


Epistemological shift



Epistemological shift. (machine translated from Russian)

The basis of science is empirical knowledge — ἐπιστήμη {1}. Empirical, i.e., a posteriori knowledge is purified of logical errors and false knowledge in the process of verifying its truthfulness, and therefore it is accurate and reliable. This distinguishes science from self-referential monological systems based on prejudice. Prejudice is not knowledge, since it is possible to make a priori assumptions, but it is impossible to know anything with certainty. Conclusions made a priori are all false, unfounded, arbitrary, and based solely on belief in the truth of a priori assumptions and the self-confidence of the person making them. This self-confidence explains the logical errors and misconceptions that arise from the absence of doubt in the truthfulness of a statement, the only basis for which is not knowledge, but assumption. Overconfidence arises from confusion of concepts, resulting in assumptions being mistaken for knowledge. Without awareness of this confusion and substitution of concepts, it is impossible to understand the fallacy of a logical conclusion based on a misconception. Until the causes of the misconception are understood, it cannot be corrected. However, awareness is impossible in self-referential monologue systems of thinking that reject the very assumption of their defectiveness. By avoiding and rejecting dialogue, autistic people who assume the infallibility of their own assumptions are unable to overcome the sick state in which they exist and break out of the cycle of self-justification and self-confidence. Insisting on being right despite the obvious fallacy of a biased judgment is a symptom of a sick state that is incapable of recognizing its own sickness. Such flawed logical systems, in which truth is replaced by dogma, give rise to fundamentalism, despotism, and Nazism, including fundamentalism of academic pseudo-science, academic despotism, and academic Nazism.

In other words, without epistemological justification, statements are meaningless. Without bothering to verify the trueness of their statements, people who consider themselves experts in a particular field of knowledge are mistaken about the infallibility of their knowledge, judgments, and opinions, which leads to logical errors in their reasoning and conclusions, and the accumulation of logical errors without correction becomes a method of creating false systems of justification, as observed in the case of self-referential systems known as peer review and endorsement. {2}

Almost 15 years have passed since my first publication in arXiv {3}, but my publication had no impact on the system for selecting manuscripts for publication in arXiv. As before, I was required to obtain approval for my publication from supposedly verified experts, for which I sent a letter describing my intention to a number of authors whom arXiv administrators had granted the right to make recommendations, as well as to arXiv administrators themselves. Since most of my letters went unanswered, and the responses I did receive did not contribute in any way to achieving my goal, I sent a letter to the Scientific Director of arXiv with a justification of my request to be allowed to publish in arXiv. I sent a copy of my letter to the same authors to whom I had sent the first letter. The correspondence that I publish in the appendix {23} allows only one conclusion to be drawn: the system for selecting manuscripts for publication in arXiv is completely arbitrary, because the decision to publish or to reject publication is not justified by anyone in any way.

However, my own experience only confirms what is already known: there are no rules for publication in arXiv. Proof of this assertion can be found in publications that, according to the rules of publication in arXiv, should not have been there. I am referring to the so-called COVID-19 e-prints, most of

which are not scientific publications. That is why they were and continue to be published in arXiv to this day without any verification. A keyword search in arXiv gives an insight into the number of such publications:

8,327 results for abstract: covid-19

0 results 2019

2,294 results 2020

2,180 results 2021

1,402 results 2022

1,002 results 2023

789 results 2024

660 results 2025

Either the rules exist, or they don't. The above examples show that the rules that arXiv administrators insist on following {4} do not exist. However, a keyword search of the published abstracts allows us to draw conclusions about the unwritten rules that guide arXiv administrators and to get some idea of what is missing in arXiv. The results of the keyword search are quite telling:

24 results for abstract: LGBT

135 results for abstract: Queer

369 results for abstract: Gay

18 results for abstract: Lesbian

307 results for abstract: Schizophrenia

4,753 results for abstract: Hallucination

19 results for abstract: Psychoanalysis

4,624 results for abstract: Psychology

117 results for abstract: Psychiatry

3,727 results for abstract: Neuroscience
16,863 results for abstract: Brain
99 results for abstract: homeless OR homelessness
436 results for abstract: Poverty
28 results for abstract: Famine
80 results for abstract: Bible
183 results for abstract: Christian OR Christianity
2 results for abstract: Jesus Christ
111,160 results for abstract: Communism
0 results for abstract: Communism NOT communication
4,467 results for abstract: Capitalism OR Capital OR capitalizing OR related
58 results for abstract: USSR
57 result for abstract: Laugh

221,591 results for abstract: Mechanism
4 results for abstract: Mechanicism
4 results for abstract: Fascism
0 results for abstract: Nazism

43,435 results for abstract: Science
24 results for abstract: unscientific
20 results for abstract: Pseudoscience
1 results for abstract: Scientism
229 results for abstract: Nonsense
107 results for abstract: Absurd OR Absurdity
29 results for abstract: Stupid OR Stupidity
41,645 results for abstract: Intelligence
0 results for abstract: Idolatry
5 results for abstract: Thoughtlessness OR thoughtless

316 results for abstract: "critical thinking"

17 results for abstract: "wishful thinking"

6 results for abstract: "magical thinking"

Recently, an Australian author proposed a system for verifying the validity of statements made in the process of artificial text or speech generation {5} because, as another author writes {6}, "Large language models exhibit intelligence without genuine epistemic understanding, exposing a key gap: the absence of epistemic architecture." However, it is not only machines that demonstrate a lack of "genuine epistemic understanding", but also people whose thinking takes place automatically within a circle of familiar concepts. By shielding themselves from criticism and the need for epistemological justification, people become like machines and identify themselves with machines {7}, thereby losing their human qualities. The consequence of self-referential closure in what is defined as [computing science](#) is a narrowing of consciousness, as a result of which the study of artifacts becomes the predominant occupation of those who create them. At the same time, a holistic and scientific worldview is reduced, becoming purely technical; in other words, science is replaced by technology, and this replacement leads to the abuse of technology for purposes far removed from science, such as brainwashing people with technical means. {8-14}

Understanding the reasons for the observed narrowing of consciousness does not require any special psychological knowledge; it is enough to read the list of sponsors of arXiv, which includes Google Inc. and Microsoft Research, as well as the names of all those organizations that are interested in maintaining the status quo {15}. As is said, he who pays the piper calls the tune. The result of this policy is a dire situation in science itself and the

insane state of those who imagine themselves to be scientists but are not, due to their lack of genuine epistemic understanding.

The bleak picture described here is not my fantasy, but merely the result of collective oblivion and ignorance of obvious facts, which are listed here for the purpose of raising awareness {16-20}. The next step after describing and understanding the causes of the current situation is to correct the mistakes that have been made. What needs to be changed in the current flawed system that hinders both the production and dissemination of knowledge, and what should the correct organization of both look like? The answers to these questions have already been given: correction is only possible through the implementation of a set of measures, some of which are essential and urgent, while others are secondary and of lesser priority. The first group of measures includes the introduction of the Universal Metadata Standard for scientifically based documentography, which is functionally necessary for the interpretation of documents in automated operating systems. Another priority measure is the abolition of the current flawed paradigm of corporate governance of science and its replacement with an epistemological one, which is described in my book {1}. Among the priority measures is the reorganization of the personnel of administrators and moderators, which should include representatives of different ethnic groups, different professions, different ages, and different minorities to ensure diversity of opinion and respect for the rights and responsibilities of those involved in the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge. At the same time, people who hinder its implementation, who lack scientific qualifications, or who are incapable of logical thinking due to mental illness should be systematically excluded from this process. {2, 21, 22}

References.

1. A. Poleev. Science in the 21st century. (2025)
<http://enzymes.at/download/episteme.pdf>
2. Freedom of thinking. Letter addressed to Dr. Jay Bhattacharya on the occasion of the 10th International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication. In: A. Poleev. [Letters to the American People, Part III](#) (2025).
3. Andrej Poleev. Universal Metadata Standard. arXiv:[1103.4218](#).
4. arXiv Policies.
<https://info.arxiv.org/help/policies/index.html>
5. Matthew Kelly. The Epistemic Suite: A Post-Foundational Diagnostic Methodology for Assessing AI Knowledge Claims. arXiv:[2510.24721](#).
6. Myung Ho Kim. Executable Epistemology: The Structured Cognitive Loop as an Architecture of Intentional Understanding. arXiv:[2510.15952](#).
7. Fangfang Li, Xiaojie Zhang. The Principles of Human-like Conscious Machine. arXiv:[2509.16859](#).
8. Robin Gröpler et al. The Future of Generative AI in Software Engineering: A Vision from Industry and Academia in the European GENIUS Project. arXiv:[2511.01348](#).
9. Ehsan Latif et al. A Systematic Assessment of OpenAI o1-Preview for Higher Order Thinking in Education. arXiv:[2410.21287](#).

