

Remarks concerning Reports submitted for the 28th ITTC

From: Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2017 3:11 PM
To: Gerhard Strasser
Cc: Marco Ferrando ; Bruce Johnson ; Joel Park
Subject: Re: 28th ITTC Reports

Dear, 'teurer' Gerhard,

as this mail 'may' be of general interest, I am using the lingua franca, not plain pidgin English, but rather mid-Atlantic.

After having returned from a wonderful excursion to the Channel Islands and having 'finished' the draft of my contribution to the 30th ATTC, to be held at West Bethesda, two weeks later than the 28th ITTC at Wuxi, I realised, that in the meantime the Reports of the ITTC Committees had been due.

But to my surprise nearly all of the Technical and Specialists Committees did not meet the dead line. Thus I first studied the Reports of the EC, the AC and the WG on the Future of ITTC. For my taste I found too many things vaguely repeated over and over again. I am missing executive abstracts, as concise and clear as the Ten Commandments, telling everybody what to do when and what not to do.

Establishing ITTC as a legal body does of course involve more than having an ISBN. I am afraid, that the implications and consequences are not fully appreciated. I guess, that at least a permanent professional 'director' and an adequate permanent secretariat with two full time professional assistants will be required. They will be 'paid' by reducing and making the very expensive Committee Meetings more efficient.

Frequently changing, inexperienced chair persons of the EC are no longer 'sufficient'. The Stig Sand disaster is unforgotten! The first permanent director may be located at Vienna, as in fact 'he' already is according to your schedule as Chairman of the AC and thus ex-officio member of the EC, in charge of the IMO liaison.

Concerning the details I would like to evaluate the Maersk trials data and to provide my results for the exercise going on! Please let me have them as soon as possible. Further, I would like to obtain a copy of the circular letter on the load variation coefficients (?) to be included in model test reports.

Finally, I wonder, whether I am eligible to inspect the following two IMO documents and related materials: MECP 67/4/7 concerning the current

corrections and MECP concerning the standard ISO 15016. I used to be informed in time by a friendly lady, but she is no longer around.

Subsequently I dived into the Report of the QSG. For ready reference I attach my earlier mail to Marco Ferrando et alii. While I read the Report I noticed, that the ITTC is in great danger to be absorbed in mushrooming bureaucracy, producing and maintaining a Golem similar ISO 900x etc.

I consider this already now as an incredible, irresponsible waste of research resources! Guidelines and terms of reference (ToRs) need to be limited to the bare essentials, namely those, that serve not only the purpose to perpetuate the Technical and Specialists Committees, and that can possibly be taken care of.

And after 'all' I studied the Report of the PSS SC. And I noticed, that this confirms my statement on 'peer' reviews in my ATTC contribution:

"According to my repeated personal experience I do not 'believe' in peer reviews of papers and research proposals. 'Peers' [and 'specialists'] are tacitly defined as people talking in terms of the current professional jargon. For reasons to be explained [in detail] I am purposely talking in a different jargon, as required by the problem at hand ..."

The section on 'Terminology and symbols' in my ATTC contribution reads: "In order not to get lost I have developed a rule driven (!) language adequate for the purpose at hand and in accordance with the rational conventions, not with the traditional conventions!

"Presence of synonymy, intuitive appeal, agreement with customary modes of speech, far from being the philosophical virtue, indicate, that not much progress has been made and that the business of investigating, what is commonly accepted, has not even started." *Paul Feyerabend: How to be a good empiricist (1999)*.

While for ready communication I am using the traditional names for many concepts, it is important to note, that their conceptions and their operational interpretations are more or less different from the traditional. Accordingly it is mandatory (!), not my hobby as has been suspected, to use symbols differing from the traditional symbols, in order to avoid very costly (!) confusions."

In particular, the section on the identification of currents by the 'experts' is absolutely ridiculous, twenty years after a reliable method has been published and is being used by professionals. In my contribution to the ATTC this subject is dealt with as follows: "That interpretations of the concepts introduced are meaningful only in the context of the language developed is still widely unknown with a very serious consequence. 'Independent' interpretations are creating an infinite regress of 'research', and [thus] an [other] irresponsible waste of research resources.

This reminds me of the old lady, who 'knew' our Earth to be based on turtles, 'all the way down'. But whom are cosmologists and naval architects laughing at? It is standard scientific practice to 'support' established theories, which are no longer adequate and/or acceptable, as long as possible by additional 'turtles'. The most famous example the Almagest dating back to Claudius Ptolemy (ca. 100 to 170 AD).

Kuhn's paradigm of disruptive changes of paradigms of 1962 vividly describes, what happens when these fragile foundations can 'no longer' be repaired, but new, 'stronger' turtles need to be introduced to 'support' the 'worlds'. Currently many cosmologists believe the universe to be based on the turtles 'dark energy' and 'dark matter'."

My paper ends with the remark: "Reading my papers may endanger your 'principles', but it is never too late, to give up your prejudices! "So when Pooh Bear experienced the burning pain of [removing] a bee sting, this symbolized the philosophical pain of discarding a cherished hypothesis. We note the unhesitating courage with which he performed this painful duty." [Addition]: MS. John T. Williams: *Pooh and the Philosophers* (1996/13).

At this stage I end this mail and shall update my contribution to the 30th ATTC with remarks concerning the pertinent ITTC Reports, that will be available before my deadline. If I understand the Report and the recent note of Verhulst in the MARIN report no. 121/27 correctly, there are two 'separate' groups at Wageningen dealing with the propulsive performance, one on full scale and one on model scale, while my basic procedures are conceived and developed since 1980 to be applicable on both scales.

Further I notice the continued, childish 'policy' of model basins (MARIN, HSVA, SVAP) and pertinent ITTC Committees in their References not to mention my contributions to the solution of the common problems, though using my arguments in my words, even in titles of their projects and/or papers. I wonder how long my esteemed colleagues will 'adhere' to this practice.

As this letter, my ATTC contribution will appear in the 'News flash' on my website under my '3rd, virtual INTERACTION', as soon as I have received the 'sentence' of 'peer' review.

With kind regards to Sonja and Clemens
yours, Michael.

PS. At my age (and my costs) I shall neither attend the 30th ATTC, nor the 28th ITTC, having been (too) many times before to Carderock and to Wuxi, respectively.