physics community. The charm hypothesis was originally a speculation of Bjorken and Glashow as early at 1964 [6]; however, it was not until 1970 that GIM (Glashow, Iliopoulos, Maiani [3]) provided a compelling motivation for charm — it handily explained one of the major mysteries of HEP at that time, the suppression of strangeness-changing-neutral-currents. But much of the experimental community was not impressed, and remained on the resonance kick (Argand diagrams, spin-parity analysis, X, Y, split A_2,...).

An interesting anecdote is what Shelly Glashow preached to the experimental skeptics at their stronghold — the 4/2–27/1974 4th International Conference on Experimental Meson Spectroscopy, held at Northeastern University in Boston. His prediction for EMS 76, the next conference of the series held every 2 years, was:

> "There are just three possibilities:
>
> 1. Charm is not found, and I eat my hat.
> 2. Charm is found by hadron spectroscopy, and we celebrate.
> 3. Charm is found by outlanders, and you eat your hats."

This was just six months before the November revolution!!! Shelly obviously got to keep his hat.

Another interesting aspect was the paper by Gaillard, Ben Lee, and Rosner [7] entitled "Search for Charm." The preprint was dated August 1974 (Fermilab-Pub-74/86-THY), but was published in Reviews of Modern physics only after the discovery (text unchanged, except for an appendix updating the discovery). All the physics of the charmonium (renamed J/ψ by the discoverers) and charm particles was expounded in glorious detail, and most was correct except for one glaring mis-prediction and one even-more-glaring omission. The mis-prediction was on the branching ratio of charm mesons to $K\pi$, where the paper predicted a BR 10 times higher than measured later — this would in 1976 make some people believe that J/ψ did not represent charmonium. The omission, which came from the experimental naïveté of theorists, was the statement that charmonium would not be discoverable in electron-positron collisions, since it was so narrow — they did not appreciate the radiative tail of the electron beam, which makes a significant fraction of the collisions occur not at twice the beam energy, but at lower energies. Thus, even when data-taking occurs at ($2 \times$ beam energy) $= 3.2\,\mathrm{GeV}$, enough collisions occur at $3.095\,\mathrm{GeV}$ to make the interaction rate 20% higher than normal, enough to make the puzzled Mark I people investigate this point more thoroughly, and discover the ψ (whether they had a spy in Sam Ting's camp remains an unsolved mystery to this day!).