

Revised edition 20 Feb. 2007

In the autumn of 2003 Anders Pape Møller (APM) was found guilty in scientific dishonesty/misconduct by the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty (designated UVVU in Danish, or DCSD in English).

In order to overview the case and document that the decision from UVVU was reasonable (APM is not accepting the decision) some further information is given below.

During winter and spring of 1996, the technician Jette Andersen (JA) measured about 3000 leaves of stone oak for which she was thanked twice in Møller, A.P. & F. de Lope (1998): Herbivory affects developmental instability of stone oak, *Quercus rotundifolia*. – *Oikos* 82: 246-252.

When this paper was published some errors were very apparent, and clear indications of wrongful data treatment were found. Furthermore, the measurements of JA dated 29 March 1996 <http://www.zi.ku.dk/terrecol/steneg/htm> could possibly not be the data-set behind the values in the tables 1, 2 and 3 in the paper of Møller & de Lope (1998).

During the autumn, winter and spring 1999-2000, Jørgen Rabøl (JR) repeatedly asked APM for sending the basic data, while the University of Copenhagen was asked for permission to use the original data-file. APM sent nothing. The university dragged its feet, but finally accepted that the file was used.

In May, 2000, JR and JA submitted an “Opinion” to *Oikos* entitled “*Fluctuating asymmetry in stone oaks as a response to man-made herbivory, fact or fabrication?*”

In the course of the summer, 2000, this contribution was revised at the request of *Oikos*. The final edition is found on the file **Oikos.doc**. At the time *Oikos* invited APM to comment and document his objections. JR informed The Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty (UVVU) about the case and submitted all correspondence between JR & JA and *Oikos*. UVVU is housed in the Danish Research Agency, Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation.

In autumn, 2000, *Oikos* concluded that the values in tables 1, 2 and 3 in Møller & de Lope (1998) were not matched by any data-file submitted by APM (see the file **Oikos.doc**). The JA data file was dismissed by APM who accused JA of having abuse problems. The editor-in-chief proposed the wording of a retraction of the Møller & de Lope paper to APM (see the file **Oikos.doc**) and the contribution of JR and JA was rejected by the editor. JR protested against the wording of the retraction which was incorrect and misleading. JR proposed that *Oikos* or APM as a minimum added that the leaves were not measured by JA. However, this proposal was not followed.

In spring, 2001, the retraction appeared in *Oikos* and in the exact wording proposed – or rather, dictated - by *Oikos*.

#### *Retraction*

*Herbivory affects developmental instability of stone oak, Quercus rotundifolia. – Oikos 82: 246-252.*

*In this article we reported data on size and (absolute and relative) asymmetry of stone oak (Quercus rotundifolia) leaves from Spain. It now appears that the measurements and analyses behind the data in the article were flawed and misinterpreted, implicating that the conclusions drawn are invalid. We therefore retract the article.*

*A.P. Møller    F. de Lope*

Clearly, the wording of the retraction absolved Møller and de Lope from the responsibility as to why the paper was retracted. Although not stated explicitly, anyone reading the retraction may get

the impression that the authors were victims rather than the ones who failed. Therefore, in spring, 2001, JR submitted a formal complaint to UVVU claiming scientific misconduct by APM. UVVU accepted the case for further investigation and in autumn, 2001, an ad hoc committee (AHC) was appointed. AHC contacted Oikos for information on the data submitted by APM. However, Oikos was not interested in a cooperation. Instead, the editor-in-chief, Nils Malmer came to the remarkable conclusion (translated from the Swedish): “By retracting the paper professor Pape Møller and his co-author admitted that they no longer stand for the content of the paper mentioned. In my opinion the case as it developed and ended cannot be considered as dishonesty in a scientific context, quite on the contrary”.

In September, 2002, AHC forwarded a recommendation to UVVU the essence of which was that the paper of APM was based on at least partly constructed data.

In November, 2002, JR informed UVVU that he had found further indications of constructions in the data-files from APM.

In October, 2003, UVVU concluded that APM was guilty in scientific dishonesty.

In November, 2003, Zoological Institute, University of Copenhagen on its home-page published the Danish version of the decision from UVVU. Later on an English version appeared. In the spring of 2004 both versions were removed from the home-page.

