

## ‡6 High Comedy at Low Altitude: Cook Cult Bare

### DIO 7.2-3 Leaves Hoaxer-Huggers in Paranoiac Frenzy

#### Faker's Defenders Reduced to Desperate Emulation

#### How About a Face-to-Face, Photo-to-Photo Debate?

### A Unharmless Cranks

After years of closeup-observation of strange scholarship in action, *DIO* has induced two simple but curiously little-appreciated principles regarding the crank — a creature generally a little more abundant outside the academic establishment than inside<sup>1</sup> it.

**A1** Anyone who is long addicted to defending scientific nonsense will eventually become addicted to deceit.<sup>2</sup> See below (§C8) for the high pinnacle of lowness by explorer Frederick Cook's modern advocates.

**A2** What starts out as a misguided-but-idealistically-motivated crusade increasingly degenerates into a self-centered vortex of frustrated rage, where upholding The Cause has become less psychologically dominant than an I-can't-have-been-this-wrong-this-long<sup>3</sup> justification of the crusader's own life and reputation.

### B CookSoc's Miss-Imps

**B1** *DIO* 7.2-3 presented simple photographic, diary, compass, and barometer proofs of the 1906 fraudulence of then-highly-respected explorer Frederick Cook's claim to have climbed 20320 ft Mt. McKinley — plus evidence that Cook had decided<sup>4</sup> early on (in his

<sup>1</sup> See D9 fn 47 & *DIO* 4.2 p.56 Table 1. [Also here: the bracket in §C7 & 1st parenthesis in §E8.]

<sup>2</sup> How else make a case for a belief, in the face of incoming evidence that consistently contradicts it? See DR's 1977 *Skeptical Inquirer* article (*Skinq* 2.1:62 at pp.73-74). Also *DIO* 8 ‡5 fn 62.

<sup>3</sup> See D9 fn 28.

<sup>4</sup> Peary was a far greater explorer than Cook but his decisiveness in firming details of his own occasional frauds was little better than Cook's. Evidence of Peary's ambivalence about his non-existent Peary Channel in 1892 is found at F46 and more convincingly at BR 80, 85, 89, 134, 336. As for Peary's back&forth indecisiveness before permanent commitment to faking his 1899/7/18 sighting of "Jesup Land": this claim (contra Rost: BR 596) was entered upon an 1899 map at the last minute (to impress the Peary Arctic Club). The map was published in that year by the AGS. (It is reproduced at F57 and analysed at F50.) But Jesup Land is not in his written reports of that time. A later DR check in the Peary Papers of his 1899/7/18 "discovery moment" manuscript material uncovered no mention of his seeing any land beyond Cannon Bay. His surveying data of this date (which DR checked a decade ago) fixed the position of nothing beyond that bay's entrance. His 1899/8/28 handwritten report to the Peary Arctic Club said he looked "some fifty miles to the northwest", a sentence which got expanded in his 1903/11 speech to RGS to read (emph added): "some 50 miles to the northwest, *beyond which appeared yet more distant land*". (See F52.) As for Peary's decision to fake his 1906/6/24&28 sightings of Crocker Land: we know this occurred between 1906/11/23 and 1907/2, probably after 1906/12/12. (See F74; also Peary to Crocker 1907/4/16&24 in the Peary Papers.) For detailed proof of deliberate fraud here, see *DIO* 1.1 ‡4 §§B1-B2. But Crocker Land wasn't Peary's only 1906 hoax: there was also his supposed "Farthest North". In that year, Peary left five cairn records along Ellesmere Island's coast: 6/8 (*NGM* 106:525; 1954/4), 6/28 (Hobbs 1936), 6/30 (F77), 7/5 (F77), 7/28 (unpublished: original at US Naval Museum, Annapolis). The 6/8 record claimed his Farthest North but gave neither its date nor even its latitude! Nor its longitude — though the very same record specifies longitude 59°W as where he struck land (5/12: F69) on the return south to Greenland, a figure he eventually (in his 1907 April book) adopted for the alleged Farthest, but only after he'd tried out 45°W for the Farthest (in his 1907 Feb *Harper's* article): see F69. The 7/28 record (hitherto unnoticed in Controversy literature) finally

final thrust) to fake the climb. His 1906 journey towards Mt. McKinley ended<sup>5</sup> at the Gateway, about 13 mi short of and 3 mi below the top of the mountain. He had already begun re-writing his diary and shooting flag-raising "summit" photos while still<sup>6</sup> about 20 mi from the top.

**B2** The family-funded Cook Society — abbreviated "CookSoc" here — predictably went more aggressively nuts than ever over these revelations, data which prove that their crusade to vindicate Cook is perfectly missin' and just as impossible.

**B3** Result: CookSoc has by now utterly lost interest in responsive and honest discussion — and has come to act as if reality is something one purchases at a convenience-store, and truth is just a football to be booted about as one pleases. Indeed, *DIO*'s prime initial reaction to the truth-kicking CookSoc folks' *Polar Priorities 18* is that its pretense to be substantially answering *DIO* 7.2-3 is just another fake.

**B4** Throughout the following, *Polar Priorities 18* (1998 Sept) will be referred to as PP18 (analogously for other PP volumes), and we will refer to *DIO* 7.2-3 ‡7, ‡8, and ‡9 as: D7, D8, D9, respectively. D7 & D8 are by Bob Bryce. PP18 falsely assumes throughout that D9 is entirely by DR, even though *DIO*'s Editor is Keith Pickering. (In fact, the authorship is joint: KP-DR.) Below, BR (followed by page-number) is sometimes used as an abbreviation for Bryce *Cook & Peary* (1997), though the book is also often referred to as: Bryce 1997. And F (followed by page-number) is uniformly used for Rawlins *Peary . . . Fiction* (1973).

### C CookSoc Crosses the Line Between Dementia and Deceit

The key arguments of D7-D9 were based on hard data:

**C1** The original, uncropped "summit" photo was published for the first time in D7. From reading PP18, one would not know that the Cook Society has possessed this photo for years without publishing it, and would not know that it proves anything — because, despite our challenge to CookSoc (at D9 §G3 & fn 48) to air the photo and its mate (D7 Fig.18 & Fig.4, resp) AS A PAIR, the cult has *still* not done so — much less published our lethal blow-up comparisons at D7 Fig.6 & Fig.8 which are undeniably *the* hard centerpiece-evidences (fn 7) in the whole Cook-McKinley affair.

**C2** It is obvious that CookSoc would prefer that its own members not *see* that its hero's alleged photo of McKinley's top is a fake — positively proven by the *DIO* blow-ups to be at a place (near Ruth Glacier) which Cook *himself* said was only 8000 ft high.<sup>7</sup>

**C3** The poison-Cookies' reaction to the photo's recovery & *DIO* publication? Vengeful slander. (Vindicating predictions at D9 §C10 & fn 47 — and inadvertently revealing how deeply *DIO* has struck home.)

**C4** Besides personal attacks, the only response is just CookSoc lawyer Sheldon Cook's bald statement at PP18 p.42 (1998): "it seems unlikely that Cook's photograph captioned [as] the top is Fake Peak." (Four years earlier, same Sheldon at PP14 p.9 [1994]: "it seems very unlikely . . .") This eyeless-echo stolidity is an *answer* to D7's Figs.18, 4, 6, & 8?

decided upon the latitude: "During Feb.-July, 1906, the Latitude of 87°06' North was reached". But none of these five records provided the Farthest's later-alleged date, 4/21 — which Cook was later to exactly copy for the final version of his 1908 N.Pole claim. Similarly, it took Peary until 1909 June to specify the date of his 1909/4/6 "Pole" attainment. (The June record said that expedition chief-scientist Ross Marvin of Cornell was "drowned": yet another lie.)

<sup>5</sup> See §§D1, D2, L2, N6.

<sup>6</sup> In 1906 Cook stopped at the Gateway (for its location, see D7 Fig.1& D9 Fig.32), so he never got within twice the distance from the top (and barely half the height) he'd already achieved during his creditable 1903 pioneer circuit of Mt. McKinley.

<sup>7</sup> Actual altitude is even less: about 5000 ft. See D7 Fig.4 for Cook's published photo (plus the text of his 8000 ft caption to it), there shown to match the "summit" photo (D7 Fig.18) by comparisons of blow-ups of two key details in both photos: see D7 Fig.6(a)vs(b) & Fig.8(a)vs(b).

**C5** The D9 §G4 suggestion of CookSoc apology to Browne-Parker-Washburn is rejected at PP18 p.39 (also p.48): “They [The Enemy] are going to have to wait.” No uninformed reader of Gibbons’ ramble here will know what is being skirted. *DIO*’s apology-suggestion was not directed at CookSoc’s logical shortcomings in persistently not facing the truth of Cook’s various fakes. Rather the apology-proposal was precisely aimed at a specific point of simple decency, bearing upon cultists’ penchant for evil fantasy: Cook’s defenders for decades have (see D9 §G1) promoted charges that sneaky-vindictive critics *used doctored photos* to prove that Cook’s “summit” photo was at Fake Peak. (This logic’s aching heel is lampooned at D9 fn 13.) But now Cook’s OWN photos (D7 Figs.18, 4, 6, & 8) have proven that the critics were right<sup>8</sup> — and thus that **the charge of dishonest conspiratorial photo-tampering to falsify a match, was itself false**. PP18 has nothing to say on this point. (Instead, CookSoc’s standard [D9 §§C9-C10] diversion-tactic alleges lots of irrelevant nit-“errors” by opponents: a cartoon-Napoleon we’re-the-authorities pose.)

**C6** A bit of revealing CookSoc history: Hugh Eames was the first Cook-promoter to propose (*Winner Lose All* 1973 pp.63-67) that Cook had indeed faked the “summit” photo — but Eames regarded that dishonesty as merely “a slight [ethical] slip”: *ibid* p.67), excusable in Eames’ eyes because the fake allegedly<sup>9</sup> *looked something rather like* (!) the real summit. In spite of this loyal alibi [now loonily “readjusted”: D9 §A3], Cook’s daughter took Eames’ admission of photographic fraud as treason. And for decades thereafter, no other Cookite committed such treason. But, after CookSoc had delved into the Cook papers, the 1990s saw a seemingly inexplicable CookSoc adoption of Eames’ originally exiled bizarre-argument. The cause of sudden CookSoc tolerance — of what it had itself once rejected as treason! — is obvious in retrospect: inner-circle Cookites had finally seen (strictly privately) the full, uncropped “summit” photo (D7 Fig.18) and thus knew that it indeed *was* taken at Fake Peak. So — without any public explanation — CookSoc began (at least as early as 1994: PP14 p.14) FOR THE FIRST TIME leaving open the “possibility” that the photo might indeed have been (innocently of course) taken at Fake Peak. (Standard party-line now: see D9 §§C7-C8 & fn 17 [D9 fn 12: sharp “summit” print last seen in 1994 early summer].)

**C7** However, even while promoting the weird last-ditch §C6 ploy that a photo’s “similarity” is as good as its genuineness, CookSoc *simultaneously* continued citing Authorities who had claimed Cook’s photo was of the real summit: decades-ago deceased Cookites E.Balch, E.Rost, T.Leitzell, & H.Waale, whose arguments had suggested (of necessity) that Belmore Browne’s Fake Peak photo-match to Cook’s “summit” photo was itself faked. Now, consider carefully what this reveals about CookSoc’s people: **How could modern inner-circle Cook-defenders (who clearly had seen privately that Cook’s own “summit” photo convicts him of faking it) deliberately continue such false slander against Browne?** The 1998/11/26 *NYTimes* frontpage story on Bryce’s discovery of the photo (acknowledging that *DIO* 7.2 first published it) quoted World Number One CookSocPerson, Russ Gibbons, as responding (p.A29): well, even if the photo WAS taken at Fake Peak, that doesn’t prove Cook’s failure! Thus, genius Gibbons thinks he has ever-so-cleverly not committed himself to *either* of two undeniable propositions: [a] The “summit” photo was taken at Fake Peak. [b] This fact condemns Cook.<sup>10</sup> Question-in-passing: if the fact that Cook’s “summit” photo was taken at Fake Peak doesn’t constitute *the slightest* evidence that Cook faked his claimed attainment, then: **why is CookSoc still unable [Fig.6 caption] to admit the photo was faked?** [Answer: fn 41.] Historians of cult-thought know the pattern: fight the evidence as long as possible; but, when your case collapses, then claim that the very same evidence (which you’ve struggled against ferociously for years, up to now, to repel) really doesn’t matter after all! [Watch a Harvard prof dancing the same shuffle: *DIO* 10 fn 177.] However, since [a] and [b] are *each* valid (to all but mercenaries for Cook),

<sup>8</sup>See also §L4.

<sup>9</sup>Not only a ludicrous line of reasoning (which CookSoc pretends not to understand the academic community’s side-splitting incredulity at) but utterly and ironically false: see D9 §B2 & Fig.34.

<sup>10</sup>See CookSoc’s malleable criteria for what constitutes proof: §E8.

