

Target

Bans, Banks, Bosses, Burglars, Blacklist&Blackmail

www.dioi.org/tar.pdf

Dennis Rawlins (DR)

dioi@mail.com

A History-of-science's Smear-Review Policy

A1 It all started as an academic disagreement about eclipses&longitude, between a competent¹ scientist and a science-challenged History-of-science cult, which has deservedly been losing respect and niches in academe for years — thus by now so anxious to survive that it will resort to ANY desperate means to hide its weaknesses

A2 The extent of the international History-of-science community's fear of DR will seem *a priori*-improbable to those not acquainted with its duration&intensity. Yet its noncitation-shun (see, e.g., *Griffith Observer* 82.8 [www.dioi.org/g828.pdf] p.16, 2018 Aug) — & recent bizarre and intensely hateful dirtytricks re him (detailed below) — leave so little doubt of its hysteria that context here will help.

A3 DR's researches and their repeated vindications have been wellknown for decades (www.dioi.org/vin.htm), including being featured both in top academic journals (www.dioi.org/dd.htm) and on newspaper front pages (e.g., <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/05/09/did-byrd-reach-pole-his-diary-hints-no.html>) & national evening news (CBS' Dan Rather, etc). But prominence&achievement are no protection from the mad-dog character-assassins of the History-of-science club, which answers academic disagreement not with competent scholarship but instead by trying (§§A7&E5 below) to destroy the good names of even the most eminent scholars in revenge for invading "their" field.

A4 After 100^y of Hist.sci's insistence that Babylonian astronomy underlay Greek astronomy, that long-dominant myth was shattered (www.dioi.org/jb.pdf) when DR's journal *DIO* mathematically traced (www.dioi.org/j116.pdf, 1991; www.dioi.org/jb11, 2002) Babylon's prime lunisolar elements to Greek origins (see British Museum tag on central cuneiform text: www.dioi.org/cot.htm#btcx). And DR's new contributions to 400^y (since Tycho, 1598) of prominent scholars' evidences of Ptolemy's fraudulence (www.dioi.org/pg.pdf) added to a growing threat to the viability of a traditional Hist.sci grantcow. Anyone in Hist.sci who doubts the (utterly mythic) primacy of Babylonian or Ptolemaic astronomy risks exile² from publication, conferences, funding. And — as we'll see — much worse. (Simple fact [www.dioi.org/j805.pdf§R2]: *To win defending sacred nonsense, one always ultimately ends up cheating.*) In 2018, DR surprise-proved decades of narrow-focus Hist.sci searches for evidence of a small Greek "stade" (to vindicate Eratosthenes' overestimate of the Earth's circumference) were just a snipe-chase: the hitherto-unsuspected actual triple-1%-fit solution was not metrological but physical (simply standard light-bending by air, "atmospheric refraction"): *Griffith Observer* 82.8 (www.dioi.org/g828.pdf, 2018 Aug pp.9-16). Hist.sci refuses (*ibid* p.16) — ever — to credit OR EVEN CITE this invincible *three-way-spot-on* successful solution (at-long-last) to the most famous ancient-science mystery. Presently true for all of DR's scores (fn 1) of original finds.

And wider academe continues to expect public trust even as it never interferes with its political bosses' shuns.

A5 In the 2015 March issue of the History of science Society's flagship journal *Isis* appeared a *new discovery*: since Eratosthenes' solar distance was c.100 Earth radii (not infinity), his famous measure of Earth's circumference as 250000 stades might've been parallax-adjusted which at last could explain Strabo's rendition, 252000 stades. The catch? **It wasn't new**, having appeared 7^y earlier (when indeed new) in DR's journal *DIO* v.14 †1: www.dioi.org/je01.pdf, fn 6.

A6 *Isis* for 2016 December carried a huge Pb 20pp article attacking Pascal Gosselin (1790), several current Max Planck Institute mathematicians (Berlin), and DR as "deluded" for concluding that ancients used lunar eclipses to find cities' separations in longitude, the denigration based upon hilarious (indeed, near-incredible) central *Isis* confusions of addition&subtraction and of a solar eclipse with a lunar eclipse! (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf, pp.4f) — along with 5 lesser but mostly obvious errors (*ibid* p.8), showing that *Isis'* alleged *six* referees&editors&readers **had checked nothing**.

A7 By chance, *Isis'* Editor had been corresponding with *DIO* in August-September & thus could have saved himself ultimate embarrassment by asking us for scientifically competent advice — or careful refereeing — which so routinely eludes History-of-science journals. **Instead, he and his Board refused to correct either the 2015 or the 2016 offenses** (*ibid* p.9). That Board happened to include María Portuondo, Chair of the History-of-science Dep't of extremely monied&powerful Johns Hopkins University. (Johns Hopkins gets more US Defense Dep't grantcash than any other university.) As for most of his life, DR lives nextdoor to JHU, one of the very few major universities that is so indiscriminate as to maintain on its campus a pseudo-supervised dep't representing a pseudo-supervised field that is notoriously mathscience-challenged — thus hypersensitive (re scientists' well-intended advice) to the point of defensive abusivity, even viciousness: www.dioi.org/ns.htm; www.dioi.org/jm00.pdf, pp.4-5&8-9&26&54-55&87 fnn 2-6. (Re Portuondo's astronomical amateurishness: www.dioi.org/sh.pdf, §B11. Re her considerable scholarly merits: www.dioi.org/rfw.pdf.) [To maintain-ensure her club-status, she can of course impute none to DR.]

¹ Partial DR vitae: scientific at www.dioi.org/jm00.pdf, pp.2&44; re scientific history (*DIO* doing justice to ghosts), near-chronologically cataloged at www.dioi.org/jw12.pdf. (Briefer: www.dioi.org/jw01.pdf §F45; www.dioi.org/ji01.pdf, p.70.)

²In recent years, Harvard University's ADS-ABS abstract service has classified *DIO* as "Unrefereed", a slanderous lie (*DIO* is in truth the most carefully refereed journal in the entire scientific history field: §A10 [b], below), a lie possibly born of our exposures of Claudius Ptolemy's fakery, which offend longtime Harvard Hist.sci Dep't head O.Gingerich, even though Ptolemy's sins aren't subtle, e.g., stealing Hipparchos' 1025-star catalog (www.dioi.org/pg.pdf §D); faking the Arbelia eclipse's time (*ibid* §E); Ptolemy's four "observations" of the Sun had (*ibid* §A) mean error of twice the Sun's diameter (!) and were **FIFTY times** closer to 280^y-old indoor tables than to the real outdoor Sun.

