

From: J. Marvin Herndon [mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 1:28 PM
To: 'steven.hall@iop.org'; 'joe.mcentee@iop.org'; 'oliver.callaghan@iop.org'; 'olaf.ernst@iop.org'; 'karen.gill@iop.org'; 'james.walker@iop.org'; 'jamie.hutchins@iop.org'; 'jo.allen@iop.org'; 'collins@ioppubusa.com'; 'moss@ioppubusa.com'; 'moss@ioppubusa.com'; 'beth.mayes@iop.org'; 'brett.rubinstein@iop.org'; 'sarah.fricker@iop.org'
Cc: 'J. Marvin Herndon'
Subject: Allegation of Complicity in Crimes against Humanity: Kindly acknowledge receipt
Importance: High

November 19, 2016

To: Officers of IOP Publications
From: J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.
Subject: Allegation of Complicity in Crimes against Humanity

The Officers of IOP Publications chose to consider my October 19, 2016 communication “Allegation of Science Fraud at Environmental Research Letters” (below) as a rebuttal to be addressed by the ERL Editorial Board. That was a mistake. The response provided by Editor Marris Stephens not only provided no legitimate basis to deny publication of my response, but served to confirm his willingness to allow the ERL published deception by Shearer et al. to stand unchallenged. As Officers of IOP Publications you rightly should question Editor Stephens’ understanding of science and his ethical commitment to humanity. It appears that Stevens does not understand that science is all about truth, not deception. It is not about tabulating opinions. He seems content with allowing Shearer et al. to continue to deceive the public about the near-daily spraying of a toxic substance into the air millions of people breathe, an activity that many consider crimes against humanity. What Editor Stevens has done by his second denial of my response, without a sound scientific basis, is, I allege, to implicate himself, several unnamed Editorial Board Members, and the Officers of IOP Publications in the act of aiding and abetting crimes against humanity.

If I were in your place, I would fire for cause Editor Stevens and replace him with someone who has the knowledge and integrity to clean up the potentially devastating mess he created. He has placed IOP Publications and its Officers in vulnerable positions. You may understand that until this matter is satisfactorily resolved, it will not go away; it will inevitably burgeon.

I will await your response until the close of business on November 25, 2016.

Sincerely,

J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

From: J. Marvin Herndon [mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2016 11:09 PM
To: 'steven.hall@iop.org'; 'joe.mcentee@iop.org'; 'oliver.callaghan@iop.org'; 'olaf.ernst@iop.org'; 'karen.gill@iop.org'; 'james.walker@iop.org'; 'jamie.hutchins@iop.org'; 'jo.allen@iop.org'; 'collins@ioppubusa.com'; 'moss@ioppubusa.com'; 'moss@ioppubusa.com'; 'beth.mayes@iop.org'; 'brett.rubinstein@iop.org'; 'sarah.fricker@iop.org'

Cc: 'J. Marvin Herndon'

Subject: Allegation of Science Fraud at Environmental Research Letters

Importance: High

October 19, 2016

To: Officers of IOP Publications

From: J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

Subject: Allegation of Science Fraud at Environmental Research Letters

From time to time unscrupulous authors successfully perpetrate fraud on unsuspecting journal editors. Previously, that might have been said about the publication in Environmental Research Letters by Shearer et al. "Quantifying expert consensus against the existence of a secret large-scale atmospheric spraying program." Environ Res Lett. 2016;084011. <http://nuclearplanet.com/erla.pdf>

But now, with the sham-rejection of my submitted response, <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/erlr.pdf>, (ERL-102975) it can be said with great confidence and I herewith allege that the Institute of Physics' IOP Publications has knowingly and willingly been corrupted to deceive the public and the scientific community of the existence of a wide-spread covert aerial tropospheric geoengineering activity that published evidence indicates is mainly coal fly ash, a toxic waste-product of coal-burning. The parties involved allegedly include the "peer review team" comprised of Marris Stephens, Editor; Helen Davis, Associate Editor; Lauren Carter, Associate Editor; Tom Slader, Editorial Assistant; Lucy Bell, Production Editor; and Guillaume Wright, Executive Editor; as well as one unnamed "Board Member" who fabricated a fraudulent-review that was wrongly used as a basis for publication denial.

