

Is Science Broken? The Failure of Peer Review (Especially in Medicine)

By Brendan D. Murphy / @BrendanDMurphyOfficial

“Today Science is up on a pedestal. A new god has appeared; his high priests conduct the rituals, with nuclear reactors, moon-probing rocket ships, cathode tubes and laser beams. And their territory is sacrosanct; laymen are denied entry.” – Bruce Cathie

For many people, the IDEA of peer review occupies special—even sacred—territory in the world of science. However, investigation of suppressed innovations, inventions, effective medical treatments, non-toxic cures, and so on rapidly reveals that the peer review system is arguably better at one thing above all others: censorship. Whether this is censorship of contrarian viewpoints or innovations that render favoured dogmas, products, or services obsolete, i.e. economic threats, depends.

Regardless, the problem is now recognised by many critics as endemic, as many scientists have had to learn the hard way. The defects in the peer review system have been the subject of a profusion of editorials and studies in the literature over recent years.

Clearly there is a problem—and denial won't solve it.

As Dr David Kaplan professor of pathology at the Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, tells us,

Peer review is known to engender bias, incompetence, excessive expense, ineffectiveness, and corruption. A surfeit of publications has documented the deficiencies of this system. – Dr David Kaplan¹

Australian physicist Brian Martin elaborates on this theme in his excellent article *Strategies for Dissenting Scientists*:

Certain sorts of innovation are welcome in science, when they fall within established frameworks and do not threaten vested interests. But aside from this sort of routine innovation, science has many similarities to systems of dogma. Dissenters are not welcome. They are ignored, rejected, and sometimes attacked.²

The late electric universe researcher Wal Thornhill stated plainly in my interview with him that the peer review system amounts to censorship. Fellow independent scientist Gary Novak is also scathing, stating: “Peer review is a form of censorship, which is tyranny over the mind. Censorship does not purify; it corrupts...There is a lot of junk science and trash that goes through the peer review process.”³

He is absolutely correct on this last point, as we will see shortly.

Brian Martin asks what scientists

have to gain by spending time helping an outsider? Most likely, the alleged discovery will turn out to be pointless or wrong from the standard point of view. If the outsider has made a genuine discovery, that means the outsider would win

rewards at the expense of those already in the field who have invested years of effort in the conventional ideas.⁴

This means that the influential and powerful on the “inside” of the Old Boys Club can and often do become gatekeepers, or a form of threshold guardian who will only yield to the correct affirmatory magic words that validate and reify the entrenched theories or sacred products. Otherwise, as Gandalf tells the fire demon, “You shall not pass!”

Incidentally, innovators and dissidents, are often cast as “demons”—or demonised—by Establishment Guardians who are threatened by novelty.

Contrary to what the bland archetype suggests, scientists are prone to being cathected to their pet theories and opinions, especially if they have been visibly rewarded or publicly obtained status and accolades as a result. Who would want to put that at risk, after all?

Scientists, just like laypeople, have susceptible emotional bodies and often fairly hefty egos—partially due to their “expertise” and academic titles, qualifications, theories, etc. Dr Malcolm Kendrick comments in *Doctoring Data* that, “by definition, anyone who is an ‘expert’ in an area of medicine will be a supporter of whatever dogma holds sway.”⁵

Close study of power dynamics in medicine bears this out—and we should never forget the Golden Rule: Whoever has the gold makes the rules. Corporations increasingly dominate oversight and funding of so-called “scientific research.”

Consider the following words from *The Lancet*’s editor Richard Horton:

The mistake, of course, is to have thought that peer review was any more than a crude means of discovering the **acceptability**—not the validity—of a new finding... We portray peer review to the public as a quasi-sacred process that helps to make science our most objective truth teller. But we know that the system of peer review is biased, unjust, unaccountable, incomplete, easily fixed, often insulting, usually ignorant, occasionally foolish, and frequently wrong.⁶

Peer review, as a “quasi-sacred” process that somehow supposedly transcends the foibles and follies of human nature has long since unconsciously taken on sacred ritual status. Has the paper been blessed by the Peer Review Priest? If not then it is epistemologically unclean, tainted, and sinful. “Get thee behind me, Satan!,” as Jesus tells Peter in the Bible.