A8 Portuondo did not reply when DR mass-emailed problems to the *Isis* Board (incl. her), nor to a 2017/6/11 phone message. When DR asked Rob't Kargon, elder of the Dep't, to look over the situation, he pleaded too "rusty" (2017/9/5). (Kargon has long loathed *DIO*. He secretly got *DIO* removed from JHU's main [MSE] library 1992-1997 [see www.dioi.org/dgs.pdf, flyer distributed 1997/4/26 at JHU Hist.sci's Galileo Symposium, causing Kargon to call in a campus cop for safety!], until *NYTimes* page-one coverage of *DIO*, <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/05/09/did-byrd-reach-pole-his-diary-hints-no.html>, made it impossible to believe his nonexpert's uncomprehending smear that *DIO* was just a fringe nothing.) All too typically, historians-of-science were responding to criticism by hiding their flubs and shunning the potentially helpful critic as an enemy, without considering: [a] the advantages of the expertise offered, [b] the possibility that criticisms are friendly heuristic advice, given cooperatively by those with a historical interest — and, oh-yes — [c] whether the criticism is scientifically/historically accurate. **Item [c] is undeniably irrelevant to a club snubbing non-members.** The field's resultant hermit-isolation from scientifically able input exemplifies how a cohesive gang can falsify Accepted Consensus, thereby corrupting the truthseeking process by amateurish science & political obeisance to selectively generous academic bosses — supplemented by coverups of both.

A9 No scholar prefers to contribute his findings in isolation. Though DR has (see esp. www.dioi.org/sh.pdf) insisted on fairness towards Hist.sci, and admired valid contributions by the Hist.sci community to history (valuably including his own), that cult has nonetheless internationally shunned DR for decades in revenge for his public exposures of its awful science (e.g., §A7; www.dioi.org/ad.pdf & www.dioi.org/dd.pdf; www.dioi.org/jm00.pdf, *passim*) and its shamelessly-BossTweed-dishonest archons, including its **fifty-plus years** of refusal (e.g., §§A8&D7) to amiably discuss his heterodox findings. DR wishes to contribute solid new communally-cited history but to do so won't follow the easy conventional path of brainkissing the very same intolerant archons who selfishly keep feeding *error immortalis*.

A10 Upshot: Portuondo&Kargon refused [a] to ask for remedy to Hist.sci-uncorrected errors (Hist.sci *leading journals prefer to just let falsehoods remain uncorrected indefinitely, rather than admit fallibility*), or [b] to tolerate DR's well-known research, though no historian has ever found bad math or science in his ordmag 100 papers, while DR catalogs scores of key (even remarkable) errors [www.dioi.org/jhb.htm] in publications by the most prominent (even arrogant) Hist.sci archons&journals. So, DR visited a Johns Hopkins Hist.sci colloquium 2018/10/4 at Gilman Hall 300 for a lecture by Margaret Schotte (AsstProf History, York Univ, tel 416-736-2100) on the sextant-based navigation of British naval officer Edw.Riou 2 centuries ago. (A full account of what transpired is found at www.dioi.org/hj.pdf.)

A11 DR pre-handed out copies of *DIO* 22 (www.dioi.org/jm00.pdf) which is critical of Hist.sci **data-tampering** (§A15) etc but also in fairness bears over 80 compliments to historians of science. During the followup-Q&A, questions were asked of the speaker which in no case hinted at scientific grasp. Correction of data for "semidiameter" had been mentioned in the lecture's discussion of sextant measures for chronometer-control. No one even asked what was meant. Because no one knew. Or cared to know. Finally, DR raised his hand and quietly asked if anyone among the 2 dozen attendees was from the math or physics/astronomy dep'ts. Typically no one was; so DR suggested the value of cross-germination & sedately asked the group 3 questions, all closely related to the lecture's subject: [1] What's the Earth's circumference in meters? Pause while DR looked about, finding no hands. [2] What's the human eye's visual acuity in radians? Pause. Again, no hands. (Arcmin would have been OK, but: silence.) [3] How far can one see over the ocean from a height of 100 meters? Again, no reaction until someone interrupted the devastating silence by declaring that DR's questions were rude and that there only a few minutes left for other questions. DR quietly responded by pointing out that a scientist [or Lieutenant Riou] could handle most of the questions in seconds. [Answers: [1] 40 million; [2] 1/10000;³ [3] 21 nautical miles.] As Q&A ended, DR announced that anyone curious about the answers could speak to him. No one did, though one JHU grad-student came nearly nose-to-nose while (incredibly) challenging DR to explain how the 3 items were of any use! Which DR did for the 1st two, each a softball: [1] Since a sextant measures angle not distance, one needs Earth-circumference to convert sextant-derived degrees to km. (**HISTORICAL** fact: the meter was originally **DEFINED** by enlightenment France as 1/10000000 of the distance from Pole to Equator. [So the Earth's circumference is BY DEFINITION 40000000 meters.] The meter is **central to science**: the basis for grams, joules, watts, calories, etc.) [2] Visual Acuity divided by sextant-telescope-magnifying-power = observationally-derived geographical position's accuracy-limit. Final question [3] was the only nonSoftball; its key equation: $2.1 \cdot 100^{0.5} = 21$ nmi. Before being interrupted, DR had told the colloquium that the applicable formula is derived in Simon Newcomb's *Compendium* pp.198-203, pointing out the handy coincidence that Newcomb's portrait was hanging over the colloquium on Gilman 300's east wall! (Though no one indicated they'd ever known the identity of their own painting's subject.) Newcomb died in 1909 as the US' #1 positional astronomer. And a Johns Hopkins prof. [This might turn out to be the last JHU Hist.sci colloquium on navigation.]

A12 After the questions ended, Gianna Pomata (JHU Hist.sci) whom DR had never met before, approached and offered that DR had done nothing rude & wrote her name at DR's request in case someone said otherwise. (She has not responded since to email. But the document survives.) Since a female student had asked the speaker about finding longitude, DR told her that article 1 of *DIO* 22 (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf) — which she already (§A11) had in her hand — might help. Like the previous student, she evidenced no connexion to the scholarship. She just handed the free copy back, thus implicitly deeming all its dozens of scrupulously-rendered contributions (& corrections to mis-science) as not even worth looking at. When DR then asked *Isis*-Boardmember Portuondo about her nonreply re *Isis*' refusal to correct undeniable key errors, she loudly shrieked: "YOU ARE NOT WELCOME HERE!" The next day, DR reported the incident (www.dioi.org/jhya5.pdf) to the Dean. No reply.

A13 When *DIO*'s Editor Bob Bryce & DR dropped by 2 weeks later for the next Hist.sci colloquium 2018/10/18 at Gilman Hall 300, both were threatened (by a **campus-cops-backed** supervisor) with ejection if either created

³Knowing 1/10000 rad is human vision's limit: key to *DIO*'s 2008 solving at last Archimedes' final *Sandreckoner* equation: www.dioi.org/je02.pdf.