In November, 2003, Oikos was contacted twice by this author for that purpose that the misleading 2001-retraction was followed up by a comment in the journal about the decision from UVVU. However, this proposal was rejected in the following words translated from the Swedish: “The opinion of the editor-in-chief is that this case as seen from the side of Oikos is finished. A discussion has to be advanced in other fora. Oikos is not open for such kind of polemic contributions.”

Both in November, 2003, and in January, 2004, the former superior of APM, Jean Clobert was informed about the decision from UVVU. In the summer of 2001 he was very eager to be informed about the retraction in Oikos and the case in UVVU (“This will help me reaching a decision”). Later on – in 2002 and 2003 – Jean Clobert was a co-author on at least three scientific papers together with APM.

The following documentations are available on <http://www.jorgenrabol.dk> where **Tables.doc** constitutes the working files APM1, APM2, APM3 and APMsmlg (designated so by AHC) submitted from APM to AHC. APM in his letter to UVVU from 12 November, 2003, explicitly acknowledges his responsibility of these constructed files (“I have given my data files to a colleague who is an expert on the subject considered. He has been able to arrive at the findings published in the original paper based on his own, independent calculations”). In his letter to UVVU from 15 March 2003 JR proposed the inclusion of the APM working files in the final decision but this advice was not followed. AHC found several examples of constructions in APM working files and JR in his letter to AHC (20 November 2002, see **UVVU decision.doc**) found further examples of constructions.

The letter from the editor-in-chief, Nils Malmer to APM dated 24 November, 2000, (**Oikos.doc**) is also most important in this connection. The letter documents that APM has submitted a data set B to Oikos not matching the data in the Møller & de Lope paper. As the journal of Oikos has not released this data set B to AHC (see the recommendation of AHC to UVVU, **UVVU decision.doc**) we do not know whether this insufficient data set sent to Oikos is the same as the constructed data files sent to AHC (UVVU). Based on the present claim of APM it cannot be, as the data he sent to UVVU is claimed to be measured/fabricated by JA/JR.

On Dec.22 2003 APM complained about the decision from UVVU to both the Danish Ombudsman and the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. On Dec.30 2003 and Feb.2 2004 he also complained to UVVU.

In Jan 29 and 30 2004 the misconduct verdict was treated in Nature and Science, respectively. APM says he is innocent and is appealing against the ruling, and his supervisor Jacob Koella at the Université Pierre et Marie Curie fully supports APM and write down the significance of the fabrications in the tables sent to AHC (the Moller3.doc) to "he did a calculation wrong".

Both documents in the files Moller1 and Moller3 are copies (and/or direct translations from the Danish to the English) based on the original documents available in paper editions only. UVVU may be contacted for verification of the documents by contacting [anr@fist.dk](mailto:anr@fist.dk) (att. Annette D.N. Rasmussen).

Following the decision from UVVU the Bird Ringing Centre at Zoological Museum, Copenhagen interrupted their collaboration with APM.

JR sent most of the documents mentioned above (i.e. also the data files of APM sent to UVVU) to Jacob Koella and Jean Clobert in Paris. The latter in an email dated 24.2.04 informed JR that "I transmit a copy of all your correspondence the CNRS ad hoc committee". The documents mentioned above were also sent to Andrew Pomiankowski and Richard Palmer who both are very sceptical about the scientific state of APM.

On the other frontier APM and supporters were very active spreading more or less distorted information, indignation and rumours such as 1) Møller, A.P. 2003. Statement of scientific misconduct raised against Anders Pape Møller by Jørgen Rabøl, 2) Alatalo, R.V. et al. 2004. Support for a colleague. Science 303, 1612, 3) Moreno, J. and T.Mosseau 2004. Dedication put Møller ahead, no fabrication. Nature 428, 695, and 4) Colleagues in support of Anders Pape Møller, send to a) The Danish Minister of Science, Technology and Innovation, Helge Sander, b) Members of the Danish Natural Science Research Council, c) the Head of the Copenhagen Ringing Centre, and d) the Head of the Zoological Museum, Copenhagen.