Gibbons’ slyness has succeeded only in doubling the evidence for his own buyability.

**C8** The Cookie mentality is getting worse, not better. CookSoc’s 1998 *Special Supplement* to PP18 pp.13-16 [see also CookSoc’s just-prior *Membership News* 5.3 p.7] repeats the standard agéd Balch-etc arguments (§§E4&L4) and takes advantage of the fact that Browne’s 1910 photo and Carter’s 1957 photos were (due to changing snow-level and eventual crumbling of the right part of Fake Peak) slightly imperfect matches to Cook’s 1906 photo — but CookSoc never lets its members know of the killer match (§C1) of two of Cook’s *own* 1906 photos. The deceptive intent is rendered particularly outrageous by the fact that the hard-earned 1910 & 1957 photos (the latter reproduced above at ¶5 Fig.6 [b]) were shot by Browne and Carter — at *enormous* expense in time and labor — *only because* Cook and his family & intimate circle [a] would not admit the truth about his 1906 lies (which were pretty obvious even before Bryce, *DIO*, & the *NYT* published the uncropped “summit” photo) and [b] *were themselves hiding Cook’s full-uncropped “summit” photo* from Browne and Carter. For a gang to *dishonestly* use the very (pre-*DIO*) imperfections in photo-matching — **imperfections which their own clique’s dishonesty thus<sup>11</sup> CAUSED** — represents a pioneering double-dip hades-depth-Low in unharmlless-crankitude (fn 2). *DIO* will be glad to explode this CookSoc imposition **in open debate, even at CookSoc’s own Ohio State home arena**. [Bold CookSoc in 1998 *Memb. News* 5.3 p.2: skeptics “wish the debate to be over. It is not.” Bluff called:]

#### ARE WE ON?

### D Sketch Maps

Further bearing on the integrity of those defending Cook: CookSoc has never published<sup>12</sup> the Cook 1906 diary’s Ruth Glacier sketch-maps — not even in the Society’s 1996 reprint of *Top*, which reproduced the text of that very diary (at pp.272f) and did not mind including others of the diary’s Cook-drawn illustrations. (The 1996 reprint has been referred to by the prefix “CTC” throughout *DIO*’s discussions.) These diary-maps indict Cook because:

**D1** *None exist past the Gateway* (as DR instantly emphasized to his old friend Ted Heckathorn when Ted first told DR of these materials years ago) versus **two** such Cook sketch-maps up to the Gateway (D7 Figs.12&13) — also Barrill’s sketch-map up to the Gateway (D7 Fig.11), likewise unaccompanied by any sketch-map beyond that point.

**D2** The one at p.44 of Cook’s 1906 diary shows (D7 Fig.12) mountains 9, 10, 11, & 12 going off into the distance north of the Gateway — beyond Cook’s range of densely-busy activities indicated (on the diary-map) south of the Gateway (D9 §D10).

### E Questions to CookSoc: Reality-Time? Or More 5th Amendment?

Several questions *DIO* would like answered by the CookSoc circle’s main defenders:

**E1** Does CookSoc agree that ¶4 Fig.6 and D7 Figs.18, 4, 6, & 8 definitely & conclusively establish that Cook’s “summit” photo was actually taken at Fake Peak? (Why is this central evidence not met AT ALL in PP18? Hitherto-overlooked skull-penetrability test: will any Cook-defender own that these photo-matches weaken his case *in any degree whatever*? During the almost 100<sup>y</sup> of this controversy, none ever has. For the nearest thing, see D9 fn 37.) No §C7 diversion into whether this proves Cook failed. Just ANSWER this repeatedly 5th-Amendment question: **YES** or **NO**. If the latter, then try providing an explanation (of the photos’ spectacular matches) that will withstand debate-crossexam.

<sup>11</sup>Let’s specially repeat-isolate the fantastically perverse heart of this situation: the very photo-match-imperfections (which the Cook cult now deceitfully mocks) only EXIST AT ALL because Browne and Carter-Washburn took photos that *wouldn’t have been necessary in the first place* had the Cook people not hidden the match (of Cook’s *own* photos: fn 7) that IS perfect.

<sup>12</sup>See §§F1&L2 below, and D9 §F2 item [c].

**E2** Why did 1995 Oct's PP15 (p.34) publish the *cropped* version of the "summit" photo, when CookSoc already<sup>13</sup> possessed and knew of the *uncropped* original? (Bryce had told CookSoc of the full "summit" photo after locating it, and CookSoc's very own Sheldon wrote on 1994/2/26 & 6/25 that he had confirmed its location: D7 fnn 10&12.) And Bryce wonders: why did CookSoc repeat this suppression when in 1996 it republished Cook's 1908 book (as CTC) with 3 reproductions of the cropped version (p.iii, Fig.1/16, & back cover) but none of the uncropped version which had been in CookSoc's hands for years.

**E3** WHERE is the super-sharp version of the "summit" photo, which CookSoc had in hand in 1994 (§E2)? — and on the back of which Cook himself had written (D7 fn 12) that it was made from the original negative. (Can CookSoc understand why it seems suspicious that this photo has since disappeared?)

**E4** From §C: why did CookSoc cite,<sup>14</sup> as defense-experts (on this matter), oldtime Balch, Rost, Leitzell, & Waale, whose common charge that Browne fudged photos (to put Cook at Fake Peak) is disproved by this same uncropped photo, which we know (§C8) *CookSoc was hiding at the very time it made these attacks on Browne's integrity* (see especially PP15 pp.35 & 41)?

**E5** Cook's label for diary p.52 bottom drawing (D7 Figs.15-16): "seen from gl. opp. Peak 7". So: where is Cook's "Peak 7"? What "gl" was he on? Answers (D7 Figs.9-13): Gateway. Ruth Gl. CookSoc *disbelieves its own hero* by alleging an East Ridge site: §F1.

**E6** CookSoc says (§N4, D9 §B3) Washburn's detailed photo-match of D9's Fig.29 to Fig.28 is merely his *opinion*, countered (without photo) by the *opinion* of CookSoc-fundee Gonnason. Question: *Why hasn't CookSoc ever published both photos together, so its own members can see this match & its import?* (PP14 p.9 used Washburn's *AAJ 11.1* [1958] plate 18a photo [taken 1947/7/9] without consulting him, so non-permission is no bar for CookSoc.) And the 1994 CookSoc expedition<sup>15</sup> spent days within a few miles of the site of Figs.28&29; if it had doubts about the legitimacy of Washburn's photo (Fig.29) of the Fake Peak amphitheatre, these could have been tested by first-hand checking of the vista. No interest. *No living CookSoc representative has ever been to Fake Peak amphitheatre.* Sympathizer Ted Leitzell went there in 1938. He photo-verified that the scene from Fake Peak was indeed that of D7's Fig.4, proving Cook was there, just as Browne had claimed. So Leitzell hid his photo (¶4 fn 32), because releasing it would help The Enemy.<sup>16</sup> Cook personally connived in this censorship, with the same integrity shown by current CookSoc failure to publish the original of the "summit" photo (D7 Fig.18) in all the pre-*DIO* 7.2-years the Society possessed it.

**E7** PP18 p.45 says again that Cook's 1906 companion Barrill was bribed, but nowhere speaks to the fact that Barrill's map (D7 Fig.11) accurately located Fake Peak (from which some Cook photos were undeniably taken, though Cook's published story never mentioned even going into Fake Peak amphitheatre: fn 35) — nor to the fact (D9 §§D7-D8) that Cook's

hard evidences all end at the Gateway, *right where Barrill swore that he and Cook turned for home.* PP18 p.42's dreamt-up alibi that Cook's film went bad at the Gateway (D9 fn 28) doesn't account for why his compass data, his sketch-maps, his scenic drawings (his own and Barrill's),<sup>17</sup> his published map's accuracy, and his camp-trash ALL stop at the Gateway, too (D9 §D9). *CookSoc's PP18 does not even attempt an explanation.* (See below at §K for yet another miracle at the Gateway.)

**E8** CookSoc apology-method logic: fake photos don't *prooove* a fake climb. See, e.g., invincibly-selective-agnostic Sheldon C at D9 §C2. (Centrist academics can be just as stolid: *DIO 2.3* ¶8 §C18.) All right, so let's try a simple mental experiment: what if this very same never-say-die approach were being turned around to defend Barrill? In that case, we'd be hearing: OK, OK, so \$5000 was paid by Peary Arctic Club Pres. Thos. Hubbard to a Tacoma, WA, lawyer (James Ashton) on 1909/10/1; but — even though that looks odd — does that **prooove** that Barrill lied for a bribe?<sup>18</sup> However, let's reason comparatively, in order to highlight CookSoc's selective imbalance: is the attractive but shaky presumption,<sup>19</sup> that Barrill lied for Peary money, as strong or crucial as the powerful presumption that a person who lied about his McK "summit" photo also faked attaining McK's summit? CookSoc is so mote-beam-unbalanced that it remains rigidly stuck on the weaker **and** far less important bribe-presumption, while vowing permanent imperviosity to the other, powerful, central one: a flag-before-turnaround, lifetime-publicly-unretracted, deceitfully-cropped molehill-photo is pretty darn good evidence of a fake summit-claim. (See D7 fn 49.)

## F The "Ignored" p.52 Drawings

As for Cook's drawings (D7 Figs.15-16) on p.52 of his diary (D9 §F2): PP18 p.41 repeatedly, dementedly, and **even bold-titularly** claims *DIO* ignores them — though Bryce expends

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Barrill's diary-map at D7 Fig.11, and his scenic drawings at D7 Figs.21&23 as well as the newly-available Barrill artistic depiction of Ruth Glacier mountains #4-#7 (Mt. Wake, Mt. Bradley, Mt. Dickey, & Mt. Barrille), discovered by R.Bryce after publication of D7 — but with the four peaks numbered exactly as in Fig.1 of D7. Note that the numbering of Mt. Barrille as peak#7 is crucial to the identification of the site of the needlessly-contended lower drawing (D7 Figs.15&16) on p.52 of Cook's diary: see D7 §G9 & fn 33.

<sup>18</sup> The record (¶4 §L14, ¶5 §E2, CTC pp.296-298) indicates that Barrill had trouble getting wages-owed (several of Cook's associates over the years had similar problems with him); so Barrill hoped finally to get recompense (by taking advantage of the now-frantically-over-the-Barrill millionaires of the Peary Arctic Club) — apparently making "wild" demands. Further, legal talent costs money; and the legal work of getting the Barrill affidavit incurred various extra expenses. Evidently, Barrill was paid a fraction of the \$5000, though reports differ as to how much (up to \$1500 by one estimate — a lot of money then). Ashton himself said between \$100 & \$200 (Bryce *Cook & Peary* p.1041), so it was never meant to be a secret that money changed hands. *DIO* is not vouching for Ashton's accuracy, and we regard it as a quite reasonable *presumption* (though see fn 19) that Barrill wouldn't have gotten any money from the Peary Arctic Club if he hadn't made the affidavit. Incidentally, DR recalls seeing long ago in the Explorers Club Archives (NYC) a 1909 communication — which has never been published — from Hubbard (a leading figure in the ethics of law) to Ashton, rejecting anything like "buying testimony" (Hubbard's words). As noted at n.19 of DR's 1993/10/22 Cook Symp. paper [*DIO 21* ¶3] (ms to RG 94/4/21, OSU ©1998 [BPRC Rep.#18], no proofs, crossrefs botched, last sentence suppressed): Eames' theory that the Cook-persecuting Peary Arctic Club spent \$350,000 to "see [Peary] through" the Cook Controversy was just a Cookie-coot's mishearing of a Bridgman speech (maybe that discussed at Bryce 1997 p.548), citing the \$350,000 the Club had spent *before 1909* to "see [Peary] through" *to the Pole*. (Ted Heckathorn was first to discern, from National Archives documents, that the center of the web of harrassers of Cook was not the Club but Peary himself.)

<sup>19</sup> Question: do we automatically disbelieve newspapers because their writers are paid for their work? (No, there are lots of better reasons to disbelieve them.) In any case, Barrill's affidavit is today generally accepted as accurate not because of associated financial considerations but due to the affidavit's many verifications, as repeatedly and very thoroughly checked in D7-D9.

<sup>13</sup> See D7 fn 9-fn 12.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., PP14 p.14, CTC pp.252-253.

<sup>15</sup> D9 §C10: "A likely purpose of the recent Cook Society expedition to the McKinley area was the establishment of we've-been-up-there Expertise", to more convincingly defend an explorer who pretended he reached McKinley's summit. But a more important purpose of CookSoc trip-funding may be: paying mountain guides large sums to pretend that the Cook Society has a sane case.

