A MEASURE FOR CRACKPOTS


Fred J. Gruenberger


December 1962

# A MEASURE FOR CRACKPOTS

Fred J. Gruenberger*

The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California

In a conversation between Richard Hamming, Ernest Nagel, and myself (while on the set for a TV filming), a topic came up concerning a certain cause which I promptly labelled "crackpot." Hamming (who loves to stir up controversy) immediately espoused it as pure science and challenged me to prove my contention. The three of us were still debating two days later.

The real point of our discussion, of course, was not whether or not this particular cause was scientific or the mouthings of a crackpot, but how one would go about telling the difference. It strikes us that almost everyone in modern life, particularly scientists, has to make this choice every day. For every article one sees in a technical journal or for that matter even in the public press, a decision has to be made: is this worth reading or is it something that can safely be skipped? It seems to us that there is

no acid test or even a small group of tests which will serve to dis—
tinguish infallibly between crackpot work and good science. For
every criterion that is advanced one can quickly think of a counter
example. Every idea that is offered to us falls somewhere between
the two extremes. Since there is no single test, the best we can do
is offer a check list of some of the attributes of science and of the
crackpot to help in making this decision.

Let us illustrate what we mean by the failure of any single
test. A scientist generally strengthens his stand greatly by his
ability to predict. Einstein's early works in the general theory of
relativity gained credence by accounting in part for a known error
in the perihelion of the planet Mercury. His theories gained real
acceptance, however, many years later when the British astronomers
(during World War I, when Einstein was a citizen of an enemy
country) verified by direct observation his statements about the
previously unsuspected bending of light in a gravitational field.
Here was the principle of predictability used to the fullest.

If predictability is to be used as a test of science, what then
shall we do with the astronomer? Astronomy is universally conceded
to be a science and in fact is one of the few sciences not only
acclaimed but supported by the general public with no demand for a
"practical" payoff. Some aspects of astronomy include predictions;

orbital motions for example, can be predicted with great precision, but there are large areas of astronomy for which prediction is virtually impossible. The astronomer announces no pending novas, or undetected Cepheid variables, or even star densities in as—yet unexplored areas. Thus, if predictability were the criterion of the moment, then the astronomer would rate rather poorly as a scientist.

In a similar way, it could be argued that a crackpot can be spotted by the (crackpot) way he tries to communicate. If he talks like a crackpot, fine; perhaps you can thereby damn him, but you take a real risk by doing so. Many weird ideas (weird, that is, after the acid test of time) have been advanced in the canonical form of true science. Yet there are many examples in history of people we now regard as outstanding scientists whose early writings look like those of a raving lunatic.

Each possible test, it would seem, can fail to discriminate by itself. It is the aggregate of many of them that we shall use to make up a discriminator. It seems fruitful (and fruitfulness is one of the attributes of science) to try to list some of the attributes of scientific endeavor (and/or crackpotism) and try to use the list as a measuring device.

What follows, then, is a check list of some significant items which we think are among the main attributes of the scientist (or, in some cases, the crackpot). In order to weight the items, and thus to provide a rough metric for the scale, we have assigned point values (totaling to 100) to the items.

1. PUBLIC VERIFIABILITY—12 points. The scientist says "I did thus and so and observed its effect; you are free to repeat my steps." The crackpot often says, "This is revealed truth; sorry, but I and my followers are the only ones who can obtain these results."

This does not mean that all science is publicly verifiable. Even such a simple thing as the population of the United States at any given moment cannot be verified by anyone except the Census Bureau itself (although it is nevertheless still verifiable). The astronomer working with the 200-inch telescope or the nuclear physicist working with an atomic reactor will announce results which are beyond the ability of most other men to duplicate. Nevertheless, when something is publicly verifiable, it has increased scientific stature. On the other hand, when some simple technique cannot be verified publicly, its stature as a scientific technique is in doubt. It is not a necessary or sufficient condition (nor is any item on this check list) but where it applies it constitutes an attribute of science.

