

[return to updates](#)

This Year's Nobel Prize Winner



Announces Boycott of Top Science Journals

by Miles Mathis

First published December 10, 2013

It is not often that mainstream scientists feel free to agree with me, but today [in a major press release Randy Schekman confirmed](#) one of my main talking points over the last decade. I have said in dozens of papers that mainstream science journals are undermining science, and on this question at least, I am now joined by the 2013 Nobel Prize winner in Physiology/Medicine. Schekman put it this way,

Leading academic journals are distorting the scientific process and represent a tyranny that must be broken. Pressure to publish in "luxury" journals is encouraging researchers to cut corners and pursue trendy fields of science instead of doing more important work. The problem is exacerbated by editors who are not active scientists but [journalism] professionals who favour studies that are likely to make a splash.

Whenever I have said that, my opponents have accused me of sour grapes. They have claimed that there is no evidence this is happening, and that anyone who complains must be a marginalized character, crying about his marginalization. Well, we now have mainstream confirmation that isn't true. Schekman's going public has emboldened several other mainstream scientists to admit he is right, so the cat is now fully out of the bag. The Wiki police and all the other gatekeepers who have been denying this was happening now have to deal with a current Nobellist, one who just accepted his award today. I wonder how they plan to slander him? Will they ask for his credentials? Will they say he isn't humble enough? Will they dismiss him as a marginalized character or a crank or a crackpot or a tinfoil hat wearer? I wouldn't put it past them, actually, since they have done it before. They have dismissed Nobellists many times when those scientists went against mainstream dogma. See Hannes Alfvén for just one example of many. [See Ivar Giaever](#)—the 1973 Nobellist in physics—for a more recent

example.

In fact, the mainstream is already subtly undercutting Schekman by choosing to publish the most unflattering picture they can find. This is one of their go-to tricks in the beginning.



Wikipedia and many of the media outlets have chosen to lead with the first picture instead of the second, although the second is the one chosen by Schekman himself for his article yesterday at the London *Guardian*. I predict the tricks will accelerate after today.

The journals Schekman is boycotting are already in complete denial mode, implying Schekman is just making it up. All three—*Nature*, *Cell*, and *Science*—have released canned responses, and the newspapers reporting Schekman's boycott included all three responses. This is curious in itself. When the mainstream reports on its own manufactured stories, it never includes responses from the other side. But when anything happens that contradicts the mainstream, the mainstream publishes the mainstream response—often giving it more time than the original press release. Apparently the “equal time” idea only applies in one direction. The mainstream gets equal time, but its competitors or critics don't.

We will wait to see what happens in the upcoming weeks, but you should find it astonishing that the mainstream journals being boycotted didn't even feel pressured to say they would look into it. All three just issued a public relations response with no content, one that didn't even bother to address the reasons for the boycott. They didn't say they would investigate it or that they were concerned or that they took it very seriously. Why? Because they don't. They know they have all the power, so they don't have to care what working scientists think.

The analogy is the artist-gallery relationship, which [I have also written about extensively](#). The galleries have all the power, so they are free to define art any way they like—even though they are not artists and have no real artistic sensibilities. The field of art hasn't been controlled by artists for more than a century. Well, we see the same complaint from scientists. They are the producers, and like all other producers in all other fields, they are being raped. They are being raped not just financially but creatively. Their own field has been stolen from them and redefined to suit the needs of salesmen and financiers. If time travel and black holes and virtual particles and backward causality sell, that is what the salesmen will print. And if real scientists complain, they will be ignored and then blacklisted. That is the whole history of the 20th and 21st centuries in “science.” Schekman just dug his grave,

because unless his boycott leads to much larger revolutions, he can't win. His field, like all science, is controlled from the top down, and he just pissed off some powerful people. Although his colleagues are probably applauding him, the university deans and presidents are not. The top dogs in physics, chemistry, medicine and other fields are not. The journals are not. The big companies are not. The tax-and-spend governments are not. And the Nobel Committee is not. If it could take back the prize, no doubt it would. I hope Schekman has already cashed the check.

You see, that is the only reason Schekman felt free to do this. He has his prize and a million in the bank, so he doesn't have to care anymore. He is of retirement age, so he doesn't have to care anymore. He is saying, "Bury me if you will. I don't have to care anymore. Fire me and blacklist me. I don't have to care anymore. I am a Nobellist and a millionaire and nearly 65, so I can say what I want. I have my own journal, and you can't stop me."