In 4) support was asked for: "1) A full and impartial inquiry into proceedings by the Danish Commission for Scientific Dishonesty against Anders Møller. This inquiry should be conducted in a manner that ensures a fair, just and impartial treatment of this case", and "2) The reinstatement of Dr. Møller's bird ringing license until such time that a fair and impartial inquiry can be made".

These questions appear rather hysterical and insulting for UVVU, and the Heads of the Ringing Centre and the Zoological Museum in Copenhagen patiently informed APM that he was not denied the possibility of ringing birds in Denmark. He just has to ask for such a permission at the superior authority, i.e. The Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Ministry of the Environment. However, as the Zoological Museum is concerned about the quality of the data entering their database the museum will not collaborate with a person appreciated for making use of constructed data. The answer of the Danish Ministry of Science is embedded in their decision of the claim of APM Dec.22 2003 (see below).

In the March issue of the Danish journal *Aktuel Naturvidenskab* an article (in Danish) *Symmetry as a measure of goodness in nature - fact or fiction?* was authored by G. Nachman and K.E. Heller former colleagues of APM in Copenhagen 1994-96. In this article the decision from UVVU was also mentioned. In the following issue of the journal APM harshly commented on both the (lack of) scientific state of the two authors and the UVVU decision. His final remarks are truly remarkable (in translation from the Danish): *Already Shakespeare made the observation: "There is something rotten in the kingdom of Denmark". I feel ashamed being a Dane.*

In a letter from April 1 2004 to the Danish lawyer of APM (Rasmus Hansen Schmiegelow, Lindh Stabell Horten, Ved Stranden 18, Box 2034, 1012 Copenhagen K) UVVU encloses remarks from AHC (the ad hoc committee of UVVU), and F.B. Christiansen (member of AHC). In this and in the following correspondence between UVVU and the Ministry on one side, and APM and his lawyer on the other side, JR only had access to the text of the former part in a more or less censored way (the Ministry). Therefore, significant parts are perhaps not included in the following notes.

**First**, notes about the data behind the values of Table 1, 2 and 3 in Møller and de Lope (1998):

AHC on March 25 2004 comments the APM letters from Dec.30 and Feb.2. According to APM "When I moved to Paris in April 1996 my computer and all my disks were stolen from my locked office". He also informs about the problems recreating the data set he send to UVVU ("I CANNOT be sure that I have done this correctly").

Translated to the English AHC finds that "the information about the burglary was not forwarded together with the data files, and no reservations were made. Furthermore, clear indications of fabrications were found in the data files (as described in the decision from AHC). This is not the same as lack of precision, which may arise because of incomplete information. Quite on the contrary, the precise agreement between the data files and most means in the paper strengthen the impression the data was fabricated in order to achieve such an agreement".

AHC also comments on the claim in the APM letter from Dec.22 2003 to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation that "The whole case is based on a computer file located in a computer at Copenhagen University". AHC states (in translation from the Danish) that "this data file had no importance/influence on the decision of AHC. The decision alone rests on the data delivered by APM.". AHC also remarks that Jette Andersen and Jorgen Rabøl in no way were able to influence the data delivered by APM.

Finally, AHC repeats and summarizes the unreliabilities, incredibilities and statistical improbabilities in the Møller and de Lope paper.

**Second**, notes about the claimed disqualification of one member of AHC:

F.B. Christiansen in a letter to UVVU from March 22 2004 comments on the claim of APM that he (FBC) was disqualified as a member of the AHC. According to APM "Dr. Christiansen is strongly opposed to the research that I am conducting on humans for political reasons".

"Furthermore, Dr.Christiansen was present when my wife attempted suicide – – – I clearly remember a more than close connection between Dr.Christiansen and my wife the day before the suicide attempt". FBC rejects these remarkable claims.

However, APM maintains that FBC is disqualified as a member of AHC. In a new letter dated May 18 2004 FBC comments on a lot of new claims and questions from APM most of which seem irrelevant for the case.

On June 18 2004 UVVU answers on a letter from the lawyer of APM dated April 28 2004. APM and the lawyer (still) maintain that F.B. Christiansen was disqualified as a member of AHC, and also that the decision from UVVU rests on a wrong and incorrect basis. Therefore the case should be reopened.