2. PREDICTABILITY—12 points. To what extent can the technique or "science" being avocated be applied to the future? When a man can predict, and the predictions turn out to be true (as in the case of Einstein mentioned previously), a great deal has been gained toward credibility. Notice that it is really a batting average that is involved, in order that the principle of predictability should not be misused. For example, any idiot can predict the result of next year's World Series simply by listing all possibilities, writing them down, and then noting after the fact that one of them was indeed correct. The honest scientist will usually admit those predictions which did not work out. If his batting average becomes high enough, his stature increases. Scientific predictability is something more than guessing, whether lucky or not.

3. CONTROLLED EXPERIMENTS—13 points. We have assigned this item the greatest weight on our list. The scientist seeks to devise controlled experiments if he can (the astronomer, for example, rarely can). The crackpot, on the other hand, often seeks to avoid controlled experiments or, if some are performed, may invent marvelous excuses for why they did not bear out his theories.

4. OCCAM'S RAZOR—5 points. This is the principle which says that, of two possible explanations for the same phenomenon, scientists prefer the simpler; that is, the one requiring the least

hypotheses. It is not a stringent test, but it is a point to consider.

A simple hypothesis which explains everything is that the devil deliberately makes what appears to be patterns to deceive us but in reality there is no pattern. Consider, however, those cases in history where Occam's razor has applied. The classic case is that of Copernicus, who advanced a much simpler explanation for planetary motion than was currently invoked. Lacking all other evidence, the scientist is inclined to except the simpler explanation.

5. FRUITFULNESS—10 points. The argument here is that a subject is the more scientific the more it tends to lead to "fruitful" results. The meaning of "fruitful" here is the ability to suggest new ideas—new approaches and new tests—rather than practical or material results. Of course, one man's fruit is another's rotten apples. Probably every scientist in history has met many times the question "what good is it?"

While fruitfulness is probably an important attribute of science, it is a poor discriminator a priori between the scientist and the crackpot. Sometimes, by the time one is able to tell whether a given venture is fruitful or not it would probably be possible to tell on the basis of other criteria whether the working theory was indeed scientific.

6. AUTHORITY—10 points. Weight of authority tells,
among scientists; it is equivalent to building up credit. Each new
subject which claims the mantle of science is supposed to be imme-
diately submitted to known and recognized scientists for both
opinion and test. Indeed, usually the first goal of any newcomer is
to seek the endorsement of known authorities. If those authorities
say "what nonsense!," the weight of authority has been exerted (in
this case against), and it does count. The authorities may be wrong;
they have been many times in the past.

7. ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE—8 points. Most scientists
soon discipline themselves in accepted methods of communication
with their colleagues, their cohorts, and the public. The crackpot
scorns accepted channels (he is even apt to deride those who "knuckle
under" to accepted practices). Many scientists may even go to the
extreme of advocating dullness in their written communications.
Perhaps this tends to cut understanding in their communications,
but it indicates a high degree of conformity.

8. HUMILITY—5 points. This is a minor point, perhaps,
but we expect a scientist to tend toward humbleness, and we tend to
honor him accordingly. To be sure, there have been (and will be)
arrogant scientists; we try to forgive them, but the very act of
forgiving implies that the test exists.

As an after-the-fact test, few, if any, crackpots have ever demonstrated humility.

9. OPEN MINDEDNESS—5 points. Here again, the test as a discriminator is weak. Many persons, judged by time to be true scientists, were stubborn and pigheaded in their early days. In general, however, the scientist tends toward phrases like "It appears that...," "It would seem plausible that...," and the like. The crackpot is generally dogmatic and arbitrary and seems to imply "Agree with me, now, or lie forever beyond the pale." Probably a given person would score either 0 or 5 on this test: there seems to be little middle ground.

10. THE FULTON NON SEQUITUR—5 points. This is a negative test. The true crackpot can frequently be spotted on this test alone. He proceeds with an argument like this: "They laughed at Fulton. He was right. They're laughing at me. Therefore, I must be an equal genius." It is so obvious, but the Fulton non sequitur keeps recurring.

11. PARANOIA—5 points. This is another negative test. It is the lack of this characteristic that is on the 5 point end of the scale. Again, paranoia is the sign of a crackpot. Every large corporation meets this characteristic frequently. A crackpot feels that the world deliberately hates him and actively opposes his project. (and somehow, to the crackpot, the very existence of oppression supports his cause.)