In April of 2015 Horton attended a secretive symposium on the reproducibility and reliability of biomedical research, at the Wellcome Trust in London. Attendees were strongly discouraged from reporting what any government agents said, or to take photos of the slides presented. The symposium, Horton reports, “touched on one of the most sensitive issues in science today: the idea that something has gone fundamentally wrong with one of our greatest human creations,” that creation being science itself.

One anonymous attendee stated that “A lot of what is published is incorrect,” acknowledging that large amounts of what is published as “science” amounts to little more than toilet paper. Horton, as the veteran editor of a prestigious scientific journal, is scathing:

The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a

turn towards darkness. As one participant put it, “poor methods get results”...The apparent endemicity of bad research behaviour is alarming. In their quest for telling a compelling story, scientists too often sculpt data to fit their preferred theory of the world. Or they retrofit hypotheses to fit their data.

To be clear - and this is no insignificant matter—what Horton is criticising here is not the scientific METHOD, but the poorly conducted misleading “studies” that masquerade as real science. An entire episode could be devoted to this important distinction between scientific method and the body of accepted so-called “scientific facts”, but let’s just make a few brief comments for clarity.

As Jordan Grant poignantly explains in a thread on my Facebook timeline:

Science is simply a method of inquiry - THE scientific method - natural science, I mean. The purpose is to adjudicate the CAUSE of a phenomenon in the natural and physical world.

That’s it. It is simply a method. It doesn't "speak". It isn't "consensus". It also has nothing to do with correlative studies—most research today.

By definition, if someone claims "this is scientific" and it has NOT gone through the steps of the scientific method, it is pseudoscience, and THAT is what we see overtaking the academic stage.

He hits the nail on the head. Speaking of nails, the late herbalist Stephen Buhner also makes the point succinctly by further clarifying the linguistic problem here:

Nearly all people in the sciences, or its admirers, tend to refer to the practice of the scientific method not as a technique or an arena of study but in more godlike terms such as: “I found an insect new to Science;” ... “We did it for Science.”

In other words, linguistically, the practice of the scientific method is not spoken of as a human pursuit, but rather as service to a divine being known as “Science.” Science, however, is not a living being, it can’t know anything, possess anything, be or do anything, and it certainly doesn’t “want” stuff. It is a tool, like a hammer.

“We found an insect new to hammer” reveals the linguistic absurdity involved. Nevertheless the majority of practitioners talk about it as if it is indeed a living being of huge stature whom they serve.” -Feb. 5, 2017

The very same linguistic absurdity Buhner exposes also applies to the very title of this video. Imagine if I called it: “Is hammer broken?” It literally makes NO sense.

I would add that the religious sort of mentality highlighted by Buhner —where science is spoken of as a divine being—only feeds the already rampant dogmatism surrounding many realms of so-called scientific endeavour. This should be kept in mind any time you hear people referring to “the science” or “believing in science.” When Horton says science has turned towards darkness he’s really denoting the way that so many of the humans presumed to be practising science have themselves turned towards darkness and ceased

rigorously employing true scientific method—usually in order to serve the agendas of those who pay their salaries. As one of Horton’s colleagues put it, “poor methods get results,” but if that’s the case you’re not really practising science anymore but are engaged in pseudoscience prepared for PR and marketing purposes, perhaps to justify your job title, or help your employer get a new product to market...

Now listen to this next bit from Horton:

Journal editors deserve their fair share of criticism too. We aid and abet the worst behaviours. Our acquiescence to the impact factor fuels an unhealthy competition to win a place in a select few journals. Our love of “significance” pollutes the literature with many a statistical fairy-tale. We reject important confirmations. Journals are not the only miscreants. Universities are in a perpetual struggle for money and talent, endpoints that foster reductive metrics, such as high-impact publication. National assessment procedures...incentivise bad practices. And individual scientists, including their most senior leaders, do little to alter a research culture that occasionally veers close to misconduct.