“another” *disturbance* as on 2018/10/4! Obviously, JHU Hist.sci had lied to Security re who’d yelled at the 10/4 colloquium (Bryce was threatened likewise even though he wasn’t even there 10/4), so DR told the Security guy he was warning the wrong person, but he showed no interest in threatening screamer Portuondo. Bryce detailed the offense (www.dioi.org/bryam.doc) to JHU’s Dean&President. No response.

(NB: Regarding JHU’s continuing [public] silence: *it has never committed itself in writing to an alternate version of the events DR&Bryce have described in detail*. Institutions so behaving leave the impression that they’re still making up their minds re what story to tell. See similarly&multiply an earlier, notorious JHU President’s like stonewalling, at www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, e.g., §O3 [p.44].)

A14 The 2018/10/18 colloquium was on astronomy — but the only astronomer in the room was disallowed to ask questions! As always, DR had not intended to do anything but help improve the Dep’t — but the Dep’t imagines (vs www.dioi.org/rfw.pdf) it doesn’t need help, and it was plain to Bryce&DR that it had (since 10/4) put in place unobtrusive plans (e.g., a pre-restricted list of those allowed to ask questions) to bar any post-talk remark from either DR or Bryce. Afterwards, DR wandered the Gilman Hall 3rd floor & poked his head into medieval history professor Anne Lester’s open office door, chatting quite amiably for awhile, ultimately promising next time in the neighborhood to bring her a copy of *DIO 18*, www.dioi.org/ji01.pdf, the journal’s Marlowe→Shakespeare volume.

A15 At the 2018/10/4 colloquium, DR had (§A11) handed to most attendees paper copies of *DIO 22*, detailing cases of censorship, skewed math&science, and deliberately-counter-DR data-tampering (www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, §§B-D&F-G) by *leading* Hist.sci figures. Though *DIO 22* was mailed to over 1000 prominent scientists & historians, no one has found the slightest error in the charges. Yet no JHU Hist.sci student inquired re *DIO 22*. Instead of curiosity, reaction was rage, loudly encouraged by Dep’t profdum. So what follows isn’t due to just a few students (e.g., students couldn’t post the sign shown at www.dioi.org/jhc.jpg without higher authorization), or to a single dep’t: *the whole field is infuriated by expert criticism*. And, fearing it, wishes not to listen to such, only to destroy it instead.

A16 On 2018/11/7, while entering into the ground floor of the building where DR lives (to visit a friend living there), the same female student who on 2018/10/4 had (§A12) refused to read *DIO 22*, happened to encounter DR and his wife Bunny. (Both Harvard B.A. 1959, married 1960/6/11. Link to a photo-bio of Bunny is found below at §C7.) The woman angrily berated both (!) for DR’s visit to the 2018/10/4 colloquium, especially for contacting the Dean the next day (www.dioi.org/jhya5.pdf), re *Isis*-Boardmember Portuondo’s editorial stonewall (§A8) & uncalled-for hostile bellow (§A12), etc. Since DR’s demeanor on that occasion had been gentlemanly&professorial (otherwise he would hardly have continued for 3 questions&pauses-for-answers before being interrupted), she was asked: was DR loud? insulting? namecalling? Well, no, but he *seemed* aggressive. (ESP, anyone?) And she added in triumph: DR is **NOT A HISTORIAN-OF-SCIENCE!** (Except for the last half-century-plus: fn 1.) Anyone wanna guess which two (unfortunately FAR less historical-discovery-generating) professors convinced her of that piece of snobbery? Further, she specifically asked: *do you live here?* Hearing the affirmative, she ordered DR not to come to any more colloquia and disappeared down the hall to visit the friend (§D4) who had just buzzed her into the building.

B Sneaking for Smearstuff: The Plot Sickens

B1 Twixt then & (§D5) 3 weeks later, while DR&Bunny (then 81^y old) were grocerying, their home was burgled by parties obviously less interested in fiscal profit than in displaying an *inadvertently cult-identifying* passion to snoop for smear-material rather than refute scholarship. (If purported scholars, they’d *chosen to spend time stalking* [§D4], scheming, **taking the time to go through everything B&D own, stealing whatever they liked**, determinedly aiming at personal ammo — rather than taking a few minutes to answer or verify elementary Hist.sci journal embarrassments: §A11.) The invaders walked right by a small, exquisitely-crafted genuine Sully painting (antiquely&elegantly framed, worth ordmag \$10000); a valuable&rare faithful photographic Norton Facsimile of the original 1623 Marlowe→Shakespeare *First Folio*; original 18th century Addison&Steele *Spectators*; originals of *Harper’s Weekly* 1859-1862; hundreds of science books (no danger they’d be of any interest to the invading “scholars”), dozens of Loeb Classics volumes (ditto), two pristine complete antique sets (Dr.Eliot’s 50-vol Harvard Classics & a rice-paper 11th Edition *Encyclopaedia Britannica*), classic histories (Gibbon, Buckle, Lecky), not to mention plenty of readily visible cash. But the hunters looked instead strictly for items that could be used to defame DR and/or stifle *DIO*: ANYthing to divert-from or disguise-pretend that DR is exiled from academe for any cause other than for occasionally exposing its frauds, coverups, & incompetencies. (E.g., *DIO* Vols.1, 4, 10, 12, 16, 22, 24, 28, 30, 32: indexed-linked at www.dioi.org/dioind.htm.) So the burglars instead stole materially-near-worthless but intimate photos, as well as a small loaded bedside pistol (and a small green box of spare bullets for it) [the absence of both was only discovered 2020/2/25] — while rifling through Bunny’s personal effects at her bedside shelves (where are kept her 60y-old diaries, and decades of Bank of America records), looking for info on DR&wife’s wealth: a matter of demonstrable Johns Hopkins interest (§D7). Also of intense disappointment: no tobacco or other drugs, no literature of or correspondence with any extreme, racist⁴ or seditious outfits were found since there weren’t&aren’t any. Despite DR’s scholarship-irrelevant (& regrettable but harmless) human imperfections, he’s

never responded to even his most academically-unprincipled cultist-enemies by:

backstabbing hypocrisy (§E4; www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf fn 5); *celebrating* opposites’ deaths (§E3); widow-swindling (§E2); hiding own key scholarly errors (esp. www.dioi.org/jg01.pdf †1 §A [vs www.dioi.org/err.htm]); noting⁵ only ene-

⁴For DR’s quite independent, longterm-merciful views, see www.dioi.org/ju00.pdf.