<sup>16</sup> Leitzell to Cook 1938/9/6 (¶4 §D5 or BR 731): publishing Leitzell's matching photo would (emph added): "only give the *opposition* a chance to confuse the issue." Cook-Leitzell's suppression presaged CookSoc's current inability to publish clear enlargements of the Killer Pair of Cook's own Fake Peak photos (D7 Figs.4&18): side-by-side, like *DIO*'s blow-ups. (Who paid Leitzell's way to Alaska? And who paid the 1956 Alaskan fare [¶4 fn 39] for yet another 1930s pro-Cook writer, Freeman?) Leitzell noted contrasts between Fake Peak's appearance: 1906 vs. 1938 (after 32' of weathering), unaware Cook was hiding the uncropped "summit photo" (D7 Fig.18). with its indicting left&right backgrounds: D7 Fig.6(a)vs(b) & Fig.8(a)vs(b). But: Fake Peak's big *left*-side rocks are same in 1906 & 1957: see Fig.6[a]&[b] & caption. And, despite snow and higher photo-site, the big rock with diagonally-lined flat-face in Fig.6[a] (& [b]) is visible in Browne's 1910 photos: e.g., D7 Fig.7, Bryce 1997 p.492.

over ten *DIO* pages<sup>20</sup> analyzing them! And *DIO* spends 2 more pages on the p.52 contradictions (and more here at §§F7 & G4), in a section (D9 §F) entitled “Self-Destruct Bombs on Diary Page 52”. The diary p.52 disasters are billed on *DIO* 7.2-3’s *cover*-sub-headline: “Cook-Defenders’ Star ‘New Evidence’ Serially Suicides”. How’d the world’s most dedicated CookSoc men miss all of this? — blithely going on (PP18 p.41) to exaggerate “ignoring” up to “wholly ignoring”!

**F1** The lower p.52 drawing’s caption (in Cook’s hand) *explicitly identifies the viewing site*: “seen from gl. opp. Peak 7.” And isn’t p.52’s “peak 7” right at the Gateway?! (Note new Bryce confirmation: fn 17.) If not, then (§E5): **where does CookSoc say Cook’s peak 7 is?** (Since CookSoc, in CTC Plate 2/12’s caption, says that both diary-p.52 drawings were made atop the East Ridge, perhaps it can explain *where* atop the East Ridge one can find any glacier at all — much less a Cook “Peak 7”!) *No comment* in PP18 — this despite the fact that PP18 p.8 and CTC p.245 **both cite Cook’s “12 peaks”** but (§D) do not reproduce the three Cook-Barrill sketch maps (D7 Figs.11-13) placing them, so that the reader can see that peak 7 is at the Gateway (according to both Cook and Barrill). See the twelve-mountain sequence in Cook’s diary sketch-maps — suppressed (§D) until Bryce produced them in D7 — “8 peaks” at D7 Figs.12&13, and peaks 9-12 atop Fig.12.

**F2** Extra item in the foregoing connection: at D9 fn 30, we pointed out where CookSoc reported (see PP18 p.8 & CTC p.245) that it had attempted to photograph Cook’s 12 peaks, “but the result is not in CTC.” Question: how *could* such a 12-peak photo — with the peaks all numbered<sup>21</sup> — be published by CookSoc, when [a] This would of course instantly raise the issue of why Cook didn’t sketch-place and carefully number any features beyond what was visible from the Gateway. [b] A CookSoc photo with numbered peaks (as in D7’s Fig.1) would reveal to the reader that Cook’s peak 7 was at the Gateway, which explodes CookSoc’s pretense that diary-p.52’s lower drawing (captioned “seen from gl. opp. Peak 7”) was up on the East Ridge. So CookSoc’s omission of its own proposed 12-peak photo simply adds another unsubtle hint that CookSoc is selecting evidence just the way any other lawyer would.

**F3** CookSoc claims the Cook p.52 drawings were made at 11000 ft, while *DIO* says they were made at 5000 ft. The barometer-reading given right on p.52, atop the drawings (D7 Figs.15&16), is 24 inches, which is quite wrong for 11000 ft. This is shown by calculation at D9 fn 43; but Doc’s own diary data cook him just as convincingly: its p.59 (CookSoc *Top of the Continent* 1996 reprint p.286) gives 5500 feet for virtually the same barometer reading (24.6 inches) — while diary pp.76-77 (*ibid* pp.286-287) twice gives 19 inches for 12100 ft (allegedly on the Ridge).

**F4** Why is the p.52 top drawing’s foreground feature labelled “East ridge cornice” if the artist was standing *upon* it? (PP18 p.46 tries calling “East ridge” merely a “description”. No, it labels a drawing of a physical feature — the recognizable shape [D7 Fig.25] of the East Ridge, as seen from Cook’s distant vantage-point.)

**F5** Why did Cook label the whole of p.52 “McK” (not Pegasus or Friendly or whatever)?

**F6** New<sup>22</sup> point (not in *DIO* 7.2-3): by CookSoc’s scenario, not only are the two drawings on p.52 out of order (see D9 fn 33) but p.52 is *itself* out of order, since Cook’s drawing on p.56 is from the Fake Peak amphitheatre (“amp th”) which Cook visited only 1906/9/10 (D8) on his outward trip and thus **before** he could have gotten atop the East Ridge, where CookSoc claims the p.52 drawings were made. [Bryce adds: the bottom p.52 drawing-label was written after p.56’s drawing. On the top drawing: see ‡5 §D16 & D7 §§G14-G15.]

**F7** Another new point (not in previous analyses, including *DIO* 7.2-3): the p.52 drawing’s caption says the left (east) peak is **higher** than “the west peak” (on right); but for CookSoc’s Pegasus Peak photo, the **lower** peak is what CookSoc *itself* rightly calls the east

peak at PP18 p.46: E.peak 12060 ft vs W.peak 12200+ ft, which contradicts the caption<sup>23</sup> of CookSoc’s lonely “hard” evidence!<sup>24</sup> CookSoc thinks p.52’s top drawing looks **north** towards the Pegasus peak-pair; so: how can the right (lower) of the two Pegasus peaks be to the **west**? This *directional absurdity* hands unalloyed victory to Okonek’s contention that p.52’s top drawing is of McK, seen from the Ruth-Fake Peak area, where the left peak looms nearer&higher than the distant lower right peak (convincing mostly-west-looking Cook that the remoter right peak [really the N.Peak] was “west”, as diary p.52 states).

**F8** CookSoc rejects the foregoing highly expert O-W-B interpretation with the following (textually unsupported) claim at PP18 p.46: “The fact that Cook wrote [upon his p.52 diary drawing] ‘west peak’ should have made it obvious [to *DIO*] that he was not sketching Mount McKinley since he already knew McKinley’s twin peaks were north and south, not east and west.” (CookSoc discussions of what Cook wrote on p.52 somehow never mention that the first word Cook wrote atop this page, describing the subject of p.52’s artwork was: “McK”.)<sup>25</sup> Not so fast. It is an oddity of the history of McKinley exploration that no map of the McKinley area (including Cook’s maps) up through 1906 ever showed that the McKinley’s near-twin peak was due north of McKinley. And what was Cook’s notion of the true direction of what we now call the “North Peak”? When in 1906 Cook returned from Alaska and recounted his triumph, this is how the *NYTimes* reported his story (slightly mangled either by Cook or *NYT*), as noted by Bryce (BR 281): “Very early on the morning of the eighth day we made the dash for the top. In our climb we encountered two peaks. We chose the southwestern. We reached the top at 10 o’clock.” When Cook published his story, his maps didn’t show the other peak, and his words were virtually identical in his two written accounts<sup>26</sup> where we have added emphasis at the crucial point: “We had seen the summit from various sides, but we were not prepared for the surprise of this great spread of surface. From below, the apex appears like a single peak, with gradual slopes. From the northern foothills we had previously discovered two distinct peaks. But now, from the upper slopes, we saw that there were several miniature ranges running up to two main peaks about two miles apart. *To the west* a ridge with a saddle, to the east a similar ridge, with one main peak to the southeast. This peak was the highest point, and to it we aimed”. How can CookSoc interpret such a description as showing that Cook knew the two peaks were north-south and that *DIO* is ignorant in supposing that Cook’s diary could refer to the lower

<sup>23</sup> A reasonable explanation of the caption has been proposed by Pickering: the artist knew he was looking westish (NW by W — almost exactly compass-west) and thus mistakenly but understandably took the lower-profile background peak (North Peak) to be west of the foreground peak (South Peak, the very top of McK). CookSoc’s problem is that the PP14 front cover photo that allegedly matches diary p.52 was taken looking roughly *north* (a little west of north), while the Okonek-Washburn-Bryce perception of the p.52 drawing has Cook looking mostly west instead (about 35° north of west) — thus Pickering’s test shows that the latter is a far better theory for matching the directions entered (in Cook’s own hand) at diary p.52. Note: the North Peak is almost exactly NORTH (not west) of South Peak, and only 1 3/4 nmi distant — so one might suppose that a man who allegedly stood on the South Peak would know enough to correct that p.52 caption. Note that Cook’s account of the alleged summit scene (CTC pp.231-233) makes no mention at all of the nearby, prominent North Peak — much less what direction it was in (due north). Nor does he mark the North Peak on his private diary sketch-maps (D7 Figs.12&13) or his published maps of his alleged 1906 route (D9 Fig.31, CTC Fig.1/5 — the latter being identical to the map in *Top of the Continent* between pp.152&153).

<sup>24</sup> Pickering has gone farther, arriving at an undeniably-final resolution for the orientation of diary p.52’s upper drawing. He points out that all three of the directions written on the drawing itself show that the viewer was looking westish: “N” (“N gl.”) is on the right, “East” (“East ridge cornice”) is in the foreground, and “west” (“west peak”) is in the background. It’s a triple-verification of the Okonek-Washburn-Bryce interpretation (fn 23 above, or D7 §G5) that diary-p.52’s top drawing looks approximately west, thus at McKinley. CookSoc’s theory demands that the drawer was looking virtually north, towards Pegasus Peak: CTC Plate 2/12 (correcting Pegasus’ position: §11), PP18 p.46.

<sup>25</sup> CTC p.284 has already agreed (1996) to this interpretation of Cookscribble at diary p.52 line 1.

<sup>26</sup> Cook 1907 p.835, & Cook 1908 (or CTC) pp.225-226. We here quote verbatim from the former.

<sup>20</sup> See text of D7 §G, as well as Figs.24-27.

<sup>21</sup> See the numbering in D7’s Fig.1.

<sup>22</sup> Also noted simultaneously by Jim Wolf of Baltimore.

of the two peaks as on the west side of the other? After all, that's *exactly* what it says in the italicized part of the passage just quoted from Cook's own account.

**F9** Cook's caption to the p.52 drawing provides (in feet) the difference in the two peaks' height.<sup>27</sup> Which raises yet another new question. If the main peak is really insignificant Pegasus Peak, then: how did Cook find such a remarkably exact estimate of the height difference vs. its neighbor? (He provides no other such estimate. Why would Cook be — by CookSoc's fantasy — so fascinated by the height difference between two minor peaks while providing such a differential datum for no other pair, not even for the two peaks of his goal, McK?) His diary does not even *claim* that he took the sort of measurements (angular height combined with triangulation for distance) required to determine the heights of distant points. Thus, it makes sense that the height-difference cited was already well-known (from prior explorations' observations at a distance) — i.e., the approximate height difference between the South & North Peaks of Mt. McKinley.

## G The Divert&Conquer Ploy (But It Won't Work in a Debate)

**G1** The above §F items typify the sort of rare entertainment we've all come to depend on receiving from CookSoc. Understand, diary p.52 is THE star "new" physical CookSoc evidence, the Cookies' prime exhibit produced by years of field work, even the proud cover-photo of its biggest McKinley issue (PP14 [1994]). And now we find that it (by §F's items) *nineways*-proves the very reverse of what Cookies have spent tens of thousands of McKinley-trek dollars to establish. (D9 §F2 refers to the multiple-backfire-collapse of Cookism's p.52 argument as perhaps "history's first known case of serial-suicide".)

**G2** CookSoc naturally wants (§G3) to keep the reader fixed on Cook's textual verbal descriptions (and, with diary-p.52 now exploded by *DIO* 7.2-3, this will increasingly be CookSoc's favorite retort-strategy), since such soft evidence is subject to various interpretations. (Reminds one of A.Salter on Freudian dream-analysis: like playing poker with every card wild.) One should note that Cook's words are so twistable that CookSoc itself can't get a consistent picture. Would-be Cook-redeemer Hans Waale (a CookSoc fave)<sup>28</sup> interprets Cook's text to mean that Cook went over and way past the East Ridge (see Bryce 1997 p.827 for a diagram of Waale's speculative Cook-route, which — contra D7 Fig.12, where peaks 9-12 are bunched — places Cook's "peak 12" all the way beyond Muldrow Glacier!) and then came at McKinley rather from the *northeast* (agreeing with Cook's own map of his route: D9 Fig.31; see §H2 for a sure lie in it). But CookSoc has spent big to try instead proving on-site that Cook came at McK from the *east* (E.Ridge), *utterly contradicting* (CTC Fig.2/12 vs D9 Fig.31) Cook's claimed route. (Hmmm: CookSoc is thus contending that Cook *on firm land* didn't know where he was in 1906 [this, even while it's claiming (§4 §O1) Cook could navigate]. So how'd he *on moving water* find the invisible N.Pole in 1908?) Thus, though the 2 top modern CookSoc theorists share unconfirmed surety that Cook's Step-One beyond the Gateway (the farthest universally agreed-upon point he actually attained in 1906) was getting onto the E.Ridge, already by just STEP-TWO of the post-Gateway journey there's huge intra-Cookite dissension! Well, if even something *this* elementary can't be gotten straight<sup>29</sup> — then it's a joke to expect credibly consistent Cook-*text*-based solutions for the *whole* post-Gateway alleged trip to the summit and back.