UVVU answers that the question of disqualification will be decided by the Ministry of Science. Furthermore, UVVU maintains that the new information from APM is not sufficient for a reopening of the case. Though UVVU has no reason to doubt the claim that the computer and some disks of APM were stolen back in 1996, UVVU has to reject the new information from APM that his paper in Oikos was based on a data set present on the stolen computer and the disks, and that the data set delivered to Oikos and UVVU was based on reconstructions of the stolen data. The central point all the time was whether APM was able to deliver a data set leading to the results published in his

paper. This was not the case as clearly the data set delivered by APM was based at least partly on fabrications carried out with that purpose to make a close fit between the delivered data and the values in the tables of the paper.

Furthermore, UVVU emphasizes that there is no reason to believe that the data set received from the University of Copenhagen through Jørgen Rabøl is a falsification. When JR initiated the case he had all reasons to believe that APM was able to deliver the data set used in the paper. JR had revealed himself as a falsifier if delivering such a data set (an important further comment of JR should be that the data file with the measurements of Jette Andersen (the same one as later send to UVVU) was already made available in the Opinion contribution send to Oikos in May 2000).

UVVU concludes that APM has not delivered new information giving UVVU basis for making another decision than the one from Oct.31 2003. Therefore UVVU refuses to reopen the case.

In a letter dated June 22 2004 the director of Biological Institute in Copenhagen confirms the presence of the Jette Andersen data file dated 29 –03 –1996 among the central backups.

The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation made a final decision (41 pages) on Nov.17 2004 concerning the APM complains about the UVVU decision Oct.31 2003.

**In short, all complains were rejected.**

The decision of the Ministry is that F.B. Christiansen was not disqualified as a member of AHC. The Ministry remarks that APM already from the very start complained about the inclusion of FBC in the ad hoc committee (AHC). However, the claim of APM was that because of their relationship (FBC was a former teacher of APM) the inclusion of FBC was not appropriate and the other part (i.e. JR) would protest about the inclusion of FBC (i.e. implicitly APM considered FBC to his advantage). However, JR never protested, and the two serious objections from APM against FBC first appeared **after** the decision from AHC and UVVU and strongly appear as ad hoc adaptations.

The Ministry also followed AHC in the point of view that APM of course was responsible for the constructed data files sent by him to UVVU. **However, both UVVU (AHC) and the Ministry fail to grasp the weird depths of APM concerning the data behind the values in the Møller and de Lope paper.**

**As APM now repeatedly maintains that the leaves were measured by JA the inherent message of APM is that the data file delivered to him by JA in April 1996 already at this very moment was falsified/constructed by JA/JR.** Of course, APM did not know about this conspiracy at that time, and in course of the next month or so APM and de Lope extracts the data, author the paper, send it to Oikos and then somewhere in May – July the computer/disks of APM were stolen and the JA data set disappears for ever and only with great difficulties and in a condensed form the latter was partly reconstructed by APM and send to AHC (UVVU). Later on in 2000, JA and JR send another constructed data file to first Oikos and then UVVU said to be the one send from JA to APM in April 1996.

However, there are several problems with this weird APM scenario. During 1995 and 1996 JR had no reasons to scandalize APM. At least the complaints to the University of Copenhagen of APM over JR first started in 1997, and it is extremely difficult to understand how JA/JR were able to construct a data file later on accepted by APM without knowing the research hypothesis in charge. Recall the words of Møller & de Lope (1998) *The leaves were measured in the laboratory during autumn and winter 1995–1996 by J.Andersen who was unaware of the origin of the leaves. Measurements were therefore done blindly with respect to the predictions under test.* APM also seems to forget that the editor of Oikos, Nils Malmer in a letter to APM dated 24 Nov. 2000 (**Oikos.doc**) writes: "In the Editorial Office we know have the two sets of data which you have admitted refer to measurements carried out on the material of leafs dealt with in your paper. One,

here called data set A. has been submitted by J. Rabol and J. Andersen; the other one, here called data set B. has been submitted by yourself. **The measurements included in data set B were done after you had seen the measurements in data set A.** There are several differences between the data sets. In your printed paper you explicitly say that you have only used data set A for the calculations and results presented there. Later **you have in letters said that you discarded data set A and instead only used data set B for the paper"**

In April 2005 the Danish Ombudsman decided not to consider the complains of APM. According to APM the reason was that the Ombudsman had no formal possibility of entering his complain because the head of UVVU was a Danish judge. However, this is not true (according to the office of the Ombudsman). This erroneous claim from APM appeared in a book of David Favrholt (2005) *Farlige tanker – forskning under hammeren*. Favrholt is very critical about Danish UVVU, and the Lomborg and Moller cases are presented and discussed in length. Unfortunately, Favrholt also buys several other lies and distortions from APM, including the important one that the UVVU decision was based on the measurements/data-file of Jette Andersen. However, as emphasized by UVVU the decision rests solely on the fabricated data-files send from APM to UVVU.

