

In the Old West, when privately-financed pseudo-lawmen kicked Undesirables out of town, they followed Sulla's 1st century BC example by publicly proscribing them as fair game for the killing. The document posted for this purpose was known as a "White Affidavit". Up to now, there is no record that a Wronger ever posted a response.

‡10 Black Affidavit

DIO & *J.HA* deem it a duty to keep readers ever-abreast of the latest exciting chapters in the serial Keystone-Kops saga of a certain almost-endearingly netherbrained academic cult of oldboypersons, which has ensconced itself at several high-prestige institutions, including even a few Ivy League universities. This generously-budgeted, extravagantly produced perpetual-opéra-bouffe stars a gaggle of outwardly arrogant, privately insecure businessmen-professors. The costuming is lavish: bumlbers, *idée-fixe* zanies, and intuitional mystics are painstakingly dressed up as centrist, technically-expert authorities. Admittedly, the story line is oftentimes improbable; but, it never fails to entertain, with its ever-cornucopic menu of inspirational behavior: unscrupulous promotion of ludicrous cult theories over competitors' patently better-fitting¹ solutions — garnished with [a] cohesive slander and-or noncitation-freezeouts of Unapproved scholars, [b] convenient switching (or conjuring-up) criteria in midstream,² [c] ritual apologia or coverup for data fabrication, fudging, and-or plagiarism (including the cult's own),³ [d] gang-up bullying and blanket denial of all discovery-credit to those who publicly dissent from orthodoxy's sacred-unfalsifiable prescribed historical vision.

It should be clearly understood that none of the above-cited behavior is wrong or deserving of the slightest censure. Indeed, leading History-of-science (Hist.sci) specialists stand ever unsleepingly at-the-ready to reprove reproof — alleging that ethical disapproval of academic hoaxery reveals nought but the commentator's own amateurishly "moralising" perspective.⁴ In these gentlemen's learned opinion: faking, fudging, and plagiarism can be excused as trifling⁵ or even defended as reflecting a "progressive" or Nobelist intellect!⁶ Condemning a Hall-of-Fame scientist for fraudulent scholarship is an inexcusable, even mortal sin in the Hist.sci profession.

Thus, our perpetual-Koperetta's castmember-careerists rightly continue to be highly honored. Their ethics, prejudgements, shunnings, and especially their vastly amusing attempts at math, science, and logic (which are generously contributing an unending supply of cackle fodder to our *Journal for Hysterical Astronomy* [*J.HA*]) have for 2 decades been woefully underappreciated — protected in their handsome captive journals from the slightest public larking.

¹ See, e.g., Dennis Rawlins (DR) *Amer J Physics* 1987 n.30, *DIO* 2.1 ‡3 §C3, *DIO* 1 ‡9 fn 60, fn 73, fn 209, & §P2.

² E.g., *J.Hysterical Astron* 1.2 ‡9 fn 99, §H3, §I1, §I7, & §I9. [Note added 1993: & *J.HA* 2.3 ‡8 §C17, §C21, & §C31.]

³ *J.HA* 1.2 §J5, *DIO* 2.1 ‡3 fn 26 & fn 38. [Note added 1993: & *J.HA* 2.3 ‡8 §C8-§C13.]

⁴ *Nature* 276:152, *DIO* 1 ‡9 fn 96.

⁵ E.g., *J.HA* 1.2 §H2.

⁶ See, e.g., v.14 of Springer-Verlag's series "Studies in the History of Mathematics and Physical Sciences", G.Graßhoff, *History of Ptolemy's Star Catalogue* 1990 p.215. See also Harvard's O.Gingerich, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society* 21:253 (1980) p.264; 22:40 (1981) p.43.