Although I am glad to see Schekman speaking out, I find it sad that his bravery depended on his winning the Nobel Prize. Why couldn't he have said this last year, or ten years ago? Can poor people without major prizes not be brave? Can they not be correct? Not in the mainstream, it would appear.

The other problem with [Schekman's public statement](#) is that it isn't nearly strong enough. Compared to the deafening silence from most of his scientific colleagues, it seems pretty brash, but it isn't. Even his boycott is couched in conciliatory tones and apparent even-handedness, which is too bad since the only hope of victory lies in stating things like they are, with no hedging. Part of the problem is that Schekman is starting his little revolution from biology or biochemistry, but physics is the greatest fraud and the revolution needs to come from there. All the major science journals (including the ones he is boycotting save *Cell*) are dominated by physics propaganda. By far the worst articles that *Nature* and *Science* publish are physics articles, and we should extend that to include *Scientific American* and most of the other top magazines. Unlike the problems Schekman is exposing in his own subfield of cell biology, physics is not just bedevilled by short-term political problems. Physics imploded decades ago and is now a completely fake field, based on nothing but smoke and mirrors. Since physics is still sold as the queen of the sciences, her extended and fatal illness could not help but infect the related sciences "beneath" her, especially chemistry—and through chemistry biochemistry, medicine, and many other sibling subfields. Baldly stated, theoretical physics has been subsisting since the 1920's on little more than bluster and fudge. It has steadily devolved since then into a huge stinking pile of faked equations, finessed experiments, bold lies, and increasingly ridiculous proposals. No real scientist could look for five minutes upon what physics has become without feeling sick.

That is the language that is called for, unfortunately, not any "even-handed" political waffling like we see from so-called science critics. The mainstream hasn't been polite, so why should I be polite? The mainstream has been running impolite and frankly slanderous propaganda against science for almost a century, so why should Schekman or any other real scientists be polite? For anything to change, mainstream scientists—including all the poor ones without major awards—are going to have to boycott the entire system, from the magazines to the universities to the governments. I don't see that happening, but it the only hope for cleaning up physics and the rest. Once physics is cleaned up, it will stop throwing its garbage down on the heads of the other sciences "beneath" it.

I know that working scientists—even the ones who agree with me in principle—won't see that as a viable solution. How does anyone boycott an entire system and still make a living? Well, there is never only one way to make a living, either in science or any other field. Young people just entering the sciences—and especially physics—can refuse to take jobs in corrupt fields, for corrupt companies, or for anyone doing corrupt work. While still in school, they can fight back against corrupt professors,

joining together whenever possible. If the universities still won't teach real physics, I suggest students go elsewhere, starting their own science cooperatives where they can investigate things honestly. Many of those in graduate science programs have parents paying large yearly fees to the universities, who are supposed to be teaching them science. If the universities are not doing so, the students should ask their parents to invest in other projects, such as research cooperatives or makeshift classrooms. You can buy pretty nice "makeshift" classrooms and labs and teachers for the amount universities are charging for a fake education. Most people are under the impression they have to buy what is being sold, either by universities or galleries or other institutions, but they don't. If they have money, they can take it elsewhere and build their own classrooms. Science is not about diplomas, it is about doing real science.

I will be told that no one will hire such students, but are you quite certain of that? If these new physics students can solve real problems better than the old physics students, they should be more useful to any sort of real business, right? Well, just about anyone should be better able to solve real problems than old physics students—who have proven they can do nothing but fudge equations and write failed computer models.

The other thing to consider is that short-term strikes often work as well as long-term boycotts. They know this in Europe, where strikes are still effective, but we tend to forget it here in the US. Classroom strikes and walk-outs should get the attention of teachers and administrators both. University professors and administrators act like you have to accept what you are told, but you don't. You are the one paying tuition, and as the buyer you have the ultimate power. If they tell you to shut up and calculate, join together with your classmates and tell them to shut up and answer questions. They can't expel all of you, since then they would have to refund all that tuition. Again, join together first, before you make demands. Just make sensible demands, such as the demand that their theories and equations make basic sense. If the professors they have hired can't meet that demand, tell them to hire some professors who can.

