
The Antiphysical Review

Founded and Edited by M. Apostol

139 (2007)

ISSN 1453-4436

Science along the time

M. Apostol

Department of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Atomic Physics,
Magurele-Bucharest MG-6, POBox Mg-35, Romania
email: apoma@theory.nipne.ro

In 1936 a paper by Einstein (and a coworker) on gravitational waves has been rejected from publication by the Phys Rev. It is true that the paper considered some non-physical boundary conditions, but, nevertheless, it was Einstein.¹ In particular, those conditions related to the Mach principle.

Around 1989, a paper by Schwinger was rejected from publication by the Phys Rev. It is true that the paper was about the cold fusion, but true is also that it was Schwinger. In response, Schwinger withdrew his membership from the American Physical Society.

Feynman's papers on diagrams have been postponed from publication in Phys. Rev. about two years, until, probably, Dyson's clarification occurred. Feynman reacted probably later, by withdrawing his membership from the National Academy of Sciences.

In 1918, Sommerfeld was called (probably by the German Emperor) to establish a new journal of physics, the famous *Zeitschrift für Physik* (beside the more classical *Annalen der Physik*). What is worth noting is that the *Z. Phys.* had no reviewers, speaking not anymore of "anonymous reviewers". It is widely and strongly, but tacitly, believed that this liberty of publication, under the sole authority of Sommerfeld, contributed essentially to the birth of quantum mechanics, quantum fields, solid-state physics, nuclear physics, etc.

In 1934, Fermi, already in USA, decided to submit his famous paper on the beta decay to the *Nature*. The *Nature* rejected it. Fermi has published it still in *Z. Phys.*

All such rejections are usually justified (by the editors!) as due to a "rigorous scrutiny of the scientific content", and so like. Everybody, however, knows that a very rigorous (and vigorous) scrutiny of the scientific content was practised fully, and exquisitely, by the Soviet School of Physics, with Landau and others alike. And the Soviet Physics authors were generously published by the Soviet Physics journals, so much that the Western World do not end to translate and study them even now.

Who is right? Einstein, Schwinger, Feynman, Fermi, Landau? Or the anonymous reviewers and the editors without any notable contribution to any field of Physics?

I have seen the CV of a young guy who recorded his reviewership to 18 physics journals. His publication list counted 17 papers. Would this one be a right reviewer? Absolutely no! I know of people, young or mature, who are authors of long review papers without having any personal contribution in the field. Is that true reviews? No, absolutely. They are fake papers.

¹In response, Einstein declined any further contribution to the Phys Rev, which he did; he was a very prolific author while in Germany. It is worth noting his response (approximate quotation): "I do not understand that an original paper be shown to an anonymous expert before the publication".

The success in research today is established by an organization called ISI-Thompson. By what legitimacy? None. It is a commercial organization, which makes a profit from the association of the so-called scientists and the trade of citations between such groups. I have seen a physics report of 25 pages of text and equations and 13 pages of references (*i.e.* one third, or one half). Research is not done today by free individuals in scientific cooperation, no, it is made by groups of individuals without no identity. They capitalize on consensus, democracy (in science?), and on some influential papers made by well-determined individuals in the past. These guys are dead and cannot argue against the manipulation of their names and legacy. I have seen papers, published in scientific journals, signed "Some Acronym Collaboration (SAC)". I witnessed the outrage of an individual who claimed, with some official papers, that he is a member of such a Collaboration and the Director of his Research Institute failed to count him as a co-author of that paper.

In the past, we had a joke: we used to say that the authors of some great papers in physics coming from Russians were in fact a bunch of communists researchers, oppressed by the communist dictatorship and not allowed to give their real names, so we called them variously, for instance, "The Red Dubnians" (because Dubna was then a great research center in physics). What is the difference today in our Western World? Bunches of anonymous individuals, called themselves peers, whose even existence may be doubted, are scientific authors, reviewers and editors. Who are these people? Nobody knows. Are not they members of subversive organizations, sometimes without even knowing it? Promoted by ISI-Thomson, scientific journals with their anonymous reviewers and illiterate editors? Surely, they are.