An interesting dichotomy emerges: those on the inside in the know, are aware that medical science has taken a turn into darkness, and peer review is broken. Meanwhile, much of the general public, and significant portions of the professional world still think of peer review as not only viable, which clearly it is not, generally speaking,—but it’s held as a transcendent, almost magical, organizing force occurring in the heavenly ivory towers of Science—a divine force that avoids falling prey to human weaknesses by virtue of the lofty qualifications of those masters of reality called “scientists.”

Scientists, in this mythology, aren’t *quite* human—they are something more, something pure, something that the layman can never be—an epistemological ubermensch. Students of science and medicine undergo a magical alchemical process as they proceed through approved educational institutions and emerge transformed from their chrysalis with their doctorates, masters, stethoscopes and equations. They are the Chosen Ones, the purified, the holy, the redeemed, the righteous. The High Priests of secular modern culture. Their holy dispensations are not to be questioned.

It is abundantly clear, however, that not only is the popular view of peer review misleading, but the most prestigious publications are some of the very worst offenders. Significant scientific publications—for example, the journal *Nature*—have a well documented history of prejudice against findings or hypotheses that run contrary to established scientific dogma, ironically treating many scientists of today the way the Catholic Church treated Galileo, Copernicus, and Bruno.

Writing in the *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* in May 2000, Canadian-based researcher, David Sackett, said that he would “never again lecture, write, or referee anything to do with evidence based clinical practice,” over his concern that “experts” are stifling new ideas. He wants the retirement of experts to be made compulsory.

Sackett says that “...progress towards the truth is impaired in the presence of an expert.”⁷

As I said, Gatekeepers.

Trusting “experts” in oncology, for example, is generally a very good way to artificially speed one’s trip to the grave, particularly if you have metastatic cancer. And don’t

get me started on how **correctly prescribed** treatments are one of the leading causes of death in America today—and THOSE ARE JUST THE CORRECTLY prescribed ones!

And yet, never ones to let unbiased research get in the way of a profitable theology, establishment-supported “Experts” are now on a rarified level that perhaps only celebrities can understand—and are virtually promoted as demigods today. The cult of celebrity is alive and well. We seem to be replacing evidence and logic with popularity, authority, and feelings—and replacing orthodox religion with the Cult of Scientism and Church of Modern Medicine.

In the main, “experts” are those people in the establishment who espouse the mainstream dogma and reify the politically correct belief structures that profit vested interests. “Experts” are lionized because the world that made them experts promotes and validates them *when they affirm the already established beliefs*—and the mainstream/legacy media is not just complicit in this, it is absolutely instrumental in indoctrinating great swaths of humanity into whatever expert-approved theology holds sway, while all the dissident and equally qualified experts are deliberately excluded from coverage.

If you want to be horribly misled on any number of important issues, just head straight to the legacy media—whether print or TV—and listen to the establishment’s “experts.”

Harvard Medical School’s Dr. Marcia Angell is the former Editor-in-Chief at the respected *New England Journal of Medicine*. She tells us:

It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of *The New England Journal of Medicine*.⁸

Consider this statement carefully if you have been considering receiving the latest and “greatest” experimental pointy thingy.

I’m reminded of Horton’s words about journal editors: “We aid and abet the worst behaviours...Our love of “significance” pollutes the literature with many a statistical fairy-tale.” Using statistical manipulation, the high priests of the Church of Modern Medicine can turn unfavourable results into apparent life-saving “breakthroughs” worthy of the 6 o’clock news. Few lay people seem aware of the various methods of manipulation the public is victimised by.

Most “experts” in medicine are, psychologically speaking, actually just engaged in well-paid groupthink and confirmation bias exercises, vigorously affirming and defending their ego’s profitable construction of the world. Many are little more than shills for the pharmaceutical industry. Medicine and, science in general, to paraphrase physicist Max Planck “advance one funeral at a time.” Once the public has accepted the scientific establishment’s truths, narratives, and designated “experts” then researchers whose results—or methods!—deviate from the accepted norm can be immediately branded as crackpots, lunatics, law-breakers, fringe nuts, pseudo-scientists and so on, regardless of how meticulous their methods, and irrefutable their results.

