

From: "Jorge E. Hirsch" <jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu>
Subject: The real reason for arXiv's censorship Re: on Dias-Salamat
arXiv:2201.11883
Date: March 21, 2022 at 2:08:00 AM PDT
To: physicscommunity

Dear colleagues,

As physicists, we are interested in facts. I am writing this email to inform you of certain facts, that were kept hidden in the recent email discussion about arxiv censorship. They remained hidden in the [science news article](#) that was recently published on this topic. I think it is important to bring these facts into the open, so that opinions are based on facts. If you are not interested in this I apologize for the intrusion.

In response to my [3/8/22 email](#) protesting the fact that [arXiv:2201.11883v1](#) by Dias and Salamat was [withdrawn by arXiv](#) due to “*inflammatory content and unprofessional language*”, that then evolved into a discussion of the censorship of my submissions, the responses of arxiv’s administrators and arxiv’s Advisory Board members were uniformly *a smokescreen*, exemplified by the following remarks:

"At arXiv we firmly believe that adhering to standards of professional and neutral language in scientific communication is important"
(private email from Ralph Wijers, Chair, arXiv Scientific Advisory Board and Physics Advisory Committee, to me, 3/8/22).

*"No one is being *prevented* from presenting their arguments. The issue is over the *form* of that presentation."*
(Jacques Distler, arXiv Physics Advisory Committee)

"Detecting inflammatory language before posting is a hard problem and presents a moving target"
(Steinn Sigurdsson, arXiv Scientific Director)

"regarding inappropriate and unprofessional language I think that personal responsibility can go a long way"

(Eitan Bachmat, arXiv Scientific Advisory Board.)

*"Do you think it is appropriate to have on arXiv a paper with a *title* containing "anatomy of a probable scientific fraud"? ...If you think such a title is not inflammatory, what would be? Or should arXiv not forbid inflammatory comments at all...?"*

"ArXiv has had a long-standing policy of not allowing personal invective...Is arXiv "censoring" people by not allowing them in postings?"

(Paul Fendley, arXiv Physics Advisory Committee.)

"respectful language must be used in all interactions, from that used in the submission content, to all subsequent communications"

(Licia Verde, arXiv Scientific Advisory Board).

"moderation helps ensure papers don't include invective against other scientists"

(Paul Fendley in [Science News article](#))

None of these [arxiv administrators](#), [scientific advisors](#), and [physics advisors](#) have told you **the real reason for arXiv's censorship** of my recent papers, nor for the censorship of [Dias and Salamat's paper](#). All of the above individuals, as well as other members of the arXiv [Scientific Advisory Board](#) and [Physics Advisory Committee](#) are aware of the real reason, and chose to keep it hidden. Let me recount some information so that the real reason becomes clear.

1) On **August 24, 2021**, I submitted to arXiv and to Physica C a paper with title "[On the ac magnetic susceptibility of a room temperature superconductor: anatomy of a probable scientific fraud](#)", **hereafter called paper0**. [That paper](#) presented arguments that suggested that the ac susceptibility data published in [the Nature paper](#) reporting room temperature superconductivity in CSH were fraudulent, the main argument being that the authors of the CSH paper had refused to release raw data for ac magnetic susceptibility for 9 months, citing [non-existent patent reasons](#). [Paper0](#) also presented an analysis of the raw data for ac susceptibility of Europium [published in 2009](#) showing crystal-clear evidence of data alteration and manipulation in that paper (that paper was [retracted 4](#)

[months later](#)). The papers on CSH and Eu have [one author in common](#). [Paper0](#) was put on hold, to be considered by arxiv moderation.

2) On **October 25, 2021**, after 2 months of “moderation”, arxiv posted [paper0](#), as [arXiv:2110.12854v1](#) (still [available on arXiv](#)). There was no suggestion nor request from arxiv to me to change any of the language in it. That action by arxiv tells us in one fell swoop that all the lofty statements quoted above by arXiv people about their moderator’s concerns over “language” and “form” as motivating their actions are just gobbledygook.

3) On **December 9, 2021**, arXiv [withdrew paper0](#), giving as reason **not** retroactive concerns about “language” or “form”, but rather [“due to temporary removal by the journal”](#) (Physica C).