10. Scherer, R., Siddiq, F. & Sánchez Viveros, B. [The cognitive benefits of learning computer programming: A meta-analysis of transfer effects](#). Journal of Educational Psychology, 2019, 111(5), 764-792.
11. Jiachu Ye, Xiaoyan Lai, Gary Ka-Wai Wong. [The transfer effects of computational thinking: A systematic review with meta-analysis and qualitative synthesis](#). Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 2022, 38,6:1620-1638.
12. Chiara Montuori et al. [The cognitive effects of computational thinking](#). Computers & Education, 2024, 210: 104961.
13. Tevfik Uyar. ASI as the New God: Technocratic Theocracy. [arXiv:2406.08492](#).
14. Seth Lazar. Automatic Authorities: Power and AI. [arXiv:2404.05990](#).
15. Funding Support.
<https://info.arxiv.org/about/funding.html>
16. Lauren Klein et al. Provocations from the Humanities for Generative AI Research. [arXiv:2502.19190](#).
17. Josu Ceberio, Borja Calvo. Time to Stop and Think: What kind of research do we want to do? [arXiv:2402.08298](#).
18. Zackary Okun Dunivin, Paul E. Smaldino. Recommender systems, stigmergy, and the tyranny of popularity. [arXiv:2506.06162](#).

19. Barve A, Wagner A. [A latent capacity for evolutionary innovation through exaptation in metabolic systems](#). Nature. 2013 Aug 8;500(7461):203-6.

20. Hochberg ME, Marquet PA, Boyd R, Wagner A. [Innovation: an emerging focus from cells to societies](#). Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2017 Dec 5;372(1735):20160414.

21. Gordon Banks et al. Cognitive BPM as an Equalizer: Improving Access and Efficiency for Employees with (and without) Cognitive Disabilities. [arXiv:2401.06375](#).

22. A. Poleev. Metaanalysis of psychoanalysis. (2016, 2019)

23. Correspondence related to the submission of two of my reviews for publication in arXiv.

The letters were sent to the following addresses:

Eduardo C. Garrido-Merchán ecgarrido@comillas.edu

Maurice HT Ling mauriceling@acm.org

Jacob Morrison jacobm@allenai.org

Kaiqu Liang kl2471@princeton.edu

Yoshua Bengio yoshua.bengio@umontreal.ca, bengioy@iro.umontreal.ca

Robert Long rgblong@gmail.com

Eric Elmoznino eric.elmoznino@mila.quebec, eric.elmoznino@gmail.com

Rufin VanRullen rufin.vanrullen@cns.fr

Zihan Ding zihand@princeton.edu

Andrej Karpathy karpathy@cs.stanford.edu, andrej.karpathy@gmail.com

Murray Shanahan m.shanahan@imperial.ac.uk

Iliia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov is410@cam.ac.uk, zs334@cam.ac.uk

Ross Anderson ross.Anderson@cl.cam.ac.uk, ross.J.Anderson@ed.ac.uk
Arseny Moskvicev arseny@santafe.edu, amoskvic@uci.edu,
arseny.moskvicev@gmail.com
Terrence J. Sejnowski terry@salk.edu, terry@snl.salk.edu
Antonio Damasio damasio@usc.edu
Hanna Damasio hdamasio@usc.edu
Richard Lippmann richardp.lippmann@gmail.com
Alex Pentland pentland@mit.edu
Eric B. Baum eric@truthsift.com
Melanie Mitchell mm@santafe.edu
Long Phan long@safe.ai, justinphan3110@gmail.com
Max Tegmark tegmark@mit.edu
Sanmi Koyejo sanmi@cs.stanford.edu
Guido Governatori guido@governatori.net
Antonio Norelli noranta4.com@mit.edu, noranta4@gmail.com,
lastname@di.uniroma1.it
Debdeep Sanyal debdeep.respailab@gmail.com, 22052634@kiit.ac.in
Hanti Lin ika@ucdavis.edu
Ramin Zabih rdz@cs.cornell.edu, rzabih@gmail.com
Steinn Sigurdsson sxs540@psu.edu
Thomas Dietterich tgd@cs.orst.edu
Krzysztof Apt apt@cw.nl
Ron Boisvert ronald.boisvert@nist.gov, boisvert@nist.gov
Carol Hutchins hutchins@nyu.edu
Scott Delman scott.Delman@hq.acm.org
Jon Doyle jdoyle2@ncsu.edu
Ed Fox fox@vt.edu, edfox0714@gmail.com
Lee Giles clg20@psu.edu
Joseph Halpern halpern@cs.cornell.edu

Michael Lesk lesk@comminfo.rutgers.edu, lesk@acm.org

Andrew McCallum mccallum@cs.umass.edu

Steve Minton inquiry@inferlink.com

Andrew Odlyzko odlyzko@umn.edu

Michael O'Donnell odonnell@cs.uchicago.edu

Stuart Shieber shieber@seas.harvard.edu

Jeff Ullman ULLMAN@CS.stanford.edu

Licia Verde liciaverde@icc.ub.edu

Mark Doyle jdoyle@g.harvard.edu

Bill Freeman billf@mit.edu

Tara Holm tara.holm@cornell.edu

Neil Lawrence ndl21@cam.ac.uk

Marta Mazzocco m.mazzocco@bham.ac.uk

Prineha Narang prineha@ucla.edu

Ronitt Rubinfeld ronitt@csail.mit.edu

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to: rdz@cs.cornell.edu, help@arxiv.org, ...

I want to include in arXiv two of my reviews of the following publications, which have been published in arXiv:

1. Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)
2. Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025)


Someone already submitted my reviews instead of me:

https://info.arxiv.org/help/submit_status.html

submit/6902832 Submission ID: 6902832

submit/6911345 Submission ID: 6911345

Dr. Andrej Poleev



Your arXiv.org account: andrejpoleev

E-mail: andrejpoleev@googlemail.com	Affiliation: Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317
Name: Andrej Poleev	URL: http://enzymes.at
Default Category: cs.CL	Country: Germany
Groups: cs and q-bio	Career Status: Other

[Change User Information](#) | [Change Password](#) | [Change Email](#) | [Disable MathJax \(What is MathJax?\)](#)

Article Submissions					
Identifier	Type	Title	Status	Actions	Expires
submit/6902832	New	Submission ID: 6902832	incomplete	Update Delete	2025-11-01
submit/6911345	New	Submission ID: 6911345	incomplete	Update Delete	2025-11-04

[START NEW SUBMISSION](#) Submit a new paper using our refreshed v1.5 system. [What changed?](#)

from: help@arxiv.org Oct 18, 2025

to me

subject: arXiv endorsement request from Andrej Poleev

(Andrej Poleev should forward this email to someone who's registered as

an endorser for the cs.CL (Computation and Language) subject class of arXiv.)

Andrej Poleev requests your endorsement to submit an article to the cs.CL section of arXiv. To tell us that you would (or would not) like to endorse this person, please visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

I'm sorry, but I do not have time to evaluate endorsement requests. You should contact a colleague who is already endorsed for arXiv.

Thomas G. Dietterich

Chair, CS Section of arXiv

(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: arXiv Technical Support <jira@arxiv-org.atlassian.net> Oct 22, 2025

AH-163296 Re: new submission

to me

from: arXiv Technical Support <jira@arxiv-org.atlassian.net> Oct 23, 2025

AH-163451 Re: new submission

to me

Dear andrejpoleev@googlemail.com

This message has been automatically generated in response to your email. Problems with new submissions that are reported before 16:00 US Eastern time are typically responded to the same day. Other issues may take longer

for a response. Extensive help pages, answering common questions, are available at: <https://info.arxiv.org/help>

Regards,
arXiv User Support Team

Ramin Zabih <rzabih@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to me, rdz, help

We will take a look.

from: Steinn Sigurðsson <steinn@arxiv.org> Oct 23, 2025
cc: help@arxiv.org
to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

I am a bit confused what you are proposing to submit to arXiv.
arXiv does not generally accept reviews of papers.

We do allow for “Comment On... arXiv Paper” as an option for criticism or dialogue on a paper, with the authors allowed a “Reply to Comment On...” further iteration is expected to be done by submitting revised version respectively. “Comments On...” are expected to be in format of an article, with associated references and citations.

The submission IDs you list are empty nothing is submitted to them.
To proceed with a submission you need an endorsement from someone qualified to endorse you for the category you intend to submit to,

the endorser would be vouching for you as an author and ought to be familiar with or willing to familiarize themselves the intended content being submitted

Steinn Sigurðsson

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 23, 2025

to: Steinn Sigurðsson <steinn@arxiv.org> ,

Ramin Zabih <rzabih@gmail.com>

cc: help@arxiv.org, rdz@cs.cornell.edu

Dear Mr. Sigurðsson,

Dear Mr. Zabih,

I will accept your proposal to publish my reviews as comments on the publications I review. For this purpose, I shall be granted full access to the relevant section of arXiv so that I can complete the preparation of my reviews for publication. However, I expect from you and from other staff and managers of arXiv the respect of my integrity and my rights, as well as compliance with US federal laws, in particular Amendment 1 to the US Constitution. Furthermore, verification of my competence and proof of my qualification is superfluous, as they have already been verified throughout my life and proven by my scientific publications and books. For your knowledge, I am polymath with deep experiences in biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence (<http://books.enzymes.at>). Respect for my rights also means that I decide what I write and publish, and no one should challenge that right. I act as a reviewer of publications that are essentially unscientific, and whose authors have poor logical thinking skills, as a result of which they

make gross logical errors in expressing their thoughts. I prove all this in the text of my reviews. And since I am the reviewer of these publications, no one has the right to review me and prohibit me from publicly criticizing the reviewed publications and their authors. Any attempts to prevent me from speaking publicly will be a gross violation of my rights and US federal law, and will have serious consequences for the violators.

I hope I have clearly expressed my views on our cooperation, the aims of which should be to maintain high standards of scientific work and accountability.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Andrej,

Please let me know which ACM publications these papers were published in. I would need to check to see if this would violate any ACM Publications Policies, such as our single and double anonymous peer review policies, before responding to your request. Thank you in advance for sending this information to me and giving me some time to evaluate your request.