That may work in some lower level courses, but of course in the upper levels it won't, since the universities don't know where to look for professors who can do real math and talk sensibly about physics. The mainstream doesn't supply any PhD's like that, since that isn't what new physics is about. For this reason, the graduate programs in many subfields have to be allowed to die. Students should just refuse to sign up for them.

Young people can take such actions, but what of older people, scientists already entrenched in the system. What can they do? Again, they should talk first and join with their colleagues, acting in concert. They should resist in any way they can, if possible by pushing back against their superiors. If that is not possible, they should move on to whistleblowing, quitting, filing lawsuits, and publishing the truth. Speak out and act in any way you can, and quit supporting the corrupt status quo. It is no excuse to say you have no choice. You always have a choice, no matter how old you are. You are as free today as the day you were born, if only you remember it.

Which brings me to the final point of this paper, a point that has to be addressed no matter how difficult it is for you to look at it. I have shown you why Schekman's reaction is weak and is likely to be buried; but if it is not to be buried, we have to look at the magnitude of the problem, which he wholly fails to address. We see this problem when we talk of boycotts. Why not call for a readers' boycott of all these science magazines? You may think—like I used to think—that this wouldn't work because the readers have already shown they prefer science fiction to science. They won't respond to a boycott because they aren't real scientists. They like what they like and that is all there is to it. But I finally discovered

that isn't the real problem.

The problem is that readers *did* boycott all mainstream newspapers and magazines long ago. That fact is just hidden from you. The nasty secret that few are aware of is that the big-name mainstream publications of all sorts no longer rely on advertising dollars or even subscriptions. If they did, they would have folded long ago. Many of them *did* fold, but the ones that remain were taken over and subsidized. I figured this out first concerning big-city newspapers like the *Los Angeles Times*. I noticed that these papers no longer write their editorials or headlines with any concern for their readers. For instance, national polls show that around 90% support labeling of genetically modified foods. This has been true for years and it is still true. Despite that, the major newspapers have consistently come out against labeling. That is just one example, but it applies across the board. Newspapers feel free to offend a large majority of their alleged readers on a wide array of topics. You should find that suspicious. Back when periodicals were self-sustaining, you wouldn't expect readers to subscribe to journals that disagreed with them on everything. If you are black you don't subscribe to KKK publications, and if you are a Democrat you don't subscribe to Republican publications, and so on. You tend to read periodicals that support your point of view, at least generally. If a newspaper recommends you vote for things that offend you over and over, it is doubtful you will continue to read that newspaper, correct? Therefore, we would expect newspapers to fear going against their readers on issues where the polls are so clear. If 90% of your readers love spaghetti, you don't write articles every week bashing spaghetti. If 90% of your readers hate discrimination, you don't publish articles every week promoting discrimination. And yet we see mainstream publications doing exactly that on a wide array of topics. You should ask how they are able to do that, financially.

The answer is that they are subsidized by the government. They are given money through many dirty backchannels, under tables, and via front companies. You may think they are just owned by billionaires who don't have to make a profit, but although that is sometimes true, it isn't the whole story. These billionaires have direct ties to government. How do you think they became billionaires? This is a plutocracy and always has been, so the billionaires *are* the government. They work hand-in-hand. In this case, the billionaires usually print what they are asked to print, and are paid for it one way or the other. The billionaires certainly aren't losing money on the deal, you can be sure of that. It all comes from the treasury, one way or the other, so taxpayers are footing all the bills in the end—even the bills for their own propagandizing.

Well, it isn't just city newspapers like the *LATimes* that exist on this plan. Almost everything exists on that plan, including *Nature*, *Science*, and *Scientific American*. They move very few issues of those magazines, and I assume the CIA buys most of them and pulps them, giving them to the Army Corps of Engineers to use as landfill in the New Orleans' levees or something. The articles in these magazines are unreadable for anyone with any intelligence, and I don't think stupid people are subscribing to science magazines. So the journals must be glossier vanity publications for the top academic frauds, underwritten by government agencies. I have never seen a real person reading one or buying one from a newsstand, so there must be a universal buyback policy. Basically, the newsstand or magazine stand at the grocery store is nothing more than a propaganda stand, existing to make you *think* other people are reading this stuff. But no one is.