4) **On the same December 9**, Ralph Wijers sent me an email stating *“the language of your communications is unprofessional, and as such in violation of the code of conduct of our field, and thus of arXiv. You regularly make personal attacks, accusations of fraud and other malfeasance, and use unnecessarily derogatory and demeaning language”*. At the same time, arXiv removed two submissions I had made **on December 6 and 8** (hereafter called [paper1](#) and [paper2](#) that provided an analysis of the raw data that had just been released by Dias and Salamat a few days earlier ([arXiv:2111.15017v1](#)). Arxiv never provided specific reasons for the removal of [paper1](#) and [paper2](#).

5) Neither [paper1](#) nor [paper2](#) nor any the subsequent submissions that arxiv blocked and then removed ([paper3](#), [paper4](#) [paper5](#)), contained any language nearly as strong as **the submission of August 24, [paper0](#), that arxiv posted on October 25** after extensive consideration by “moderation”.

6) There was never any *“personal invective”* nor *“personal attacks”* in any of the papers blocked by arxiv. In [paper0](#), posted by arxiv as [arXiv:2110.12854v1](#), there was the “personal” information that the intersection of the authors set of the papers on CSH in 2020 and Eu in 2009 was 1 author, that was involved in ac susceptibility

measurements for both papers. Is that an “invective” or is it relevant information?

7) **The first time ever that arxiv notified me of any concern with "unprofessional/inflammatory language" was on December 7, 2021**, in connection with the review article titled “[Hole Superconductivity xOr Hot Hydride Superconductivity](#)”, [published in Journal of Applied Physics](#), submitted to arXiv on October 15, 2021, [blocked](#) and never posted by arXiv.

8) On February 7, 2022, arXiv [suspended my submission](#) and [replacement](#) privileges for 6 months, on the grounds that my submissions "violated moderation standards".

To summarize the above: this makes no sense: on October 25 [arXiv posted paper0](#) after prolonged “moderation”, thus implying that it didn’t violate “moderation standards”. Arxiv did not publicly modify moderation standards after October 25. Why did arXiv suddenly decide, beginning on December 7, that my subsequent papers with far milder language were a criminal offense?

The answer is contained in facts that arXiv hasn’t told me, nor you, which must include that:

Sometime between October 25 and December 7, arXiv received one or more “Cease and Desist” letters from author(s) of the Nature paper and the Eu paper, threatening legal action against arXiv if it posted my papers with analysis indicating that data published in the CSH paper and the Eu paper were fraudulent.

ArXiv did not know for a fact whether or not the CSH and Eu papers are fraudulent. And arXiv is extremely concerned that legal action against it would drain its scarce resources and negatively affect its ability to serve the scientific community. So it expeditiously decided to throw [one physicist](#) under the bus for the greater good, and squelch scientific debate, instead of following the alternative route of allowing the scientific community to sort out the validity or invalidity of the data analysis indicating scientific fraud, through scientific analysis and exchange of information.

How do I know that this is true? Consider the following facts;

1) This provides a simple explanation for the facts recounted above that otherwise don't make sense.

2) My collaborator Dirk van der Marel received such a "Cease and Desist" letter a few days after our paper was posted by arXiv on January 20 as [arXiv:2201.07686v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.07686v2).

3) The Chair of my Physics Department received such a "Cease and Desist" letter on January 31, 2022.

4) Others, that I am not at liberty to disclose, received such "Cease and Desist" letters in connection with these issues.

5) None of my many emails to arXiv following "the process" of appeals, etc, had any effect. Then, on February 25, 2022, I wrote a letter to the Cornell Legal department threatening with legal action due to the fact that the Dias-Salamat paper [arXiv: 2201.11883v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11883v1) posted on January 28, 2022, contained defamatory statements against me and I was not allowed by arXiv to post a response to it. Please note that I did not request that the Dias-Salamat paper be removed, rather that I should be allowed to post a response. Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution arXiv did both on March 7, i.e. [removed](#) Dias and Salamat's [arXiv:2201.11883v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11883v1) and allowed posting of [arXiv:2201.07686v4](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.07686v4).

The above clearly shows that arXiv acts and reacts in response to legal threats, following strict self-interest, disregarding fairness, consistency, scientific, ethical or moral considerations. And it hides that information and [proclaims alternative reasons](#) to justify its actions.

Finally, why did arxiv suspend me for 6 months? Why didn't it instead simply continue to block my submissions, without giving reasons?

