

History of the site.

CV.

The originator of this site started in practice in 1973 as an associated general practitioner in the naval base Den Helder. This place has a pumping station, known as "de Helsdeur" (Door Of Hell).

From the beginning he was confronted with not very regular treating techniques such as "manual therapy" and later "neural therapy".

Appreciated by the patients but not that much appreciated by the colleagues. It was not sufficiently scientific. Young and naive he started a quest (between 1980 and 1990) for the backgrounds of the diagnosed effects, the base of every scientific investigation.

Naive because he expected science and doctors would be waiting for an answer.

Nothing appeared to be less true.

PUBLISHING.

Rowing against the stream the investigations in Den Helder nevertheless produced results which are today still valid and have practical consequences, but could not be published.

Various universities have been approached for cooperation. The general opinion was: "We think that a general practitioner has no surplus value to offer in this field."

Approached magazines did not react on the material sent to them. One or two wrote back: "The subject is not in the interest sphere of our readers. "It was indeed a new field, a rediscovery of 100-years-old investigation material with an investigation technique which has not been applied before for this goal. There was hardly any expertise. In 1990 the attempts were stopped. Until 2010.

In a university pain policlinic the almost forgotten method was applied again on pain investigation: Acute CRPS.

PROMOTION STAGE.

A promotion stage with publication of the investigation results obtained appeared to be possible. Until in 2011 scientific fraud was made known. The Law Medical Scientific Investigation on People from 1998 was hanging like a sword of Damocles above the 30-years-old investigation. A promotion stage was no longer ventured. Editors conformed to this law as well.

ABUSES.

At the same time also abuses became visible in scientific publication field. Scientists and magazines don't count any longer when they are not being quoted sufficiently. And scientists would not be scientists if they would not think of a solution for this. To them the solution was: publishing under as many names as possible. The most famous first. And when the last are quoted more, the order moves up. Publications are cut into pieces and published separately which pushes the citation index. It also leads to more publications and thus to more scientific magazines. Those magazines can stimulate aspirant writers to frequently quote other articles appeared in the magazine in which they want to publish themselves, This advances the citation index of the magazines and strengthens their scientific standing which results in high prices for seeing and downloading articles published in this magazines.

For instance, Elsevier has rates of 40-60 euro's for articles of 30 years old size eight pages. Which investigator can pay these rates?

Recently a group of 2500 scientists decided no longer to cooperate to these practices. You can only do so for that matter if your own scientific caliber is no longer an issue of discussion.

An outside scientist has little chance in this in-crowd which is no news.

INTERNET.

Remains publishing at your own authority and responsibility.

In the eighties hardly an option. Today in the turn of a hand.

The title of the site shows ambition. It is an attempt to break through the established order of investigation and publishing. This also has disadvantages. Screening professionals who experience scientific publications before they are offered to the professional group is no longer possible. Ripe and green is mixed. May the reader have the critical ability to select.

On the other hand a preselection also has its disadvantages. An American investigation from the past century showed that well qualified articles by famous investigators were rejected for publication when offered under an unknown name. The other way round, for this goal fabricated worthless articles were accepted when offered under a well-known name.

This is not different today. Scientific theft and plagiarism occurs today as well and not rarely. The author of this article experienced this himself. A well-known scientist signed for this. Well-known scientists own and owned up publicly. Without intention psychologist Stapel recently produced indisputable evidence of this. Fabricated and thus worthless articles were judged to be of high level. Scientific prejudice does exist and has no small influence in publications.

Scientists who enter this website are anyway sure of placement. The reader will decide whether it is of value to him/her.

For myself this way of publishing means that I did my job. The job to show others what the investigations to which so many people have cooperated have produced, hoping to gain by them myself. We hope these investigations will be followed.

It was worthwhile and for the patients they can contribute to a practical solution of their problems.

I hope this will become a success and if not it was a useful experiment.

P.H.E. van der Veen. 10-02-2012