Regards,

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications
Assoc. Computing Machinery

1601 Broadway, 10th Floor

New York, New York 10019

Office: +1-212-626-0659

Mobile: +1-212-729-7515

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/scottdelman>

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0381-0696>

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025

to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I don't know which ACM publications these papers were published in or not, I just want to get access to arXiv in order to submit my two reviews. Please visit the following URL: <https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

Thank you very much in advance for help.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Andrej,

I am confused by your messages. If these are not ACM Publications, then why are you contacting ACM. Without knowing which publications these articles are a part of, it is impossible to know if posting public peer reviews would be a violation of ACM Publications Policy. As you likely know, arXiv is not a Publisher (i.e.- they are a preprint service), so articles posted in arXiv are not peer reviewed or officially “published”. Please advise.

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I contact you because your name is listed in Computer Science Section Editorial Committee of arXiv <https://info.arxiv.org/help/cs/index.html>, therefore you can help me to get access to arXiv in order to submit my two post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Andrej,

Got it. My role with arXiv is as a volunteer advisor. For operational questions, I'm carbon copying Ramin Zabih, who should be able to either answer your question or connect you to a staff member at arXiv who can.

Regards,

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I would ask you to forward my request in your name to Mr. Ramin Zabih or to someone else who can assist me. Because you are listed in the editorial committee of arXiv, it is your duty to respond to such requests as for example mine in an appropriate way.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to Dieterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Dear Mr. Dieterich,

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

Dr. Andrej Poleev

Polymath and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317

<http://enzymes.at>

Dieterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

Endorsement requires reading your proposed submission carefully. I'm sorry, but I do not have the time to do this.

Thomas G. Dieterich, University Distinguished Professor (Emeritus)
School of EECS, Oregon State University

US Mail: 1148 Kelley Engineering Center, Corvallis, OR 97331-5501 USA
Office: 2063 Kelley Engineering Center
Voice: 541-737-5559; FAX: 541-737-1300
<https://web.engr.oregonstate.edu/~tgd/>

Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

I'm not sure why I received this email message. Can you explain the background?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Because I can not proceed with my submission.

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Have you contacted the user support team?
<https://info.arxiv.org/help/contact.html>

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Yes, I contacted the user support team and several other people within and outside arXiv, but without result.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

How long have you been waiting for a response?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Since October 20 I am waiting for approval of my submissions, without possibility to proceed and to complete them. Such behavior is not acceptable.

There is clear description of what I want to submit:
<https://info.arxiv.org/help/policies/content-types.html>
Policies for specific content types
Comments and Replies to Comments

arXiv encourages dialogue and debate about scientific matters. Normally this occurs via a series of papers that build on or critically examine each other. These are moderated each individually as standalone papers. Sometimes, a remark on or note about another paper that is not a full standalone paper is of sufficient interest to arXiv readers. These can be put on arXiv as so-called "comments-on" papers.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

According to the system, the submission process is not completed for these papers. It shows that you are still editing the submission. Are you seeing any error message?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@gmail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

No, I simple have no possibility to edit something because I have no access to editing option. I can not proceed and to complete my submissions. That is all.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Are you saying that clicking on the “edit” icon in the Actions column doesn’t work for you? Does the “delete” icon work? You could delete and start the submission process over again. It has been several years since I made a submission to arXiv, so that is the only suggestion I can make.

My advice in any communications with the arXiv staff is to be very polite. Otherwise, you will be banned from arXiv. They have zero tolerance for unprofessional language.

I hope you can find a way to make your submissions!


Sincerely,

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

It is your duty as Chair of CS Section of arXiv to assist me in such a case.
There is following problem:

You are not endorsed for this archive. See [endorsement help](#) or request endorsement



Start >> Add Files >> Review Files >> Process >> Metadata >> Preview

Start Submission

You are not endorsed for this archive. See [endorsement help](#) or [request endorsement](#)

You may pause in the submission process at any stage and return to your submission from your user page at <https://arxiv.org/user>

Verify Your Contact Information Continue

First Name:	Andrej
Last Name:	Poleev
Suffix:	
Affiliation:	Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317
E-mail:	andrejpoleev@qooqlemail.com

And 2nd problem:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <help@arxiv.org>
Date: Sat, Oct 18, 2025 at 6:14 PM
Subject: arXiv endorsement request from Andrej Poleev
To: <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com>

(Andrej Poleev should forward this email to someone who's registered as an endorser for the cs.CL (Computation and Language subject class of arXiv.)

Andrej Poleev requests your endorsement to submit an article to the cs.CL section of arXiv. To tell us that you would (or would not) like to endorse this person, please visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

This is not in fact my duty. My duty is to recruit and manage moderators. I have been helping you as a favor. According to arXiv rules, I was supposed to just refer you to the contact form.

You need to find someone in your field who can read your submission and provide the endorsement. I am sorry, but I do not provide endorsements. I lack both the time and the expertise.

Thomas G. Dietterich

Chair, CS Section of arXiv

(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Nicholas Collins <ncollins@ias.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Hello and thank you for your email.

I will be out of the office until Thursday, October 30th.

If you are writing with an urgent request, please contact Joey Cifelli (jocifelli@ias.edu).

If you are writing in regard to speaking requests for Professor Nelson, please contact Christine Lancman (christine.lancman@caa.com).

If you are writing with a media request for Professor Nelson, please contact Ellen Qualls (ellen@quallscommunications.com).

Best,

Nicholas Collins

from: Doyle, John <jdoyle@g.harvard.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

There may be a significant delay in responses to emails sent to this address. If this is related to the QSE PhD program, or is urgent, please text me or contact Nishant Sule at nsule@g.harvard.edu (QSE) or Elaine Mangelix at elaine_mangelix@g.harvard.edu. I will be in regular email contact 1 November 2025.

休暇中のためすぐに返信できません。

緊急の場合携帯電話におかけ下さい。

2025年11月1日までには平常通りに返信できるようになります。

Eduardo César Garrido Merchán <ecgarrido@icade.comillas.edu> Oct 30, 2025

to me

Dear Andrej,

I do not know who are you nor dr Sigurdsson, please stop sending me emails.

Best,

Eduardo C. Garrido Merchán

Profesor Propio Adjunto. Departamento de Métodos Cuantitativos. ICADE

Investigador - Instituto de Investigación Tecnológica (IIT)

Mesa 424, Cuarta Planta, Sede Rey Francisco, 4.

Github: <https://github.com/EduardoGarrido90/>

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to: Krzysztof Apt <apt@cw.nl>

Dear Mr.Apt,

thank you for your reply.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already published in my book entitled "Science in the 21st century" (in Russian). For

your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence, just look in internet.

Because you are the member of the Advisory Board, it is your duty to assist me in submitting my post-publication peer reviews. Actually, arXiv endorsement system does not work because my inquiries remain unanswered or rejected for no reason.

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

from: Krzysztof Apt <apt@cwil.nl> Nov 3, 2025

to me

Dear Colleague,

Arxiv is not a venue to submit reviews of papers, in particular not of other Arxiv papers.. Therefore I shall not endorse your papers.

Sincerely,

K. R. Apt

from: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to me

I am not sure why you are asking me for this. But I looked you up on Google Scholar, and unless I am finding the wrong person, it appears you do not publish or work in CS. You seem to be interested in enzymes. Am I missing something?

regards,

Jeffrey Ullman

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Ullman,

Yes, your first impression is wrong.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already published in my book entitled "Science in the 21st century" (in Russian). For your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence.

Because you are the member of the Computer Science Section Editorial Committee, it is your duty to assist me in submitting my post-publication peer reviews. Actually, arXiv endorsement system does not work because my inquiries remain unanswered or rejected for no reason.

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

I include copies of my reviews as pdf files.

1. Reciprocity.

A Review of: Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)

2. Narration and reality.

A Review of: Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025) (in Russian)

If you have other questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to me

I'm sorry. I cannot help you. Your articles, which seem to be poorly translated (for example, the first talks about "psychopaths," which I doubt you intended) have nothing to do with computer science, and do not demonstrate your qualifications to comment about CS.

regards,

Jeffrey Ullman

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Ullman,

"psychopaths" you mentioned in your reply refer to my competency as psychoanalyst and author of corresponding books <http://books.enzymes.at>. My competence in computer science demonstrate my other books, for example one about ChatGPT (2023).

Actually, ChatGPT and other AIs are "diagnosed" as "psychopaths":

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.07377>

Do GPT Language Models Suffer From Split Personality Disorder? The Advent Of Substrate-Free Psychometrics

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.08016>

Emergence of psychopathological computations in large language models

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.16150>

PRISON: Unmasking the Criminal Potential of Large Language Models

But you have no competence in psychopathology.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

Before I endorse you, I would have to see the papers you are hoping to post. Based on the titles, cs.CL does not seem like the right subject area. --

Joe Halpern

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025

to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

thank you for your reply.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already published in my book entitled "Science in 21st century" (in Russian). For your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in

biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence, just look in internet.

If you have other questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

I'm afraid that I will still have to see the papers you are planning to post before I endorse you.

-- Joe Halpern

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025

to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

as mentioned before, you can free download my book from my site <http://books.enzymes.at>. Especially, my book with two my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv has following address: <http://enzymes.at/download/episteme.pdf>

I hope you can read it in Russian, or ask your colleagues who can read Russian, or translate it from Russian into English.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025
to me

I'm afraid that I can't read Russian. I will ask yet again that you send me what you plan to post, including an English abstract (which is required for arxiv). -- Joe

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

please find included a copy of my review as pdf file.

