aspects of the Muffia-Orbituary incident. While the *JHA* appears to have done little more than the bare minimum [this consistent strategy becomes crystal clear at §H] (so that, knowing AAAS-*Science* to be watching [§A3-A4], *JHA* can appear honest), nonetheless: some slight improvement is visible.

**F1** First, Hoskin's promise to publish the Thurston & Jones note was kept. (A similar Hoskin promise to DR has not been kept: *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 fn 25 & Rawlins 1991W §O8. DR continues to await its consummation — and Hoskin's attainment of sufficient maturity to communicate with DR.) Further: the following §§F2&F3 compliments reflect some credit also upon Hoskin, since the *JHA* printed the material.

**F2** Second, Alex Jones (*Isis* Board) deserves commendation for going somewhat beyond the minimum: it was evidently his decision to cite the *DIO* 1.2-3 paper correcting his errors — this despite the fact that this paper was none too gentle on him & his Muffia colleagues. (I.e., it was written rather in the fashion<sup>18</sup> of the Muffia scorn heaped for decades upon Robert Newton & co.) Which factor only adds to the praise Jones merits — and to the respect which *DIO* henceforth owes him.

**F3** Third, Hugh Thurston was the sole participating scholar who possessed both the specialized math knowledge and the sheer nerve that were required to compose his correcting note and then to send it to the *JHA*. For these deeds, he merits the gratitude and admiration of every ancient-astronomy scholar — and, as well, of all academics who value open thinking and free speech in the scholarly community.

<sup>17</sup> *DIO* 1.1 ¶3 fn 7, *DIO* 1.3 fn 269.

<sup>18</sup> With the critical difference that *DIO* explicitly recognized the worth & high scholarship of some of Jones' work (*DIO* 1.2 §J4) and suggested that he had elsewhere been let down by poor refereeing (*ibid* §F4).

## G Postscript A: Un-Re-Evaluating

**G1** A Hist.sci scholar of the highest credentials & international esteem wrote Thurston (1994/12/29, with copy to DR):

I am so very pleased to see that your article will appear in *JHA* [26:164; 1995/5], as it deserves . . . . I am glad both that the meanderings of Jones' argumentation can be set aside, and that Rawlins will have a little bit of recognition for the discovery of UH [Hipparchos' long-lost solar orbit, used by him for his solar-obs trio C]. . . . I have checked [Rawlins'] calculations and found nothing to quibble about. I hope your article will trigger some important re-evaluations.

**G2** In the many months since, nothing has been re-evaluated.<sup>19</sup>

## H Postscript B: Biggie's Smallness Confuses Even Him

**H1** On 1995/6/2, Thurston sent the following to Hoskin, asking that it be printed as a correction to Thurston's *JHA* 26:164 note:

The phrase "As Jones shows" which starts the second paragraph is not part of the original note and was added without my knowledge. It was Rawlins, not Jones, who showed that a simple eccentric motion fits the data. What Jones did was to try but fail (as his addendum openly and honestly acknowledges) to show that no continuous motion fits the data. . . . Hugh Thurston

**H2** On 1995/6/20, Hoskin responded by: [i] transmitting an incredibly complicated attempted explanation for *JHA*'s inexcusable behavior, and [ii] refusing to publish Thurston's very brief §H1 notice, instead publishing Hoskin's own ultra-brief correcting note (pleading carelessness,<sup>20</sup> contra §§C3-C5 and §§D7-D9), thus, directly refusing to publish an unambiguous notice that DR has contributed significantly to scientific history. (*JHA* can hardly claim that it has made DR's contributions clear, when *its own Editor* pleads so much confusion about the matter, that *JHA* has had to correct itself!) The latest *JHA* note could've simply said that "As Rawlins shows" was meant. But Hoskin sees black at the middle word: after years of Hoskin attempts to banish & damn DR into nonexistence (for which *JHA* will never express regret), the *JHA* just *can't* bring itself to frankly admit an important DR achievement. I.e., the most vital shortcoming here is not of math but of character.