⁵ **Despite virtually zero reciprocity** for decades, *DIO* has oft and regularly admired enemies’ positives (e.g., §§A9&A11; www.dioi.org/sh.pdf [brief summary]; www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §W10 [p.69]) — even thanked them (OK, occasionally semi-sardonically: www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf fn 10) — for their intermittent contributions to general knowledge and/or DR’s own.

mies' bad sides (fn 5 [vs, e.g., §A7]); fake-refereeing (§§A6&D6, www.dioi.org/jk03.pdf fn 22 [!], www.dioi.org/j129.pdf §§B1-B3 & fn 6); censorship (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf); plagiarism (*idem*); theft (§B1, www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf fn 126); data-tampering (§A15); threat (§A13, www.dioi.org/j129.pdf §B, www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §§M11&O5 [pp.38&46] & fnn 54-55 [p.56]); burglary (§§B1&D1); killing dissent (www.dioi.org/j129.pdf §§B2&B3, www.dioi.org/pm3.htm); hiding crucial empirical scientific records (www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §Q3 [p.54], §§V1-V2 [p.60], & §W8 [p.68]); doctoring official reports (*ibid* §E10 [p.16] & fn 46 [p.46]); debate-dodging (www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf fn 6); blackmail (§§C8); **most antiTruth of all**: shun-nonciting enemy contributory high creativity (www.dioi.org/j601.pdf §§I-J).

However, **every one of those charming tactics HAS been employed** (sources in foregoing respective parentheses) to Demean, Contain, or Ruin successive challengers to establishment-history, a *prime* academic casualty thereof being **accurate scientific history**, so robbing science's modern&ancient greats of credit, even heroically-merited credit. (The often-cruel secondary effect is discouragement — even serious harm — to able but insufficiently tractable scholars.) Off-limits to ordinary, human, less-ruthlessly ambitious citizens, such dark arts are instead the province of the most Socially Acceptable institutions — the “Respectable” ones. Indeed, such methods are just how establishments maintain their Respectability — and specifically how they guard it whenever imperilled.

C Banishment&Banishers Multiply

C1 Lunching 2018/11/29 at the Johns Hopkins Club, Bryce&DR agreed to skip that day's particularly trivial Hist.sci colloquium. A little after 3 PM EST, DR went alone to Gilman Hall, to deliver as promised (§A14) *DIO 18* (Marlowe→Shakespeare) to the medieval-history prof he'd met 2018/10/18. As he exited the elevator on Gilman Hall's 3rd floor, he found that he was looking at the slightly-ajar door of the latest 3 PM Hist.sci colloquium (this time in room Gilman 308), which bore a prominent sign reading “Authorized persons only”. Previous to 2018/11/29, Hist.sci colloquia were open to all (www.dioi.org/jhya5.pdf, 2nd-last paragraph). Exiling DR from JHU Hist.sci colloquia (since that date) created a dissent-free Safe Space so typical of the modern campus — **without stated specification of offense** as befits JHU's police-state convent, and prevented DR from in-person fingering the irate Hist.sci student (of nearby JHU) who had inquired (§A16) re the location of DR's home just before it was robbed.

C2 Though DR was evidently spotted by one or more persons within Gilman 308, he tried photographing the door from its left, but found his camera's battery was dead & so slipped around the corner of the adjacent stairwell while replacing it. Meanwhile, the elevator door opened, and he could hear a throat being cleared, sounding like a black lady — which would almost certainly be a campus cop. When he finished replacing the battery, he came back around the corner to look & found her gone (presumably back down the elevator). After taking a few photos of the sign (e.g., www.dioi.org/jhc.jpg), he turned to go down the hall to deliver *DIO 18* — but found that the intended History-Dep't recipient Prof.Lester was just coming out of her office and was heading up the hall towards Gilman 308 when she recognized DR and said so. As we got closer, it became obvious that she was getting quite upset (in startling contrast to her earlier [§A14] amiability). DR handed her *DIO 18* which she nervously stuck just into her office, instantly shut the door, & mutely walked away at max speed — in the opposite direction from a moment earlier.

C3 It seems DR had been seen through the door when he peered momentarily into Gilman 308 (to confirm that it was indeed Hist.sci which had put up the sign). Evidently, both cop&prof had been phone-alerted to the appalling presence. Had the cop seen DR, he obviously would've been escorted from the building. (Fortunately, he was able to leave on his own and hasn't been back.) Curious way of treating one who has tried to enlighten the dep't & the field.

C4 Eventually, the secret leaked out that the excuse the Hist.sci Dep't was privately using (starting 2018 November) to protect students from horribilis DR was that he might shoot someone! Since, throughout DR's **purely scholarly** critiques of his academic opponents, **ALL shunning&hysteria — library-exile, censorship, banishment, screaming, calling-cops, highly intimate home-invasion, gun-theft** [not to mention blackmail (§C8 below) & secretly-instigated vain TRIPLE fiscal-investigation (JHU prof Barnett, IRS, PNC) *to seek out fervently-imagined illegal income*: §D1 etc, below] — has come from parties other than DR, it's obvious who will kill whom if the shooting starts. [And now the cultists could bump him off with his own pistol!] DR wasn't told that gun-nut smear was being used to **post-justify** a colloquium-hush of *DIO* which had already existed (§A14) back on 10/18, well before the gun-theft. DR only heard that slander later & not from ever cagily mute JHU.

C5 It's obvious that, by 2018/11/29, various JHU departments (Hist.sci, Physics [§D7], History [§C2]) had been told that DR was armed. Question: **WHAT WAS THE SOURCE OF THIS REMARKABLY ACCURATE INFORMATION?** No wonder the gungel-slander for banishment was kept from DR, since **IT REVEALED THE SLANDERERS' CONNEXION TO THE BURGLARY**. That connexion is to more than just a few youngsters, since elders knew of the gun-slander & (§D7) DR's wealth. But none cared to tell DR who was invading his home or how. (What sort of university harbors “scholars” of this stripe?) Identifying the origin of the snoops' curiosity is easy: since there's only one international academic club that wishes DR dead.

C6 The burglars went to an extreme one would normally find hard to believe: stealing longago nude photos of DR's spouse, unambiguously betraying a desire to “get something” on a frank journal, to silence its 3 decade tradition of exposing fraud and its coverups in academe. A curious irony: before burgling DR's home started in 2018, the Hist.sci establishment had kept virtually all of DR's main heretical ancient-astronomy findings from escaping to the general public. (As hermetically as the containment of SARS. And way, WAY easier in academe, with its vaunted “free-marketplace-of-ideas”.) So, hysterics like barring&bellowing (§A12), etc, were needless overkill. (Parallel case: The Dumbos had it made in 1972's election without Watergate burglary of the Dembos, but Nixon just couldn't resist.) All this explosively born of ever-more-desperate panic at DR's varied&ongoing&disseminated demonstrations (e.g., §A10, above) of Hist.sci's scholarly decline.