You may be balking at this kind of talk, seeing it as “conspiracy theory.” But it isn't conspiracy theory, it is the way things are, and there is a lot of evidence for that if you are interested in looking at it. [Over on my art site](#), I have just published a series of papers reminding my readers that the CIA has long since admitted it has been controlling all forms of media since the late 1940's. Documents have been declassified and agents have gone on record, in Congress and in major magazines, confirming it. These

things are happening and they don't really care that you know. The information is up at places like Wikipedia, so it isn't hard to find. Just take my links. In those papers, I concentrate more on the control of the art market since 1950, but it turns out that the same thing is happening in science and every other field. If Intelligence can take over the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and TIME and Newsweek, controlling *Scientific American* or *Nature* is small potatoes.

The same applies to the published subscriber numbers, which I no longer believe. If they can manipulate Wall Street and voting machines and interbank loan rates (search on LIBOR scandal) and municipal bond rates and pension guarantees and major news stories, they can certainly manipulate subscription numbers. I don't believe *anything* I read from the mainstream anymore, and neither should you. Apparently you don't, since you aren't really subscribing to any of these publications.

That being the case, we see that what passes for science is just one more closed circle. If these magazines aren't really “luxury” publications because they have large readerships, why are they considered “luxury”? Because they are subsidized with the most foundation and government money. They are top magazines because they most perfectly write what they are told to write. They are the most perfectly controlled. Schekman's critique of the publishing process makes you think that some “journalistic” standards are being applied, rather than the scientific standards he would prefer. But it is far far worse than that. *No* journalistic standards are being applied, since the articles published aren't being published for either scientific or journalistic reasons. These editors aren't selecting articles that will sell magazines or sell advertising anymore than the editors at the *LATimes* are choosing articles for those reasons. The articles are being chosen to sell government and military and industrial and Intelligence products, via the standard propaganda channels. That is why they don't appear to care a flip for real science: they don't. Just as those in the art market don't care a flip about art, those in the science market don't care a flip about science. Both science and art have been destroyed—with full intent—simply to make an easier buck. Billionaires have found new art and new science easier to control and profit from than old art and science, and that is the whole reason you see what you see. Treasuries could be siphoned in x amount to support the old science, but the sexy new science allows siphoning of $100x$, so of course that is what we will see.

Or that is the thinking. What the billionaires haven't really considered is that the $100x$ mark-up hasn't occurred because people or legislatures or parliaments are more impressed by new science. The mark-up has occurred because legislatures are now controlled $100x$ more efficiently than they were controlled in the past. The billionaires aren't taking into account the rise of their own CIA, under whose threat Congress would now fund a rubber ladder to the Moon. Which means the billionaires could profit from public funding of real science just as easily as they now profit from fake science. In fact, if the billionaires were thinking, they would realize they could profit even *more* from real science, since real science would generate real projects, not just make-believe steal-from-the-treasury projects. With real science, the billionaires could tap the treasury while *at the same time* tapping the financial outcomes of the real science. Real science used to produce real things, like cars and airplanes and other things the billionaires could sell to everyone. When is the last time anyone invented a car or a plane or anything useful? The scientists have been too busy jacking off with fake neutrinos in SNOLAB or fake bosons in the LHC to invent anything useful.

The same applies to art. If the contemporary art market—which contains no real art—can be inflated into a multi-billion dollar business, just think what could be done with some real works of art. Shouldn't it be easier in the long-run to inflate and maintain a market based on real and superior things than a market based on fake and inferior things? If some colored circles by Damien Hirst can be inflated to six figures, my triptych should be capable of being inflated to eight or nine.



[click to go to details](#)

That triptych is fifteen feet tall, by the way. If you put Damien Hirst in that picture, he would look very small—in every way.

But back to Schekman. I went back to my research a day later, to finish off this paper, and I discovered some more things that may help us understand what is going here. You may have thought I was already down the rabbit hole, but the elevator just keeps descending. Upon re-reading what I have already written, I thought that Schekman might be in danger of losing his funding from this brouhaha. So I researched his backers at *eLife*, the open-access magazine he edits and touts in his *Guardian* article. I was surprised to find two of the largest charitable foundations in the world behind him—which goes a long way in explaining his confidence. He is supported by both the Wellcome Trust and the Howard Hughes Trust, which rank 3 and 4 in the world, having a combined endowment of over 40 billion dollars. This fact puts this boycott in a whole other light, and takes our elevator down to another sublevel. It appears that my first assumption was naïve. I had assumed Schekman was using his new fame to tell a truth, but this whole thing is beginning to look like cover for an intended buy-out or

