

How we do - more precisely, TRY to do - science nowadays ?

Elemér Elad Rosinger

*GWLBRI - Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Basic Research Institute
Central Europe
Budapest, Munich, Portoroz*

*Department of Mathematics
and Applied Mathematics
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0002 South Africa*

eerosinger@hotmail.com

Abstract

This item is about one of those rather typical interactions with editors and referees of so called top scientific journals, in this case, an American one.

The specific feature is in the fact that the editor happens to be a Nobel Laureate in physics. By the way, he is European, and not American ...

How we do - more precisely, TRY to do - science nowadays ?

Here below is the relevant section of a recent email which is part of an exchange with the editor of a so called top American physics journal. By the way, the editor happens to be a Nobel Laureate physicist, and European.

The story below may be of a more general interest in view of the following :

It took me some decades in science research, mostly mathematics, and also physics, to wake up to, and accept the SORRY fact that, nowadays :

*** Science is NOT done scientifically ... ***

But then, for long long ages, love was far too often not done lovingly either ...
And religion was not done religiously ...

On the other hand, brutality is certainly done brutally ...

Yes, quite amusingly, cheating is done ... honestly ... !!!
Indeed, when someone wants to cheat you, well, that person will most honestly do his or her best to MANAGE to cheat you ...

Funny life, isn't it ?

And now, back to ... science not being done scientifically ...
Not even by Nobel Laureate physicists ...

By the way, the ... scientific dispute ... is about my paper "Five Departures in Logic, Mathematics, and thus - either we like it, or not - in Physics as well ..."

<http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00802273>

<http://vixra.org/abs/1303.0136>

This paper, due to the SEVERE space restrictions imposed by the respective journal, had to be shortened significantly, and then, one of the referees is using that fact AGAINST the publication of the paper ...

As for the editor, well, he seems to agree with the referee ...

Dear Editor

The latest revised comment of the referee is, I am afraid, self-contradictory :

It requires that within the very same SEVERE SPACE RESTRICTIONS, my revised paper should present a summary of the novelties in each of the FIVE fields of Logic and Mathematics I mention. And so sorry, the referee FAILS to explain how that is possible ...

Furthermore, such a ... major revision ... is NOT necessary, even if there would be more space, since those FIVE major openings are clearly mentioned in detail in the references, ALL of which are easily accessible on the web.

As for the objection of citing Exodus 3:14, well, it is - even if nowadays not known, or at best known but derided - one of GLORIES of Western Civilization. And it is so precisely to the extent that - unlike the unfortunate major mistake of ancient Greek civilization - it is not only not afraid of self-reference, but in fact it raises it to the level of the NAME of God ...

Yes indeed, this is most definitely NOT a mere issue of being religious Christian, let alone, of being Jewish : no, it is simply a most fundamental issue : human awareness, as essentially different from the animal one, CAN be self-referential ...

Yes, it can be, even if all too OFTEN fails to be so ...

After all, modern digital computers - in their so called "von Neumann architecture" - are what they are ESSENTIALLY so, due but to a rather primitive form of self-reference, namely, the program being able to act upon itself, depending on the data ...

And an even more primitive form of self-reference is "feed-back" which is the essence of modern automation and control ...

Amusingly, both these forms of rudimentary self-reference emerged in science and technology only during the last about seven or eight

decades, yet they created much of the modern world ...

However, what is missed nowadays quite completely is that von Neumann did use a significantly more involved form of self-reference when he proved, back in the 1950s, the possibility of constructing self-reproducing automata which may be extraordinarily useful in cosmic space exploration ...

As it happens, that application of self-reference has, so far, proved to be ... too advanced ... even for mere mention nowadays ...

So much for the relevance of self-reference ...

But then, who cares to TRY to understand better what may indeed be going on ... ?

After all, is not enough to ... have some buttons, and know how to push them ... ?

Of course, ... our most competent referee ... is fully aware of ALL of the above, and HONESTLY tries to claim its ... detailed ... mentioning in my paper ..., and of course, all of that within the VERY SAME SEVERELY LIMITED space ...

And now some remarks to the essence of the issue of getting my paper published, or not, in your journal :

1) In principle, it is a rather self-destructing and yet growing tendency of scientific publishing that “blind referees” whose GENUINE SPECIFIC credentials are not known sufficiently well, either by the editors, or by the authors of the papers submitted, end up having an OBSTINATE veto right on the publication of the papers, since the editors obviously do not have the time to focus enough on the MERITS of each and every disputed paper, not to mention the impossibility for the editors to be sufficiently familiar with the very large number of specialties of the papers submitted for publication.

Certainly, reviewing is IMPORTANT.

However, to do it the way it is being done is SEVERELY damaging science. It is therefore quite regrettable that, on occasion, better and more honest scientists keep ... happily ... being part of that self-destructive trend ...

2) I am 77 years old, in my 13th year of retirement, and as my CV shows it, in the last years I posted well over one hundred papers in more than thirty different branches of mathematics and physics, and did so on various science websites. Some of those papers were published in usual journals. And in the last two years, I published on top of all that two research monographs in nonlinear mathematics.

This ... “explosion” ... of research publications came PRECISELY from the fact that I did NO LONGER have to bother about the usual ways of editors and referees ...

3) I am LONG past the “publish or perish” story, and therefore, I CAN do research out of sheer amusement, and post it ONLY AND ONLY in order NOT to prevent the chance for becoming it known, and possibly useful for some other researchers. Otherwise, I could not care less whether anyone may ever read it or use it : I DO MY DUTY by GIVING THE CHANCE for the public to see it. The rest is BUT THE DUTY of ALL the others ...

4) My paper under discussion has already been posted on two such websites, plus it was presented in public at an international conference on quanta.

5) It is therefore EXCLUSIVELY YOUR OWN MORAL RESPONSIBILITY to help - or NOT - my respective paper to become yet more widely known ...

6) Please, feel free to do as you wish, and in view of the above, I simply could not care less ...

7) As for the referee, he is but wallowing in his own mix of incompetence, carelessness, inconsistency and ego-trip ...

8) If you want to have some further FUN along the above, you may have a look at the section “Is It A Mere Story ?” on page 5, in my paper “Wealth Creation and Science Research : Science Research, the root of wealth in our Knowledge Society, is endangered”

<http://vixra.org/abs/0912.0042>

But ENOUGH of spending my time on the above hopeless issues ...

And then, please, try, and have a nice day ...

As far as I am concerned, I certainly DO ...