**H3** Hoskin's §H2 gyrations add to those described earlier here — and have the same bottom lines: embarrassment-minimization, & the *JHA*'s squandering yet another opportunity to partake of the bracing & cleansing experience of honest, open, uninhibited generosity. (In extenuation: [i] Even though posing as the type of deity known as "editor", Hoskin is human; no one enjoys self-embarrassment. [ii] He has, for years, had untrustworthy advice from archons whose eminence superficially implied trustworthiness, and whose hefty censorial bigotry constrained editorial options.) Plain facts: [a] Hoskin tampered with Thurston's text in a way that tended to cover *JHA* shame. [b] *JHA* then prevented correction of this inexcusable alteration by failing to send proofs to Thurston. [c] Now, it must prevent publication of the further §H1 embarrassment — failing yet again to print (as DR repeatedly urged: fn 7 & *DIO* 4.2 ¶7 §B42; see also §§D5-D6) clear *JHA* acknowledgement of *DIO*'s undeniable priority in proving that (contra *JHA*'s lead paper) Greek-style

<sup>19</sup> Indeed, despite the Muffia Orbituary disasters (and DR's perfect-fit Hipparchos-based solutions to all the 3 data trios involved: §H3), Muffiosi continue lockstep-swear that the solar data of eclipse-trios A&B are Babylonian: *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 fn 26. See DR-vs-Muffia comparisons at Rawlins 1991W fn 209. Similarly, see *ibid* §§P1-P2.

<sup>20</sup> *JHA* 26:274 (1995/8): "In the Note by Hugh Thurston that appeared on p.146 of our May issue, the opening words of the second paragraph ('As Jones shows') were an incorrect editorial gloss and should be deleted. The Editor pleads *incuria*."

continuous-function solutions fit all the 3 trios of *Almajest* data under discussion in the *JHA* paper and (§D5) that all 3 of these orbit-solutions are derived & presented<sup>21</sup> in *DIO* 1.2-3.

**H4** Adding to these credits, the *Journal for-the-History-of-Astronomy* has also refused even to inform its readership of the existence of *DIO* 3's 1993 Tycho star catalog, published by DR, with whom Hoskin still insists on total noncommunication — a unilateral breach that persists (it's been over 12 years) only & entirely because Hoskin is afraid that ending it under criticism might create a Wicked-Witch-style meltdown of a long-nurtured image of: Bigness. He remains sadly short of understanding the deeper meaning of the word.

**H5** It's inspirational to realize that (contra the naïve mild optimism<sup>22</sup> of §A5), despite the daunting challenges presented by the *JHA*'s ghastly "Muffia Orbituary" (*DIO* 1.2-3) episode, nonetheless, that curious journal's degree of devotion to integrity, impersonal equity, and *astronomical history* has overcome all — and thus (§E3) miraculously emerged essentially intact.<sup>23</sup>

## I Postscript C: Priorities & Sentences

**I1** Hoskin's last letter (1983/3/3) before condemning DR (3/21) to an indeterminate<sup>24</sup> sentence of exile:

. . . I devoutly hope that in future you will honour other editors with your contributions. Your undoubted talents are bought at too high a price.

**I2** I urge that Hoskin issue a public (not [typically] behind-the-back, thus uncheckable) explanation of the mysterious priorities underlying that revealing final sentence.

<sup>21</sup> See *DIO* 1.2 fn 33.

<sup>22</sup> See the more prescient suggestion at *DIO* 1.2 fn 30: "In reaction to Hist.sci's current ['Muffia Orbituary'] incident, no Hist.sci institution will effect any changes beyond the cosmetic."

<sup>23</sup> The standing causes of Muffia niggardliness & non-motion are discussed at *DIO* 4.3 ¶15 §§E4&E7.

<sup>24</sup> *DIO-JHA* 1.2 §B3. Note: Hoskin hasn't many more years left in which to fulfill the *JHA*'s written 1981 agreement (fn 12) to publish Rawlins 1999.