The media is crucial in this control dynamic because it sells the Establishment’s reality, while simultaneously waging a psychological war against consumers, programming

them to passively accept the weakest evidence and most illogical arguments and contradictions without question. The opinions and advice of “expert panels” rank the lowest in the 7-level hierarchy of medical evidence, and yet, this is how a large amount of public policy is generated, including when so-called epidemics occur—whether real or figments of statistical manipulation and bogus diagnostics. Thus is the politically correct status quo maintained.

Rocking the boat with unwanted paradigm-busters or innovations that permanently cure certain diseases, like cancer for instance, just isn't how to get ahead in Science Land. There is no profit to be found in cures. Cures kill repeat business.

“Peer review” censorship exemplifies the neophobia in the world of science which serves to protect the status quo rather than improve knowledge by weeding out dubious ideas, methods, and data, as it is **meant** to. This supposed mechanism of “quality control” has resulted not only in the dismissal of loads of important and credible research, but it has also let fraudulent research—and TONNES of it!—be published at the same time. Papers that appear to support fashionable ideas or entrenched dogmas are likely to fare well, even if they are flat out wrong.

Dr Kaplan, has stated that,

Peer review is broken. It needs to be overhauled, not just tinkered with. The incentives should be changed so that: authors are more satisfied and more likely to produce better work, the reviewing is more transparent and honest, and journals do not have to manage an unwieldy and corrupt system that produces disaffection and misses out on innovation.⁹

Is it any wonder that Dr John Ionnidis reported in his famous 2005 paper: “Most research findings are false for most research designs and for most fields.”

Let that marinade for a moment. Most findings in most fields are false. Given the already outlined problems, is it really surprising that, in Ionnidis words, “Claimed research findings may often be simply accurate measures of the prevailing bias”?¹⁰

This is essentially what Kendrick, Sackett, Kaplan, Martin, and others are indicating. In medical science, perhaps more than virtually any other field, there is a manifest culture of “going along to get along.”

Dr. Marc Girard, a mathematician and physician who serves on the editorial board of *Medicine Veritas (The Journal of Medical Truth)*, has written,

The reason for this disaster is too clear: the power of money. In academic institutions, the current dynamics of research is more favourable to the ability of getting grants - collecting money and spending it - than to scientific imagination or creativity.¹¹

Consider pharmaceutical giants like Pfizer—behemoths who can cop billions in fines for fraudulent and deceptive practices, and keep right on rolling ahead with whatever their latest scheme is. The Big Pharma giant has paid more than \$ 4.7 billion in fines since the year 2000, “for 80 different crimes and violations, including off-label or unapproved promotion of medical products, foreign corrupt practices, bribery, government-contracting-related offenses and drug or medical equipment safety violations.”¹² And here they are now supposedly to “save the world” with the Pfizer-BionTech pointy thing which must not be named.

Thanks, but I'll pass on that, guys. I like my blood clean and my DNA intact. Let it be noted that, with pockets so deep, these entities have the resources to demonise and destroy—or de-platform—any heretic or whistleblower that threatens their profit margins. Guess who profits from Cancel Culture...? Just follow the money.

In general, peer reviewers—who are not usually time-rich—don't try to replicate experiments and rarely even request the raw data supporting a paper's conclusions. According to Richard Smith writing in *Peer review in health sciences*, peer review is

thought to be slow, expensive, profligate of academic time, highly subjective, prone to bias, easily abused, poor at detecting gross defects, and almost useless for detecting fraud.¹³

Billions of dollars worth of after-the-fact Big Pharma punishments bears this out—and that's only the tip of the iceberg.

What about fake peer review?

Berlin-based Springer Nature, who publishes the aforementioned *Nature* journal announced the retraction of 64 articles in 10 journals in an August 18th statement in 2015. This followed an internal investigation which found fabricated peer-review write-ups linked to the articles.

The purge followed

similar discoveries of “fake peer review” by several other major publishers, including London-based BioMed Central, an arm of Springer, which began retracting 43 articles in March citing “reviews from fabricated reviewers.”¹⁴

Yes, that means reviewers that don't exist.

In response to fake peer review some publishers have actually ended the practice of author-suggested reviewers,¹⁵ that's how bad it got!

But I've been saving the best for last. Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you...the Conceptual Penis...