C7 DR utterly adores his wife Bunny: every cubic inch of her wise, generous, empathetic mind (incl. its unusual memory) & every square inch of her unmatched innocent divine corporality.⁶ For inspiration and remembrance of (regrettably-so-very) longago, DR has kept beautiful & playful photos of Bunny in their living room, porch, bedroom, & hall, and for the last decade (displayed largely in his study) near-60^y-old nudes: celestial (see www.dioi.org/np.pdf, §A1 bracket), gorgeous, ecstatic — valued&sentimental family treasures from early in their 6 decade marriage, *created to preserve through all time the angelic-dreamer glory of his gentle, skeptical, saintly goddess*. (Ere anyone damns DR for mesmerization into such worship, he should consult for himself the qualities, achievements, & typically irresistible photos contained in *DIO*'s bio-record of Bunny at www.dioi.org/bunny.htm.) In his 84^y of life, DR has never even met, much less known & intimately loved the like.

(Protestant-agnostic Brahms' *Ein Deutsches Requiem* [which he privately called "A Human Requiem" — inspired by the 1856&1865 deaths of his spiritual father Rob't Schumann and his genetic mother, Christiane]: the work's grave, overwhelming Part 2 opens with [text from Peter 1.24], "Denn alles Fleisch es ist wie Gras und alle Herrlichkeit des Menschen wie die Grases Blumen. Das Gras ist verdorret und die Blume abgefallen.") ["For all flesh is as grass and the glory of humanity as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away."])

C8 Robbing a joyfully intense portion of their so-distant early past [reminiscent of ill-starred 1814 Brit Washington-looter Maj.Gen.Ross' theft of James&Dolley Madison's love letters. . .] — stealing memories & history from a couple well into their 9th decade of life Bunny now barely walking, living for years with diabetes, arthritis, & scoliosis (extreme spinal curvature, *which burglars could plainly see during stalking* [§D4] & which Ms.Irate saw close-up 2018/11/7 [§A16]) — is a special brand of crime, most especially as the aim was blackmailing *DIO* into extinction.

D Banking Information

D1 Also in DR's study, PNC Bank fiscal statements were unmissably stacked near the pilfered photos. Reading B&D's considerable PNC holdings (atop the stack) took the burglars but a moment, but the dream of smearing DR for illegally obtained wealth lingered for months: §§D7-D14 below.

D2 What was the burglars' purpose in stealing every nude they could discern? (A thorough research-sabbatical?) They missed only 2 nudes: [1] a tiny facing-wrongway one near the living room window; [2] an unobvious one on the porch wall. EVERY ONE of the score of displayed non-nude photos was skipped. Aside from the thefts' plain threat to B&D: reflect on the fear-driven (§§A2&A15) vindictive meanness of trying to *extirpate every single erotic vestige* of a hate-object's lovely, irreplaceable romantic past.

D3 Consistent with *DIO*'s ethical & fearless tradition, B&D (quoting Wellington's reply to a blackmailer "publish & be damned") knowingly chose to risk even further establishment revenge rather than be blackmailer-extorted (dirtytricks-to-bury-dirtytricks) into abandonment of *DIO*'s unalloyed, inextinguishable commitment to valid, competent, *weighty* scientific history, and thus defiantly (www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, pp.69-70) — in the Pentagon-Papers tradition — mass-mailed on 2019/11/6 (*DIO 24*) dozens of pages of ultra-high academe's long-secret correspondence, VERBATIM-detailing coverup, corruption & censorial threat, to effect the monumental scientific crime of killing an accurate, evidence-based but heretically science-establishment-offending 1935 book that would have unleashed the truth of the most durable and most institutionally-protected science fraud of the 20th century, which *still* robs the greatest polar explorer, Norway's Roald Amundsen, of full public credit for his unique double: 1st at the South Pole (1911/12/14) & 1st at the North Pole (1926/5/12). *DIO 24* actually detailed — in his own words — *US science's top figure CELEBRATING* (§E3, below) the deaths of skeptics, including the then-wellknown suppressed rationalist author, C. Henshaw Ward (e.g., *Charles Darwin: The Man and His Warfare*, NYC 1927). The determined, persistent murderer of Ward's Peary-book (luckily-salvaged ms preserved at www.dioi.org/ph.pdf) was the groveling academic circle of no less than Isaiah Bowman, 1935-1949 President of Johns Hopkins University, VP National Academy of Sciences, chief Amer Association for the ADVANCEMENT of Science — that is: scientific academe's very pinnacle. Considering the amazing, invaluable contributions the scientific community — prominently incl. Johns Hopkins University — has made to knowledge (which astronomer DR *particularly* appreciates), it seems superficially inexplicable that institutional science has regularly been involved in censorship to guard sacred tenets: www.dioi.org/jw00.pdf †11.

D4 The thieves' well-planned&scheduled invasion required an undeclared occupant of B&D's building to get the thieves past its entrances' locks (ere penetrating the home itself), plus preparation by stalking to find when the home was usually unguarded, as well as enough lookouts for failsafe insurance on that point during the actual thefts. All this obviously involved a considerable investment of planning & time — time that could have been better spent acquiring at least a minimal dose of *scientific knowledge*, a sector of human achievement which actually *matters* (§A11) when attempting to pursue the grail toward which *DIO* has aimed from its 1991 inception: by original inductive analysis, imperfect people reconstruct the most perfect scientific history possible.

D5 During their criminal penetration, the burglars also stole a small pistol (loaded but never fired) kept next to Bunny (among a pile of modest Bank of America financial statements) that had resided for safety — undisturbed for 3/8 of a century — near her side of the bed. (Along with rope for climbing down from the 3rd floor in case of exit-cutoff by fire. [Needless to say, the rope wasn't stolen.]) Johns Hopkins campus-slander (§C4) of DR as a gun-obsessed maniac — which had so disturbed Prof Lester 2018/11/29 (§C2 above) — is not quite consistent with DR's neglect to even notice the pistol's absence before it was incidentally revealed during a thorough general home-search on 2020/2/25, over a year after the theft. (Launched by DR's rooting-out Bunny's longago memorabilia, en route to creating his 60th Wedding-Anniversary love-letter — since posted for all to co-worship at www.dioi.org/bunny.htm.)

⁶The pioneer unraveller of Brit astronomers' 150^y coverup of the truth of planet Neptune's discovery (www.dioi.org/j911.pdf, *Scientific American* 2004 December p.98, www.dioi.org/ju00.pdf §L), DR ranks lovely blue Neptune as his 2nd favorite celestial body: www.dioi.org/np.pdf §A1.

D6 DR followed his late stepfather in passing membership in Baltimore's venerable (now fading) 14 West Hamilton Street Club (mostly businessmen & lawyers) & years ago gave lectures there on Aristarchos & on Christopher Marlowe, also criticizing the science, integrity, & smear-review pseudo-refereeing policies (www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, fn 52, and www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf, fnn 3-5) of the by-now-understandably desperate History-of-science community, which has long been losing ground on campuses, to a degree that would frighten any cult.