takeover. Since both *Nature* and *Scientific American* are owned by Georg von Holtzbrinck Group in Germany, it looks like some bigger billionaire senses an opportunity to takeover the von Holtzbrinck publishing empire. This reading of the story is supported by the fact that Stefan von Holtzbrinck, chairman of his family's Publishing Group, is also chairman of the board of trustees of the Max Planck Foundation. Why is that important? Because the Max Planck Foundation is the third backer of Randy Schekman and his *eLife* magazine. So what we are seeing is two of *eLife*'s backers attacking the third. That can't be a coincidence. I predict that either the Max Planck Foundation will drop its support for *eLife*, or von Holtzbrinck will quit as chairman of the board. We will then see the von Holtzbrinck Publishing Group bought out by . . . whom? Well, the current chairman of the Wellcome Trust is William Castell, who is also a director of . . . General Electric. So if you thought something positive was going on here, you are probably wrong. I would say it is very unlikely that a director of GE is going to steer the Wellcome Trust in a direction any ethical person would approve of. So the odds Schekman is a good guy here also just fell dramatically.

What we have seen in the past decade—and especially since 2008—is worldwide media concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. We have seen an unusually high number of acquisitions and mergers. We have also seen old privately owned empires bought out in hostile takeovers by groups with strong ties to governments. Comcast would be the perfect example, since if [MOMA is the CIA's museum](#), Comcast is the CIA's media company. In other words, the billionaires are now swallowing one another, and the billionaires with the strongest ties to government are the only ones not getting eaten. My guess is von Holtzbrinck was seen by someone as being too independent, and therefore prime fishfood.

I can't say without doing more research who is behind this attack on *Science* and *Nature*, but finding out who was behind Schekman cured me of any optimism. I won't be sorry to see these magazines go, but it now looks like if they go they will just be swallowed by bigger, meaner fish, and I don't see that benefitting science, medicine, or anything else. If the third and fourth largest charitable trusts in the world were doing good, the world wouldn't be what it is, would it? For instance, Wellcome Trust came from Wellcome Pharmaceuticals, which sold out in 1995 to GlaxoSmithKline. GSK, like Pfizer and Monsanto, is one of the most evil companies in the world, responsible for overdrugging and poisoning the world for profit. This is not my opinion or another conspiracy theory, since GSK just paid over 3 billion in fines, pleading guilty to criminal charges in the US for [a host of offenses](#), including hiding and faking data, bribing doctors, and illegal promotion. That is the largest fine ever paid by a drug company and the largest fraud case in healthcare in the history of the United States. You may think Wellcome cut its ties to GSK decades ago, and is now just doing the Lord's work, but if you think that you aren't paying attention. With a GE director as head of Wellcome Trust, you should not expect this fund derived from pharmaceuticals sales to have changed its course.

Unfortunately, I have to admit this new reading of the facts throws a wrench into my original thesis, since if Schekman is just the frontman and pawn in some media takeover, I can't take his agreeing with me as a mark of distinction. Unlike me, it appears he is not attacking the system: he is only attacking his competitors in order to replace them with his own backers. So even if he is telling a small truth about these three journals, no good will come of it. As I have shown before, these people are always right about the opposition, but always wrong about themselves. Or, they often use the truth to destroy their competitors, but then hide behind the same old lies with regard to themselves.

Schekman is certainly right in telling the world that science is being tyrannized, but it isn't *Nature* and *Science* that are the major tyrants. They are just the two of the publishing arms of a much larger tyrant, and even larger tyrants appear to be lurking. If you think all these mergers and acquisitions are likely to lead to more scientific freedom or better science, I think you are in for more disappointments. More

mergers will just lead to more information monopolies and less intellectual diversity. In both art and science, we appear to be moving to what in farming they call a monoculture. Give it a few more decades, and one company will own all the intellectual property in the world, including all past and current art, science, film, music, sports, and other media. That is your New World Order, and once it finalizes there will be no escape. A paper like this will no longer be possible, since all sources of alternative information will have been wiped. I am just one of the last lizards before the freeze.

Since I don't like to end on a down-note, I will point out that this can be stopped. If people don't want to live in that world, they don't have to. If you don't want to live in Mordor, don't help to build it.