Narration and reality.

A Review of: Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025) (in Russian)

A summary and pdf file for second review will follow tomorrow.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@gmail.com> Oct 21, 2025
to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

please find included a copy of my review as pdf file.

Reciprocity.

A Review of: Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 21, 2025

to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

Sorry to have put you through the work of sending me the paper,s but I'm afraid that I can't endorse you.

Arxiv focuses on research papers. While we do occasionally take reviews, we hold them to a higher standard than regular research papers; they must of interest to the community in the subject area of interest. Both of your papers are on topics that are not CS, and have only extremely limited relationship to CS. (I find topics like consciousness quite interesting, but it is not CS.). Actually, while the papers claim to be reviews, from what I could tell from the English, neither paper even discusses the paper it's supposed to be reviewing (although I clearly may be missing something, since I don't speak Russian).

Regrads,

Joe Halpern

from: Andrew Odlyzko <odlyzko@umn.edu> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Dear Mr. Poleev,

Sorry, but I cannot offer any assistance. I am currently working in an entirely different area. Furthermore, I am getting an increasing number of requests for comments about various observations, claimed proofs (and disproofs) of the Riemann Hypothesis, etc., so, although I used to try to respond to all people who had questions on this topic, I have had to give up.

Best regards,
Andrew Odlyzko
Professor Emeritus
School of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
127 Vincent Hall
206 Church St. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
voice phone 612-625-6413
<https://www-users.cse.umn.edu/~odlyzko>

from: Michael J. O'Donnell <odonnell@cs.uchicago.edu> Oct 21, 2025
to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

I think I might not be the person to whom you intended to send this endorsement request. I am moderator of cs.SD, not cs.CL nor cs.AI. I don't

remember the "registered as an endorser" phrase, so I'm not sure whether or not I am "registered" for cs.CL or cs.AI.

I am having some memory problems due to some neural damage, so there may be a connection that I've forgotten, and you should remind me.

As a long-time moderator, I have found some of the arXiv procedures, including the endorsement procedure, quite confusing, but the intent is not to exclude anyone doing research. If you are confused, I encourage you to keep asking the staff.

If you are sure that I should consider the endorsement, the rules seem to require me to look at the article(s) you wish to submit. The message to you might not have mentioned that. So, in that case, perhaps you can send me copies.

But, I looked up the Leibo and Gillon articles that you mentioned, and I am not familiar with their topics. Both are listed as primarily cs.AI, so there may be an error in the message to you mentioning cs.CL.

Best wishes to straighten things out,

Mike O'Donnell

Seminar on Critical Studies in Scientific Communication (alphaXiv).

[Podcast on 'Epistemological shift'](#). Transcript.

John: Welcome to our seminar on Critical Studies in Scientific Communication. Today's lecture is on a paper by Dr. Andrej Poleev titled 'Epistemological shift'. We've seen a growing number of papers critiquing academic systems, like 'A Case for a 'Refutations and Critiques' Track in Statistics Journals'. Poleev's work, coming from an independent researcher, pushes this critique further by directly challenging the institutional gatekeeping of platforms like arXiv. It forces us to ask whether our systems for disseminating knowledge actually support genuine scientific progress.

John: Yes, Noah?

Noah: Excuse me, Professor. You mentioned this is from an independent researcher. How does that framing affect the paper's core argument? Does it rely heavily on personal experience?

John: That's an excellent question, and it's central to understanding this work. The paper's empirical basis is almost entirely the author's personal experience, which he documents meticulously. The main concept he puts forward is a call for a return to what he terms 'episteme'—knowledge that is empirical and derived a posteriori. He contrasts this with what he calls 'self-referential monological systems,' which he argues are based on a priori assumptions and prejudice, and have come to dominate modern science.

Noah: So what does he consider a 'self-referential system' in practice?

John: Primarily, the systems of peer review and institutional endorsement. He argues that when a platform like arXiv requires an 'endorser' from an established institution to vouch for a submission, it's no longer judging the work on its own empirical merits. Instead, it's relying on a system of authority and reputation. In his view, this creates a closed loop where only ideas that conform to the existing consensus, or come from within the 'in-group', are allowed to be disseminated. He sees this as a fundamental corruption of the scientific ideal.

Noah: So it's a critique of academic gatekeeping, framed as a philosophical argument about the nature of knowledge.

John: Precisely. He claims these systems prevent the correction of logical errors and false knowledge, leading to what he provocatively calls 'academic despotism'.

John: This leads us to his methodology, which is unconventional. He doesn't run a controlled experiment. Instead, his approach has three main parts. First, the philosophical argumentation we just discussed. Second, and most significantly, he presents a detailed case study consisting of his own email correspondence with arXiv administrators and potential endorsers over many years. This is his primary evidence, used to demonstrate what he sees as arbitrary rejections and a lack of clear justification in the platform's moderation.

Noah: Wait, his primary data is his own email inbox? That seems highly subjective. How does he generalize from his own experience to a systemic failure?

John: He attempts to do that with his third methodological component: a simple data analysis. He performs keyword searches on arXiv for terms like 'COVID-19' versus socially charged terms like 'LGBT' or 'Nazism'. He argues the high volume of what he calls 'unverified' COVID papers, compared to the absence of others, points to unwritten rules and biases in content moderation. However, as you rightly point out, this approach has limitations. The validity of using a single, personal case study is a major point of critique, and the keyword analysis lacks controls for confounding variables.

Noah: So you're saying the methodology isn't traditionally rigorous, but serves to support a polemical argument?

John: Correct. The paper's contribution isn't a new empirical finding in the traditional sense, but a detailed, evidence-backed provocation.

John: The implications of this work are therefore more about discussion than implementation. The paper serves as a catalyst for debate on publishing reform. By making his private correspondence public, Poleev provides a rare, if one-sided, look into the opaque processes of preprint moderation. This connects to broader critiques we've discussed, such as concerns over corporate influence, since he points out that platforms like arXiv are sponsored by companies like Google and Microsoft. He argues this leads to a 'corporate governance of science'.

Noah: That also reminds me of the arguments around AI. The paper mentions AI's 'lack of genuine epistemic understanding'. Is he connecting the flaws in human scientific systems to the potential flaws we're building into our AI systems?

John: Exactly. He positions the epistemological problem as something that infects both human researchers and the AI tools they build. If our own process for generating knowledge is flawed and self-referential, he suggests, then the AI systems trained within that ecosystem will inherit and potentially amplify those flaws. He sees it as a deep, systemic issue that transcends any single discipline.

John: To wrap up, Poleev's 'Epistemological shift' is a challenging and confrontational paper. Its methodology is open to criticism, but its value lies in its direct and uncompromising critique of the systems that govern scientific communication. It forces a necessary, if uncomfortable, conversation about who holds power in science and whether our institutions are truly serving the pursuit of knowledge. The key takeaway is that the structures of science are not neutral; they must be interrogated with the same rigor we apply to scientific claims themselves.

John: Thanks for listening. If you have any further questions, ask our AI assistant or drop a comment.

Эпистемологический сдвиг.

Основанием науки является послеопытное знание — ἐπιστήμη {1}. Послеопытное, т.е. апостериорное знание очищено от логических ошибок и ложного знания в процессе проверки его истинности, и поэтому оно верное и достоверное. Этим наука отличается от самореферентных монологовых систем, основанных на предубеждении. Предубеждение не является знанием, поскольку априорно возможно предполагать, но невозможно ничего знать достоверно. Выводы, которые делаются априорно, все ложные, ничем не обоснованные, произвольные, их единственным основанием является вера в истинность доопытного предположения и самоуверенность предполагающего. Этой самоуверенностью объясняются логические ошибки и заблуждения, возникающие по причине отсутствия сомнения в истинности высказывания, единственным основанием которого является не знание, а предположение. Самоуверенность возникает из-за путаницы понятий, в результате чего предположение принимается за знание. Без осознания этой путаницы и подмены понятий невозможно понимание ошибочности логического вывода, построенного на заблуждении. До тех пор, пока не произойдёт осознание причин заблуждения, невозможно его исправление. Однако осознание невозможно в самореферентных монологовых системах мышления, отвергающих само предположение об их дефектности. Избегая и отвергая диалог, аутисты, предполагающие непогрешимость собственного предположения, неспособны преодолеть то болезненное состояние, в котором они находятся, и выйти из круговорота самообоснования и самоуверенности. Отстаивание своей правоты вопреки очевидной ошибочности предвзятого суждения является симптомом

болезненного состояния, неспособного распознать свою болезненность. Из таких дефектных логических систем, в которых истина подменяется догмой, происходят фундаментализм, деспотизм, нацизм, в том числе фундаментализм академической наукообразности, академический деспотизм, и академический нацизм.

