

Mr. Pearlman and some of you have raised legitimate concerns regarding the validity of my engineering position, e.g., Day's

Publish in a peer-reviewed journal and I'll take this seriously.

And Robert writes,

You have yet to address why any lay reader should accept your theories when you cannot get the scientific community that exists to study such ideas to even consider your position.

The massive effort to publish during 1989-92 left my family and me bruised and ruined. That effort ended with a plea from a distinguished space authority, Wilbur Pritchard, whose credentials in transient analysis were impeccable. From a previous post, he wrote in April 1992,

At this point, in view of the importance of the issue and in recognition of Mr. Ali AbuTaha's respectable credentials as a member of the space fraternity, this paper should be published.

Pearlman writes, "*You have said that the peer reviewers "were not qualified" and that "they were biased."* After thorough evaluation of my "technical paper" and the peer-reviewers non-technical responses, Pritchard wrote that the peer-reviewers were "*possibly biased, reviewers.*" Qualified? Certainly, highly qualified. The proper word here should be "dis-qualified. The reviewers should have bowed out to avoid the appearance of "conflict of interest." Whose? Theirs. They were involved in the design of the Shuttle and the investigation of the Challenger accident. Read their "technical evaluation" words! They invoked *Presidential* and *Congressional* authorities to buttress their non-technical reviews, "*Clearly, Mr. AbuTaha does not understand the shuttle loads, their evolution, nor the Presidential and other investigative reports.*" I do understand the "*shuttle loads and their evolution,*" but they, the reviewers, tried to hide behind the Commission and the Congress.

It is simple. The peer-reviewers had only one technical (or engineering) leg to stand on: Newton's Third Law of Motion. We all learned it by heart when young boys and girls, "**To every action, there is always an equal and opposite reaction.**" The SSMEs produce 1.1 million lbs at lift-off and the structures react with 1.1 MP – end of story to the peer-reviewers. Not so fast, because the engines ramp up quickly to full thrust, the reaction is magnified and the magnification can be calculated and measured. Oh my God! Do you mean NASA will have to change all those wonderful children shows on NASA Select TV and teach the children something contrary to Newton? Mr. Pearlman and dear readers of collectSpace: This and higher issues are not my problem. That's the NASA Administrator's problem. I did my part.

I told of how after a lengthy conversation, the distinguished Commissioner and Professor Emeritus of Engineering at MIT, Eugene Covert, agreed with my results and summarized it all by saying, "*You can lead a horse to the water, but you cannot make it drink.*" Robert says that these anecdotes do not count. To me, they do – a lot. Dr. Covert taught how to design systems like the Space Shuttle, not only to the peer-reviewers, but their teachers.

I will let Galileo say a few words about the highly educated, but biased, peer-reviewers who disguise themselves, as he writes, as "*Unknown Academician*" and the like. In the Third Letter on Sunspots, Galileo writes:

My friends are of the opinion, and I do not disagree, that unless some opposition more solid than this (opinions of the peer-reviewers on the Dynamic Overshoot) comes forth there is no need to reply further.

Also, Galileo had experience with the "horses," that Professor Covert spoke about above, when he writes in *The Assayer*:

If reasoning were like hauling I should agree that several reasoners would be worth more than one, just as several horses can haul more sacks of grain than one can. But reasoning is like racing and not like hauling, and a single Arabian steed can outrun a hundred plowhorses.

Galileo upset the cart. He wrote in vernacular, in plain Italian, so that "any lay reader," that Robert writes about, can read, study and accept. Pearlman and others want me to write in Latin in the Journals, which will give 5 or 10 engineers the free hand to decide whether the "lay readers" should know. I cannot take one more step downward in life. As I scratch my way up, I might submit my paper again for publication in the esteemed Journals. Until then, I have preempted the peer-reviewers by making the issues available and known to all "lay readers."

Ali