Anyway, everything was not bad for APM. Already in the autumn of 2004 he send a translation in English to the Danish Ombudsman of a decision made in French by his employer French CNRS. This decision is now available on [http://cricket.biol.sc.edu/dedication/moller/CNRS\\_Decision.pdf](http://cricket.biol.sc.edu/dedication/moller/CNRS_Decision.pdf) In short (and for a superficial and short-term consideration) his French employer clears APM for scientific misconduct (as several times since claimed by APM). However, the "clearing" is not unambiguous and APM should not be too happy about it in the long run and outside France.

The decision from CNRS rests on a report from a so-called **independent** "committee of wise men". According to CNRS *"Its work consisted in an examination of the documents of the case - - - In addition it heard individuals connected to the case as well as Anders Pape Moller himself"*. However, the committee neither consulted UVVU nor JR, and probably only investigated documents delivered by APM and supporters (according to the book of Favrholt APM was interviewed twice by the committee). Anyway, the central conclusion of CNRS is a masterpiece of irresponsible nonsense and laundering of APM: *"After a very fine, detailed examination of the facts and a meticulous search for evidence, the committee has found that it is not possible to establish formal proof of intent to commit scientific fraud on the part of Anders Pape Moller concerning the research published in the article, which was withdrawn from the journal Oikos. Lacking the material evidence necessary to establish innocence, the committee was equally unable to reach this conclusion. In such a situation, by French legal principle, it is the presumption of innocence that must be applied"*.

Thus, CNRS does not question that the data sent by APM to UVVU was fabricated/reassembled, i.e. CNRS buys the claim of APM that JA is the one behind the data, or at least they consent that this possibility cannot be excluded. **But it can** as outlined above.

ISBE Newsletter, Vol. 17(1), May 2005 (the journal Behavioral Ecology) published a commentary *A beginners Guide to Scientific Misconduct* by Bob Montgomerie og Tim Birkhead. The APM case was not mentioned, but according to Bob Montgomerie (in litt.) the APM case was a strong inspiration for the release/appearance of this commentary. APM and Birkhead co-authored the book *Sperm Competition and Sexual Selection*, 826 pp., Academic Press 1998.

The Danish newspaper Politiken on two occasions in June 2005 brings articles about scientific fraud. The APM case was mentioned and discussed, and in the second article (19 June) APM

announced that he would ask for a free case in the Danish court system and complain to the court of human rights in Strasbourg. However, until now neither UVVU nor JR has been sued.

In ISBE Newsletter, Vol.17(2), Nov.2005 APM had a commentary: *Improving the processing of scientific misconduct charges: an eyewitness perspective*. JR submitted a commentary: *Anders Pape Møller and scientific misconduct* to ISBE Newsletter. JR demonstrated several errors, lies and distortions in the APM commentary. However, the commentary of JR was not accepted for publication. In a recent issue of the ISBE journal Behavioral Ecology APM was the single author of a paper on about tail length in Barn Swallow. Apparently, the editors still have confidence in data delivered by APM.

In 2006 there has been rather quite about APM who seemed on his way back to a more or less full recovery of his former position.

In the Danish newspaper Kristeligt Dagblad 5 May APM told that he personally spent about 30.000 Euro in vain to the lawyer in his complains to UVVU and the ministry. He appears as a tired and sad person and his last words (in the following translation from the Danish) are truly remarkable: *If APM had been able to look into the future at the time when the complains to UVVU appeared about him and his science he would not have done anything different. "As far as I can figure out, I did nothing wrong. Perhaps I am stupid because I open up my mouth and says what I mean. Anyway, this attitude has cost me a lot, but in the eyes of mine it is better to be honest and live as I do instead of being dishonest"*. The last sentence obviously comes from another world than the present one.