Иначе говоря, без эпистемологического обоснования высказывания являются бессмысленными. Не обременяя себя проверкой истинности своих высказываний, люди, мнящие себя экспертами в какой-либо области знания, заблуждаются относительно безошибочности своего знания, суждения, и мнения, что приводит к логическим ошибкам в процессе их рассуждения и умозаключения, а накопление логических ошибок без их исправления становится методом создания ложных систем обоснования, что и наблюдается в случае peer review и endorsement. {2}

Со времени моей первой публикации в arXiv прошло почти 15 лет {3}, однако моя публикация не оказала никакого влияния на систему отбора рукописей для публикации в arXiv. Как и тогда от меня потребовали одобрения моей публикации от якобы проверенных экспертов, что я и сделал, направив письмо с описанием моего намерения ряду авторов, которых администраторы arXiv наделили правом рекомендации, а также самим администраторам arXiv. Поскольку большая часть моих писем осталась без ответа, а полученные мной ответы нисколько не способствовали достижению моей цели, я отправил письмо Научному директору arXiv с обоснованием моего требования, предоставить мне возможность публикации в arXiv. Копию моего письма я разослал тем же авторам, которым уже было направлено первое письмо. Переписка,

которую я публикую в приложении {23}, позволяет сделать только один вывод: система отбора рукописей для публикации в arXiv является полным произволом, потому что решение о публикации или об отклонении публикации никем и никак не обосновывается.

Однако мой собственный опыт лишь подтверждает и без того известное: никаких правил для публикации в arXiv не существует. Доказательством этого утверждения являются публикации, которых согласно правилам публикации в arXiv не должно было быть. Я имею ввиду так называемые COVID-19 e-prints, большинство из которых не являются научными публикациями. Именно поэтому они публиковались и продолжают публиковаться в arXiv по сей день без всякой проверки. Поиск по ключевым словам в arXiv позволяет получить представление о количестве подобных публикаций:

8,327 results for abstract: covid-19

0 results 2019

2,294 results 2020

2,180 results 2021

1,402 results 2022

1,002 results 2023

789 results 2024

660 results 2025

Или правила существуют, или их нет. Вышеприведённые примеры свидетельствуют о том, что тех правил, на соблюдении которых настаивают администраторы arXiv {4}, нет. Однако поиск по ключевым

словам в опубликованных резюме позволяет сделать выводы о неписанных правилах, которыми руководствуются администраторы arXiv, и получить некоторое представление о том, что в нём отсутствует. Результаты поиска по ключевым словам весьма красноречивы:

24 results for abstract: LGBT

135 results for abstract: Queer

369 results for abstract: Gay

18 results for abstract: Lesbian

307 results for abstract: Schizophrenia

4,753 results for abstract: Hallucination

19 results for abstract: Psychoanalysis

4,624 results for abstract: Psychology

117 results for abstract: Psychiatry

3,727 results for abstract: Neuroscience

16,863 results for abstract: Brain

99 results for abstract: homeless OR homelessness

436 results for abstract: Poverty

28 results for abstract: Famine

80 results for abstract: Bible

183 results for abstract: Christian OR Christianity

2 results for abstract: Jesus Christ

111,160 results for abstract: Communism

0 results for abstract: Communism NOT communication

4,467 results for abstract: Capitalism OR Capital OR capitalizing OR related

58 results for abstract: USSR

57 result for abstract: Laugh

221,591 results for abstract: Mechanism

4 results for abstract: Mechanicism

4 results for abstract: Fascism

0 results for abstract: Nazism

43,435 results for abstract: Science

24 results for abstract: unscientific

20 results for abstract: Pseudoscience

1 results for abstract: Scientism

229 results for abstract: Nonsense

107 results for abstract: Absurd OR Absurdity

29 results for abstract: Stupid OR Stupidity

41,645 results for abstract: Intelligence

0 results for abstract: Idolatry

5 results for abstract: Thoughtlessness OR thoughtless

316 results for abstract: "critical thinking"

17 results for abstract: "wishful thinking"

6 results for abstract: "magical thinking"

Недавно один австралийский автор предложил ввести систему проверки обоснованности утверждений, сделанных в процессе искусственной генерации текста или речи {5}, поскольку, как пишет другой автор {6}, „Большие языковые модели демонстрируют интеллект без подлинного эпистемного понимания, что обнажает ключевой пробел: отсутствие эпистемной архитектуры.“ Однако отсутствие „подлинного эпистемного понимания“ демонстрируют не только машины, но также люди, мышление

которых совершается в круге привычных понятий чисто автоматически. Ограждая себя от критики и необходимости эпистемологического обоснования, люди уподобляются машинам и отождествляют себя с машинами {7}, утрачивая при этом свои человеческие качества. Следствием самореферентного замыкания в том, что определяется как [computing science](#), является сужение сознания, в результате чего изучение артефактов становится преобладающим занятием тех, кто их создаёт. При этом целостное и научное мирозерцание подвергается редукции, становясь чисто техническим, иначе говоря, наука подменяется техникой, а такая подмена приводит к злоупотреблению техники для целей, далёких от науки, например для промыванию мозгов людей техническими средствами. {8-14}

Понимание причин наблюдаемого сужения сознания не требует каких-то специальных психологических знаний, достаточно прочесть список спонсоров архива, среди которых Google Inc. и Microsoft Research, а также названия всех тех организаций, которые заинтересованы в сохранении status quo {15}. Как говорится, кто платит, тот и музыку заказывает. Результатом этой политики является скверное положение дел в самой науке, и невменяемое состояние тех, которые мнят себя учёными, но таковыми не являются ввиду отсутствия у них подлинного эпистемологического понимания.

Описанная здесь безрадостная картина не является моим вымыслом, а лишь следствие коллективного забвения и игнорирования очевидных фактов, перечисление которых служит цели их осознания {16-20}. Следующим шагом после описания и осознания причин нынешнего

состояния является исправление допущенных ошибок. Что необходимо изменить в нынешней порочной системе, препятствующей как производству, так и обнародованию знаний, как должна выглядеть правильная организация того и другого? На этот вопрос уже даны ответы: исправление возможно лишь при реализации комплекса мер, одни из которых основополагающие и первоочередные, а другие — сопутствующие и второстепенные. К первой группе мер относится введение во всеобщее употребление Универсального стандарта метаданных для научно обоснованной документографии, функционально необходимой для интерпретации документов в автоматических операционных системах. Другой первоочередной мерой является отмена нынешней порочной парадигмы корпоративного управления наукой, и замена её на эпистемологическую, о чём можно прочесть в моей книге {1}. К первоочередным мерам относится реорганизация персонального состава администраторов и модераторов, в которые должны войти представители различных этнических групп, различных профессий, различных возрастов, и различных меньшинств, чтобы гарантировать разнообразие мнений и соблюдение прав и обязанностей людей, вовлечённых в производство и обнародование научного знания. Одновременно из этого процесса должны систематически исключаться люди, препятствующие его реализации, не обладающие научной квалификацией, или неспособные к логическому мышлению вследствие болезней сознания. {2, 21, 22}

Список цитированных источников и публикаций.

1. A. Poleev. Наука, 21-й век. (2025)

<http://enzymes.at/download/episteme.pdf>

2. Freedom of thinking. Letter addressed to Dr. Jay Bhattacharya on the occasion of the 10th International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication. In: A. Poleev. [Letters to the American People, Part III](#) (2025).

3. Andrej Poleev. Universal Metadata Standard. arXiv:[1103.4218](#).

4. arXiv Policies.

<https://info.arxiv.org/help/policies/index.html>

5. Matthew Kelly. The Epistemic Suite: A Post-Foundational Diagnostic Methodology for Assessing AI Knowledge Claims. arXiv:[2510.24721](#).

6. Myung Ho Kim. Executable Epistemology: The Structured Cognitive Loop as an Architecture of Intentional Understanding. arXiv:[2510.15952](#).

7. Fangfang Li, Xiaojie Zhang. The Principles of Human-like Conscious Machine. arXiv:[2509.16859](#).

8. Robin Gröpler et al. The Future of Generative AI in Software Engineering: A Vision from Industry and Academia in the European GENIUS Project. arXiv:[2511.01348](#).

9. Ehsan Latif et al. A Systematic Assessment of OpenAI o1-Preview for Higher Order Thinking in Education. arXiv:[2410.21287](#).

10. Scherer, R., Siddiq, F. & Sánchez Viveros, B. [The cognitive benefits of learning computer programming: A meta-analysis of transfer effects.](#) Journal of Educational Psychology, 2019, 111(5), 764-792.
11. Jiachu Ye, Xiaoyan Lai, Gary Ka-Wai Wong. [The transfer effects of computational thinking: A systematic review with meta-analysis and qualitative synthesis.](#) Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 2022, 38,6:1620-1638.
12. Chiara Montuori et al. [The cognitive effects of computational thinking.](#) Computers & Education, 2024, 210: 104961.
13. Tevfik Uyar. ASI as the New God: Technocratic Theocracy. arXiv:[2406.08492](#).
14. Seth Lazar. Automatic Authorities: Power and AI. arXiv:[2404.05990](#).
15. Funding Support.
<https://info.arxiv.org/about/funding.html>
16. Lauren Klein et al. Provocations from the Humanities for Generative AI Research. arXiv:[2502.19190](#).
17. Josu Ceberio, Borja Calvo. Time to Stop and Think: What kind of research do we want to do? arXiv:[2402.08298](#).

18. Zackary Okun Dunivin, Paul E. Smaldino. Recommender systems, stigmergy, and the tyranny of popularity. arXiv:[2506.06162](https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.06162).

19. Barve A, Wagner A. [A latent capacity for evolutionary innovation through exaptation in metabolic systems](#). Nature. 2013 Aug 8;500(7461):203-6.

20. Hochberg ME, Marquet PA, Boyd R, Wagner A. [Innovation: an emerging focus from cells to societies](#). Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2017 Dec 5;372(1735):20160414.

