

pm 7-1-91 r 17-1-91

Ivor Catt,  
 P O Box 99,  
 St. Albans AL3 4HQ  
 tel 0727 864257  
 (temp 0923 248122)  
 7jan91

Brian Martin,  
 Science and Technology Studies Dept.,  
 University of Wollongong  
 P O Box 1144, Wollongong,  
 NSW, Australia.  
 (tel 042 270691)

Dear Brian Martin,

I feel that you are very much needed as part of ASAF.

I did not carry out your suggestions in your 18aug90 letter yet, but intend to take them up in the future. I have been under a lot of pressure recently.

Meeting with Hiram, he came up to all of my highest expectations.

I have made good use of your articles. However, I regret losing the one which establishes that (even) mathematics is value-laden. Please would you send me another copy please?

I will value further letters and copies of further papers etc. by you.

Notice below that I am homing in on the case of the suppression of theory re AIDS. Such being the case, Hiram and I will both need more information on it. All I have so far is four or five lines in your 18aug90 letter.

"There's lots of noise in the system" - by you at bottom of pl, 18aug90. The counter-example is myself, consistently suppressed for ten or twenty years in my two fields of research. The noise did not seem to tip me into being published, even occasionally. I think I am a key case for study.

Yours sincerely,

Ivor Catt



Send

- ① Search 88
- ② copy of letter to Hiram
- ③ address of AIDS fellow  
 (see current correspondence file)
- check my letter of 18 August
- ④ other papers

Ivor Catt,  
P.O. Box 99,  
St. Albans AL3 4HQ  
temp tel  
0923 248122  
tel 0727 864257  
21dec90

Hiram Caton,  
Griffith University  
Brisbane 4111  
Australia  
tel (07) 875 7538

Dear Hiram,

Association for Academic Freedom.

---

Thank you for your note dated 10dec90. With it you enclosed your report on the 6oct90 meeting which founded the Association for Academic Freedom.

Yours sincerely,

Ivor Catt

---

Momentary comments on Hiram's report.

I thought that I was supposed to be secretary, but the report says Harold is "secretariat". Are they different functions?

I feel remiss at failing to follow up the 6oct90 meeting. The reason is that during my move I mislaid my notes on that meeting. I shall therefore be very grateful if attenders tell me again what they expected me to do. This included the following;

1

Ivor write to two organisations/journals in the U.S.A. with a view to our linking up with them. I need their titles/addresses again please.

2

?

3

?

---

Proposals for action.

I suggest that the interim name be ASAF. Please comment, and also advise if such a name already exists.

The board will initially be Caton, Hillman, Theocharis, Catt. A fifth board member will be recruited based in the U.S.A. a.s.a.p.

Consensus will be achieved by "no reply means yes". A board member can act if he first informs the other three, then waits for a reasonable time if possible. If not possible, unilateral action only to be taken on less important matters. However, we will usually take action rather than miss press etc. deadlines.

Activities will be classified. Activity S, called "Suppression", will be bringing pressure to bear on institutions which are obstructing scientific advance. The first action will be to approach one such institution, telling it that it is the first to be approached. This will be in a sub-class of S, called Sa, meaning that the institution will have been suppressing communication on a matter of importance. This first case must be vetted by two members of the board. The obvious case to take on first is the suppression of proposals for alleviating the AIDS epidemic. Please would Hiram get the information from Brian Martin, himself check it as bona fide, and then convince a second member of the Board of ASAF. At that point we will inform the press, simultaneously in Australia and England, of two matters;

1

ASAF has been set up, with intentions broadly and briefly stated.

2

The AIDS case has been taken as the first job by ASAF, and details given to the press at the same time as (1).

(1) and (2) will make a newsworthy package, which I would estimate will reach the press in about six months from now. I am happy to organise the handling of the media in England, unless Harold wants to do it.

This meeting set up the Association for Academic Freedom.

The report, by Hiram Caton in dec90, is three pages long.

We need two tiers. First, a board, which has responsibility for statements made on behalf of ASAF. Note, above, that I think an individual

omments on Hiram's report on the 6oct90 meeting.

board member should act on his own if he adjudges it reasonable; preferably by getting a "no answer means yes" from other board members; otherwise by getting post hoc agreement to save time. We must minimise bureaucratic delays and costs.

The level below the board will be on the notepaper of press releases etc. but will not have approved actions in advance, except where practicable and adjudged necessary.

Please send me the address of ACADEMIC QUESTIONS.

On 6oct90 I said that organisations should be classified by ASAF for good or bad attitude and behaviour re. ASAF's objectives. The setting up of such a black/white list will be called Activity B, also called "Black". Listing primary institutions - Royal Society, New Scientist etc, will be class Ba.

Staff Associations should be listed as co-operative or unco-operative over the objectives of ASAF. Listing of such secondary institutions, which themselves should be forwarding the objectives of ASAF, will be activity Bb.

ASAF should intervene a.s.a.p. on the matter of the case known by Brian Martin; suppression on communication of amelioration of AIDS. This should be our flagship, and so urgent, case.

It is not clear what should be the attitude of ASAF to grievances in class Sa of ASAF board members. This must not be an internally looking group, and so the first case taken up, AIDS, must be for an outsider. However, we must not get into a situation where potential members of ASAF refuse to join because then their own grievance(s) will be blacklisted. Perhaps the ideal would be to impose a minimum delay (say one year) before cases involving board or ordinary members can be dealt with by ASAF.

A second contender for first treatment, instead of AIDS, which I would find attractive would be the Arp Case. Would Hiram embark on both please, and see which is up and running fastest?