No one has the right to poison the air people breathe. No one has the right to harm the most vulnerable among us: pregnant women, children, the elderly, and those with compromised respiratory and immune systems. No one has the right to knowingly and willingly act to deceive the public and the scientific community of such harmful activities. There are many who consider the ongoing tropospheric geoengineering to constitute crimes against humanity. Already, the required notice has been given of one lawsuit: <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/LASG 60-Day Notice.pdf>; others will doubtlessly be filed in the U.S.A., and in European and Commonwealth Nations. I would find it difficult to believe that aiding and abetting the systematic poisoning of people's air would be permitted under British law, as it is based upon English common law which is based upon common sense reasoning. I would likewise find it difficult to believe that said aiding and abetting would be deemed appropriate behavior for a registered charity.

The Officers of IOP Publishing should, I submit, do what the editor should have done in the first instance: Publish my submitted response, <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/erlr.pdf>, without delay. This is a prudent action because there is no legitimate basis to do otherwise; the reviewer's remarks were a sham, a fraud, fabricated to unwarrantedly justify rejection where there is no legitimate basis shown for rejection: This I demonstrate in the following. The verbatim reviewer remarks are shown following the end of this letter.

Science is all about telling the truth, not deceiving the public and the scientific community. Science review is not about suppressing publication on the basis of capricious, pejorative remarks that are without basis, such as those made by said unnamed Board Member. Moreover, it appears that said unnamed Board Member did not thoroughly read the manuscript he/she criticized.

●The unnamed Board Member wrongly states "the main aerosolized particulate matter [**in aircraft exhaust**] is..." No. What I wrote is this: "Similarly, the intent of the Letter by Shearer et al., whether deliberate or not, is to mislead the scientific community and the public about the existence and public health risks of "a secret large-scale atmospheric program ... commonly referred to as 'chemtrails or 'covert geoengineering'" which **involves tropospheric aerial spraying of micron and submicron particulate matter.**" (Emphasis mine).

- The unnamed Board Member wrongly states: “The manuscript submitted combines personal opinion and reflections on the scientific process, including the assertion that “In any event, tabulating opinions is neither science nor “objective science.”” These reflections do not fit the criterion that an ERL Comment be “factually-based,” and would be better-suited to an op-ed or other perspective essay. Nonsense. My remarks quoted above are indeed “factually-based” and, moreover, contain literature citations. Science is based upon observations and understanding securely linked to the properties and behavior of matter and radiation, not upon opinion. Technology is based upon science; imagine technology based solely upon opinion – shades of the dark ages. There is serious inconsistency here as the paper by Shearer et al. was based upon a tabulation of opinions collected under less than objective circumstances and therefore could hardly be said to be “factually based.” But as the basis of the paper by Shearer et al. is a collection of opinions, my response about opinions is therefore appropriate, relevant and hence “factually based.”
- The unnamed Board Member does not seem concerned about the ERL paper by Shearer et al. not being “factually-based” or that said paper deceives the public and the scientific community by stating “*There have been no peer-reviewed studies in the scientific literature addressing SLAP [secret, large-scale atmospheric spraying program] claims.*” When in fact in my response I cite three peer-reviewed articles published in the scientific literature on the subject.
- The unnamed Board Member wrongly states “The author does present facts drawn from photos and rainwater samples, but in neither case is the evidence presented in a matter that would allow a rigorous evaluation of the data or reproducibility (e.g. dates and places of photos; methodology for rainwater measuring).” Those remarks are absurd and hypocritical. About the pictures, I clearly stated “Six views of the San Diego, California (USA) sky...” Dates could be easily added in revision. Why hypocrisy? Shearer et al. presented four sky photos for solicitation of opinions: **Only one identified the place and date; one identified the place, but only the year; one only identified the year, not the place; one neither identified the place nor the date.** Similarly, Shearer et al. solicited opinions about web-posed rainwater analyses and failed to acknowledge rainwater studies published in peer-reviewed literature. I cited those rainwater measurements in my response including one with the title “**Obtaining evidence of coal fly ash content in weather modification (geoengineering) through analyses of post-aerosol spraying rainwater and solid substances**” which describes the methodology in some detail. After having made that remark, said Board Member engages in an out-of-context pejorative assault that I find repugnant in any scientific endeavor, especially in manuscript review.
- The unnamed Board Member misleadingly states “It is possible that more detailed discussions were presented in past publications, but it appears that at least some of these publications have since been retracted by the journals in which they were published. It is not appropriate to cite retracted papers, or to consider these papers as part of the peer-reviewed literature.” The uninformed reader might assume from that out-of-context remark that my work is in some way deficient. I did mention retracted articles in my response, specifically in the context that a team of disinformation agents have assaulted with lies and misinformation editors and journals that published my work disclosing evidence and public health risks of ongoing tropospheric geoengineering. In at least one instance, someone made a personal visit to the editor to “encourage” retraction. In one instance, the editor provided me verbatim criticism statements for my written response. The editor would have published the comments and my response, but the disinformation agents would not give permission and nothing further happened. These people who act to hide public health threats are like yapping dogs, with no biting teeth. But they were successful in two instances causing my public health papers to be retracted while never providing me the lying comments and the opportunity to respond. You should read the latest peer-reviewed and published paper that was retracted: <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/frontiers1.pdf> Women, the protectors of our progeny, especially, should read it. You may get a clearer picture of the science-deceit by reading the ongoing communications involved: <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/retraction.html>. The unwarranted retraction matter is not closed by any means. One of the authors of Shearer et al., Mick West, operates two disinformation websites and allegedly is part of the disinformation apparatus.
- The unnamed Board Member twists out of proportion a statement I made in order to deceive. I wrote “...presumably were recipients of **government** funding and thus subject to the dictum “do not bite the hand