**G3** In the Baltimore *Sun* of 1998/10/17 (p.3), CookSoc again commits projection (§L7) in accusing *DIO* of (by concentrating on mere hard evidence) diverting<sup>30</sup> attention away

<sup>27</sup> CTC p.284 reads Cook's writing as 150 ft (close to the difference in heights of the Pegasus pair, while *DIO* makes it 750 ft (McK's N&S peaks differ by about 850 ft). But PP18 p.46 creditably agrees that the first digit does have a sevenish appearance.

<sup>28</sup> See, e.g., PP15 p.36 (1995 Oct), PP18 p.41 (1998 Sept).

<sup>29</sup> See Bryce 1997 p.823f.

<sup>30</sup> See similarly PP15 p.34.

from Cook's "descriptive and [diary] sketch evidence". Like the PP18 p.41 allegation that *DIO* ignores same — a falsehood right in the **title**<sup>31</sup> of Sheldon Cook's article there: see §F. That is, the CookSoc editorship requires 5-digit annual support in order to turn out — once a year! — a journal that publishes a falsehood right in a title; and, while damning those evil Cook-doubting "patisans" [*sic*], the editorship tells us on the same page (PP18 p.3), in huge print, atop the issue's table of contents, the name of its cult: "The Fredrick [*sic*] A. Cook Society". This is the CookSoc Representative to Ohio State University. Does OSU have *any* academic standards left? [We answer that question in *DIO* 10 §Q & © 1.] Does OSU not even care that, regarding the documents it was supposed to hand over to OSU, CookSoc has (e.g., §E3, D7 §E2) repeatedly tried to hold back the most damning photographs?

**G4** The alleged *DIO* "ignoring" of sketch-evidence is a Cook-size whopper. Facts:

[a] *DIO* spent page after page (fn 20) on the diary-p.52-drawing so beloved of Cookies, plus much more<sup>32</sup> on Cook's diary sketch-maps. (Also, Bryce in his article and book pointed out insuperable difficulties *in* the very Cook textual accounts which Bryce is accused of diverting *from*.)

[b] There are no less than NINE distinct diary counterindications (§F) of CookSoc's interpretation of p.52.

**G5** No wonder PP18 couldn't quite meet our D9 challenge to print *DIO*'s phone number, fax number, and address — as we did for *Polar Priorities* (at D7 fn 30 and D9 fn 14). PP18 prints only the address — hoping that anyone checking with *DIO* will be slowed or discouraged. (One just keeps getting the feeling that CookSoc really doesn't *want* its faithful to be exposed to dissent. *DIO* has no such problems.) We ask again that our phone numbers be provided *Polar Priorities* readers, in the same detail as we (in D7-D9) provided full contact-info for CookSoc chiefs and publications.

**G6** This is an apt place to make a general reflection: CookSoc repeatedly and unqualifiedly states as fact that it has proven Cook's ascent of the East Ridge, based upon the diary p.52 rough *drawing's* alleged match to a view & photo which it in fact only faintly resembles. (The pretended match of p.52's art to Pegasus & Friendly requires ignoring a flock of obvious negative hard evidences against it, right *on* p.52. See §F.) But, more to the point, CookSoc at the same time argues<sup>33</sup> (D9 §B3 and PP18 p.42) against accepting PERFECT photographic matches. (*PP18 Suppl* p.15: "Dr. Cook's pencil might prove to be mightier than the [*sic*] Brad Washburn's camera tower.") The contrast belongs in the realm of the more pathetic branches of psychology. It ranks with believing oneself to be Julius Caesar just by vaguely-matching his baldness — without counting any of the unambiguous contrary evidences: nation, chronology, language, wealth, skill. And sanity.

## H Molenaar's Objection to CookSoc's Moosterstroke-Shortcut

**H1** The CookSoc CTC Plate 2/12 map depicts Cook's outward 1906 journey as including a bizarre "shortcut" directly from the Fake Peak amphitheatre to the Gateway, right past the Moose's Tooth. (As with CookSoc's newly-favored East Ridge route to the top, topographical difficulties are tossed aside in favor of beeline shortness — to help the plausibility of Cook's supposed fastest-climb-ever-from-southeast.)

<sup>31</sup> Univ Chicago talent has pulled off a stunt comparably whacky: publishing a book review that didn't even understand the *title* of the book being reviewed. (See *DIO* 1.1 ¶5. Such brilliance won the reviewer a MacArthur grant.)

<sup>32</sup> See sources at §D.

<sup>33</sup> At *National Review* 1998/10/26 p.44, Jonah Golberg comments on the peril of expanding (into general society) a standard lawyer-sleight (central to the O Simpson-trial-#1 farce): "the moral equivalence of facts. According to this credo, an almost comical abundance of DNA evidence carries no more weight than one detective's racist comments ten years before the murders in question. As Felix Frankfurter once observed, 'To some lawyers, all facts are equal.'" [See ¶5 §D19.] Another ever more pervasive expansion-of-courtroomdom: "experts" who'll say absolutely anything if paid.

**H2** This odd Shortcut was a masterstroke ploy, not only making his route look (superficially) shorter&faster but additionally incorporating — and thus softening the strangeness of — Cook’s diary-certified (fn 34) foray into the Fake Peak area, a side-trip which was pointless except for faking a “summit” photo, and was thus never mentioned in his published writings on the trip. Even less excusable is a hitherto-neglected elementary point: though Cook’s Fake Peak amphitheatre side-trip is unquestionably in his diary<sup>34</sup> and positively verified by four of his photographs,<sup>35</sup> his own published depiction of his 1906 September path (D9 Fig.31) takes him **straight up Ruth Glacier to the Gateway without interruption.**

**H3** The “short”cut theory has a difficulty which the highly experienced alpinist Dee Molenaar immediately spotlighted (D7 fn 30): it goes right over the *horrible* terrain of the Moose’s Tooth region. CookSoc’s proposed “shortcut” takes one directly towards Mt. McKinley, right over the mountainous region shown in the foreground of Cook’s own excellent photo of McKinley, seen from atop Fake Peak — first published at D7 Fig.25. (In 1999, Brad Washburn — only about a year short of his 90th birthday! — precisely verified the exact location by duplicating the vista photographically from atop Fake Peak.) Why would an explorer adopt such a ghastly route towards a point which he could arrive at much more easily by (not diverting to Fake Peak but instead) just continuing-on up Ruth Glacier? The Shortcut is on a ©1995 map said to have been rushed<sup>36</sup> for a 1996 Sept book’s deadline.

**H4** Another question: why would Cook not take a single photo of the magnificent scenery along this alleged Shortcut — until he’d gotten past it, back into the smooth Gateway area we all agree he was at?

## I Bare Nitbin

**I1** Considering the massive amounts of data published in D7-D9, it is striking that the self-styled mountaineer-experts of CookSoc found NOT ONE INACCURATE *DIO* DATUM. By contrast, D9 fn 46 noted that CookSoc’s map (CTC Plate 2/12) of the McKinley area seriously mis-placed the Society’s beloved Pegasus Peak — actually putting it on the wrong side of the West Fork Traleika Glacier!

**I2** And note that, in D9 fn 46, instead of using this glaringly central screwup to slander the CookSoc crew, *DIO* instead (*idem*) mercifully suggested that this was just a slip — and so explicitly (and vainly) asked that CookSoc not get us all into a nit-contest.

**I3** PP18 p.49 n.12 reacts to this kindness by claiming that the CookSoc error was about-to-be-corrected (hey, no non-expertise here) and then humorlessly and (ignoring *DIO*’s generosity and warning) rashly attempts counter-nitting that Keith Pickering’s map (D9 Fig.32) of the Ruth Glacier (which Brad Washburn deems an excellent job) contained worse errors — allegedly omitting the glacier that CookSoc had climbed in 1994. However, D9 Fig.32’s caption explicitly states that the map is “simplified” and that “Boundaries of glaciers in their

<sup>34</sup> See Cook diary p.59 (CTC p.286 or D8 p.79 Day 3).

<sup>35</sup> Several of the Cook photos definitely taken in Fake Peak amphitheatre (a few miles east of the straight-up-Ruth-Glacier path depicted on Cook’s map of his path: D9 Fig.31) are in *DIO* 7.2-3 (Figs. 4, 18, 24, 28). Regarding other amphitheatre photos, see fn 41, also D7 §E6 and BR 1088-1089.

<sup>36</sup> One supposes that this proposed Shortcut was originally just a mistake that occurred in a careless hurry and thus in ignorance of the roughness of the Fake Peak amphitheatre — a region which CookSoc’s 1994 venture studiously avoided. But, now that CookSoc has published the blunder, it’s stuck with it. This because: admitting the mistake could give aid&comfort to Evil Enemies (not a speculative theory: see fn 16), who might point to it as suggesting that CookSoc’s pretense to alpine expertise is slightly transparent. The idea that standing by nonsense will keep genuine mountaineers from eyeroll-snickering, is just one more index of CookSoc’s grip on reality. The deadline-rush is acknowledged by CookSoc in extenuation of the same map’s undeniable error in positioning Pegasus Peak. See PP18 p.49 n.12, where we also learn that CookSoc errors are merely slips due to deadlines while CookSoc-critics’ “errors” which are lesser (*and*, by the way, not actually errors: see, e.g., §J2) are said to be [a] greater and [b] proof of non-expertise. (See D9 §C10 on: balanced judgement.)

upper reaches are approximate.” I.e., CookSoc nit-collecting came up so bare that it is left with nothing better-worse than proudly announcing to the world that: *DIO*’s approximate map is approximate! A nitbin this empty speaks pretty well for *DIO*’s accuracy.

**I4** As to the *ad-hominem* attack on remote-skilled *DIO*’s expertise: CookSoc’s only capable researcher agrees (PP18 p.46) to our Pegasus Peak altitudes (12200+ ft & 12060 ft — already published at D9 fn 46) and admits CookSoc’s error (p.48) in placing this, its favorite peak. But CookSoc cannot acknowledge that this contrast establishes the very opposite of the alleged relative technical expertise. Understand: *DIO* correctly identified & located Pegasus (which *DIO* 7.2-3’s three writers had never seen), even though: [a] It’s CookSoc’s obsession, not *DIO*’s, [b] Pegasus isn’t marked with that name on standard topo charts, & [c] CookSoc had seriously mismapped it. If *DIO* is to be slandered as too ignorant of the area to be listened to, then: how did we (again: none of whom had ever been within 1000 miles of the place) manage to get this right, while been-there CookSoc fumbled it? (At D9 fn 32, we — also without visiting the area — correctly identified understandably-unlabelled Friendly Peak in CTC Plate 2/13, — noting that this CookSoc photo itself proves that, from where CTC Plate 2/12’s caption claims Cook made Fig.52’s lower drawing, Friendly Peak looks *nothing at all* like the drawing.)

## J CookSoc Mapmaking

Meanwhile, one notes that CookSoc’s Plate 2/12 is riddled with obvious distortions which we passed over in D9. Examples:

**J1** The peninsula containing the Pegasus Peak pair (63°06’N, 150°40’W) is depicted as sharp, when it is actually blunt and stubby as shown in Keith’s *DIO* map.

**J2** At the very point where PP18 is complaining that *DIO*’s map doesn’t show the 1994 CookSoc team’s steep glacier climb (the place where the 1994 team was re-tracing Cook’s supposed CTC Plate 2/12 route, starting up onto the East Ridge), the *DIO* map in fact shows<sup>37</sup> a strong gradient starting upward well before CookSoc’s Plate 2/12 shows same.

**J3** Final oddity (noticed during a productive, detailed 1998/10/25 DR chat with Jim Wolf): right opposite CTC Plate 2/12 one finds Plate 2/13, with “Dr. Cook’s 1906 Route on the Ruth Glacier” depicted by a white line — which comes right up Ruth Glacier, *not* across §H3’s Moose-mess.