In the Danish newspaper Politiken 3 Sept. there was an article about psychopaths the 10 main characteristics of who were said to be 1. Lack of conscience, 2. Transfer of guilt, 3. Grandiose self-understanding, 4. Impulsivity, 5. Charming in a smooth way, 6. Lack of empathy, 7. Lies easily, 8. Superficial feelings, 9. Lack of self-control, and 10. Skills for manipulation.

I am not saying that APM is a psychopath. However, the objective observation is that he fits most of and perhaps all the characteristics above.

In Dansk Ornith. Foren. Tidsskr. (2006) 100: 50, I published a short note on the APM case, and APM answered in (2006) 100: 318. APM is a famous Danish ornithologist, and after some years of reluctance the journal accepted its natural role for bringing the "news".

The message from me was short and factual, and the final section (translated from the Danish) was: "APM has several times announced that he will go to the Danish court or if necessary to the court for human rights in Strasbourg to be cleaned for the verdict of scientific misconduct. Until now nothing has happened but hopefully it will because neither APM nor the scientific community can live with the present situation".

In his reaction APM did not comment on this point. He mostly talks round his impressive paper production and all his friends, and about half the text was concerned with his employer French CNRS. To his credit he does not – as usual – claim that he was acquitted by CNRS but said about the so called independent committee appointed by CNRS: "This committee found no proof that I made scientific misconduct". That is correct. No proof was found because the committee did a bad and superficial work.

The next important thing happened in Jan.2007 when Brendan Borrell authored the article *A Fluctuating Reality* about APM in the journal *The Scientist* on <http://www.the-scientist.com/2007/1/1/26/1>

Borrell says that APM has travelled from superstar evolutionary biologist to pariah. Borrell relies much on Rich. Palmer who certainly is no fan of APM, but also friends of APM such as Mousseau are listened to. Borrell fairly correctly informs about the UVVU decision and the CNRS communiqué. Pomiankowski who is no fan of APM too (but more reluctant so than he was a few years ago) has the constructive final remark "I find it an unsatisfactory situation to be in, but that's where we are. I would much prefer that he was properly absolved for what happened or found properly guilty".

Following the article 18 comments appeared (until 20 Feb.). The most remarkable was the **APM-supporting comment by Crawford Prize winner Robert Trivers, according to who you are allowed to fix your data if you are right and a genius.**

Triver mentions Gregor Mendel as a good example of a suspected data misconductor who was right. However, Mendel was right in another way than APM, and because Mendel was right this is no proof that APM is also right and therefore should be welcomed to be a data fabricator.

The situation of Mendel was quite another than that of APM. Mendel lived in another time and investigated offspring patterns of peas and beans and sometimes the observed numbers were in almost too perfect accordance with the ratios 3:1, 2:1 or 1:1:1:1. According to Fairbanks & Rytting (*Amer. J. Botany* 2001, 88, 737-752) there was no intended misconduct and no fabrications only selected data presentations to some extent. Furthermore, at least in the start Mendel had no clear theory behind the pattern. Later on he seemingly achieved a sketchy understanding of the laws of inheritance attributed to him.

APM lives in another time and the most interesting and prestigious kind of science is testing of a hypothesis. Many of these hypotheses are in principle very simple and the prediction goes that something becomes bigger (or smaller), if a certain mechanism or system works. As an example outside the world of APM let us consider the concept of morphological character displacement.

Competition theory predicts that if a common resource – which may be placed on an axis from small to bigger size – is in short then nearby competitors should displace their utilization on the resource axis as also their corresponding trophic morphological structure such as beak depth in seed-eating finches should change. The smaller species should develop a smaller bill more convenient for eating smaller seeds, and the bigger species a bigger bill more convenient for eating larger seeds. In this way their overlap on the resource axis becomes smaller, competition is diminished and coexistence is promoted.