Not that long ago, two scientists performed a brilliant Sokal-style hoax on the journal *Cogent Social Sciences*. Under the pen names “Jamie Lindsay” and “Peter Boyle,” and writing for the fictitious “Southeast Independent Social Research Group,” Peter Boghossian and James Lindsay wrote a deliberately absurd paper loosely composed in the style of “post-structuralist discursive gender theory”—what exactly that is they made no attempt to find out. The authors tell us:

The paper was ridiculous by intention, essentially arguing that penises shouldn't be thought of as male genital organs but as damaging social constructions... We assumed that if we were merely clear in our moral implications that maleness is intrinsically bad and that the penis is somehow at the root of it, we could get the paper published in a respectable journal.¹⁶

And they did. After completing the paper, and being unable to identify what it was actually about, it was deemed a success and ready for submission, which went ahead in April

2017. It was published the next month after some editorial feedback and additional tweaking. To illustrate how deliberately absurd the paper is, a quote is in order:

We conclude that penises are not best understood as the male sexual organ, or as a male reproductive organ, but instead as an enacted social construct that is both damaging and problematic for society and future generations... and is the conceptual driver behind much of climate change.¹⁷

In plain English, they (seemingly) argued here that a penis is not simply part of male biology but a *social construct* which is also the “conceptual driver” of climate change. No, really. How this ever got published is something to ponder. The paper is filled with meaningless jargon, arrant nonsense, and references to fake papers and authors. As part of the hoax, none of the sources that were cited were even read by the perpetrators of the hoax. As Boghossian and Lindsay point out, it *never should have been published*. No one—not even Boghossian and Lindsay—knows what it is *actually* saying.

Almost a third of the sources cited in the original version of the paper point to fake sources, such as created by Postmodern Generator, making mock of how absurdly easy it is to execute this kind of hoax, especially, the authors add, in “‘academic’ fields corrupted by postmodernism.”¹⁸

How Fake Science Papers Make Non-Existent Scientists Renowned

In April 2010, Cyril Labbé of Joseph Fourier University in Grenoble, France, used a computer program called SCIgen to create 102 fake papers under the pseudonym of Ike Antkare. SCIgen was created in 2005 by researchers at MIT in Cambridge in order to demonstrate that conferences would accept such nonsense...as well as to amuse themselves. Labbé added the bogus papers to the Google Scholar database, which boosted Ike Antkare’s *h*-index, a measure of published output, to 94 — at the time, **making Antkare the world's 21st most highly cited scientist**.¹⁹ emphasis added

So a non-existent scientist has achieved the distinction of being one of the world’s most highly cited authors—while “authoring” papers consisting of utter gibberish. In February 2014 it was reported that Springer and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE), were removing over 120 such bogus papers from their subscription services after Labbe identified them using his own software.

Let me take you back in time to help illustrate how serious this problem of bogus science is in medicine—to Dr Robert Gallo’s seminal 1980s paper supposedly “proving” that an HIV virus causes AIDS.

Even after five different teams of investigators—both scientific and forensic—established Gallo’s work to be completely fraudulent and without foundation, Gallo stubbornly held to his HIV-AIDS mythos as the public and media accolades rolled in, narrowly missing jail time based on a technicality. Meanwhile, his bogus “study” remains one of the most highly cited papers in the scientific and medical world, defrauding the entire scientific and medical community, and probably doing more than anyone to lead them down a fruitless and toxic treatment path for many thousands of AIDS sufferers, when far better

treatments were available all along. Over 100,000 people have died from the toxic AIDS “treatment” known as AZT, despite better options being easily available—but suppressed, demonised, and ignored. As usual.

At least as far back as 1996, journalists and researchers have been getting spoof papers published in conferences or journals to deliberately expose weaknesses in academic quality controls. “Physicist Alan Sokal, of the famous Sokal Affair, succeeded in the journal *Social Text* in 1996,” while Harvard science journalist John Bohannon revealed in a 2013 issue of *Science* that he had duped over 150 open-access journals into publishing “a deliberately flawed study.”²⁰ Bohannon organized submission of the flawed study, technically, many different but very similar variations of the study, to 304 open access journals worldwide over a period of 10 months. 255 went through the whole editing process to the point of either acceptance or rejection.