21. Gordon Banks et al. Cognitive BPM as an Equalizer: Improving Access and Efficiency for Employees with (and without) Cognitive Disabilities. arXiv:[2401.06375](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06375).

22. A. Poleev. Metaanalysis of psychoanalysis. (2016, 2019)

23. Протокол переписки, связанной с подачей заявки на публикацию двух моих рецензий в arXiv.

Письма рассылались на ниже перечисленные адреса:

Eduardo C. Garrido-Merchán ecgarrido@comillas.edu

Maurice HT Ling mauriceling@acm.org

Jacob Morrison jacobm@allenai.org

Kaiqu Liang kl2471@princeton.edu

Yoshua Bengio yoshua.bengio@umontreal.ca, bengioy@iro.umontreal.ca

Robert Long rgblong@gmail.com

Eric Elmoznino eric.elmoznino@mila.quebec, eric.elmoznino@gmail.com

Rufin VanRullen rufin.vanrullen@cnr.fr

Zihan Ding zihand@princeton.edu
Andrej Karpathy karpathy@cs.stanford.edu, andrej.karpathy@gmail.com
Murray Shanahan m.shanahan@imperial.ac.uk
Ilia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov is410@cam.ac.uk, zs334@cam.ac.uk
Ross Anderson ross.Anderson@cl.cam.ac.uk, ross.J.Anderson@ed.ac.uk
Arseny Moskvichev arseny@santafe.edu, amoskvic@uci.edu,
arseny.moskvichev@gmail.com
Terrence J. Sejnowski terry@salk.edu, terry@snl.salk.edu
Antonio Damasio damasio@usc.edu
Hanna Damasio hdamasio@usc.edu
Richard Lippmann richardp.lippmann@gmail.com
Alex Pentland pentland@mit.edu
Eric B. Baum eric@truthsift.com
Melanie Mitchell mm@santafe.edu
Long Phan long@safe.ai, justinphan3110@gmail.com
Max Tegmark tegmark@mit.edu
Sanmi Koyejo sanmi@cs.stanford.edu
Guido Governatori guido@governatori.net
Antonio Norelli noranta4.com@mit.edu, noranta4@gmail.com,
lastname@di.uniroma1.it
Debdeep Sanyal debdeep.respailab@gmail.com, 22052634@kiit.ac.in
Hanti Lin ika@ucdavis.edu
Ramin Zabih rdz@cs.cornell.edu, rzabih@gmail.com
Steinn Sigurdsson sxs540@psu.edu
Thomas Dietterich tgd@cs.orst.edu
Krzysztof Apt apt@cw.nl
Ron Boisvert ronald.boisvert@nist.gov, boisvert@nist.gov
Carol Hutchins hutchins@nyu.edu
Scott Delman scott.Delman@hq.acm.org

Jon Doyle jdoyle2@ncsu.edu
Ed Fox fox@vt.edu, edfox0714@gmail.com
Lee Giles clg20@psu.edu
Joseph Halpern halpern@cs.cornell.edu
Michael Lesk lesk@comminfo.rutgers.edu, lesk@acm.org
Andrew McCallum mccallum@cs.umass.edu
Steve Minton inquiry@inferlink.com
Andrew Odlyzko odlyzko@umn.edu
Michael O'Donnell odonnell@cs.uchicago.edu
Stuart Shieber shieber@seas.harvard.edu
Jeff Ullman ULLMAN@CS.stanford.edu
Licia Verde liciaverde@icc.ub.edu
Mark Doyle jdoyle@g.harvard.edu
Bill Freeman billf@mit.edu
Tara Holm tara.holm@cornell.edu
Neil Lawrence ndl21@cam.ac.uk
Marta Mazzocco m.mazzocco@bham.ac.uk
Prineha Narang prineha@ucla.edu
Ronitt Rubinfeld ronitt@csail.mit.edu

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to: rdz@cs.cornell.edu, help@arxiv.org, ...

I want to include in arXiv two of my reviews of the following publications, which have been published in arXiv:

1. Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)

2. Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025)


Someone already submitted my reviews instead of me:

https://info.arxiv.org/help/submit_status.html

submit/6902832 Submission ID: 6902832

submit/6911345 Submission ID: 6911345

Dr. Andrej Poleev



Your arXiv.org account: andrejpoleev

E-mail: andrejpoleev@googlemail.com	Affiliation: Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317
Name: Andrej Poleev	URL: http://enzymes.at
Default Category: cs.CL	Country: Germany
Groups: cs and q-bio	Career Status: Other

[Change User Information](#) | [Change Password](#) | [Change Email](#) | [Disable MathJax \(What is MathJax?\)](#)

Article Submissions					
Identifier	Type	Title	Status	Actions	Expires
submit/6902832	New	Submission ID: 6902832	incomplete		2025-11-01
submit/6911345	New	Submission ID: 6911345	incomplete		2025-11-04

START NEW SUBMISSION Submit a new paper using our refreshed v1.5 system. [What changed?](#)

from: help@arxiv.org Oct 18, 2025
to me
subject: arXiv endorsement request from Andrej Poleev

(Andrej Poleev should forward this email to someone who's registered as an endorser for the cs.CL (Computation and Language) subject class of arXiv.)

Andrej Poleev requests your endorsement to submit an article to the cs.CL section of arXiv. To tell us that you would (or would not) like to endorse this person, please visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 20, 2025
to me

I'm sorry, but I do not have time to evaluate endorsement requests. You should contact a colleague who is already endorsed for arXiv.

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: arXiv Technical Support <jira@arxiv-org.atlassian.net> Oct 22, 2025
AH-163296 Re: new submission
to me

from: arXiv Technical Support <jira@arxiv-org.atlassian.net> Oct 23, 2025
AH-163451 Re: new submission
to me

Dear andrejpoleev@googlemail.com

This message has been automatically generated in response to your email. Problems with new submissions that are reported before 16:00 US Eastern time are typically responded to the same day. Other issues may take longer for a response. Extensive help pages, answering common questions, are available at: <https://info.arxiv.org/help>

Regards,
arXiv User Support Team

Ramin Zabih <rzabih@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to me, rdz, help

We will take a look.

from: Steinn Sigurðsson <steinn@arxiv.org> Oct 23, 2025
cc: help@arxiv.org
to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

I am a bit confused what you are proposing to submit to arXiv. arXiv does not generally accept reviews of papers.

We do allow for “Comment On... arXiv Paper” as an option for criticism or dialogue on a paper, with the authors allowed a “Reply to Comment On...” further iteration is expected to be done by submitting revised version

respectively. "Comments On..." are expected to be in format of an article, with associated references and citations.

The submission IDs you list are empty nothing is submitted to them.

To proceed with a submission you need an endorsement from someone qualified to endorse you for the category you intend to submit to, the endorser would be vouching for you as an author and ought to be familiar with or willing to familiarize themselves the intended content being submitted

Steinn Sigurðsson

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 23, 2025

to: Steinn Sigurðsson <steinn@arxiv.org>,

Ramin Zabih <rzabih@gmail.com>

cc: help@arxiv.org, rdz@cs.cornell.edu

Уважаемый г-н Сигурдссон,

Уважаемый г-н Забих,

Я приму Ваше предложение опубликовать мои рецензии в качестве комментариев к публикациям, которые я рецензирую. С этой целью мне должен быть предоставлен полный доступ к соответствующему разделу архива, чтобы я мог завершить начатую подготовку моих рецензий к публикации. Однако я ожидаю от Вас и от других сотрудников и руководителей архива уважение моей добросовестности и моих прав, а также соблюдение американских федеральных законов, в частности, поправки 1 к конституции США. Также проверка моей компетенции и моей

квалификации излишня, поскольку они уже проверены в продолжении моей жизни, и доказаны моими научными публикациями и книгами. Уважение моих прав подразумевает также, что я решаю, что писать и публиковать, и никто не должен оспаривать это моё право. Я выступаю в качестве рецензента публикаций, которые по сути дела ненаучны, а их авторы не обладают навыками логического мышления, вследствие чего они совершают грубые логические ошибки при изложении их мыслей. Всё это я доказываю в тексте моих рецензий. И поскольку я рецензент этих публикаций, никто не имеет права меня рецензировать и запрещать мне публично критиковать рецензируемые публикации и их авторов. Любые попытки воспрепятствовать моему публичному высказыванию будут являться грубым нарушением моих прав и американских федеральных законов, и будут иметь серьёзные последствия для нарушителей.

Я надеюсь, я ясно выразил мои представления о нашем сотрудничестве, целями которого должно быть сохранение высоких стандартов научной работы и отчётности.

к.б.н. Андрей Полев

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025

to me

Andrej,

Please let me know which ACM publications these papers were published in. I would need to check to see if this would violate any ACM Publications Policies, such as our single and double anonymous peer review policies,

before responding to your request. Thank you in advance for sending this information to me and giving me some time to evaluate your request.

Regards,

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications

Assoc. Computing Machinery
1601 Broadway, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10019
Office: +1-212-626-0659
Mobile: +1-212-729-7515

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/scottdelman>

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0381-0696>

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I don't know which ACM publications these papers were published in or not, I just want to get access to arXiv in order to submit my two reviews. Please visit the following URL: <https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

Thank you very much in advance for help.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Andrej,

I am confused by your messages. If these are not ACM Publications, then why are you contacting ACM. Without knowing which publications these articles are a part of, it is impossible to know if posting public peer reviews would be a violation of ACM Publications Policy. As you likely know, arXiv is not a Publisher (i.e.- they are a preprint service), so articles posted in arXiv are not peer reviewed or officially “published”. Please advise.