The normal way to demonstrate the hypothesis of character displacement is to consider nearby competitors living together (in sympatry) or away from one another (in allopatry). Among the classical cases are the two seed-eating Galapagos Ground Finches *Geospiza fortis* and *Geospiza fuliginosa* in sympatry on island Santa Cruz and in allopatry on islands Daphne Major (*fortis*) and Los Hermanos (*fuliginosa*). In general *fortis* is the bigger species but in allopatry the two species acting as generalists free from competitors develop about the same size. However, in the competitive match on Santa Cruz the bigger one (*fortis*) displace to the right and the smaller one to the left.

There are many similar examples and among these the outstanding papers of Dayan, Simberloff and co. on community wide character displacement in carnivores.

Ten to forty years ago the journals were full of examples on character displacement and the field was very attractive for competitive scientists (including Simberloff originally a harsh proponent of no influence of competition) because of the significant and easy way for paper-production.

As may be easily verified, almost all the papers produced on character displacement were full of data manipulated in one way or another in order to make the pattern/process so clear as possible. In the Dayan/Simberloff-papers as an example were manipulations with species included or omitted, characters considered, regions considered, separation between males or females as different morpho-species, and so on. Nobody cared about these manipulations because everyone considered the hypothesis to be right and self-evident.

We are now back to Trivers, because the problem is and was that the hypothesis of character displacement (or fluctuating asymmetry or what so ever) is not always right. Sometimes sympatric species converge in size and characters and still coexist. Sometimes a species goes extinct. In short, given that, and that, and that, and that, character displacement axiomatic will appear, but this is not the same as it always will be the general/normal process out there in the nature. However, if you only publish papers confirming the hypothesis it looks like it is the general/normal process.

Now the simple hypotheses of APM works in more or less the same way as described for the hypothesis of character displacement above. This also means that APM is not always right in the same way as Mendel, and it is not acceptable that he fix his data, because in effect many innocent and subordinate scientists and students are deflected on a false or uninteresting track for years. There is no simple correlation between the rightness of a hypothesis and the number of scientists working on it.

In a comment from 16 Feb. with the hysterical title **Something rotten in the Kingdom of Denmark** APM strongly reacted on the Borrell article in The Scientist. The comment is mostly a repetition of old stuff and the stories grow more and more distorted and bizarre. New for me is his deep concern about the leaves which were never re-measured in spite he asked the Danish Committee to do so. Apparently, APM has forgotten that he informed The Danish Ministry of Science that the leaves – for unknown reasons deposited in his parents house in northern and most rotten part of Denmark - by a mistake disappeared in 2001 at about the time when his Danish case started.

As usual APM talks much about personal stuff irrelevant for the case, and he refers to all his friends, co-authors and significant publications. He also talks about violations of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, but no matter whether he is right or wrong he will not be cleared as a fabricating scientist proceeding that way.

The hard fact is that APM personally sent fabricated data to the Danish Committee. He was convicted alone on the basis of these fabrications, and the data file of Jette Andersen he is so concerned about had no influence on the decision. Seemingly, his French employer CNRS accepted his weird scenario that both these data files were possibly fabricated by Jette Andersen (and me?). Probably, we also made the break into his computer and were the agents behind the disappearance of the leaves from northern Denmark.

APM is an alien as clearly demonstrated in his comment to the Scientist article: On the basis of impact factors of scientific journals he makes an absolute nonsense-calculation showing that the probability of his OIKOS paper being fraudulent is less than 1 to 100 millions. Regrettably, many of his papers rest on the same kind of bad science fiction.

#### **Summing up the present state in February 2007:**

APM seems on his way to establish his reputation at least partly. Clearly, the decision/"acquittal" from French CNRS, the accept of the journal Behavioral Ecology/ISBE Newsletter of his hypocritical commentary, and the friendly support from another genius (Robert Trivers) have improved the odds for a total come back. Obviously, the international system/society cannot accept

that one of its most prominent and significant officers was sentenced by what is considered an outside committee (UVVU) from a small country like Denmark. The system wants to control and manage the development and avoid public discussions about e.g. the general state of scientific (dis)honesty, the referee system and the hypothesis testing method.

A major problem is that the appropriate societies/systems such as in the present case ISBE on the one hand will not accept an UVVU decision and on the other hand are not tuned to take any responsibility for scientific misconduct. It is all too easy for characters like APM to survive and fight forever, because they do not realize or understand that they did something wrong.

Jørgen Rabøl