

## Crimes of the scientific community

Khrapko R.I.<sup>1</sup>

An intentional concealment of serious longstanding mistakes of physicists is a crime, because the physicists get pay, grants, *etc.* Meanwhile Editors:

Jonathan Marangos (JMO), Eberhard Bodenschatz (NJP), Raminder Shergill (Proc. R. Soc. A), Martin Booth (OC), C J R Sheppard (J. of Optics), V. M. Agranovich (PLA), Leo Degiorgi (Physica B), Vladimir Buzek (EPJD), Paul Corkum (J. of Physics B), Grover Swartzlander (JOSA B), Xi-Cheng Zhang (OL), Stojan Rebic Assistant Editor (PRL) refused to review the paper [1], which showed mistakes of a huge number of works ignored electrodynamic spin tensor (see Notes in [1]).

The paper [1] is an extension of [2-6].

It is remarkable that J. Marangos (JMO) published paper [5] and invited: “We are pleased to accept your paper in its current form and we look forward to receiving further submissions from you”. And his reviewer wrote: “This paper attempts to clarify and correct some questions in one of the 4 or so century-old controversies in classical electrodynamics, perhaps the major one of interest in modern optics. I think the paper, almost in the present form, would be a useful addition to the research literature on the topic, and I'm willing to recommend publication with minor changes. The paper is on a topic where the literature is literally riddled with error, confusion, and dispute. The topic is of interest in practical issues in optical micromanipulation and of theoretical interest in the foundations of field theory and classical electrodynamics. Given the confused situation of the literature on this topic, I'm prepared to recommend the paper for publication” (see Notes in [1]).

It is remarkable that an Optics Letters reviewer wrote on January 4, 2006 concerning spin tensor: “The result, dealing with matters at the heart of the rather confused matter of electromagnetic angular momentum, is interesting and merits publication”.

C J R Sheppard (J. of Optics) refused to review also another paper, [7], which showed mistakes of the paper [8] published by that very journal! Please see Addendum in [7]. This is a good example of the crime: Editor-in-Chief hides errors of his authors!

After C J R Sheppard, the paper [7] was refused to review by Paul Corkum (Journal of Physics B), by Eberhard Bodenschatz (New Journal of Physics)

As one can see, now no physicists are ready to review spin tensor. But attempts to review spin tensor were in the past. Unfortunately, these attempts proved to be discreditable and became the laughingstocks of the journals [9-11].

There is another serious longstanding mistake of physicists besides the denial of the spin tensor. The paper [12] shows that the concept of the pseudo-tensor of the gravitational field, which is due to Einstein, is a mistake. But, according to the scientific community's style, paper [12] was given discreditable reviews by Abhay Ashtekar (GERG) and by Erick J. Weinberg (PRD). Then: C M Will (Classical and Quantum Gravity) and Eberhard Bodenschatz (New Journal of Physics) refused to review the paper (see details in Addition in [12]). This is another good example of the crime.

Another mistake is the concept of mass by L.B. Okun' [13] and J. Roche [14]. According to this concept, “mass is mass is mass” [15], or ‘mass’ is ‘matter’, or a mass is a body itself rather than a property of matter or of the body, i.e. ‘mass’ is synonymous with ‘quantity of matter’, and ‘mass’ is synonymous with ‘body’ [14]. A criticism of this concept was published owing to a support of V.L. Ginzburg [16]. But Alastair Rae (EJP) and David P. Jackson (AJP) refused to review the paper [17]. David P. Jackson wrote, “We do not feel such a manuscript would be of interest to readers of the

---

<sup>1</sup> [khrapko\\_ri@hotmail.com](mailto:khrapko_ri@hotmail.com) <http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru> 16 July, 2014

American Journal of Physics”. At the same time, a letters-exchange Roche-Khrapko was interrupted by Roche because Roche could not answer the question: “What is  $m$  in  $p=mv$ ? Is this  $m$  quantity of substance, is this  $m$  the invariant mass  $\sqrt{E^2/c^4 - p^2/c^2}$ , etc.?” [18].