He wrote:

Any reviewer with more than a high-school knowledge of chemistry and the ability to understand a basic data plot should have spotted the paper's shortcomings immediately. Its experiments are so hopelessly flawed that the results are meaningless.²¹

Never the less, the hoax paper was accepted by a whopping 157 of the 255 journals and rejected by only 98. To make matters even worse,

Of the 106 journals that did conduct peer review, 70% accepted the paper...²²

To Novak,

If peer review were open and accountable, there might be a small chance of correcting some of the corruptions through truth and criticism; but the process is cloaked in the darkness of anonymity...Due to the exploitive and corrupt process, nearly everything in science has official errors within it...a culture of protecting and exploiting the errors creates an official reality which cannot be opposed.²³

Now, disturbingly, we see Big Tech’s suppression of free speech aiding and abetting the official errors and frauds in mainstream medical “science,” shutting down any heretic silly enough to criticise the benevolent offerings and sacraments of Big pHarma—with disastrous social, medical, and economic results worldwide. You know what I’m talking about. We have even closed national and state borders on the flimsiest of evidence in case someone—heaven forbid—gets a cold.

A quote in *PLoS Medicine*, offers this brief overview of the state of play in medical science:

“Journals have devolved into information laundering operations for the pharmaceutical industry”, wrote Richard Horton, editor of the *Lancet*, in March 2004. In the same year, Marcia Angell, former editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine*, lambasted the industry for becoming “primarily a marketing machine” and

co-opting “every institution that might stand in its way”...Jerry Kassirer, another former editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine*, argues that the industry has deflected the moral compasses of many physicians, and the editors of *PLoS Medicine* have declared that they will not become “part of the cycle of dependency... between journals and the pharmaceutical industry”.²⁴

In the words of John Ionnidis, “Most scientific studies are wrong, and they are wrong because scientists are interested in funding and careers rather than truth.”

Clearly the problem of corruption and conflicts of interest have been increasingly on the radar of professionals for some time now, so much so that it has been the subject of an increasing number of articles and editorials. Conveying the depth and breadth of venality and deception to the “uninitiated,” however, presents a big challenge. And it isn’t just conflict of interest and corruption to blame for the failure of peer review; there is human bias, shoddy review work, fake reviewers and fraud, and varying other human interests to factor in.²⁵

At the very least we need to cease indoctrinating *students* into the dogma that all good things have been sacralised by so-called “peer review,” and the converse: anything that has not been peer reviewed is probably blasphemous, and crafted by the hands of heretics.

It turns out that science as an institution IS broken, and the Old Boys’ Club in charge of much peer review is not the least bit interested in evidence or truth—especially in mainstream medicine.

Truth, transparency, Innovation and progress are sacrificed by the high priests at the altar of the Church of Modern Medicine. As much of half as what is published as “science” is likely to be junk—and we can name any number of well known biomedical corporations that have no qualms whatsoever about selling the masses junk science to push their latest unnecessary product and please their stock holders.

Keep that in mind next time the government-Pharma-media complex presents the next “life-saving” drug or needle. In a world of pathological inversion, these things often turn out to achieve the very **opposite** of what is advertised.

We have got to take responsibility for our own health, our own safety, and our own lives. We cannot rely on so-called authorities or experts to do it for us.

Bonus Materials for TEOC Participants

Head [HERE](#) for your bonuses and special offers, exclusive to TEOC participants

Thanks for bringing in the new health paradigm with us!

Brendan

About Brendan

Brendan D. Murphy is the “consciousness guy,” host of popular [Truthiverse](#) podcast, and author of the epic, “[The Grand Illusion: A Synthesis of Science and Spirituality — Book 1](#)” He’s also the founder of [The Truthiversity](#), the #1 consciousness-raising university. This is a one-of-a-kind multimedia learning portal for awake and discerning minds who want to see past the edge—with a host who can show them.

Bonus Peer Review Quote

Richard Smoley interviewed Robert Temple for *New Dawn* magazine (2023)

Smoley: ...Fred Hoyle said that you quoted in your book: that the scientific peer review process is merely a retardation of the advancement of knowledge. Could you expand on that a little?