**J4** I.e., before attacking others, can CookSoc get its OWN act straight here? (Similarly, see §G2.)

**J5** As if in answer to the question: in 1998 and again in 1999, CookSoc bungled yet another elementary geographical matter. PP18 (1998/10) p.47 and the 1999 April *PP Supplement* p.15 display photographically a scene from the Pegasus Peak-Traleika area.<sup>38</sup> Both captions play yet again the CookSoc broken-record fantasy that Cook made the drawing on diary p.52 from the East Ridge; 1998 caption: “Dr. Cook drew the sketch from atop the East Ridge (upper right)” — and 1999 caption similarly: “Dr. Cook drew the sketch on page 52 of his diary from atop the East Ridge seen at the upper right.” CookSoc has again demonstrated its capacity for durable error. For, in the photos, the upper right is actually a ridge (connecting three peaks of respective heights 11880 ft, 11610 ft, 12290 ft) which aims *more north* than east (trending towards Mt. Silverthrone, 13220 ft, the slopes of which dominate the top of the right side of the photos). This ridge is far east (& north) of the path CookSoc has dreamed for its hero. (Neither side believes Cook was anywhere near the ridge specified in the captions.) I.e., PP thinks its camera was aimed roughly E when it was actually

<sup>37</sup> This point can be confirmed simply by making photocopies of both maps and then (since the scales are nearly the same) just holding the pair (superposed) up to a bright light.

<sup>38</sup> The 1998 & 1999 photos are from nearly the same point and the camera was aimed in virtually the same direction, thus the misorientation of each is about the same: roughly half a right angle.

aimed about NE by N. This study-in-misorientation is published under PP18's (p.45) inadvertently ironic title: "A Response [to Not-Been-There *DIO*] from Someone Who Actually Went There". Further: in PP's been-there photos, the East Ridge (as so labelled on Fig.2/12 of CookSoc 1996) isn't just on the right but stretches *all the way across* the middle of the photos, and the Ridge isn't in the upper part of the photos — indeed all points consistent with where CookSoc suggests<sup>39</sup> the diary-p.52 drawing was made are very near the photo's horizontal midline. [Traleika Col is actually below the 1999 photo's middle.]

## K Flimflamming and the Miraculous

*DIO* finds yet another hilarious improbability regarding the §H3 MooseMess Shortcut:

**K1** It has been thoroughly established by Brad Washburn, Brian Okonek, & Bob Bryce that Cook took photos in the Fake Peak area and in the *middle*<sup>40</sup> of the Great Gorge (upper Ruth Glacier). Problem: by the CookSoc's OWN map (CTC Plate 2/12), Cook was never in the former on the return trip or in the latter on the outward trip.

**K2** Therefore, the CookSoc alibi<sup>41</sup> that Cook ran out of good film becomes rather more complicated than as originally proposed (D7 fn 49). We must believe that Cook's film [a] went bad right as he passed the Gateway going north and [b] *stayed bad* all the way up CookSoc's precious East Ridge (which all Cookies assume *positively* he got onto — though not a single one of his photos puts him there; or drawings: §F); then, [c] up McKinley and [d] down McKinley and [e] down the same beloved East Ridge. Baaaad film on all these parts of the trip; however, more inspired and inspiring is the capper: **his film suddenly GOT WELL again as soon as he passed the Gateway going back south.**<sup>42</sup> (What a doctor!) How else could he get a photo in mid-Great-Gorge, when [according to CookSoc: §K1] he wasn't there at any other time than the return trip.

**K3** The Gateway is the same location where all Cook's other hard evidences stop. (See above, §E7.) For CookSoc to be right about Cook, the Gateway has to be a more improbable miracle-spot than Lourdes.

<sup>39</sup> CookSoc keeps insisting that it has proved Cook got onto the East Ridge. But, oddly, it can't quite make up its mind WHERE Cook is supposed to have first struck the Ridge. CTC p.245 implies it was at Traleika Col (which is almost all the way to the right on the midline of the misoriented photo in question: PP18 p.47 bottom). But CTC Fig.2/12 puts the arrival spot (highly improbably) east of TC, while Fig.2/13 puts it west of TC.

<sup>40</sup> At least three Cook photos place him in mid-Great Gorge; two are found opp. pp.171&205 of *Top* [Washburn-Cherici 2001 pp.134&136].

<sup>41</sup> PP15 p.35. Or (*idem*): his camera might have frozen. Cook is said to have claimed at one point that his "films spoiled" (Browne: Explorers Club minutes 1909/10/15 p.12). Or maybe (BR 452&814 vs 821) he left his camera at the Gateway. Which doesn't explain claiming a photo at 15,400 ft (D9 Fig.28). The PP15 p.35 ran-out-of-film theory creates yet another oddity: why would an explorer (at Gateway), down to his last films, take at least *five* photos [e.g., Washburn-Cherici 2001 pp.138, 140, 142, 145: latter 2 virtually same!] from this northernmost verified campsite? And how'd he (so early on) *get* to the end of his film? By (pre-Gateway!) sneaking into the Fake Peak amphitheatre, to shoot Barrill flagwaving atop a geological zit. [Fake Peak is *so* minor that even top McK expert Washburn's new book (p.97) confuses adjacent molehills for it at pp.131&163. It's one zit to the right of the arrowed one, in both photos. (Former slip from Browne 1913 p.114.) Correct in p.117's S view & p.147's S-of-E view.] Cook wasted at least 12 photos on this tiptoe side-trip: see, e.g., fn 35 & BR 832. [Note: The outta-film alibi implies the "summit" photo is fake. But CookSoc won't say so, knowing this exonerates (§C5) satanic Browne! The Moosterstroke idea can be even ditzier: dense northward phototaking stops at Gateway, *no shots for over 12 beeline miles* 'til summit, *just ONE* shot (at best) there *to save film for the mid-Great-Gorge??* (See fn 40.)] All Cook 1906 photo-vistas have been identified by alpinists Washburn & Okonek, whose highly expert 1sthand mapping of these photos' sites&directions was generously shared with *DIO*, thus effecting 100% resolution of the Cook-McKinley ex-controversy.

<sup>42</sup> There is an inverse parallel here to Peary's 1909 fable: his dogs dawdled until his April Fool Camp, when they all turned into jet-snowmobiles for the sprint from there to "the Pole" and back to April Fool Camp — and then they suddenly got tuckered again. See F159.

## L Evidential Cowardice: the Boys Who Cried Proof

CookSoc is so dreamily disdainful of hard evidences that it meets none in PP18. However, once upon a time, most of *DIO*'s now-CookSoc-discarded hard data (the sort by which genuine scientists test claims) were of downright magnetic fascination to CookSoc. But, in each case, CookSoc turned tail just as soon as the evidence's unwelcome implication began emerging. (See D9 §E.)

**L1** The Cook circle was creditably the first to realize that some of the diary drawings displayed compass data — and was so excited (at the possibilities) that this important find was (D9 §E) written up in PP14 (1994) p.5 & CTC (1996) p.239 as new evidence that potentially could finally tell us where Cook was in 1906. However, the data later all turned out to be from Ruth Glacier (privately acknowledged in 1997), south of the Gateway.

So brave CookSoc ran off its self-created compass-data evidential battleground.

**L2** DR first learned (1995) of the two diary sketch-maps directly from the Cook group, which was naturally looking for vindication from them. But these Cook diary sketch-maps (D7 Figs.12-13) end at the Gateway, thus *both visibly resemble the already-published (& long-CookSoc-hated) Peary-Arctic-Club "purchased" sketch-map of Cook's "Judas"*,<sup>43</sup> *Ed Barrill*. (Compare Cook's sketch-map at D7 Figs.12&13 to Barrill's at D7 Fig.11.) CookSoc does not explain why Cook's McK diary contains *two* Cook sketch-maps of Ruth Glacier,<sup>44</sup> but *zero* sketch-maps for anyplace beyond it, and why the sketch-map (D7 Fig.12) showing Cook's activities indicate *zero* beyond the Gateway, e.g., no activity at all near the four in-line mountains (#9-#12) he saw in the distance from the Gateway, mountains which his & CookSoc's (1996 Fig.2/12-13) routes demand he passed next to.<sup>45</sup>

So bold CookSoc bailed out (§D) of its self-created sketch-map arena, too — and omitted reproducing the diary sketch-maps even in its publication of the diary (which included some of Cook's other, *less damaging* drawings) as an appendix to CTC. The sketch-maps belonged at CTC pp.281-282.

**L3** Fave (fn 28) Cook-defender Hans Waale used to insist that Russell Porter's drawings were based upon 1906 Sept photos which Cook supposedly had taken well above 10,000 ft (see PP15 p.36). But Bryce 1997 (pp.830f; also D7 §E7) showed that no such photos ever existed. So, CookSoc now claims (PP15 p.34) that mere hard photographic evidence just "diverts" from the real debate.

And so CookSoc exited yet another evidential battlefield. . . .

**L4** Right up until the *DIO* surprise-publication of the (previously CookSoc-hidden) full uncropped original "summit" photo (D7 Fig.18), Cookites have repeatedly suggested (§C5, or D9 §G1 & fn 46) that conspiratorial forgery might have secretly lurked behind the apparent match between Cook's "summit" photo and *others'* photos of Fake Peak. But Bryce's find of the original (and *DIO* 7.2's publication of it) has finally killed off that avenue, since it is Cook's *OWN* photos that now (see also §C5) prove beyond all doubt the identity of Fake Peak and his "summit".

So intrepid CookSoc fled its self-created doctored-"summit"-photo evidential arena, too.

**L5** CookSoc originally stated that Cook's barometer readings were trustworthy within "several hundred feet . . . good, broadly accurate" (CTC p.269). But then D9 §F2 [d] showed that the barometer reading on CookSoc's sole "hard" evidence, diary p.52, disagreed by thousands of feet with CookSoc's East-Ridge (11000 ft) placement of p.52. CookSoc's "reply"? A headline-fantasy (§F) that *DIO* had ignored p.52!

Thus did brave CookSoc run off even the barometric-data battleground.

<sup>43</sup> [Byrd (*DIO* 10 fn 20) was not the only North Pole faker to compare himself to Jesus. Cook wrote (1911/1/29) that his movie (see cover & ‡4 fn 95) would help "heal the wounds inflicted in my side." (Letter displayed at start of film.) See below at §O1.]

<sup>44</sup> Each of the two sketch-maps in Cook's diary bears the hand-written words, "Ruth Gl" at its head. See D7 Figs.12&13.

<sup>45</sup> D7 Fig.12's peaks are numbered in Cook's hand as #9-#12. Compare to CTC Plate 2/12.

**L6** When each of these *CookSoc-chosen* avenues led to cul-de-sac disaster, the Cook Society — undeterred — didn't get the consistent message and (lacking the integrity to admit a big mistake) simply **turned to emphasizing other** (progressively vaguer: §G2) alleged evidences in order to keep unquestioningly driving towards Cookies' ever-unalterable (& ever-unattainable) goal of ultimate vindication.

**L7** Thus, when looking (§G3) to identify *those devious baddies who cleverly deflect attention from key evidences brought forth by Cookites*, CookSoc need only

CHECK THE MIRROR.

## M Mirrorless Plot-Accusers

**M1** PP18 also enragedly and (standard-confusedly) threw names at “enemies”, and repeated as fact increasingly fantastic theories of vendettas and secret “alliances” to persecute hero Cook.

**M2** Reading these, one learns little about McKinley and alot about Russ Gibbons' sanity — and his painfully obvious *loathing* of DR, who refuses to hate<sup>46</sup> him or anyone else back.

**M3** DR has never had an unfriendly social exchange with RG (despite his ignorably pathetic snipings in DR's direction since 1973).<sup>47</sup>

**M4** But RG has evidently been squirreling away for decades every enraged, clumsy, trite, misattributed, and-or fantasized personal attack ever made on DR in print — and now that he has come unhinged at the debacle of seeing publication (by former friends and fellow Peary-claim-skeptics) of the very same fatal photograph which CookSoc thought it had successfully hidden, RG has unloaded his whole raw garbage-file on DR into PP18, in sheer — seemingly pointless — vindictive spleen, *a CookSoc reaction explicitly anticipated at D9 fn 47*. (DR believes that D7-9 contained only one [rather mild] personal attack on a specific Cookie: that in D7 fn 30, which was ameliorated on the spot by inserting bracketed praise of the great earlier contributions of the subject.)<sup>48</sup> Unfortunately for RG, none of PP18's *ad hominem*s answer the D7 centerfold photo's fatal implications for RG's hero.

**M5** Overview point. Though D9 attempted (again: only *after*, please note, the establishment of hyper-overkill evidence destroying Cook's McKinley claim: fn 48) an evaluation of the Cook crowd's argumentation-methods and cult-religious mental impenetrability toward incoming disconfirmatory evidence, D9 made no argument that Cookites should be disbelieved just because they are unreliable.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> All the hate is coming from one side in this case, for a simple reason noted at *DIO* 8 ¶5 §I2.

<sup>47</sup> Typical contentless RG denigration-pet: *American History Illustrated* 10.1 p.49 (1974/4).