One can also become familiar with crime of arXiv [19].

- [1] Khrapko R.I. Circularly polarized beam carries the double angular momentum  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=115&module=files> (148 [viXra:1308.0147](https://arxiv.org/abs/1308.0147) (80 downloads)
- [2] Khrapko R.I. True energy-momentum tensors are unique. Electrodynamics spin tensor is not zero [arXiv:physics/0102084](https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0102084)
- [3] Khrapko R.I. Violation of the gauge equivalence [arXiv:physics/0105031](https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0105031)
- [4] Khrapko R.I. Circularly polarized beam carries the double angular momentum  
<http://www.ma.utexas.edu/cgi-bin/mps?key=03-311> (2003)
- [5] Khrapko R.I. Mechanical stresses produced by a light beam” J. Modern Optics, 55, 1487-1500 (2008) [viXra:1307.0111](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.0111) (26 downloads)  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=9&module=files> (829 downloads)
- [6] Khrapko R.I. On the possibility of an experiment on 'nonlocality' of electrodynamics", *QUANTUM ELECTRON*, 2012, 42 (12), 1133–1136.  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=34&module=files> (886 downloads)  
[viXra:1307.0110](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.0110) (36 downloads).
- [7] Khrapko R.I. Note about ‘Angular momentum of a strongly focused Gaussian beam J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt. 10 (2008) 115005’ [http://www.physics-online.ru/php/paper.phtml?option\\_lang=&jrnid=null&paperid=17214](http://www.physics-online.ru/php/paper.phtml?option_lang=&jrnid=null&paperid=17214) [viXra:1401.0074](https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.0074) (45 downloads) <http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=119&module=files> (79 downloads)  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=121&module=files> (79 downloads)
- [8] Nieminen T. A. et al., “Angular momentum of a strongly focused Gaussian beam,” J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt. 10 (2008) 115005 (6pp); physics/0408080.
- [9] Comments on the rejection by JOSA B  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=103&module=files> (2012) (254 downloads).
- [10] Reply to a rejection by EPL <http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=44&module=files> (2010) (983 downloads).
- [11] Reply to a rejection by FOOP <http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=45&module=files> (2010) (821 downloads).
- [12] Khrapko R.I. The energy-momentum pseudo-tensor of the gravitational field is a mistake  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=114&module=files> (157 downloads)  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=112&module=files> (1744 downloads)  
[viXra:1308.0151](https://arxiv.org/abs/1308.0151) (71 downloads)
- [13] Okun’ L The concept of mass *Phys. Today* 42 31 (1989)
- [14] Roche J “What is mass?” *Eur. J. Phys.* 26 225 (2005)
- [15] Okun’ L. B. Reply to the letter “What is mass?” by R I Khrapko, *Physics - Uspekhi* 43 (12) 1273 (2000) [http://viXra.org/abs/1407.0116](https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.0116)
- [16] Khrapko R.I. What is mass? *Physics – Uspekhi*, 43 1267–1270 (2000)  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=14&module=files> (172 downloads)  
[http://viXra.org/abs/1407.0116](https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.0116)
- [17] Khrapko R.I. "John Roche asks, What is Mass?" [viXra:0703.0043](https://arxiv.org/abs/0703.0043) (24 downloads)  
<http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/ftpgetfile.php?id=17&module=files> (346 downloads)
- [18] Logical end of the concept of mass originated by L.B. Okun. <http://khrapko-ri.livejournal.com/14074.html>
- [19] Struggle with arXiv <http://khrapkori.wmsite.ru/files/struggle-with-arxiv-9> (702 downloads).  
This text is posted to viXra, <http://khrapko-ri.livejournal.com/14358.html>,  
sci.physics.research, [sci.physics.electromag](https://arxiv.org/abs/sci.physics.electromag), [sci.physics.foundations](https://arxiv.org/abs/sci.physics.foundations), [sci.physics.relativity](https://arxiv.org/abs/sci.physics.relativity)