

Dear Matt,

My apologies, I had not noticed the comment. Thanks for the response.

Your response does not provide an answer to any of my questions and simply provides a public relations response that tangentially touches upon the topic of my letter. I am surprised STM takes a passive position on this matter ("we are confident the matter will be addressed in due course") while not doing so on other copyright related issues such as Text- and Data mining (e.g., [this](#) press release).

Moreover, you simply say that if anyone spends time and money to host content, they may recover value. I understand your logic and nowhere do I state charging money is illegal. I simply find it disappointing that organisations that (supposedly) aim to communicate information are inept at balancing commercial interests and the scholar's need for readily available knowledge. In this way, scholar's are alienated, while being your primary customer base. Don't expect them (including me) to remain passive for much longer.

However, I understand the need for a constructive position. I am willing to post all the articles that are in the public domain on Zenodo. Pro bono --- because I care about the public domain. In fact, I have started doing so. Attached is a list of articles that Elsevier (I can provide you with similar lists for other publishers in due time) is falsely claiming copyright over and [I have made available on Zenodo](#). Almost 200 years after publication, the copyright has expired.

I would enjoy if you help me liberate the public domain and to rebuild the trust I have lost in you as an association that helps "disseminat[e] the results of research". With respect to liberating public domain works, Sci-Hub has done a great job because no copyright infringement exists.

Kind regards,
Chris

Ps. I have cross-posted this on my blog as well.