D7 In 2018 December at the Club, JHU physics-prof-politician Bruce Barnett (finding he&DR were out of earshot of anyone else) quietly asked DR: whence comes the money to pay for DR's journal *DIO*? This was the first time anyone had ever asked DR such an intrusive question. It wouldn't be the last. DR didn't immediately answer, so a determined Barnett persisted: come-on, there's printing costs, mailing costs, etc. DR replied he was paying for the journal himself. Barnett then asked what fraction of *DIO* is written by DR, which made the inimical motive for his questions even more obvious, since a *Sky&Telescope* mob-hit article had earlier (2002 Feb p.40) mis-claimed that DR was writing most of it. Same month: DR noted at a HSClub luncheon that the Club was hearing only DR's side on the academic issues between himself&Hist.sci so he asked Barnett (before the whole assemblage), sitting at the other end of the long luncheon table: why not invite one or more members of the JHU Hist.sci Dep't to evaluate-debate at the Club DR's scientific-historical findings and/or refute them? Incredibly (& irrelevantly), Barnett said he didn't know any historians of science! DR replied that, just days ago, on 2018/11/29, he and *DIO*'s Editor Bryce had seen him hip-to-hip, talking with Hist.sci's Kargon. (As Barnett regularly does at the middle dining-room table at the Johns Hopkins Club, of which we are all 3 longtime members.) This hardly answered the suggestion of a (1/2-century-elusive) meeting of scholars to learn who's right. (*DIO* has long offered to publish written debates under scrupulously-designed fair rules: www.dioi.org/deb.htm. No takers: just part of the shun. See www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf, fn 6 [also fn 1].)

D8 Why Barnett would wish to deny (§D7) an association with Kargon raises a statistical question, given that the intellectually waning HSC still (despite 50% decline even ere the pandemic) then had over 100 members: [a] Who's the only Hamilton Street Club member routinely lunching with Kargon, who (§A8 above) wants to destroy *DIO* and would be glad to spy a way to ruin the journal financially? [b] Who's the only HSC member who ever probed *DIO*'s finances? Same person. Small world.

(Barnett keeps explaining&explaining that his fiscal questions of DR were entirely from finding no ads in *DIO*. Oh.) [Another statistical question: On 2018/11/7, the **JHU Hist.sci dep't** learned where DR lived (a few minutes walk from JHU), and within 3 weeks his home was burgled: the 1st burglary in the 40-home building in the decades he's lived there, and (of the 40) the home specifically of international-Hist.sci's #1-enemy. What are the odds?]

D9 When DR&wife sent in their taxes in 2019 April: for the 1st time in their 59^y marriage, the IRS requested backup documents. These were promptly sent. No reply. Until 2021/11/22! (note 1^d-proximity to *PNC-severance date*: §D13), when the case was closed: but IRS notice mailed to DR&wife a month later.

D10 In 2019, DR was exceptionally phone-contacted, by name, by a PNC-bank-related person claiming to be merely updating records and denying relation to IRS. Never happened before during all the years PNC had held DR&wife's custody account. (Going back to the 1990s with Mercantile Bank, before it was eaten by PNC.)

D11 Then, DR&wife began receiving written PNC requests from Cleveland (though PNC is located in Pittsburgh) for private information: they were each to fill out a form pseudo-amiably entitled, "Know Your Client Information Form (As required by the USA Patriot Act)". The first such were mailed 2019/9/19: see www.dioi.org/PNC2.pdf & www.dioi.org/PNC3.pdf. And the information sought was the very same (*idem* above) that the burglars had sought: what is DR's TOTAL worth? Besides asking for standard Patriot-Act identification info (Social Security #, and passport # or driver's license #), it requested, with a bold intrusiveness redolent of Barnett's inquiry (§D7) the previous December: "Estimate [*sic*] annual income ___", "Estimated net worth ___", "Source of wealth ___".

(Curious that the form was poorly proof-read. New? Special? See below at §D13.)

Despite the deceitful Patriot-Act header, the Patriot Act does NOT require such info. (As PNC was to admit on specific request in 2019 November: §D13 below.) Days later, DR passed around the PNC form at a Hamilton Street Club luncheon. The reactive chorus was almost unanimous: "Outrageous" — "Unbankerly". Many thought it must be a scam. But DR had already verified that *real* PNC-related people were *really* doing this. Inquiries of various (non-Baltimore) PNC people passed it off as just normal info-updating. So DR began asking around at various Baltimore banks. None said they required such info — especially from a client of decades-long standing. Baltimore's central PNC office showed DR a closely similar "Know Your Customer" form but it omitted the 3 offensive questions of the "Know Your Client" form sent to DR&wife, and the Baltimore office pleaded unfamiliarity with that.

D12 In October, a 2nd mailed PNC request triggered an eventual DR October phone call to PNC (during a respite from intensive work on *DIO* vol.24) asking about such oddities, but imparting DR&wife's approximate income.

D13 A 3rd PNC request in November triggered a DR inquiry at his local PNC branch, which contacted main PNC, who then phoned DR later that day. DR pressed re the Patriot Act header: if the Patriot Act required the 3 intimately offensive items, why is no other bank requesting such of established clients? She admitted that the Patriot Act actually did not require those 3 items. (Another error = yet another hint [like §D11's typo] of a fresh, special document?) DR urged that the falsehood (quoted above at §D11) be removed from future editions of the PNC forms. He also asked why PNC was requesting such intimate info from old customers when all other banks said it wasn't normal (except for new custody accounts). She *claimed oh, PNC is the only bank that's doing it*. As an experiment, DR then volunteered all the intimate tri-info requested: income, wealth, & its source. And then stopped. This test isolated variables perfectly: suddenly, *not one of the Patriot Act items* [passport#, etc.: §D11] *henceforth drew the slightest interest* from PNC. This also ended the 'til-then-monthly mailed dunnings for such, via printed forms (§§D11-D13): in December (& subsequently), nothing arrived. [When DR&B later tried severing relations with PNC, PNC clung on for months, only giving up after phoning DR by name 2021/11/23 & taping the call.] All suggesting an obvious hypothesis: the entire

request for Patriot-Act-identification-info was a ruse covering for a probe of the fiscal support of a heretical journal, published by someone who'd upset an institution rich&powerful enough to generate a fellow institution's aid.

