Realigning Science

Jack Cook, Matt Beckstrand

December 2025

Abstract

Science suffers from a crisis of prestige. This is evident in funding mechanisms, citations, and institutional incentives that reward visibility over truth. To counteract this, we propose a new market for scientific ideas. By attaching scientific papers to cryptocurrency tokens, we allow decentralized price discovery on the perceived value, credibility, and future importance of a scientific claim. This proposal has the potential to realign scientists to work on the most daring problems the world has to offer, ushering in a new enlightenment.

1 Introduction

For most of its history, science operated as a "Republic of Science," a term popularized by Michael Polanyi to describe a community of independent researchers coordinating together to work on new projects. From the curiosity of the Royal Society to the foundational breakthroughs of the early 20th century, the incentive structure was relatively simple: discovery was its own reward. The pursuit of "Natural Philosophy" was largely a solitary endeavor, insulated from the hyper-efficiency demands of the market. While this model had its flaws, primarily exclusivity and resource scarcity, it allowed for high-variance exploration. A scientist could dedicate a decade to a risky hypothesis without the immediate pressure of quarterly metric performance.

However, the post-war industrialization of research introduced a fundamental shift. As science scaled into "Big Science," it required massive public funding, and with that funding came the bureaucratic need to measure, rank, and allocate resources efficiently. Slowly, the focus shifted from the quality of the discovery to the quantity of the output. The introduction of the Science Citation Index (SCI) in the 1960s, originally intended as a tool for librarians, was co-opted by administrators as a proxy for scientific quality.

1.1 The Metric Fixation

Today, the academic landscape is defined by this metric fixation, leading to a classic manifestation of *Goodhart's Law*: "When a measure becomes a target,

it ceases to be a good measure." The currency of modern science is no longer truth, but prestige—measured in citations, h-indices, and impact factors.

This misalignment of incentives has trapped researchers in a "Publish or Perish" dynamic. Because career survival depends on maximizing these proxies, rational actors are incentivized to game the system rather than advance knowledge. This manifests in several damaging behaviors:

- **Salami Slicing:** Researchers partition cohesive findings into multiple "least publishable units" to maximize publication counts, diluting the density of insight.
- **Novelty Bias:** High-impact journals prioritize sensational, positive results over robust, negative findings. This leads to null results being suppressed, creating a distorted view of reality.
- **Risk Aversion:** Granting bodies, fearful of waste, fund "safe" science rather than the daring, foundational work that drives paradigm shifts.

1.2 The Gatekeepers of Knowledge

Compounding the internal crisis of incentives is the external crisis of access. Scientific publishing is currently dominated by a rent-seeking oligopoly that exerts monopolistic control over the dissemination of knowledge. This system operates on a parasitic business model: the public funds the research, scientists perform the labor (writing and peer-reviewing) for free, and publishers then sell the finished product back to universities and the public at exorbitant rates.

This commodification of access has two profound consequences:

1. **Institutional Gatekeeping:** A small group of editors and anonymous reviewers determine which ideas are "worthy" of visibility. This centralizes authority and stifles heterodox or non-institutional research that does not fit the current academic fashion.
2. **Public Scientific Illiteracy:** By locking primary sources behind paywalls, the scientific establishment effectively alienates the general public. Laypeople are forced to rely on sensationalized press releases or diluted journalism rather than raw data. This opacity fuels a growing distrust in expertise and widens the gulf between the "Ivory Tower" and the society it is meant to serve.

1.3 The Stagnation of Progress

The aggregate result of these perverse incentives and restrictive gatekeeping is a paradox: while the volume of scientific production has exploded, the rate of disruptive breakthroughs is declining. Recent meta-scientific analyses suggest that papers are becoming less likely to disrupt existing canons and more likely to merely cement them. We are witnessing a crisis of stagnation, where the vast

bureaucratic overhead of modern academia stifles the very innovation it aims to produce.

To reverse this stagnation, we cannot rely on policy tweaks or ethical guidelines alone. We require a structural mechanism that decouples scientific survival from institutional prestige and realigns the researcher's long-term reputation with the veracity of their claims. We propose that a decentralized market for scientific ideas—where the value of a claim is discovered through price rather than committee—offers a pathway out of this crisis.

2 Proposed Solution

Prediction markets have long been recognized as powerful tools for aggregating dispersed information. Although the general public began paying attention after the 2024 United States Presidential election, where platforms like Kalshi and Polymarket consistently outperformed major polling models, the underlying theory was established much earlier. Academic research from the Iowa Electronic Markets, combined with Robin Hanson's work on automated market makers, repeatedly showed that markets can outperform experts whenever participants are properly incentivized to reveal what they truly believe.

Traditional prediction markets are highly effective at pricing information, but they share one central limitation. They only function when an event has a clear and verifiable outcome. Elections reach a conclusion. Sporting events conclude. Macroeconomic indicators are released on a fixed schedule. Most scientific ideas do not behave this way. Scientific claims develop slowly and often remain partially unresolved for long periods of time. The truth becomes clearer through replications, theoretical refinements, follow-on discoveries, and technological applications. Because prediction markets depend on short-term, discrete endpoints, they cannot meaningfully assess the long-term credibility or impact of a scientific idea.

This limitation creates an opportunity for a new type of market. Instead of relying on short-lived contracts, we propose attaching each scientific claim or paper to a cryptocurrency token. Each token represents a durable information object whose value is continuously updated by the market. The price reflects the community's changing assessment of the idea's credibility, originality, and eventual scientific importance. For the first time, it becomes possible to measure belief in an idea's long-term significance, even if the idea does not have a single moment of resolution.