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I contact you because your name is listed in Computer Science Section Editorial Committee of arXiv

<https://info.arxiv.org/help/cs/index.html>, therefore you can help me to get access to arXiv in order to submit my two post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Andrej,

Got it. My role with arXiv is as a volunteer advisor. For operational questions, I'm carbon copying Ramin Zabih, who should be able to either answer your question or connect you to a staff member at arXiv who can.

Regards,

Scott Delman
ACM Director of Publications

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Scott Delman <scott.delman@hq.acm.org>

Dear Mr. Delman,

I would ask you to forward my request in your name to Mr. Ramin Zabih or to someone else who can assist me. Because you are listed in cs editorial committee of arXiv, it is your duty to respond such requests as for example my in an appropriate way.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to Dieterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Dear Mr. Dieterich,

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

Dr. Andrej Poleev

Polymath and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317

<http://enzymes.at>

Dieterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

Endorsement requires reading your proposed submission carefully. I'm sorry, but I do not have the time to do this.

Thomas G. Dieterich, University Distinguished Professor (Emeritus)

School of EECS, Oregon State University

US Mail: 1148 Kelley Engineering Center, Corvallis, OR 97331-5501 USA

Office: 2063 Kelley Engineering Center
Voice: 541-737-5559; FAX: 541-737-1300
<https://web.engr.oregonstate.edu/~tgd/>

Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

I'm not sure why I received this email message. Can you explain the background?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Because I can not proceed with my submission.

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Have you contacted the user support team?
<https://info.arxiv.org/help/contact.html>

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Yes, I contacted the user support team and several other people within and outside arXiv, but without result.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

How long have you been waiting for a response?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

Since October 20 I am waiting for approval of my submissions, without possibility to proceed and to complete them. Such behavior is not acceptable.

There is clear description of what I want to submit:
<https://info.arxiv.org/help/policies/content-types.html>
Policies for specific content types
Comments and Replies to Comments

arXiv encourages dialogue and debate about scientific matters. Normally this occurs via a series of papers that build on or critically examine each other. These are moderated each individually as standalone papers. Sometimes, a remark on or note about another paper that is not a full standalone paper is of sufficient interest to arXiv readers. These can be put on arXiv as so-called "comments-on" papers.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

According to the system, the submission process is not completed for these papers. It shows that you are still editing the submission. Are you seeing any error message?

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@gmail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

No, I simple have no possibility to edit something because I have no access to editing option. I can not proceed and to complete my submissions. That is all.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Are you saying that clicking on the “edit” icon in the Actions column doesn’t work for you? Does the “delete” icon work? You could delete and start the submission process over again. It has been several years since I made a submission to arXiv, so that is the only suggestion I can make.

My advice in any communications with the arXiv staff is to be very polite. Otherwise, you will be banned from arXiv. They have zero tolerance for unprofessional language.

I hope you can find a way to make your submissions!


Sincerely,

Thomas G. Dietterich
Chair, CS Section of arXiv
(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 29, 2025
to: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu>

It is your duty as Chair of CS Section of arXiv to assist me in such a case.
There is following problem:

You are not endorsed for this archive. See [endorsement help](#) or request endorsement



Start >> Add Files >> Review Files >> Process >> Metadata >> Preview

Start Submission

You are not endorsed for this archive. See [endorsement help](#) or [request endorsement](#)

You may pause in the submission process at any stage and return to your submission from your user page at <https://arxiv.org/user>

Verify Your Contact Information		Continue
First Name:	Andrej	
Last Name:	Poleev	
Suffix:		
Affiliation:	Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317	
E-mail:	andrejpoleev@googlemail.com	

And 2nd problem:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <help@arxiv.org>

Date: Sat, Oct 18, 2025 at 6:14 PM

Subject: arXiv endorsement request from Andrej Poleev

To: <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com>

(Andrej Poleev should forward this email to someone who's registered as an endorser for the cs.CL (Computation and Language subject class of arXiv.)

Andrej Poleev requests your endorsement to submit an article to the cs.CL section of arXiv. To tell us that you would (or would not) like to endorse this person, please visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

from: Dietterich, Thomas <tgd@oregonstate.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

This is not in fact my duty. My duty is to recruit and manage moderators. I have been helping you as a favor. According to arXiv rules, I was supposed to just refer you to the contact form.

You need to find someone in your field who can read your submission and provide the endorsement. I am sorry, but I do not provide endorsements. I lack both the time and the expertise.

Thomas G. Dietterich

Chair, CS Section of arXiv

(also known as CoRR: The Computing Research Repository)

from: Nicholas Collins <ncollins@ias.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

Hello and thank you for your email.

I will be out of the office until Thursday, October 30th.

If you are writing with an urgent request, please contact Joey Cifelli (jocifelli@ias.edu).

If you are writing in regard to speaking requests for Professor Nelson, please contact Christine Lancman (christine.lancman@caa.com).

If you are writing with a media request for Professor Nelson, please contact Ellen Qualls (ellen@quallscommunications.com).

Best,
Nicholas Collins

from: Doyle, John <jdoyle@g.harvard.edu> Oct 29, 2025
to me

There may be a significant delay in responses to emails sent to this address. If this is related to the QSE PhD program, or is urgent, please text me or contact Nishant Sule at nsule@g.harvard.edu (QSE) or Elaine Mangelinkx at elaine_mangelinkx@g.harvard.edu. I will be in regular email contact 1 November 2025.

休暇中のためすぐに返信できません。

緊急の場合携帯電話におかけ下さい。

2025年11月1日までは平常通りに返信できるようになります。

Eduardo César Garrido Merchán <ecgarrido@icade.comillas.edu> Oct 30, 2025
to me

Dear Andrej,

I do not know who are you nor dr Sigurdsson, please stop sending me emails.

Best,

Eduardo C. Garrido Merchán
Profesor Propio Adjunto. Departamento de Métodos Cuantitativos. ICADE
Investigador - Instituto de Investigación Tecnológica (IIT)
Mesa 424, Cuarta Planta, Sede Rey Francisco, 4.
Github: <https://github.com/EduardoGarrido90/>

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to: Krzysztof Apt <apt@cwi.nl>

Dear Mr.Apt,

thank you for your reply.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already

published in my book entitled "Science in the 21st century" (in Russian). For your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence, just look in internet.

Because you are the member of the Advisory Board, it is your duty to assist me in submitting my post-publication peer reviews. Actually, arXiv endorsement system does not work because my inquiries remain unanswered or rejected for no reason.

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

from: Krzysztof Apt <apt@cwil.nl> Nov 3, 2025
to me

Dear Colleague,

Arxiv is not a venue to submit reviews of papers, in particular not of other Arxiv papers.. Therefore I shall not endorse your papers.

Sincerely,

K. R. Apt

from: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to me

I am not sure why you are asking me for this. But I looked you up on Google Scholar, and unless I am finding the wrong person, it appears you do not publish or work in CS. You seem to be interested in enzymes. Am I missing something?

regards,

Jeffrey Ullman

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025

to: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Ullman,

Yes, your first impression is wrong.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already published in my book entitled "Science in the 21st century" (in Russian). For your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence.

Because you are the member of the Computer Science Section Editorial Committee, it is your duty to assist me in submitting my post-publication peer reviews. Actually, arXiv endorsement system does not work because my inquiries remain unanswered or rejected for no reason.

I don't want to steal your time, just visit the following URL:

<https://arxiv.org/auth/endorse?x=SH3MYQ>

If that URL does not work for you, please visit

<http://arxiv.org/auth/endorse.php>

and enter the following six-digit alphanumeric string:

Endorsement Code: SH3MYQ

I include copies of my reviews as pdf files.

1. Reciprocity.

A Review of: Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)

2. Narration and reality.

A Review of: Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025) (in Russian)

If you have other questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to me

I'm sorry. I cannot help you. Your articles, which seem to be poorly translated (for example, the first talks about "psychopaths," which I doubt you intended) have nothing to do with computer science, and do not demonstrate your qualifications to comment about CS.

regards,

Jeffrey Ullman

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 22, 2025
to: Jeffrey Ullman <ullman@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Ullman,

"psychopaths" you mentioned in your reply refer to my competency as psychoanalyst and author of corresponding books <http://books.enzymes.at>. My competence in computer science demonstrate my other books, for example one about ChatGPT (2023).

Actually, ChatGPT and other AIs are "diagnosed" as "psychopaths":

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.07377>

Do GPT Language Models Suffer From Split Personality Disorder? The Advent Of Substrate-Free Psychometrics

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.08016>

Emergence of psychopathological computations in large language models

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.16150>

PRISON: Unmasking the Criminal Potential of Large Language Models

But you have no competence in psychopathology.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

Before I endorse you, I would have to see the papers you are hoping to post. Based on the titles, cs.CL does not seem like the right subject area. --

Joe Halpern

from: Andrej Poleev <andrepoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025

to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

thank you for your reply.

I am not hoping to post something in arXiv, but I want to include in arXiv two of my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv. Both my post-publication peer reviews are already published in my book entitled "Science in 21st century" (in Russian). For your knowledge, I am editor and publisher of the Journal Enzymes ISSN 1867-3317, and also author of several books, here are some of them: <http://books.enzymes.at>. Furthermore, I am polymath with deep experiences in

biology, molecular biology, psychoanalysis, law, literature, linguistics, history and now in artificial intelligence, just look in internet.