D14 Since DR has spent tens of thousands of dollars to fund a journal he doesn't charge anyone for, while bought-silent academics' fear of objecting to dissent, heresy, and/or wavemaking is related to keeping their grantfunders undisturbed, then: aren't the various above-cited fiscal probes aiming at the wrong party? Since it's clear that, right after the burglary, an entity higher than the burglars learned of both banking info (§D7) & pistol (§§C2&C4), then: since burglary is a jailable crime & stealing a gun even worse, shouldn't that institution (which can protest it didn't plan the invasion) have stayed clear of the burglars' swag? Instead, it exploited *crime-gotten* info: [a] gun to bar dissent; [b] bank-info to trigger an investigative effort, in hopes of ruining DR&wife's finances. All to extort *DIO*'s silence or shut it down altogether. So the institution used criminally-obtained material, to crush criticism & dissent via blackmail and/or impoverishment. Bottom line: that institution and those accepting its desperate tactics are ENDORSING affecting scientific history by suppressing heresy via burglary-theft, plus use of stolen material to slander a heretic via gossip *strictly behind-the-back* (e.g., §C5) in order to duck self-slander by public admission of burglary.

E Johns Hopkins as Mute Convent

E1 Johns Hopkins U's record for throwing its weight at a skeptic (§A13) — without charges (or indeed any comment) even before fiscal-inquisition or slander re gun-nuttery — is a lamentable matter of recent record: www.dioi.org/hj.pdf.

E2 But JHU high officialdom's record for behind-the-scenes fixes isn't new. See above at §D3 (full details at *DIO 24* = www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf): the beyond-belief conspiracy (laid out verbatim in the conspirators' own detailed correspondence) to destroy a famous but just-deceased too-independent author's ultimate book, exposing an even more famous science fraud. Bowman's suppression of Henshaw Ward was followed by persistently conspiring to swindle (*ibid* §T [pp.56-57]) his widow⁷ out of the glory (& royalties) his projected YaleU Press book would've brought.

E3 There is no doubt whatever (see, e.g., citations provided at fn 9 below) that this was deliberately-clandestine conspiracy: the President of Johns Hopkins, Izzy Bowman, the #1 politician of US science (e.g., head of AAAS) is thoroughly exposed by his own (accidentally-surviving) letters: ordering death to the book, even **WHILE requesting that his own name be kept secret** (www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, §M, etc). When the book's honest&famous author dies, along with another rebel Peary-skeptic, the courageous polar explorer General Adolphus Greely, Yale referee Bowman actually writes of the need for CELEBRATION of the glad events! (www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, §K5, p.28). Izzy deliberately keeps Yale Press from knowing that he is secretly corresponding with the rich family of the explorer whose fraud is the very subject of the book's analysis. (An earlier Johns Hopkins President, Ira Remsen, had in 1909 also assisted in protecting the same sensational fraud: *ibid* §§B16&U9.) From *ibid* §W10, it doesn't look like the currently planned history of JHU (by an associate of the JHU History-of-science Dep't) is very much interested in reporting on its scientific Presidents' involvement in protecting this extremely notorious & long-successful science hoax: R.Peary's now-defunct (*NYTimes* 2009/9/8 science dep't; *National Geographic History* 2020 Jan-Feb)⁸ 1909 North Pole claim.

E4 Multiplying Sins: Academic Espionage and Stabs in the Back Not satisfied with past coverups&banishments, Johns Hopkins added to that record with yet another case of new-dirty-tricks-to-hide-old-ones. Following the burglary, it hired a spy (following Barnett's early espionage: §D7), to track DR's planned response to a scandal which JHU — while publicly mum — was frantic to keep from escaping to the public. (No chance of that, given the state of The Press — the last decade's collapse of honest investigative reporting.) But there's never a need to recruit: spies volunteer, to suck up to power. E.g., in 1935, Yale's Bert Keller was JHU President Izzy Bowman's spy, to help kill Henshaw Ward's book: www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §§M3-M4&P3-P4. This, though Keller was Ward's "dearest and oldest friend" according to Ward's wife (*ibid* §T2). When in 1981 DR published the *STARBABY* exposé of deliberately-eminant CSICOP's blunders&deceits, http://cura.free.fr/xv/14starbb.html, CSICOP appointed a volunteer, DR's seeming friend and colleague, the genius-magician-politician Randi, as his solicitous "Keeper". (Telling the truth [re, e.g., CSICOP's bungles] without regard to political self-damage was&is regarded as cageable wildman behavior: www.dioi.org/stb.htm.) In 2019 an agilely-Lib lawyer-politician & longtime DR-acquaintance "S" volunteered to act as DR's Keeper for JHU by spying TO PROTECT BURGLARS (that's where political ambition will take one's ethics) and began persistently phoning liberal (but non-Liberal) DR with enticements of legal&press help in bringing out news of it. (In truth, JHU doesn't care if the crime occurred, only whether it's known.) Which he was actually aiming at preventing, by finding out (for thieves who were understandably terrified re public exposure or even jail), details of what DR knew&intended, and how much could be forensically proven. Neither Randi nor S were aware: [a] DR had seen such pseudo-amiably spying before & knew pols always choose alliance with Goliath not David, [b] prior hostile behavior (incl. S's ultraLib wife's unconcealable dislike of DR) undid their intelligence-insultingly obvious shams from the outset. (The spy always pretends [sometimes even to himself] he's helping his quarry [e.g., www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §P4&V2], even while libelling him behind his back.) Anyway, most of what S got from DR were merely data already posted. Randi later apologized. But Bowman proudly never did. And S won't ever regret transparently trying to advance his own political status by: [1] inimically faking friendship with an ever-civil&amiably skeptic and club-colleague who had never harmed him beyond dissenting from his upper-case Liberal views [but Libs today see dissent as EVIL: best snuffed — for the good of mankind]; [2] trying to aid a powerful cult's suppression of public awareness of its use of info&gun (criminally-obtained by its own people) to vindictively & persistently

⁷Florence Ward Wood, whom DR knew: a thoroughly lovable lady — who fortunately lived long enough to see DR publish & vindicate her late husband Henshaw Ward's crucial discoveries: *Peary . . . Fiction* 1973 Appendix pp.281-290; www.dioi.org/ph.pdf (slow download time).

⁸Published just after the 2019/11/6 first mass-mailout of *DIO 24*, containing explicit secret admission by the US' #1 science mogul that Peary's North Pole claim could never pass neutral experts' exam: www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf §V9.

try destroying a rigorously honest&competent independent journal, while thus [3] suppressing the varied fruits of a half-century of hard-wrought accurate scientific history: www.dioi.org/dd.pdf.

