

**'Final' correspondence concerning
my contribution drafted for the
30th ATTC at NSWC Carderock**

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Schmiechen

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2017 3:13 PM

To: John G. Hoyt III

Cc: Joel Park ; Eric Giesberg

Subject: Re: ATTC Paper

Dear John,

many thanks for your prompt and very clear response, which I had expected and which 'nicely' adds to my 'hi-stories'. If you can include my paper as it is among the apocrypha, I shall be very thankful, particularly in view of all the trouble it has caused for you and of the publicity it has gained that way. I myself shall of course publish the paper together with our 'final' correspondence in the '3rd, virtual INTERACTION 2017' on my website.

Evidently your reviewers have not read and/or not understood (!) my paper, else they could not possibly have confirmed Gulliver's report about his journey to the Houyhnhnms. The old rational horses still believe, that there are no countries beyond the sea. And they even try to perpetuate that belief, ignoring what has happened elsewhere in the past decades and underestimating the curiosity of their young colleagues, who of course will now be longing for the forbidden fruits.

Has any of the reviewers, as I urgently requested, obtained and studied (!) the three volumes of my METEOR-Festschrift, which I gave as a present to 'a big boss' at Copenhagen and which I also sent to you? Evidently it is not my fault, that my 'peers' are not aware of the state of my research, which since twenty years is documented on my website in every detail, only a mouse click away.

The arrogance, with which ignorants are judging my work, has always amused me, the more so as many colleagues are monitoring whatever I publish. So did our Russian colleagues very carefully since at least 1964. And my Dutch fans have only recently advertised the forthcoming introduction of quasi-steady testing, which I am promoting since 1980 on model and full scale.

That beliefs may 'deteriorate', as I have described in detail, has most precisely been pinpointed by Clifford Truesdell in his 'verdict', that applies of course not only to physicists (1984/584): "A research paper by a physicist is often not more than a chant of beliefs common to his hogan, the members of which rock back and forth in applause of each repetition of the tribal lore."

As my references show, I have everywhere and always during my whole professional life been permitted to express my views, though admittedly usually without much applause, but in accordance with the dictum, only ascribed to Voltaire: 'I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.' So far only the Scientific American, SNAME and now ATTC insisted on papers confirming their prejudices in their 'American style'.

Concerning the conception of a short summary of my paper I notice, that nothing is simpler than that. In Europe this belongs to the basic exercises for high school students, But in my case that exercise is not even necessary. Just take my abstract and select some of the slides I prepared! I can't even imagine, what Eric Giesberg's problem might have been, in case he would have been 'permitted' to mention my paper!

Yours, Michael.

-----Original Message-----

From: John G. Hoyt III
Sent: Friday, September 8, 2017 10:43 PM
To: m.schm@t-online.de
Subject: Re: ATTC Paper

Michael,

First I am sorry that the hotel rates in Washington are so high, I have no control over that.

This is hard, but I tried to distill your paper down to some technical content that would be acceptable to my reviewers. Your paper is full of generalized criticisms and philosophical stories but light on technical content. I know your opinion of peer review, however it is a requirement of the ATTC.

I am willing to include the paper in the DVD as is, however I see no value in having it presented by Eric who could not be able to express your opini-

ons. My committee has advised me to not have the paper presented or even included.

I am sorry, however try rereading your own work from the perspective of someone reading it for the first time. Unfortunately the points you are trying to make are not clear, and the technical content is also difficult to see.

John

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Schmiechen

To: John G. Hoyt III <jgh3@aol.com>

Sent: Fri, Sep 8, 2017 9:38 am

Subject: Re: ATTC Paper

Dear John,

while I am working on another paper, I am wondering, what might have happened to my ATTC draft. The few necessary corrections you indicated and I consented to can't possibly take that long, even for a very busy chair-person! Or are you re-writing my paper in the 'short American style'?

In that case I would prefer to withdraw my draft, which has been conceived for young colleagues, purposely avoiding ritual repetitions of standard phrases. But maybe I misunderstood the aims of ATTC? At least I thought so yesterday, when I received the generous offer to book a room at 250 US\$ per diem.

I confess never to have heard of such rate before in connection with a scientific meeting. But I remember once to have paid for the inclusion of a paper into the printed (!) proceedings of a conference!

Quite concerned with kind regards
yours, Michael.