<sup>48</sup> D7 & D9 indeed contained general remarks on CookSoc's religious mentality. But, when the hard evidence is 100.000% against a group that isn't adjusting its sacred conclusions *at all* (D9 fn 37) to that evidence, then (and only then): a few sociological speculations may be permissible and justified. And the speculation of D9 fn 47 has been vindicated by PP18's publication of extensive personal attacks instead of the *pair* of key Fake Peak photos (D7 Fig.18 & Fig.4) which D9 §G3 challenged the Cook Society finally to let its members see AS A PAIR (§C1), which CookSoc has never done and will never do. See also §E6 (above) on yet another photo-pairing (D9 Figs.28&29) that you'll find discussed (see quote at D9 §B1) but NEVER photographically reproduced (as a pair) in CookSoc literature.

<sup>49</sup> D9 does undo Cookite pretenses to expertise, but that is merely to neutralize an invalid and rather irrelevant CookSoc ploy. *DIO* has repeatedly acknowledged the occasional Cook (e.g., *DIO* 1.1 ¶4 §B4) and Cookite (e.g., *DIO* 2.2) contributions to the Polar Controversy. By contrast, Gibbons cannot acknowledge any value to *DIO*. (Ted Heckathorn, notably, is not so narrow: see PP18 p.5.) This is the approach of a politician, not a scholar — and it is therefore the most indicative feature to look for when trying to distinguish the two types of creatures. *DIO* has cited numerous parties who pursue similar policies (including National Geographic, which Gibbons increasingly resembles: fn 70) — many of them in Ivy League academe, well outside of polar studies. *DIO* behaves in a quite opposite fashion. See, e.g., *DIO* 2.2 on Ted Heckathorn; also *DIO* 1.2 fnn 16&174, cataloging *DIO*'s various appreciations of the valid productions of a clique of historians, even though they are often wrong and have tried strenuously to inflict lethal harm upon several able scientists.

**M6** D7-D9 instead argued tightly via facts and logical reasoning therefrom. The opposition's *own choice* (§L) of its main pro-Cook points were cited and were met head-on in detail. (PP18 does the opposite and meets none of *DIO*'s points.)

**M7** By contrast, PP18's main thrust was browfurrowedly to pretend to sober expertise,<sup>50</sup> like one of the old SatNightLive voice-of-authority talking-head skits: We're Heavy-Face, and You're Not.

**M8** Namecalling is slung with demented passion, inaccuracy, and irrelevancy. Meantime, CookSoc complains of vindictiveness.

**M9** Hurling slander at DR is noted above as a seemingly pointless RG effort. (DR is not *DIO*'s main researcher on Cook. Bryce is.) That is, *unless* the intent is to intimidate *DIO* into silence. Which (as one can see from this issue) isn't going to work any better than it has against Brad Washburn.

**M10** Scientist DR is particularly tickled at being called a press-contact sort<sup>51</sup> by Gibbons, a professional p.r. man, who exhales press-releases in his sleep, while knowing exactly as much navigational math as his hero. (On Cook's hysterical astronomy, see F53-56.)

## N From Sacred-Cowing to Money-Cowing to Critic-Cowing

**N1** Personal remarks are *inevitably* a Cookite tactic: [1] Arguments for pathetic lies will never convert rational observers (no matter how near acceptance may occasionally seem). Thus, Cook-loyalists are self-condemned to relive forever the legendary punishment of Sisyphos. After suffering enough frustration with reasoned argument, they, in time, *always* segue into attacking opponents' credibility. (If such work is funded by a family-contributed trust, does that make one a subsidized-slander-slinger?) [2] Lacking credible evidence for Cook's claims, supporters have depended [¶4 §E1] upon citing *testimonials*. (Cook himself devised all the current defense-tactics, the several bizarre conspiracy-theories,<sup>52</sup> the buttering-up and-or hiring of publicly-trusted figures or institutions,<sup>53</sup> etc. The testimonials-ploy is no different: Cook launched it firsthand. See, e.g., Cook *My Attainment* 1913 ed. p.584; tradition carried on at p.262 of the CookSoc edition of *Top*.)

<sup>50</sup> A pretense predicted & countered at D9 §§C9-C10.

<sup>51</sup> RG puts into scientists' mouths some ludicrously unscholarly slanderous language, which his own source cites to the Marie-Peary-family-NGS circle: standard bad-loser lashing-out sputterings. Just as reliably, RG (PP18 p.40) says, “DR insisted on examining the [Richard Byrd 1926] diary, and concluded that erased sextant readings that [*sic*] differed from those in the official report (also to the sponsoring NGS). Again DR rushed to the press”. Facts: in 1996 Ted Heckathorn pushed a (stupidly) reluctant DR to come out to the Byrd Center to see the newly “discovered” Byrd diary — in which DR wrongly expected to find nothing of great interest. However, upon the historic and shocking finding of these discrepancies, DR's immediate reaction (in Ted's presence) to OSU's archivist was that Ted&DR would stay silent and let the Byrd Center bring the truth out, though DR would write a report for it to use or not use towards that aim. As OSU and the *NYT*'s Science Dep't will remember, DR's report on Byrd was sent to the *NYT* by OSU, not DR. (DR suggested to the Byrd Center that the report instead be released through *Science* magazine, Amer Assoc Advancement Sci. The Center vetoed that and opted for the *NYTimes*; so DR then alerted the latter and set the ball rolling.) Gibbons' version: DR “rushed to the press”. How much brain-atrophy does it take to mangle facts so well-known (firsthand) to one's own top scholar (Ted)? [By the way, DR's Byrd report (basis of the *NYT* 1996/5/9 story that ended the Byrd 1926 N.Pole claim) was ultimately published by the world's leading polar journal (Scott Polar Research Institute, Univ of Cambridge, *Polar Record* 2000 January pp.25-50), jointly with *DIO* 10. The idea of Cambridge publication of the report was initiated by SPRI, not DR.]

<sup>52</sup> Only paranoid theories could counter contra-Cook proofs appearing already in 1909. He concocted such on his own: Cook 1911 Chap.34 (“The Mt. McKinley Bribery”) & Chap.35 (“The Dunkle-Loose Forgery”). On Cook's evolution from noble to ignoble, see F80, 81, 243, 244, 246. From 1909 on, hedonism encroached (e.g., BR 505-506 [vs 241], 627).

<sup>53</sup> Biggest CookSoc kiss-up success: §N2. [But of four B.Gibbons pals (3 spelled OK) cited at *Memb. News* 8 (2001/7) as academic fans of “My Attainment of the Pole”, none say Cook attained it. Yet.]

**N2** Of course, obtaining testimonials for baseless contentions requires alot of politics and funding — thus the current CookSoc tactic of cozying up to Ohio State University’s Byrd Polar Research Center and supplying it welcome 5-figure fiscal injections at least annually. (Byrd’s lovable daughter Bolling — a distant relative of Bolling-family-descended DR — has recently joined the board of the Cook Society!)

**N3** To reply critically to such testimonial (as against physical or logical) “evidence” inevitably requires suggesting its unreliability — which enrages Cookies, who then charge hate-crime or somesuch and go on vindictively to “emulate” something that never existed in the first place among skeptics.

**N4** An especially funny unsubstantial testimonial is analysed at D9 §B3, where *DIO* adduces a perfect Washburn photographic match (Figs.28&29) showing Cook’s [nontrivially retouched] “15400 ft” photo was taken at c.5000 ft: an unevadable hard-evidence proof (§E6). But instead of conceding even this obvious point, CookSoc says (*idem*) it’s just a matter of opinion, since Gonnason saw (but neglected to photograph!) a similar scene at 15000 ft. How can one reply? Other than by identifying Gonnason’s testimony as that of one who has supped at the Cook table for decades? (Indeed, Cook’s daughter was [PP14 p.25] chief funder of Gonnason’s 1956 expedition. [Even so, he later at first wrote Molenaar that Cook had failed.]) If people make incredible claims dependent only upon their unsupported word, that word may get doubted, as Cook’s fate illustrates. (CookSoc’s Gibbons counters at PP18 p.39 that skeptics have also drawn non-neutral funding. Which typically attempts to obscure the germaine point: Gonnason’s PP-cited contributions are merely his unsupported opinions or claims, the pro-Cook value of which is entirely dependent upon Gonnason’s word. On the other hand, skeptics’ contributions are: data, records, photos, topographical work, math, and logical connexions — none of which depend on our word.)

**N5** Lesson: instead of resorting to for-every-expert-there’s-an-equal&opposite-expert ploys (as in our ever-more-farcical, O Simpson-springing courts: fn 33; *DIO* 6 ¶4 & ¶5) and engaging in deliberate obfuscation, if CookSoc had merely played the game according to the rules of evidence, then there would have been no question of personal reliability.

**N6** Another example of unnecessary integrity-questioning is central to the Cook case: Barrill’s affidavit against Cook says they stopped at the Gateway. Test after test on hard evidence (compass data, camp-trash, maps, photos) confirm the Gateway as the pair’s farthest point towards the mountain (fn 5) — thus utterly vindicating the affidavit’s account of their movements. CookSoc reply: Barrill was bribed to lie against Cook. Comments: [a] When the evidence independently and consistently supports a document, does it even matter how much it cost? (E.g., Barrill told where Fake Peak was, and the newly-recovered full original “summit” photo now backs him up.) [b] When a cult for decades generates such needless and irrelevant slander (out of sheer fury at having its religion exploded by proof after proof), it takes nerve for this same cult then to accuse others of intrinsic nastiness.

**N7** The verbal examples Gibbons thinks prove *DIO* “venom” are: “chimera”, “mole-hill”, “cult”, “clique” — vicious stuff like that. (It takes some imagination to see hatred in these expressions, but if there’s one thing RG doesn’t lack, it’s imagination.)

**N8** Gibbons portrays the whole world in terms of vendettas — unable to admit that Browne and others attacked Cook simply for lying, and that *DIO* did a double-issue on Cook not out of venom but because Bryce had made a spectacular archival discovery. DR learned of it at the Byrd Center in late 1997, when Bryce brought the “summit” photo up on his laptop — while Gibbons&co were snubbing Bryce and going off elsewhere in the building, dreaming up imaginary plots to explain why Bryce’s findings were negative even though CookSoc had paid him. (Imagine Gibbons’ shock of misprojection: just because you pay someone, that doesn’t guarantee he’ll support your fanatical viewpoint. Not everyone sells out.) The “summit” photo was obviously worth publication, as the *NYTimes* was soon to agree, bigtime [1998/11/26 p.1]. What has that undeniable fact got to do with vendettas?<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup>During proofreading-checking of *DIO* 7.2-3, *DIO* became so appalled at the kind of indefensibly evidence-immune argumentation (e.g., [§C6, esp. bracketed ref there! — &] D9 §B3) and the insane

**N9** Gibbons has a hard time explaining DR’s putative venom — since DR has had no personal problems with the Cook Society and was even a paid speaker at its amiable<sup>55</sup> 1993 meeting. Gibbons’ past attacks (fn 47) on DR were never replied to in kind. In sympathy with a fellow non-establishmentarian, DR always spoke kindly of RG (also in DR’s *Peary . . . Fiction?* 1973 p.253), as the 1993 Byrd Center symposium videotape will confirm. (At PP18 p.39, the 3-digit sums paid DR in 1993 & Bryce in 1997 for putting together and delivering research papers are somehow rendered pseudo-sinister, while 5-digit Cook-trust sums, paid regularly to CookSoc biggies — often for pathetic scholarship (e.g., §G3) — seem never to be fit copy for PP.)

**N10** But RG’s canny intuition finally figured out the source of DR’s venom. It has to be that: obscure DR has been quietly harboring a quarter-century-old jealousy-vendetta against the awesome scholarship of Cook-supporter Hugh Eames. And DR is allegedly green-eyed (PP18 p.38: “nursing a 25-year-old grudge”) against this Who Eames, specifically because: [a] Eames got his book rigged to come out the same day (1973/6/29) as DR’s.

[b] Eames’ book did better among reviewers.

Comments:

[a] RG’s explanation of simultaneous 1973/6/29 publication is the precise reverse of the truth<sup>56</sup> — and makes no sense, because Eames’ publisher was big-name (Little-Brown), while DR’s was small (R.B.Luce). The same-day coincidence was agile Luce editor Joe Binns’ achievement (at DR’s urging), not Eames’.

[b] As for the books’ relative reception: well, other than grumpy Gibbons’ own (trite-insult) reviews and those of the *New York Times* (a newspaper which Eames’ sane, unvitriolic book deemed<sup>57</sup> a “yellow”, underdog-kicking, “braying” donkey-servant to the Peary Arctic Club’s “ruling mind”), DR’s reviews were consistently better than those of Eames (whose book is now deservedly forgotten by everyone but serious scientists, who never noticed it in the 1st place): see the joint reviews of, e.g., *Wash Post*, *Wall Str Journal*, *Chi Trib*, *la Times*, *Atlantic*, *Time*, etc. Eames’ “joke of a book” (*Wash Post* 1973/7/29) was not even paired with DR’s in the 1973 review by *The New Yorker*; nor that by the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* (1975 March).