The answer is: **arXiv has the resources to detect and block submissions that it dreads might make it susceptible to legal challenges if posted, through their moderation system. But it does not have the resources to do the same with paper replacements.** Note that the 6 months suspension on me applies both to submissions of new papers [and to replacement of any of the 127 papers](#) I have posted on arxiv for *any* reason, including correcting a typo.

To understand the relevance of that, the following fact is important: at the same time that I submitted paper0 to arxiv on August 24, I submitted a replacement to an [earlier submission on Eu](#), [arXiv:2012.07537v3](#), containing the same analysis of the Eu raw data and conclusions contained in [paper0](#). Thus, **the Eu replacement did not violate “moderation standards” any more than paper0, that was posted by arxiv on October 25.** However, **after arxiv received the “Cease and Desist” letter(s) [the Eu paper](#) became toxic for arXiv, and they [deleted in on December 9 for “inflammatory content and unprofessional language”](#).**

The relevance of that fact to arXiv actions was revealed by Paul Fendley in the earlier email interchange when he stated "*ArXiv relies to a large extent on trusting the authors to not violate its standards (like them or not). When that trust is repeatedly violated (e.g. by adding fraud accusations in v3), should arXiv take further measures, such as withdrawing the ability to submit/replace?*". Note that the v3 referred to by Fendley, i.e the [arXiv:2012.07537v3](#) discussed in the above paragraph, was submitted on 25 Aug 2021, two months *before* arXiv posted paper0, [arXiv:2110.12854v1](#), containing the same “fraud accusations”, thus violating its own “trust” in itself, and 3.5 months before arXiv informed me for the first time (December 7) about its concern with these issues. The arrow of time is nonexistent to Fendley.

Note also that the replacement of the [earlier version of the Eu paper](#) with new information ([arXiv:2012.07537v3](#)) follows strictly the arXiv guidelines that "*submissions that cover the same topic as previous papers should be replacements rather than new submissions*" (email from Jim Entwood to me, 2/11/22), and "*“We do not want to be flooded with separate comments” on single papers*" by [Steinn Sigurdsson in Science News](#).

In summary:

Concerning the science: the Eu paper was fraudulent, as [exposed in paper0](#) and in my [replacement of the Eu paper](#). It was [retracted by the authors on December 23, 2021](#) on grounds of “*the susceptibility*

data presented in Fig. 2 were not accurately reported". About the CSH paper, the analysis of the raw data for pressure 160 GPa contained in [arXiv:2201.07686v4](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.07686v4), together with the description of "UDB_1" contained in Dias and Salamat's [arXiv:2201.11883v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11883v1), are crystal-clear evidence of data alteration and manipulation for the 160 GPa data. ArXiv has blocked posting of my submissions analyzing the measurements at six other pressure values reported in [the Nature paper](#), namely [paper1](#), [paper2](#) and [paper3](#), thus preventing the scientific community from evaluating the findings in that analysis, which is highly relevant to the question whether CSH is or is not a room temperature superconductor.

Concerning the process: arXiv is misleading the scientific community, acting for self-interest reasons it doesn't disclose and pretending that the reasons for its actions are different from what they really are. It blocks scientific discussion of evidence of scientific fraud when and only when it is threatened with lawsuits, thus preventing the scientific community from analyzing the information and reaching scientific conclusions. It misleadingly advertises that it offers a "process" to appeal moderation decisions, but the appeals are bound to fail when the decisions are made for hidden reasons. It imposes draconian suspension of submission and replacement privileges on me to cope with its own shortcomings, namely (i) its panic of legal challenges, even frivolous ones, and (ii) its inability to moderate replacement submissions.

Concerning a solution: short of arXiv being run by more principled scientists, a possible solution is that arXiv is no longer run as a shoestring operation when faced with these situations. That it has access to sufficient funds to defend itself against lawsuits alleging that it posted something "defamatory" or "injurious" or whatever to somebody. I personally pledge to donate up to \$10,000 towards arXiv's legal defense of any lawsuit against arXiv on the basis that somebody says it posted something it should not have posted. I hope other donors would do likewise.

In closing I would like to express my disappointment that the only statement on record [regarding these issues from the American Physical Society](#) so far is "*The culture of physics is one that is more*

aggressive and not very welcoming". The culture of physics should NOT be "*very welcoming*" to scientific fraud.

I hope to get responses to this email. Absence of responses from arXiv-connected people would clearly indicate acknowledgement of the above-given facts and implications.

Jorge E. Hirsch