

Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2002 09:48:09 +0200 (IST)
From: Dror Bar-Natan <drorbn@math.huji.ac.il>
To: Robert John Aumann <raumann@math.huji.ac.il>
Subject: Minority Report

Shalom Prof. Aumann,

I have mostly lost interest in the subject of Bible Codes, and thus barring the unlikely occurrence of a statistical fluke, my only remaining interest in the "Gans Committee" is that the data it had collected will be made available to the public for scrutiny. Therefore I have no interest in submitting a "minority report".

Lehitraot,

Dror Bar-Natan.

Minority Report by E. Rips

A. The experiment performed by Gans [G] has the following components:

- 1) The subject (that is the decision to look for the names of the communities of birth and death of the Famous Rabbis).
- 2) The format (that is the decision to use the name as such or in conjunction with *khal* / or *khilat*).
- 3) Rules for data collection (the so called Inbal Algorithm).
- 4) Actual data collection.
- 5) Computation.

In my view, the Committee had to investigate the components 3) and 4), that is to check whether the rules for data collection are proper and whether they are applied in a proper way. Instead, the Committee chose to perform two different tests thus missing the main objective of the Committee, which was "set up to look into the results reported by Gans in [G]."

The instructions to the expert given in the "Fresh test" ([F]) proposed by Prof. Bar-Natan lead to a completely different experiment the outcome of which provides no basis for a judgement about the Gans experiment. Here are two specific examples.

(A) The Gans experiment deals with birth and death places which corresponds to the WRR experiment (which dealt with birth and death dates). In contrast, in [F] the expert is instructed to prepare for each personality a list of places which are of importance in the biography of this personality (with special emphasis on birth and death places).

(B) [F] ignores the question of spelling which is of critical importance in the Code research. The WRR experiment was done according to explicitly stated spelling rules and [G] also uses the same rules. Instead, [F] suggests use of "reasonable spelling" which practically means that no rules are prescribed.

The majority report states that "the Fresh test cannot be regarded as completely "fresh" -- it is correlated with data on which codes experiments were performed before." However, in view of (A) and (B), the design [F] is more similar to Prof. Simon's experiment (which has a negative outcome) than to [G], so no positive bias could be claimed.

The "Replicative test" preserves 1) and 2) and deals only with the aspects 3) and 4). Still, only the general guiding principles were stated, so the expert(s) may choose conventions different from those used by Gans and leading to very different results, with no need to raise the eyebrows.

B. I oppose setting pre-specified thresholds by which to judge the results, and in this aspect I agree with Prof. Bar-Natan. I see no objective basis for setting up the thresholds. They are different for the two tests, arbitrary and high.