If you have other questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025

to me

I'm afraid that I will still have to see the papers you are planning to post before I endorse you.

-- Joe Halpern

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@googlemail.com> Oct 20, 2025

to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

as mentioned before, you can free download my book from my site <http://books.enzymes.at>. Especially, my book with two my post-publication peer reviews of publications, which have been published in arXiv has following address: <http://enzymes.at/download/episteme.pdf>

I hope you can read it in Russian, or ask your colleagues who can read Russian, or translate it from Russian into English.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 20, 2025
to me

I'm afraid that I can't read Russian. I will ask yet again that you send me what you plan to post, including an English abstract (which is required for arxiv). -- Joe

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@gmail.com> Oct 20, 2025
to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

please find included a copy of my review as pdf file.

Narration and reality.

A Review of: Michaël Gillon. A Modular Theory of Subjective Consciousness for Natural and Artificial Minds. (2025) (in Russian)

A summary and pdf file for second review will follow tomorrow.

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Andrej Poleev <andrejpoleev@gmail.com> Oct 21, 2025
to: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu>

Dear Mr. Halpern,

please find included a copy of my review as pdf file.

Reciprocity.

A Review of: Joel Z. Leibo et al. A theory of appropriateness with applications to generative artificial intelligence. (2024)

Dr. Andrej Poleev

from: Joe Halpern <jyh13@cornell.edu> Oct 21, 2025

to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

Sorry to have put you through the work of sending me the paper,s but I'm afraid that I can't endorse you.

Arxiv focuses on research papers. While we do occasionally take reviews, we hold them to a higher standard than regular research papers; they must of interest to the community in the subject area of interest. Both of your papers are on topics that are not CS, and have only extremely limited relationship to CS. (I find topics like consciousness quite interesting, but it is not CS.). Actually, while the papers claim to be reviews, from what I could tell from the English, neither paper even discusses the paper it's supposed to be reviewing (although I clearly may be missing something, since I don't speak Russian).

Regrads,

Joe Halpern

from: Andrew Odlyzko <odlyzko@umn.edu> Oct 20, 2025
to me

Dear Mr. Poleev,

Sorry, but I cannot offer any assistance. I am currently working in an entirely different area. Furthermore, I am getting an increasing number of requests for comments about various observations, claimed proofs (and disproofs) of the Riemann Hypothesis, etc., so, although I used to try to respond to all people who had questions on this topic, I have had to give up.

Best regards,
Andrew Odlyzko
Professor Emeritus
School of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
127 Vincent Hall
206 Church St. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
voice phone 612-625-6413
<https://www-users.cse.umn.edu/~odlyzko>

from: Michael J. O'Donnell <odonnell@cs.uchicago.edu> Oct 21, 2025
to me

Dear Dr. Poleev,

I think I might not be the person to whom you intended to send this endorsement request. I am moderator of cs.SD, not cs.CL nor cs.AI. I don't

remember the "registered as an endorser" phrase, so I'm not sure whether or not I am "registered" for cs.CL or cs.AI.

I am having some memory problems due to some neural damage, so there may be a connection that I've forgotten, and you should remind me.

As a long-time moderator, I have found some of the arXiv procedures, including the endorsement procedure, quite confusing, but the intent is not to exclude anyone doing research. If you are confused, I encourage you to keep asking the staff.

If you are sure that I should consider the endorsement, the rules seem to require me to look at the article(s) you wish to submit. The message to you might not have mentioned that. So, in that case, perhaps you can send me copies.

But, I looked up the Leibo and Gillon articles that you mentioned, and I am not familiar with their topics. Both are listed as primarily cs.AI, so there may be an error in the message to you mentioning cs.CL.

Best wishes to straighten things out,

Mike O'Donnell

Seminar on Critical Studies in Scientific Communication (alphaXiv).

[Podcast on 'Epistemological shift'](#). Transcript.

Джон: Добро пожаловать на наш семинар «Критические исследования в научной коммуникации». Сегодняшняя лекция посвящена докладу д-ра Андрея Полеева под названием «Эпистемологический сдвиг». Мы наблюдаем растущее число статей, критикующих академические системы, например, «Аргументы в пользу направления «Опровержения и критика» в статистических журналах». Работа Полеева, написанная независимым исследователем, развивает эту критику, напрямую бросая вызов институциональному контролю над такими платформами, как arXiv. Она заставляет нас задаться вопросом, действительно ли наши системы распространения знаний способствуют подлинному научному прогрессу.

Джон: Да, Ной?

Ной: Извините, профессор. Вы упомянули, что это работа независимого исследователя. Как такая постановка вопроса влияет на основную аргументацию статьи? В значительной степени ли она основана на личном опыте?

Джон: Отличный вопрос, и он имеет решающее значение для понимания данной работы. Эмпирическая основа статьи практически полностью основана на личном опыте автора, который он тщательно документирует. Основная концепция, которую он выдвигает, — это призыв к возвращению к тому, что он называет «эпистемой» — эмпирическому знанию, полученному апостериори. Он противопоставляет это «самореферентным

монологическим системам», которые, по его мнению, основаны на априорных предположениях и предрассудках и стали доминировать в современной науке.

Ной: Так что же он считает «самореферентной системой» на практике?

Джон: В первую очередь, это системы рецензирования и институционального одобрения. Он утверждает, что когда платформа, подобная arXiv, требует «референта» от авторитетного учреждения для подтверждения представленной работы, она больше не оценивает работу по её собственным эмпирическим достоинствам. Вместо этого она полагается на систему авторитета и репутации. По его мнению, это создаёт замкнутый цикл, в котором разрешено распространять только идеи, соответствующие существующему консенсусу или исходящие из «своей группы». Он считает это фундаментальным искажением научного идеала.

Ноа: Значит, это критика академического гейткипинга, представленная как философский аргумент о природе знания.

Джон: Именно. Он утверждает, что эти системы препятствуют исправлению логических ошибок и ложных знаний, что приводит к тому, что он провокационно называет «академическим деспотизмом».

Джон: Это подводит нас к его нетрадиционной методологии. Он не проводит контролируемый эксперимент. Вместо этого его подход состоит из трёх основных частей. Во-первых, философская аргументация, которую

мы только что обсудили. Во-вторых, и это самое важное, он представляет подробное исследование, состоящее из его собственной электронной переписки с администраторами arXiv и потенциальными сторонниками за многие годы. Это его главное доказательство, используемое для демонстрации того, что он считает произвольными отклонениями и отсутствием чёткого обоснования модерации платформы.

Ноа: Постойте, его основные данные — это его собственный почтовый ящик? Это кажется крайне субъективным. Как он делает обобщения, основываясь на собственном опыте, для вывода о системном сбое?

Джон: Он пытается сделать это с помощью своего третьего методологического компонента: простого анализа данных. Он выполняет поиск по ключевым словам в arXiv, сравнивая такие термины, как «COVID-19», с социально значимыми терминами, как «ЛГБТ» или «нацизм». Он утверждает, что большой объём так называемых «непроверенных» статей о COVID, по сравнению с отсутствием других, указывает на неписанные правила и предвзятость модерации контента. Однако, как вы справедливо отмечаете, у этого подхода есть ограничения. Обоснованность использования одного личного исследования является одним из основных пунктов критики, а анализ ключевых слов не позволяет контролировать сопутствующие переменные.

Ной: То есть вы утверждаете, что методология не является традиционно строгой, но служит для обоснования полемического аргумента?

Джон: Верно. Вклад статьи — это не новое эмпирическое открытие в традиционном смысле, а детальная, подтверждённая фактами провокация.

Джон: Таким образом, выводы из этой работы скорее дискуссионные, чем практические. Статья служит катализатором дискуссии о реформе издательской деятельности. Публикуя свою личную переписку, Полеев предлагает редкий, хотя и односторонний, взгляд на непрозрачные процессы модерации препринтов. Это перекликается с более широкими критическими замечаниями, которые мы уже обсуждали, например, с опасениями по поводу влияния корпораций, поскольку он отмечает, что платформы, подобные arXiv, спонсируются такими компаниями, как Google и Microsoft. Он утверждает, что это приводит к «корпоративному управлению наукой».

Ной: Это также напоминает мне споры вокруг ИИ. В статье упоминается «отсутствие подлинного эпистемологического понимания» ИИ. Связывает ли он недостатки человеческих научных систем с потенциальными недостатками, которые мы встраиваем в наши системы ИИ?

Джон: Именно. Он позиционирует эпистемологическую проблему как нечто, что затрагивает как исследователей-людей, так и создаваемые ими инструменты ИИ. Если наш собственный процесс генерации знаний несовершенен и самореферентен, предполагает он, то системы искусственного интеллекта, обученные в рамках этой экосистемы, унаследуют и потенциально усилят эти недостатки. Он рассматривает это как глубокую системную проблему, выходящую за рамки любой отдельной дисциплины.

Джон: В заключение, «Эпистемологический сдвиг» Полеева — сложная и противоречивая работа. Её методология открыта для критики, но её ценность заключается в прямой и бескомпромиссной критике систем, управляющих научной коммуникацией. Она побуждает к необходимому, хотя и неловкому, разговору о том, кто обладает властью в науке и действительно ли наши институты служат поиску знаний. Ключевой вывод заключается в том, что структуры науки не нейтральны; их следует подвергать с той же строгостью, с которой мы относимся к самим научным утверждениям.