12. THE DOLLAR COMPLEX—5 points. This is another negative test: the crackpot almost always is overly impressed with the value of his discoveries—they're earth—shaking. The test is somewhat related to humility, but different enough to be worth its own 5% of the total vote. The true scientist will score high: there are few, if any cases, of a scientific announcement that says or implies "This is truly revolutionary." The crackpot, of course, scores low. The question is not "What is the worth of this thing?" but rather what the sponsor claims its worth is.

13. STATISTICS COMPULSION—5 points. It seems to be a characteristic of crackpot literature (perhaps because a little knowledge is a dangerous thing and the crackpot has as little as anyone) that statistics are not only used, but continuously explained. The crackpot is fascinated to have discovered that a coin tossed 1000 times doesn't necessarily fall heads 500 times. He is com—pelled to tell the reader—sometimes on every page—the probability of having 523 heads. The scientist who knows his statistics generally assumes that his reader is informed; he may give the chi—squared value, but he seldom ends the sentence with an exclamation point.

Any new measuring device is customarily applied to known cases in order to calibrate it. (This practice is another characteristic of scientists.) Suppose we apply our checklist to three types of people:

1. The universally recognized scientist (e. g. , the physicist).

2. The widely discredited crackpot—say, the advocate of dowsing rods as a method of locating underground treasure. Such an advocate will, of course, cry "foul" immediately. I'm sorry; among all those in the first group above (plus most of the general public), the dowser is a crackpot.

3. The middle group, still open to debate, represented by the advocates of Extra Sensory Perception (ESP).

Table 1 shows scores that I have assigned to each of these three groups for the 13 items. The scores are personal, arbitrary, and biased. The reader is urged to fill in his own values, rather than to waste time quibbling over mine. I cannot defend any precise values (indeed, if I were to fill out the sheet again, I would probably have different values). It is their relative size that is important, and their meaning to me as a tool for discrimination.

I should, however, explain my reasoning at arriving at some of the values shown.

Table 1.

BOX SCORES

| TEST | MAXIMUM POINTS | PHYSICIST | ESP-er | DOWSER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Public verifiability | 12 | 12 | 5 | 0 |
| 2. Predictability | 12 | 11 | 2 | 2 |
| 3. Controlled experimentation | 13 | 13 | 5 | 0 |
| 4. Occam's razor | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 5. Fruitfulness | 10 | 10 | 7 | 5 |
| 6. Authority | 10 | 10 | 3 | 0 |
| 7. Communication | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 8. Humility | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 9. Open mindedness | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Fulton non-sequitur | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 11. Paranoia | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 12. Dollar complex | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 13. Statistics compulsion | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 100 | 97 | 38 | 28 |

Low scores, for the person who is peddling black magic and shark's teeth (either through ignorance or avarice), should not be surprising. The charlatan and the boob are both intrinsically opposed to a search for truth; the last thing they want is public verifiability and controlled experimentation. In fact, when outsiders crassly insist on such tests—and the results fail to support the claims—the non-scientist calls on a marvelous array of excuses as to why the uninitiated have perverted their domain.

Such things are not all black-and-white. Thus, I do not assign zero scores to more than three items for the ESP advocate. Those books on ESP that I have waded through exhibit a complete lack of open-mindedness; one of them is singularly annoying in its compulsion to explain statistics to me on every other page. On the principle of Occam's Razor, I can find a marvelously simple expla-nation for all the wonders of ESP; namely, that they don't exist, or that simple natural explanations are at hand.

The devotees of ESP <u>have</u> sought public verification; they <u>do</u> observe all the niceties and trappings of the scientific community, and so on. Perhaps their case is still open. My personal score for them is 38; yours may be considerably higher.

The checklist amounts, in the aggregate, to a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the claim that "this pursuit is scientific. " Each item by itself is open to attack.

This paper offers a theory; namely, that a metric can be assigned to the merits of another theory. It would be an interesting exercise for the reader to apply the measure (using, of course, his own weights) to this paper.