

Message from the Editor-in-Chief concerning *Medical Veritas*[®]: The Journal of Medical Truth

Concerned patients and even some healthcare providers are becoming aware of major deficiencies in medicine and are abandoning ship, disavowing current medical practice and turning increasingly toward alternative care. We, the editorial staff of *Medical Veritas*[®], are dedicated to restoring objectivity and accuracy of reporting in medical science. Our peer-reviewed medical journal will aspire towards discovering and disclosing medical truth or “veritas”—whether about vaccines, medicines, disease mechanisms, or other medical/health concerns. Specifically you will read honest opinions even when such opinions go contrary to vested interests and regimented medical practices.

We are committed to uncovering medical truth by (1) looking beyond the biased, self-serving, selective presentations of data; (2) researching for forgotten or suppressed concepts and data; (3) setting a model for other publications; (4) encouraging others with inside information to come forward; and (5) providing a sounding board for presentations of views that may be in conflict with mainstream medicine or science.

Some physicians and researchers, even prominent ones, will be quick to argue that there is no such thing as medical or indeed scientific truth. We may appear to be somewhat arrogant in our choice of the word “Veritas” in our journal title in that even prominent scientists are wary of assuming they have all the answers. It is virtually universally admitted that what we believe and consequently practice today is less than optimal and will be supplanted in the future by more accurate theories based upon improved understanding of disease mechanisms. Nevertheless, we can resist the current practice of flavoring data to meet financial and political objectives. Medical practice can be improved by full and honest disclosure of available data, research and analyses. We are committed to providing such disclosure and balanced information in *Medical Veritas* (Medical Truth). This journal will assist patients and conscientious healthcare providers in making informed medical decisions based on manuscripts of the highest integrity—presenting research that likely will not always harmonize with the interests of pharmaceutical companies and profit motives of present day health establishments. We will present evidence fundamental to deliberations of a court—reliable, authentic, accurate, and complete. We believe that a better informed public will help to ensure better medical practice.

Adverse reactions to vaccines and other interventions invariably start as a small number of poorly described reports which are anecdotal and easily attributed to chance. As the numbers increase, those in authority in public health discern something might be wrong and closer scrutiny is needed. When the numbers reach the hundreds, decision makers have to persuade themselves that every adverse reaction is a false alarm—not a single one is a true association. When that happens, the numbers support a causal relationship except for the skeptics and those with conflicts of interest—who accept nothing but “scientific proof.”

Public health officials and their respective medical establishments in the U.S. and U.K. often ignore important evidence, especially with regard to vaccines, stating “the weight

of currently available scientific evidence does not support the hypothesis...” U.S. professor Donald W. Miller, Jr., MD and British lawyer Clifford G. Miller, Esq, explain, “Editors can subvert peer review by selecting only reviewers who will reject papers that run counter to—or praise papers that support—the interests of journal’s advertisers or its owners. Lines of independent research contradicting conventional wisdom can systematically remain unpublished.” They continue, “Such hard-to-publish research may prove that what the scientific community generally accepts as correct is, in fact, wrong. Research follows the funding, resulting in a wealth of publications favoring the funding interests. This can have a disproportionate effect on the ‘weight’ of evidence, especially for epidemiologic evidence in court.” [On Evidence, Medical and Legal, Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, Fall 2005;10(3):70–75].

Medical Veritas includes a special feature entitled *Forum* that provides real life accounts on a specific topic based on the personal perspective of parents and caretakers. These reports combined with the more technical data, analyses, and results contained in other manuscripts throughout the journal will ultimately help all readers to see some underlying problems with the current medical system and encourage physicians and scientists to consider medical evidence instead of medical theories.

Some researchers and scientists carrying on clinical and epidemiological investigations and other research have found that virtually all favorable data and analyses generated are readily published in peer-reviewed medical journals; while negative or deleterious findings appear to be suppressed. Some researchers have found themselves resigning on ethical grounds in an attempt to distance themselves from research fraud. Others have attempted to independently publish their data and analyses—only to receive directives from legal entities to “cease and desist publication in a medical journal.” We do not believe this to be an isolated occurrence and recognize other journals’ tendencies toward positive bias. When individuals are subjected to censorship, experience intimidation, are not permitted to conduct research objectively, or when research data concerning a vaccine used in human populations is being suppressed or misrepresented, this is very disturbing and goes against all scientific norms—compromising professional ethics.

When full disclosure of both positive and deleterious effects of an intervention is lacking, this undermines stated aims of medical programs which can ultimately lead to recommendations for treatments that are ineffective and cause harm or death. Full disclosure is the characteristic aim of *Medical Veritas* and we believe that this less biased approach distinguishes it from other medical journals that may be prone to reporting only positive results.

Sincerely,



Gary S. Goldman, Ph.D., Editor-in-Chief
President/Founder, Medical Veritas International Inc.