Robert Temple:

In my book, I give case histories of scientists who made crucial experiments but were prevented from publishing. One leading case is Fritz Zwicky, a Swiss astronomer who, in the late forties and all through the fifties, kept trying to publish his paper showing evidence that outer space was not empty. The establishment insisted that it was empty; it was a vacuum. So he couldn't get his paper published for ten years.

Zwicky went to every physics and astrophysics journal in the world. They all said no. They refused to publish his evidence that outer space was not empty. The head of his own observatory wrote to the journal editors and said, "Whatever you do, don't publish Zwicky's paper."

Of course, this man behaved illegally, but he was never held to account. Finally, Zwicky went to a biology journal and got it – an astronomical article – published; it was in a peer-reviewed biology journal. This meant that he could have offprints from the publication, which he could then send to all the astronomers.

It took him ten years to get around the blockage. This is an example of how the advancement of knowledge is held back, not just by the peer review process, which is almost continually abused, but by the knowledge control freaks. The establishment doesn't want to be shown to be wrong because people would lose face and their reputations damaged. They want to always be correct, and they want to be the wise ones.

If you come up with anything that goes against what they've already said, they'll try and stop you, just for egotistical reasons. The whole peer review process is to maintain the status quo of science and prevent advances and anything that challenges the establishment; that's what it's for.

References/Citations:

¹ Kaplan, How to fix peer review, http://www.newmediaexplorer.org/sepp/2004/01/29/peer_review_politics_of_science.htm

² Brian Martin, Strategies for Dissenting Scientists, *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1998, pp. 605-616.

³ Gary Novak, <http://nov55.com/prv.html>

⁴ Martin, op. cit.

⁵ Kendrick, 133.

⁶ Richard Horton, "Genetically modified food: Consternation, confusion, and crack-up," *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 172 (4), 2000.

⁷ Too many experts spoil the science, http://www.abc.net.au/science/news/health/HealthRepublish_124166.htm

⁸ Marcia Angell, *Drug Companies & Doctors: A Story of Corruption* <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2009/01/15/drug-companies-doctors-a-story-of-corruption/>

⁹ David Kaplan, How to fix peer review, http://www.newmediaexplorer.org/sepp/2004/01/29/peer_review_politics_of_science.htm

¹⁰ John Ionnidis, Why Most Published Research Findings Are False, *PLoS Medicine*, August 2005

¹¹ Marc Girard, http://www.laleva.org/eng/2006/02/false_medical_research_shows_up_systemic_flaws.html

¹² Pfizer was fined nearly \$ 5 billion for healthcare-related offenses and drug or medical equipment safety violation, <https://usareally.com/8550-pfizer-was-fined-nearly-usd-5-billion-for-healthcare-related-offenses-and-drug-or-medical-equipment-safety-violation>

¹³ <http://www.peere.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Willis.pdf>

¹⁴ Ewen Callaway, Faked peer reviews prompt 64 retractions, <http://www.nature.com/news/publishers-withdraw-more-than-120-gibberish-papers-1.14763>

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Peter Boghossian, Ed.D. (aka Peter Boyle, Ed.D.) and James Lindsay, Ph.D. (aka, Jamie Lindsay, Ph.D.), The Conceptual Penis as a Social Construct: A Sokal-Style Hoax on Gender Studies by http://www.skeptic.com/reading_room/conceptual-penis-social-construct-sokal-style-hoax-on-gender-studies/#.WR_ysma0ssk.facebook

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Richard Van Noorden, Publishers withdraw more than 120 gibberish papers, <https://www.nature.com/news/publishers-withdraw-more-than-120-gibberish-papers-1.14763>

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2013/oct/04/open-access-journals-fake-paper>

²² Hundreds of open access journals accept fake science paper, <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2013/oct/04/open-access-journals-fake-paper>

²³ Novak, op.cit.

²⁴ Richard Smith, Medical Journals Are an Extension of the Marketing Arm of Pharmaceutical Companies, <http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.0020138>

²⁵ Ionnidis, op. cit.