Scientists would be rewarded for producing ideas that maintain scientific integrity and survive long-term scrutiny. If an idea is robust, its associated token appreciates as the community gains confidence. If an idea is weak or reproducibility fails, the token naturally declines. The market becomes a continuous and transparent signal about the quality of scientific reasoning, rather than a reflection of institutional gatekeeping.

Prediction markets have shown that distributed groups can outperform experts at forecasting measurable events. A scientific idea market extends this

principle into the domain of knowledge creation. Such a system places the evaluation of scientific ideas in the hands of a broad and incentivized community. It moves scientific progress away from bureaucratic ranking systems and closer to a self-regulating process grounded in truth, risk-taking, and a shared pursuit of discovery.

3 Changes in Behavior

The introduction of a tokenized market fundamentally alters the behavioral economics of the researcher. By transitioning from a prestige economy to a liquid market economy, we align the selfish incentives of the scientist with the collective goals of science.

When the value of a scientific contribution is tied to a tradable asset rather than a static citation count, three distinct behavioral shifts emerge:

3.1 From "Publish or Perish" to "Verify and Vest"

In the current regime, the cost of publishing a false positive is low. Retractions are rare, and the career benefits of a high-impact publication often outweigh the reputational risk of future correction. Consequently, scientists are incentivized to rush to publication, often employing "p-hacking" or data dredging to achieve statistical significance.

Under a market-based system, the incentives invert. If a researcher holds a stake in their paper's token, they carry a financial exposure to the long-term validity of their claims. A rush to publish weak results becomes a financial liability. Rational actors will therefore engage in *pre-publication self-auditing*. Scientists will become their own harshest critics, running additional controls and larger sample sizes not to satisfy a reviewer, but to protect the future value of their asset. The behavior shifts from maximizing publication volume to maximizing claim durability.

3.2 The Monetization of Skepticism (Replication)

Currently, replication is a public good with a private cost. There is little career incentive for a researcher to spend months verifying another lab's work; journals rarely publish replications, and funding bodies rarely support them. As a result, bad science festers.

In a tokenized market, skepticism becomes profitable. Other researchers act as decentralized auditors. If a scientist suspects a popular paper is flawed, they have a financial incentive to "short" the corresponding token or sell their position before conducting a replication study. This creates a *market for replication*. The moment a claim appears dubious, the market incentivizes independent labs to test it. This ensures that errors are detected and corrected in real-time by profit-seeking auditors, rather than lingering for decades due to academic politeness.

3.3 Incentivizing "Blue Sky" Risk

Grant committees are notoriously risk-averse, preferring incremental studies with guaranteed outcomes. This forces scientists to act as conservative managers rather than explorers.

A market mechanism re-introduces the venture capital dynamic to science. Just as high-risk startups attract investors seeking outsized returns, high-risk scientific theories can attract speculators willing to back "long-shot" tokens. A scientist proposing a radical new theory of physics no longer needs to convince a consensus-seeking panel of senior peers; they only need to convince a minority of the market that their idea has non-zero probability of changing the paradigm. This liberates scientists to pursue high-variance, high-reward inquiries that are currently filtered out by bureaucratic conservatism.

4 Our Vision

We envision a scientific ecosystem that is permissionless, borderless, and strictly meritocratic. By financializing scientific claims, we do not merely seek to improve the efficiency of existing institutions; we aim to unbundle the university itself. The ultimate goal of this proposal is to liberate the scientific process from its bureaucratic constraints, allowing science to finally reach its full, theoretical velocity.

4.1 The Sovereign Scientist

For the last century, legitimate scientific inquiry has been strictly credential-gated. Without a university affiliation, access to funding is nonexistent and access to journals is prohibitively expensive. This has created a caste system where intelligence is abundant, but the opportunity to contribute is artificially scarce.

Our vision is to dismantle these barriers. In a tokenized market, the market does not care about the author's pedigree, their institution's endowment, or their h-index. The market cares only about the veracity and value of the claim. This effectively resurrects the archetype of the "Gentleman Scientist"—figures like Charles Darwin or Benjamin Franklin—who drove progress as independent observers of nature.

By removing the gatekeepers, we empower a new class of "sovereign scientists"—biohackers, data analysts, and citizen researchers—to monetize their insights directly. An anonymous researcher who discovers a novel pattern in public genomic data should be able to stake their reputation and capital on that finding, earning a return proportional to the truth they have uncovered.

4.2 Unlocking the Potential of Science

The current system operates at a fraction of its potential capacity. By restricting scientific participation to a small group of professional academics and subjecting

them to extreme risk aversion, we are effectively leaving the vast majority of human ingenuity on the sidelines.

We propose that a market-based system will trigger a "Cambrian Explosion" of discovery. When the incentives for truth are liquid and accessible:

- **Global Cognitive Arbitrage:** A mathematician in Mumbai or a biologist in Lagos no longer needs to emigrate to a Western university to have their work valued. If their work stands up to market scrutiny, they can access global capital directly, integrating the "cognitive surplus" of the developing world into the scientific engine.
- **Acceleration of Truth:** Markets react faster than committees. Instead of waiting years for a grant to be approved or a paper to pass peer review, funding can flow instantly to promising ideas. This velocity allows for rapid iteration, where failed hypotheses are discarded quickly and successful ones are capitalized immediately.

Ultimately, our vision is to transform science from a centralized hierarchy into a global mesh network. By aligning the profit motive with the pursuit of knowledge, we believe humanity can enter a new era of Enlightenment, solving the most daring problems the world has to offer.