E.g., eminent BrownU scholars have discovered the previously unsuspected existence of the Winter Equinox (*Journal for the History of Astronomy* 22.2:101 [1991] p.119) and Autumn Solstice (*Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 13:321 [1976]). Both triumphs are praised at *J.Hysterical Astron* 1.2 §B4. (Who can fail to repose perfect trust in said discriminating geni's judgement, as they condemn nonmembers of their clique as "disreputable", "incompetent", and "crank"?⁷ These Ivy League firsts will forever rank with W.T.Pooh's equally epochal 1926 discovery of the East Pole of the Earth. An understandably puzzled C.Robin has lamented such envy-submerged scientific breakthroughs: "people don't like talking about them" (*Winnie-the-Pooh* Chap.9). But *DIO* & *J.HA* are consecrated to dispelling this heartwrenchingly unjust neglect — concurrently revealing the proportional shares of competence vs. brainkissing requisite for Ivy League professorship, at least in certain disciplines. (So that there will be no charge of suppression against *DIO*: physicist DR must confess to being a Harvard graduate.) Granted, critiquing these frantic magnates' attempts at math and apologia is oftentimes about as challenging as shooting fishstories in a barrel of monkeys. But, the targets insist: the showbiz must go on.

Above all, this remarkably long-running Hist.sci farce has the social utility of illustrating (with the sort of preciously stark nonambiguity which laymen and even children can follow) just how seriously we should take top academe's aggressively-advertised Deep-Concern for maintaining open discourse and for ensuring reliable, non-crank expertise and refereeing. E.g., in the ongoing ancient astronomy controversy, the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study has profoundly invested⁸ its reputation into the hyperglorification of the uniquely clumsy faker-astrologer C.Ptolemy, boldly and devotedly promoting this notorious occultist as "The Greatest Astronomer of Antiquity"⁹ — a mission so special that the Institute has itself faked several calculations in support of it.¹⁰ (These math pretenses have, with exquisite irony, simply backfire-enhanced the Institute-resented notion that Ptolemy would behave likewise.) Those eminent journals and scholars (e.g., the extremely handsome *Journal for the History of Astronomy* [*JHA*] and its esteemed Editor-for-Life) whose prestige has been hurled against skepticism of Ptolemy have also emulated the scholarly National Geographic Society's longstanding example of: [1] courageously hiding from open debate or mutual cross-exam situations, during 20^y of behind-the-back slander of dissenters, and [2] graduating from mere judge of an issue to championing-advocate of one side of that issue — ultimately becoming about as open to conversion-by-evidence as astrologers or parapsychologists.

Finally: both as justice and as demonstration of what certain handsome journals are incapable of doing, it will be the consistent policy of *DIO* to praise and utilize the occasional genuine accomplishments of our self-appointed Enemies — including even those of the brave Neugebauer klan, ever honored in these reverent pages as "the Muffia". To quote¹¹ from our premier issue: "The Muffia's essential attitude is that [hate-objects Robert Newton] and DR are not *ever*¹² right. . . . By contrast, the *J.HA* will merely show that Muffiosi are not *always* right. I recommend careful attention to this distinction. (Though, admittedly, [*DIO* is] not denying the tenuous possibility that the inverse of these propositions is nearer the truth.)"

DIO is, among other things, an ongoing experiment: attempting to discover whether there is any limit whatever to the ethical, comedic, censorial, appropriational, and gang-tactical extremes which will find acceptance by the Neugebauer Muffia — and silent assent to, or outright promotion by, the larger Hist.sci community's archon-angels.

The search continues.

⁷ *DIO* 1.1 ‡1 §C7, fn 20, & ‡3 §D3.

⁸ *J.HA* 1.2 fn 172. [Note added 1993-7: See also fn 63, §I3, & *DIO* 1.1 ‡7 fn 13.]

⁹ See, e.g., *Science* 193:476 (1976/8/6) or *DIO* 2.1 ‡3 fn 28.

¹⁰ See Rawlins *Amer J Physics* 1987 *loc cit*, & *DIO* 2.1 ‡3 fn 38.

¹¹ *DIO* 1.1 ‡1 §C12.

¹² This lockstep pretense's origins are examined at *DIO* 1 ‡9 §D4 & §H2, *DIO* 2.1 ‡6 §F4.