I personally think the first case should be drawn from Australia of the USA to balance the preponderance of board members from England. Let the first three be from Australia, USA and England, in that order. Of course, we can in practice deviate from this as events unfold. But we must not let the first two come from one country. This needs to be orchestrated. How it appears to the media, that it is truly international, is important for the long term. We will be thinking in the long term.

Professionalisation of Peer Review will be called Activity P, or "Peer".

Ivor Catt,  
P.O. Box 99,  
St. Albans AL3 4HQ,  
England.  
tel 0727 864257.  
(temp 0923 248122)  
6jan91

David Lloyd,  
Senior Commissioning Editor,  
News & Current Affairs, Channel 4 TV,  
60 Charlotte St., London W1P 2AX

Dear David Lloyd,  
Association for Academic Freedom (ASAF)

On October 6, 1990, Harold Hillman, Ivor Catt, Theo Theocharis, and Hiram Caton met in London to discuss remedies against the obstruction of innovative research and obstruction of the reception of research findings by administrative means, chiefly peer review and appointments.

It was agreed to form the Association for Academic Freedom to lend substance to our individual efforts and to the efforts of others like-minded. - first two paras. of report written by Caton.

Theo Theocharis has made the point that journalists could participate in ASAF. He particularly recommended that I write to you, because you broadcast the Greenhouse Conspiracy and ?the Aids conspiracy?., and also you wrote a good letter to The Independent. (Could you send me a copy?)

I could send you a report since written by me where I propose that our first case for analysis be either (1) the suppression of communication of a ?cure? for AIDS in Australia, reported to me by Brian Martin, Univ. of Wollongong, or (2) The Arp case, outlined in Caton's report on the 6oct90 meeting. Halton Arp accumulated evidence that the red shift isn't a measure of cosmological distance. He has as a result been denied further access to the Wilson Telescope and other facilities.

In my report I assert that the announcement of the formation of ASAF coupled with our first report, on (1) or (2) above, should be a media item in about six months from now. I do not think there should be earlier communication with and by the media. I think the combination of formation and the first case makes the best news story. However, I feel that we would be happy to fall into line with your schedules, should you become involved.

I further assert that ASAF should limit its initial work to grievances outside the coterie of founders - thus excluding the Catt case, for instance, for a year or two. This would also exclude the Hillman case, ~~which is an important one. (Harold Hillman, fired from Surrey Univ. and then reinstated. Fired because he asserted that 60% of all research in microbiology is futile.)~~

My idea is to set up an international organisation (Caton is in Australia) with weight. Then bring the weight to bear on a very small number of scandals, and commit to success in those cases. Then in the future, cite previous success when trying to get misconduct by further institutions rectified.

One could think of our first public visibility being via a programme by you on our concerns and activities in say nine months from now.

I enclose two sheets on the Catt case. You probably know the Hillman case, which received quite a lot of publicity. Please outline to me what further material you would like to receive.

Yours sincerely,

Ivor Catt

Roger Scruton, "A Dictionary of Political Thought", pub. Pan 1983.

Whig Interpretation of history. Expression coined by Sir Herbert Butterfield in a book of that title (1931), to denote the vision of history as generated by a conflict between progress and reaction, in which the first is always, in the end, victorious, bringing about the ever increasing prosperity, enlightenment and emancipation of mankind. The identification of this view as 'Whig' reflects the theory that the aristocratic faction which went by that name was given to an exaggerated estimate of its historical mission. However, it is clear that, in so far as anything so schematic can be believed as doctrine, there have been plenty of American, French and German Whigs in history.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES  
Department

University of Wollongong  
PO Box 1144, Wollongong, NSW 2500, Australia.  
Telephone: 042-270691 Telegram: UNIOFWOL Telex: 29022

Head of Department: Professor Jim Falk

**STS**  
Science  
and Technology  
in their  
Social Context

15 January 1991

Dear Ivor,

My apologies for not replying sooner to your most recent communications of last year, including your letter of 24 September, your letter of 5 October (but which came surface mail, arriving only 6 December) and the copy of your letter to Hiram Caton of 4 November. Let me respond to a few of the points raised.

Hiram rang me about a week ago to discuss the issues covered in his meeting with you, Harold Hillman, etc., in London. I will be responding, with some comments about the proposed organisation/network/publication, to Hiram shortly.

In your letter of 24 September you presented a picture of "Multiple Whig History". I think that captures an important feature of intellectual analysis in the (social) sciences. There is a line of thought in sociology that argues that even an apparently relativist analysis actually treats some assumptions as "objective" - namely not subject to the relativist analysis. This is another way of saying that disciplines treat some other disciplines (or areas of their own discipline) as given.

Now, to take up a point in your letter of 5 October. You say that if all science is value laden, then one block of science is no better than another. However, this conclusion does not follow.

One block of science ~~is~~ can be judged better (or more useful, or more appropriate) than another even if both are value laden,



Simply by judging ~~the~~ <sup>how</sup> effective each block of science is for specific purposes — <sup>the point is that</sup> ~~and~~ this judgement will be influenced by the criteria used, and this depends ~~again~~ on values.

In practice, in many cases, values are not crucial for comparing two blocks of science, since both sides (say) agree on the purposes of the science — to help make a machine run, for example.

Thus, within a particular value framework, the usual objectivist analysis proceeds pretty much as usual. This point is very similar to your point about Multiple Whig History, in a sense.

I hope this makes sense, even if you disagree with it!

Yours,

Brian Martin