**N11** When (at PP18 p.39) attacking 88<sup>y</sup>-old Washburn for not wishing to debate a whole mob of (much-younger) fanatics all at once, RG lacks the balance to point out that DR did precisely this on 1993/10/22 (at CookSoc’s Ohio State University Symposium on Cook): a lone skeptical speaker vs. the entire CookSoc house. (RG knows that DR did the same on 1991/4/19 at the US Naval Institute, effectively taking on a room full of Peary cultists and apoplectic family-members simultaneously in the afternoon debate session. RG’s sole productive researcher Ted Heckathorn was there — and materially contributed to DR’s success.) Is RG so hate-possessed that he is incapable of recognizing positive qualities in an “enemy”? (See *DIO* 2.2 §A2 on this point. And see *ibid* fn 14 for what Roald Amundsen would think of atypical war-combatant RG.) In any case, we have covered the issue of courage elsewhere here (§L). And for defenders of Frederick Cook (the explorer who turned for home at the first steep grade in 1906: D9 §D11) to be attacking Washburn (who has thrice risked his life genuinely climbing McKinley) proves only that CookSoc has

slander being hurled against Washburn, that we felt some evaluation of Cookite logic was permissible — not out of hate, but rather from desire to shine light into long-darkened Cookite skulls. We regretted the inevitable upset this would cause a longtime valued DR friend within the CookSoc circle; but such is the price which truth-seeking will occasionally exact.

<sup>55</sup>CookSoc President Warren Cook to DR (1993/12/16): “On behalf of the Frederick A. Cook Society, many thanks for your very valuable participation in our recent Ohio State Symposium. . . . Your very articulate presentation was most impressive and corroborated our Symposium theme of total objectivity and not a ‘stacked deck of cards.’”

<sup>56</sup>This is obvious from PP18 p.52. Eames first told DR (1972/1/5 letter) about his publishing contract (and 1973 Spring publ date), not vice-versa.

<sup>57</sup>See Eames’ immortal *Winner* 1973 pp.233-236. [Also *DIO* 10 fn 155 on C.Lehmann-Haupt.]

finally attained its pinnacle. Of blind perversity.

**N12** In rage that *DIO* has done more than any modern party but Washburn & Bryce to bring out the truth about Cook's lies, RG (PP18 p.40) pretends that DR's work on Peary has only scantily acknowledged the work of predecessors. Just another Cooksymp falsehood.<sup>58</sup>

*DIO* 1.1 ¶4 (1991) goes to meticulous lengths to disentangle which of the proofs against Peary were due to which party (has anyone else done so?) — crediting Cook, Hall, Hayes, Helgesen,<sup>59</sup> Ward (and DR) with their several original contributions. Cookite Ted Heckathorn and Cook-critical biographer Bob Bryce have since added numerous new finds.

**N13** By instructive contrast: while spending a half-century kissing up to the well-heeled but emotionally vulnerable Cook family, Buss Gibbons has done so little historical research that he has himself contributed no discovery of the slightest scholarly value to the controversy. How could BG be CookSoc#1 for years and yet have never carefully<sup>60</sup> scoured the contents of Cook's records — so that it was left to Bryce, not CookSoc, to bring out the 1906 diary's problems and the "summit" photo?

**N14** CookSoc repeatedly implies (e.g., PP18 p.47) that numerous alpine experts back Cook. When in 1998 DR asked a top Cook-defender about the perversity of asserting bribery of Barrill even while its own alpine-experts were being paid<sup>61</sup> CookSoc funds (see Bryce at D7 §G2), Prof. Jos. Davidson was mentioned as an independent sympathizer (also cited at PP18 p.47, during further implication-but-not-statement that modern mountaineers accept Cook). So DR checked with Davidson (phone: Arizona State Univ 602-965-3824

<sup>58</sup>It's particularly amusing to be accused (PP18 p.40) of slighting Henshaw Ward's key original research, which had been secret until DR's 1973 book extensively (F281-290) brought forth Ward's findings as crucial, long-suppressed exhibits — along with (F292) previously-unknown details from Yale Univ Press files revealing just how the suppression was carried out.

<sup>59</sup>Actually E&E Rost: see Bryce 1997 pp.594-597, which does them more justice than DR's specially laudatory (but too brief) praise of the Helgesen contributions at F248. Helgesen's findings are cited at various pages in *Fiction* (and-or in their notes): F104, 155, 243, 247, 248, 254, 284, 292.

<sup>60</sup>Parallel consideration: while the Cook cult is quick (e.g., ¶4 §§A1-A2, ¶5 §D19 & fn 37, & PP18 p.8) to question the style & integrity of those who disagree with it, CookSoc continues to publish a magazine which consistently displays slovenly editing and regularly mangles facts, science, simple grammar & spelling. (Peculiar to PP: insertion of an extra "that" into prose, so as to turn a valid sentence into Gibberish: fn 51 & ¶4 §U1. In order to lampoon DR's compact ref-codes, CookSoc printed a few compact ones at PP18 p.40 — and bungled its copy.) CookSoc has even headlined the Society's own name mis-spelled: §G3. These desecrations ignite one's curiosity: Is CookSoc officers' prime concern the elevation of F.Cook? Or is it: frequent personal five-digit Cook-trust fiscal infusions, for two-digit annual hours? (Gibbons used to be unremuneratively strange. His 5pp 1974/11/13 ms defending Velikovsky has been sent *DIO* by Leroy Ellenberger.)

<sup>61</sup>Nonetheless, Vern Tejas, one of the very finest mountain-guides in the world (and a genuine CookSoc friend & sympathizer), the chief living guide hired by CookSoc for its 1994 expedition, indicates that even he is unconvinced of Cook's success in reaching the top of McKinley. And he agrees (1999/3/27 chat) totally with the skeptics — adding that the Cook people know it too, even while not saying so — that Cook in 1906 told "provable lies", publishing (and never retracting) a "hoax" photographic record for high 1906 altitudes: a "damning" and "unconscionable" set of "obviously fake" photos, proving that he was indeed a "liar" with a "pathetic regard for reality", and "seemed like a pathological liar". (Understand: this is from the top mountaineer who's *friendliest* to Cook's claim.) But Vern: [a] does not see these points as proving Cook's 1906 nonsuccess, [b] says he's never yet seen any proof that Cook didn't reach the top, and [c] looks askance at the partisan ferocity of the Peary Arctic Club against Cook. Brad Washburn and *DIO* disagree with Vern on [a]&[b]; and *DIO* disagrees somewhat on [c], while Brad seems closer to Vern on that point. (See the criticism of the Pearyites' ferocity in Brad's oft-neglected gentle preface to his pioneering and definitive *AAJ* 1958 analysis.) Vern views Cook's claim as "possible but not probable", with the "preponderance of evidence" against it. So he is (and one expects will permanently remain) open-to-new-findings-up-on-the-mountain — a position which (under the circumstances) is fiscally provident. The other highly able mountain guide hired for CookSoc's 1994 expedition, Scott Fischer, was such a daredevil that he got killed atop Mt. Everest soon after — but even a man *who'd take chances like that* wasn't crazy enough to try Hairy Ridge (see D9 §D11 & Fig.33), which CookSoc now swears was Cook's 1906 bridge-to-swift-glory.

or 3291) and found that he gently doubts Cook could do the climb in the time claimed.

**N15** Gibbons unqualifiedly imagines (PP18 p.38) that Bob Bryce & DR were "fronting" for Brad Washburn, in our joint NPR appearance in 1997 Feb. An odd idea, since Mt. McKinley was not the main subject — and, at this time, Washburn was not in contact with either of us. (After a few letters over several decades, DR had only met Washburn once, in 1995 — once since in 1999. And Bryce has never met him.) We did not even inform Brad of the full "summit" photo's survival until the whole *DIO* issue was about ready to go to press — at which time we hoped the news would be a terrific 88th birthday present for someone who has been the brunt of subsidized, systematic slander for decades, merely for telling the truth. (Brad warned us that the three scholars who put together *DIO* 7.2-3 would soon be targets, too. Another victory for prescience.) Of course, we drew heavily (during the next few weeks) upon Brad's expertise, since none of those responsible for the issue had ever been anywhere near McKinley. Predictably (D9 §C10), PP18 used this to damn *DIO*. But, with Brad advising us, *DIO* had oversight by the top McKinley expert, ever. Additionally, Bryce worked perceptively from photos & maps, and *DIO* Editor Keith Pickering deftly tested contentions via fine-scale-geography computer reconstructions.

**N16** If *DIO* is to be portrayed as ignorant, where are the fruits of said ignorance to be found? The *DIO* 7.2-3 issue on Cook-McKinley contains hundreds of data & analyses of Cook's photos, drawings, compass-data, diary-maps, etc. But PP18 finds not one non-trivial *DIO* error (despite automatic claims of such). [The present issue's 1st printing was less well-proofed.] *DIO* even (§I4) located Pegasus & Friendly Peaks without assistance from standard maps (which don't bother marking these obscure features), merely by comparing photos to a beautiful McKinley-area map<sup>62</sup> which Brad had sent DR decades ago. (This deduction was built upon Bryce's sharpeyed discovery of the unannounced fact that PP14's top-back cover photo was of Pegasus Peak, which'd been identified only for the front cover.) And, as honestly acknowledged at PP18 p.48 (not by RG but by CookSoc's single academically-productive associate), *DIO* was more accurate in this matter than the CookSoc explorers who'd been there. Which backs librarian Bryce's just conclusion that archival & logical abilities are at least comparable in importance to on-the-spot experience here, though Brad's advice repeatedly proved crucial, as well, in ensuring that *DIO* 7.2-3 would prove a solid, lasting scholarly contribution, one that's easily withstood the frustratedly enraged shrieks of eternally-hard-evidence-bare cultists.

**N17** Note: While criticizing Ted Heckathorn's balance,<sup>63</sup> *DIO* admires his owning<sup>64</sup> to an error. (Compare to *JHA* Assoc. Ed. J.Evans: *DIO* 8 News Notes.) And Ted has contributed major discoveries to the Polar Controversy: see, e.g., p.46 & ¶4 fn 80.

<sup>62</sup>"Mount McKinley, Alaska" (1960) Swiss Federal Institute of Topography (Bern-Webern), Mercator projection: 62°56'N to 63°15'N by 150°34'W to 151°16'W. (Mailed DR by Washburn, 1973.)

<sup>63</sup>What's costing Cook his due isn't Evil Plotting (§M1 & fn 46) but his cult's love (vs PP17 p.41) of gossamer-tenuous fantasy. Peary lodged 3 US claims of finding new separate land in the American Arctic (all false: fn 4), but *Cook alone ever made such a US discovery*: Meighen I. (1908), well mapped by his Eskimos (F91-94). [Claim lost when he shifted this flat "glacial island" 450 nmi north & subbed a photo of dramatically-unflat elsewhere: ¶4 Fig.4.] CookSoc rejects Cook's unique prize, *handing it to Cook's arch-enemy Peary*, who PP18 p.13 suggests discovered Meighen I. in 1906 *but kept secret this, his career's precious sole new-land discovery*, so that, years later, he could use Meighen I. to squash Cook's credibility! No matter that in 1906, the men's fight & Cook's odd off-poleward-track 1908 wanderings (west to Meighen I.) were far in the future [compare ¶4 §L12] & unknown to Peary.

<sup>64</sup>§N16. However, we continue to be disappointed at the cagey hedging of CookSoc figures, as the "summit" photo evidence has progressively turned out more and more clearly against Cook, now at last unequivocally so (fn 16). For decades, CookSoc's top defensemen went farther&farther down the wrong-alley of defending Cook because they were unwilling to face the unwelcome truth (that their cause is logically dead) early enough to take stitch-in-time loss-cutting steps that could have providently headed off the process of getting past the point of reputation-investment no-return. Thus, leading Cookites' lives seem now locked irrevocably (§A2) into a one-way, downhill process of ever-deeper commitment to defending an unresurrectable claim, based upon one of the great lies of history.

## O Appendix: Cook's Naïve-Act — a Glimpse-Behind-the-Scenes

**O1** Among the more extreme delusions in the Cook circle is the idea that its hero was incompetent about money, implying that he got rich merely by accident!<sup>65</sup> The greatest con-man of his day actually had no interest in money.<sup>66</sup> He went to his Pole merely as a sporting<sup>67</sup> venture, thinking (F83) no one would pay to hear about it. He, “an innocent,”<sup>68</sup> went into the ethereal business of oil (and related stock-reloading schemes & exploitation of “sucker-lists”)<sup>69</sup> just to help impoverished widows.<sup>70</sup> A staple chapter in the Cookite gospel is that Cook turned down huge sums for his North Pole fantasy. E.g., according to Eames 1973 p.128: a member of the US Embassy staff in Copenhagen “was unable to control the Doctor’s enthusiasm for ignoring money. Although *Hampton’s* magazine offered to meet any price he asked for magazine rights to his story, and Hearst offered to double anyone else’s bid for newspaper and magazine rights, he simply<sup>71</sup> sold his story to James Gordon

<sup>65</sup> Cook was clumsy with evidence (not money). E.g., he said (1911 pp.243-247, 284, & 571) Bradley Land was 40 mi distant, 1000’-1800’ high, shoreline ever-misted. But in his “Bradley Land” photo (Fig.5), rippling ice goes unobscured to the shoreline. With camera-hgt c.3 m (see Eskimos-vs-horizon), Earth-curvature limits shore-distance to under 5 mi. Shoreline parallaxic curves correlate (correctly for shore ordmag 10000 ft distant) with features’ prominence (nearness). Land is roughly 1/100 radian high on the photo, so physical height is (like distance) ordmag 1/10 Cook’s claim.