E5 It is hard not to notice from the foregoing that, since DR on 2018/10/4 asked a few simple science questions of a closed-circle History-of-science club, a great deal has come down on him — deliberately telegraphing that it's not healthy for a heretic or his journal to ask questions of historians-of-science, esp. on the Johns Hopkins Convent campus. Academe's purported ideals seem a mite discordant with History-of-science's repeated attempts to crush or impoverish an independent, non-profit, all-sides-citing, ineluctably competent (scientifically AND historically), ever-humbly-self-correcting (www.dioi.org/err.htm), enemy-positives-crediting, debate-space-offering, & scrupulously refereed journal — a journal that has tried to the utmost throughout its 3 decades of life to be as trustworthy, apolitically-independent, and *incorruptible* (motto: www.dioi.org/mot.htm#gbsc) as a much-humanly-flawed publisher can achieve in the real world. But no one in ever-more-grantmoney-frantic academe is sufficiently disturbed at the David-Goliath spectacle to even complain — much less take effective corrective action. DR's response to burglary's attempted intimidation was to publish (and mail to over 1000 leading scholars) *DIO*'s most powerful exposé ever, based on JHU's own long-secreted files: *DIO 24*, www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, detailing (in Bowman's own words) how Johns Hopkins' 1935-1948 President Izzy Bowman (also National Academy of Sciences VP & Amer Assoc for the Advancement of Science chief) ring-led the **EXPLICITLY**⁹ **conspiratorial** protection of the 20th century's enduringest science fraud. Again: all this while (§E3) maintaining a chummy private correspondence with the hoaxer's family! DR also included an opening section sincerely admiring JHU's enormous achievements and numerous genius scientists *whose dedicated positive grand contributions to knowledge and human welfare massively outweigh a mess of negatives from its ethically-wanting dep'ts & presidents* — plus a concluding section on coverups, banks, nudes, & blackmail. All this trouble simply because a weak-science, strongly-political dep't — indeed the entire pathetic Hist.sci field, with rigid coherence — refuses amiable but critical scholarly engagement, preferring censorship, smears, coverups, and worse, while too often distorting history to promote the fave myths¹⁰ (e.g., www.dioi.org/jw11.pdf) of academic politicians that control funding (particularly amusing& durable [though now-fading] Swerdlowian example: www.dioi.org/jw07.pdf). Shunning or damaging the reputations of even the most productive, expert, well-known scholars who dare disturb Hist.sci sacred verities, has long been standard procedure in Hist.sci. (And indeed in some other areas of larger academe. [**Don't miss www.dioi.org/ju00.pdf**.] Smearees include no less than (slandorous details cited in respective brackets below):

[1] The late Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Lab Space Sciences Supervisor Robert Newton [www.dioi.org/ns.htm, www.dioi.org/j111.pdf §C7, www.dioi.org/j113.pdf §D].

[2] Indiana U philology prof, ancient geographical mss world expert Aubrey Diller [www.dioi.org/jm03.pdf pp.54-55].

[3] University of Cambridge-trained mathematician&WW2cryptographer and 1994 author of Springer's *Early Astronomy*¹¹ Hugh Thurston [www.dioi.org/qqq.htm#hbbm].

[4] Internationally-renowned mathematician (obit: www.dioi.org/j716.pdf), science-historian (e.g., *Science Awakening*) & Springer statistics-volume author B. L. van der Waerden¹² [www.dioi.org/j129.pdf fn 123].

[5] Multi-faceted scientist Prof. Clifford Truesdell, Hist.sci-loathed&shunned [personal communications] longtime head of JHU's Dep't of Rational Mechanics.

Not to mention Hist.sci's demeaning of physicists in general as historians [www.dioi.org/j43f.pdf §C4 p.124]. That all Responsible institutions have for decades issued no overt warning or even comment regarding the History-of-science field's viciousness — as well as (www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf) its routine scholarly inadequacy&dishonesty (e.g., refereeing primarily to eliminate dissent instead of incompetence: e.g., www.dioi.org/jm02.pdf p.10) — only exemplifies academe's clubbiness, which increasingly entails shunning not academe's scholarly criminals but their critics.

E6 During the half-century DR has lived near JHU and has occasionally talked at members of the Hist.sci Dep't, he has never been able to have a single conversation on his many well-known,¹³ often-seminal (e.g., www.dioi.org/g828.pdf & www.dioi.org/g841.pdf) scientific-historical discoveries. Years ago, he was twice invited by the Physics Dep't to talk at JHU, but the Hist.sci Dep't has never done so during an acquaintanceship of over a half-century. Indeed, due to resentment of DR's heresies and JHU-teampayer-upset at criticism of a single JHU dep't, there is now no one at JHU who will offer to competently evaluate-referee any of DR's scores (e.g., fn 1) of scholarly contributions, so that the scientifically helpless JHU Hist.sci Dep't might acquire a glimmer of their value. (Many have been well recognized by genuine experts: e.g., www.dioi.org/quotes.htm.) Enduring vengeful¹⁴ shunning of *DIO*'s genuine scholarship (not just DR's: e.g., fn 12) continues since ever-more corrupt&fearful academe&press do nothing about it, besides profiting from playing ball with the most powerful corruptors. Concern for truth & for accurate history just gets in the way of business. And — make no mistake — academe is now predominantly a business. **And far less principled than most.**

To call it a mere nest of vipers wouldn't begin to do it justice.

Despite all, DIO will publish so long as DR lives. Its example & contributions to knowledge may last a little longer.

⁹ Regarding the conspirators' unambiguous deliberateness in their secrecy, see www.dioi.org/jo00.pdf, at, e.g., §§E3, L1, M.

¹⁰ **GREAT DISCOVERERS CHALLENGE THE ACCEPTED**, while prominent Historians-of-science have instead cheated to MAINTAIN the Accepted. And will even projectively defend Ptolemy's clumsy inaccuracies by misclaiming that all Greek scientists **DID LIKEWISE** — by forcing data to agree with Accepted theories! See for yourself this incredible alibi promoted (for pages! — without ever citing a single ancient witness or attestation to such discreditable practice) in *Scientific American* 240.3:90-93, 1979 March (at the behest of Hist.sci's idea of a MacArthur Genius, Noel Swerdlow) — and see its itemized-atomization at www.dioi.org/jL09.pdf §§A3&L3 & www.dioi.org/jm01.pdf §B.

¹¹ DR's copy bears the author's handwritten note on the front page: "With thanks for fascinating *DIO*, much interesting correspondence [e.g., www.dioi.org/j413.pdf §§A&B1: where Hugh inspires discovery of ancients' latitudes] and general inspiration. Hugh Thurston February 1994."

¹² The great mathematician-historian B. L. van der Waerden's final work's final page hands the torch to *DIO: Astronomie der Griechen* Darmstadt 1988 p.307. The 3 here-prior-listed Hist.sci-demeaned experts published their final papers in *DIO*, as did unique JHU-APL astronomer&discoverer Charles Kowal, & the eminent Univ London classicist David Dicks. And *DIO* Editor Rob't Bryce's 1997 book broke the famous Peary fraud's back.

¹³ See above at §A3 or back-cover of any issue of *DIO*.

¹⁴ Neither DR nor Bunny has pleasure from — or even interest in — pursuing vengeance. Answering in kind professorial hate, that inspires fighting embarrassingly-valid scholarship via student criminality (to which JHU **and larger academe** remains approvingly silent), is not in us.