

---

*This article was originally submitted to the online Earhart Forum as a way of addressing some of the issues in assessing Betty's Notebook. It is a fine example of the kind of research and analysis we are able to bring to bear on each new piece of evidence in the Earhart Project.*

# *Organizing the Argument*

*by John Pratt, TIGHAR # 2373*

**A**s I see the process of assessing Betty's notebook, it looks something like this:

- Seek anachronisms in the related pages
- Reconstruct transmission
- Assess content

Therefore I want to look ahead to the issue of content assessment. What follows is an attempt to clarify the assessment process by getting criteria and definitions "on the table." It is unlikely that everyone can agree on criteria, or agree on the relative importance of specific criteria. However, if a discussion begins without some framework confusion seems likely.

Already some postings have identified possible "categories" to characterize the notebook contents, and I think I saw:

<b>Authentic</b>	<b>From AE and FN</b>
<b>Hoax</b>	<b>Transmitted hoax by noncommercial radio</b>
<b>Drama</b>	<b>Radio play, transmitted by commercial radio station</b>
<b>Fabrication</b>	<b>Entire incident made up by Betty</b>

A fabrication is early discounted but included for completeness.

The following matrix is created to identify some of those characteristics and compare the categories based on those characteristics. Note that in some categories a characteristic may have a broad range of values, therefore it may not be a particularly good determinant of that category. Poorly-characterized categories may

also be indicators of poorly defined categories, which require division into finer and more descriptive categories. Of course, the "Authentic" category will have more variability in its characteristics than the "Drama" category. On the other hand this type of analysis may identify some characteristics as critical indicators.

*(This is an updated version of John's original suggestion.)*

<b>What Betty Heard</b>	<b>Authentic</b>	<b>Hoax</b>	<b>Drama</b>	<b>Fabrication</b>
<b>Heard in St. Pete</b>	(pending)	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Duration 1 hr. 45 min.</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>No music</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>No commercials</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>No story line</b>	Yes	No	No	No
<b>Sporadic reception</b>	Yes	Yes (Possible)	Yes (Possible)	Yes
<b>Variable clarity</b>	Yes	Yes (Possible)	Yes (Possible)	Yes
<b>Multiple voices</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Action and emotion</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Attempted statement of location</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Specific situation details</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Specific situation details correct for Lockheed 10</b>	Yes	No	No	No
<b>"Occult" situation details</b>	Yes	No	No	No
<b>Specific personal details</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Little known correct personal details</b>	Yes	No	No	No
<b>"Occult" personal details</b>	Yes	No	No	No
		<b>5 No</b>	<b>9 No</b>	<b>5 No</b>

*"Occult" does not refer to magic; it is only a compact notation for information that does not appear to make sense.*

I expect that everyone who reads that matrix will disagree with one or more of my characterization-values. That is part of the beauty of this formalism because the discussion can then find a focus. If we can't get something like consensus of what these categories will be like, it is unlikely that we can share conclusions that result. This type of discussion has already started, with the discussion that some sort of location should have been available for broadcast and therefore real transmissions should have that characteristic.

Another advantage is that it lets us identify the logic we are intuitively using. For example, one might say that the apparent lack of a coherent story line is an indication that this is an Authentic transmission because the alternatives are likely to have a story line.

Also, intuitively, almost everyone seems keen to spot the "occult" details that would strongly indicate authenticity because few outside the participants would know them.

Finally, it may show places where categories are "degenerate," not distinguished. For exam-

ple, this set of characteristics does not seem to strongly distinguish an Authentic transmission from a Hoax. The solution is to find more definitive characteristics or admit that the cases cannot be distinguished.

In conclusion, I have attempted to organize the logic some of the credibility assessment posted so far. I see two features:

1. Some people have intuitively focused on characteristics that would support a conclu-

sion of Authentic if found. It is probably not wishful thinking. If it finds the pony, they get the first ride.

2. It is not clear from the discussion so far that we can strongly distinguish between a Hoax and an Authentic transmission based on internal content. Of course post-loss hoaxes were recorded so this is not a new problem.