<sup>66</sup> See, e.g., PP18 p.50, where W.Eames argues that because Cook was allegedly flush in 1906 (though Cook 1908 p.523 admits his 1906 cheques were bouncing: ‡5 §J3), he wasn’t making sensational exploration claims for money. But when, on the page immediately opposite, Eames claims that Cook was bankrupt in 1909, Eames still insists: Cook wasn’t making sensational exploration claims for money. Even amidst 180° reversals of evidence, the Believer’s pet theory endures unaltered. (For the spectacle of Ivy Leaguers suffering like cranial impenetrability, see *DIO* 2.3 ‡8 §§C31-C33.)

<sup>67</sup>Eames 1973 pp.64, 237. And see pp.4, 116, 131, 162f for similar alleged Cook contempt for scientific verification (also Cook 1913 pp.495, 533) — contra pp.83-86, 112, 117, and D9 fn 27.

<sup>68</sup>In the tradition of murderer Dr. Sam Sheppard’s equally cemental defenders [*DIO* 6 ‡5 fn 4], Eames continues (1973 p.216): “a healer who healed for brotherhood. . . . As Shakespeare wrote . . .”

<sup>69</sup>See, e.g., Bryce 1997 pp.613, 626, & 645 — and especially pp.672-673, where Cook denies ever having heard the term “sucker lists”, even though Bryce finds the term in some of his own literature.

<sup>70</sup> After his 1923 conviction for mail-fraud and using “sucker lists” to swindle gullible “people of poor means” (as the judge put it), Cook claimed: “I had only altruistic aims”. (See BR 672&675.) The judge suspected he’d stashed money. CookSoc scoffs (PP18 p.39) at the idea. (Contrast to attitude cited at ‡4 §K25.) Hmmm. Cook was pardoned by FDR in 1940; like most such pardons, it came in an election-year, when pols have special needs for off-the-record cash. Cook acted impoverished in 1940, but: how could a pauper buy influence with the President of the US? (Earlier, our childish-naïve sucker-list exploiter had mesmerized a US senator and gaggle of congressmen: F247 & BR 573f. Did they & the required go-betweens [& helpful journalists: fn 16] cost any less than Peary’s lobbyfolk?) We know (BR 623) that, in 1922-3, millions disappeared from Cook’s oil enterprise. And here, nearly 8 decades later, well-paid lawyers-for-Cook still stagger inexorably onward — with a cine-zombie’s imperviousity to logical bullets — strangling & mangling blind-frail Lady-Justice. (All in order to defend an epic swindler’s lies. Which is apparently most satisfyingly accomplished by absorbing big sums, supplied by said swindler’s family.) Whatever the history & whereabouts of Cook’s ill-gained profits, one thing is certain: today, money alone provides his claims the slightest credence anywhere. [Mechanics delineated at *DIO* 10 © 21.] Thus, again (see also fn 49), CookSoc achieves par with formerly-scorned NGS’ mythmaking. (Prediction: NGS will get sane first.)

<sup>71</sup>Bryce believes (BR 365, 956-958) Cook was merely incompetent & illogical about money, but Bryce’s sharp eye also launched (BR 1120-1121) a new theory: Cook had a secret publishing deal all along (see *NYH* 1909/8/29 “Forecast” boast: *NYH* 1909/9/2:5:3-5) with Bennett’s *Herald* (1899 exclusive 1st publisher of his great Antarctic story: BR 201). He may also have contracted exclusively with Harper & Bros. for a book. If such an arrangement was legally binding, then [a] it would look to be worth vast sums, and [b] it might well preclude other publishing contracts. This theory provides one of several reasonable (if speculative) possible explanations for naïf Cook’s 1909 behavior regarding publishers. It also leaves open the possibility that Bennett privately paid Cook a great deal more than was ever admitted publicly, in order to preserve Cook for as long as possible as a *Herald* exclusive property. Note that Peary and the *NYTimes* publicly gave it out that Peary had only gotten \$4000 for

Bennett for \$25,000. The magazine *Town Topics* estimated that this story alone was worth \$100,000. . . .” These tales (partly based on Cook’s word)<sup>72</sup> are hard to fully verify. And, after all, real offers for magazine & book publication were volatile (e.g., BR 479) and the big ones would obviously be contingent<sup>73</sup> upon eventual vindication of his claims by investigators. Which is why Cook preferred in-hand smaller sums rather than some-day bigger promises. He was already getting flush anyway in 1909 from fees for lectures, whose promoters couldn’t wait for (and didn’t much care about) scientific verification. After 1911, he played the mid-US as a *crucified* (fn 43 [& cover]) victim of the Eastern rich — and made even more lecture-fee cash than in 1909 as “discoverer” (BR 958).

**O2** A quarter-century ago, when DR was looking through the University of Copenhagen Archives, he dug up a letter to the Director of the University of Copenhagen from one of the world’s most prominent literary agents, Hughes Massie, a document which reveals the truth behind Cook’s facade of publishing-naïveté. The letter (1909/12/16, headed “Private”) has lain hidden too long. So we will here quote its entire body:

In the interests of common justice I feel it to be a duty to lay before you certain facts apropos of the investigation which you are now making concerning a recent North Pole Expedition. The head of one of the greatest publishing firms in America — a man whose honour and word cannot be questioned, and who is the publisher and friend of the greatest living writers in the English language — told the writer in the course of conversation at this office a few days ago, that before Dr. Cook had arranged for the American rights of his forthcoming book he had asked him the price he wished for it. Dr. Cook replied that he scarcely knew what to say in return, but that some indication of the value of the publication might be obtained from the fact that he had sold the European rights for \$500,000. The publisher in question, whose name I am prepared to give in confidence, at once replied that he did not care to make any offer whatever. It so happens that he has had considerable experience with the Continental market and the improbability of any such price having been obtained there was so great that it seemed to him that even the veracity of the book itself would be questionable.

It so happens that we have knowledge of a curious sequel to the foregoing. We act as Literary and Dramatic Agents, and through our foreign representatives, have been making for some months past a very thorough enquiry into the Continental market for books of Polar Exploration. Previous to hearing the statement of the American publisher in question, we had learned in the course of our business enquiries that Dr. Cook had made an acceptable arrangement

his story — even though (BR 1121) the true amount was about 2 1/2 times as much.

<sup>72</sup>Keep in mind that Cook was not a small liar. (The suggestion [F92] that Cook *never even left of sight of land* in 1908 is supported by his total lack of photos showing sledging through or over rough ice. [See *DIO* 21 ‡3 fn 33.] Peary had many such, e.g., 1910 opp. pp.216, 217, 224, 240.) Most of Eames’ data on alleged publishing offers are straight out of Cook 1911 pp.491f. Cook later claimed (*ibid* pp.482&494; BR 532, 958) he voluntarily released Harper & Bros. from a \$300,000 contract. (Does a copy survive?) But Cook was faced (BR 420, 1040) with the inevitability of Harper & Bros. suing him for fraud if he tried holding the company to payment of a big advance on a book about a false and collapsed claim. (See Cook 1911 p.494 on publishers’ “cold feet”.) So he might find it several-ways advantageous just to ever-so-graciously bow out of the contract. Bryce suggests this would enhance his lucrative (BR 958) image-rôle as a gentleman-victim (‡4 fn 70).

<sup>73</sup>See, e.g., Cook 1913 p.494. See also BR 365 for some of the huge early offers Cook received (1909/9/3-5: BR 1035) — all made BEFORE publishers’ caution set in, following Peary’s fraud charge on 1909/9/8. Before Peary’s 9/6 return, Cook had no apparent need for urgency, as he was the object of an increasingly aggressive orgy of fantastic publishing offers. But, by not locking up a deal before Peary’s exposures of him, Cook missed out on these offers. Bryce (who takes a less cynical view: BR 365, 374, 956-958 vs 790f) has noted the irony that Brown&Massie in particular had previously been (BR 365) among Cook’s most ardent suitors for rights to his polar publications!

in Scandinavia for his book but that in those countries which usually pay the largest prices — including France and Germany — the serialization of his story in the Paris New York Herald was claimed so to injure the volume production that only comparatively nominal prices were offered for the rights of the book. It is to be hoped for Dr. Cook's sake that he did receive such a price as that mentioned — amounting to Two Million Marks — for his Continental rights — but I present the matter to you for what it is worth, as having possible bearing on the accuracy of the records which are now in your possession.

It is only right to give you, in conclusion, the names of some of those people who are familiar with our work and standing, and of whom you doubtless know. Our clients include such authors as Mrs. Humphry Ward, the Grand Duke Michael, Dr. Alfred Russel [*sic*] Wallace<sup>74</sup> (author of “Man's Place in the Universe”), Dr. Andrew D. White<sup>75</sup> (former American Ambassador in Germany and Russia and Delegate at the Hague Conference), and, among well known explorers — Sir Ernest H. Shackleton, Captain Roald Amundsen, and others. We are also known to Baron Palle Rosenkranz of Vimmelskaftet 42, Copenhagen (author and dramatist) and the Agency known as the Bureau Hamlet of Vimmelskaftet 36, Copenhagen, is familiar with our name and standing.

[COMMENT: While welcoming the beauty of (and past pioneering contributions preserved in) Washburn-Cherici 2001 (p.97), *DIO* notes 2 sad oddities. (1) The book never mentions R.Bryce (world #1 expert on Cook). (2) Null vetting is reflected in numerous errors; e.g., [a] Fake Peak twice misidentified (fn 41). [b] Group-photo at p.47 miscited, misdated, 80% misidentified. [c] Wright Bros. flight dated after 1906 (p.90). [d] Mis-directions at pp.104, 136, 147. [e] Five Cook-photo archival sources cited (p.181), but only 3 archived prints included (pp.120, 128, 145), 2 as “unpublished” though all 3 are in *DIO* 7.2. [f] Eleven Cook photos pp.114-142 cited to OSU archives, actually scanned from Cook's 1908 book. [g] Photo at p.145 mistakenly called unpublished, uncropped, & same as p.142 photo.

<sup>74</sup> Alfred Russel Wallace was (with Darwin) co-discoverer of the theory of evolution.

<sup>75</sup> A quite religious man, Andrew Dickson White is immortalized by his authorship of the classic, *The History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896; Dover repr. 1960), dedicated to the memory of Ezra Cornell, White's partner in founding Cornell University as a progressively co-educational institution, of which White was 1st President. While (e.g., 1:168f) pointing to worse (if less organized) offenses by Protestant religious bigots, his book politely took on (as no current university's top money-hustler [read “president”] would dare) the Roman Church's megalomaniacal pretense to divine inspiration & papal infallibility. [DR questions-in-passing: [a] The pope is held Infallible only in certain restricted areas; but are the restricting boundaries themselves infallibly established & applied? (And by whom?) [b] Was the cardinal-college that in 1870 voted Papal Infallibility itself infallible when making such a decree? (If so, we have a human source of infallibility without need for a pope.) [c] Papal Infallibility implies a conveniently selective divine connexion — somehow permitting god-certified judgement-perfect on a very few utterly untestable points, even while the alleged connectee often shows astonishing shortsightedness on those real issues where he *can* be tested by history.] Embarrassed apologists have been vainly attempting to tear down White's book throughout the century since it was published; see, e.g., *The Popes and Science* 1908 by Fordham University's James J. Walsh (author of the incomparable *Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries* 1907). Ever tactically transforming, this chimeral project will never die [see fn 70 under zombies, also ‡4 §Y6], so long as the Church finds it fiscally sound to continue faking possession of a link to *all-seeing* omnipotence, even while it repeatedly screws up with spectacular improvidence (committing epochal offenses against truth and equity), e.g., banning heliocentricity well into the 19th century (bailing out of Ptolemy's 160 AD astronomy only in 1835! — see White 1896 1:156, and compare his 1:157 misconception to *DIO-JHA* 1.1 ‡7 §F3); barring women from rulership; conjuring-up fine-point excuses for (on a limited planet: *DIO* 1.1 ‡2 §F) opposing any birth control method that really works (and thus might slow the Church's growth-industry push for power); and engaging by treaty in tempestuous romances with anti-Commie bulwarks like atheist Mussolini (1929) & still-unexcommunicated Catholic Hitler (1933). [The anti-White obsession continues, predictably-unabated, right into the new millennium: see, e.g., Thos. Lessl (University of Georgia) *New Oxford Review* 2000 June pp.27-33.]