that feeds you.” He/she twists “**government** funding” to “**federal** funding” and claims that many were respondents were foreign, or from private companies and not subject to U.S. funding. The reality is that most basic research throughout the world, including private companies, is directly or indirectly **government** funded. (Emphasis mine).

Misrepresentations and distortions, such as described above, do not constitute legitimate grounds for refusing publication of my response (ERL-102975). Instead, as alleged above, such actions expose IOP Publishing, and certain named and unnamed individuals to potential civil and perhaps even criminal liability. I herewith request that the Officers of IOP Publishing reverse the decision and promptly publish my response (ERL-102975).

Kindly respond by the close of business on October 28, 2016.

Sincerely,

J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: onbehalfof+erl+iop.org@manuscriptcentral.com

[<mailto:onbehalfof+erl+iop.org@manuscriptcentral.com>]

Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 3:11 AM

To: mherndon@san.rr.com

Subject: Our decision on your article: ERL-102975

Dear Dr Herndon,

Re: "Another Anthropogenic Cause of Global Warming: Response to the Letter by Shearer et al." by Herndon, J.

Article reference: ERL-102975

Your Comment has now been considered by the Board Member of Environmental Research Letters and the Board Member's report can be found below and/or attached to this message.

We regret to inform you that the Board Member has recommended that your article should not be published in the journal, for the reasons given in the enclosed report. Your manuscript has therefore been withdrawn from consideration.

We would like to thank you for your interest in Environmental Research Letters.

Yours sincerely

Marric Stephens

On behalf of the IOP peer-review team:

Marric Stephens - Editor

Helen Davis and Lauren Carter - Associate Editors

Tom Slader - Editorial Assistant

Lucy Bell - Production Editor

Guillaume Wright - Executive Editor

erl@iop.org

IOP Publishing
Temple Circus, Temple Way, Bristol
BS1 6HG, UK

www.iopscience.org/erl

2015 Impact Factor = 4.134

We are always looking for ways to improve our service and would appreciate it if you could take five minutes to complete a short survey (<https://freeonlinesurveys.com/s/1ydl899J#/>) about your experience of submitting to IOP Publishing. All of your feedback is incredibly valuable to us, and we would like to thank you in advance for your help.

REFEREE REPORT(S):

Referee: 1 (Board Member)

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

I have carefully reviewed the comment entitled "Another Anthropogenic Cause of Global Warming: Response to the Letter by Shearer et al." The article is well-written, and presents an integrated argument "the main aerosolized particulate matter [in aircraft exhaust] is coal combustion fly ash, by-product waste of coal-burning electric utilities."

The manuscript submitted combines personal opinion and reflections on the scientific process, including the assertion that "In any event, tabulating opinions is neither science nor "objective science."" These reflections do not fit the criterion that an ERL Comment be "factually-based," and would be better-suited to an op-ed or other perspective essay.

The author does present facts drawn from photos and rainwater samples, but in neither case is the evidence presented in a manner that would allow a rigorous evaluation of the data or reproducibility (e.g. dates and places of photos; methodology for rainwater measuring). It is possible that more detailed discussions were presented in past publications, but it appears that at least some of these publications have since been retracted by the journals in which they were published. It is not appropriate to cite retracted papers, or to consider these papers as part of the peer-reviewed literature.

A core concern of the author is whether the expert solicitation methodology of Shearer et al. should be considered "objective science." The author speculates that federal funding may undermine the scientific objectivity of the surveyed experts. However, the study design of Shearer et al. includes experts from a wide range of countries and institutions, including private companies. As such, the conclusions on which the vast majority of respondents agreed, especially Figures 1 and 2 in Shearer et al., would be consistent with or without federally funded U.S. respondents included in the results.

The submitted comment does not meet the criteria of an ERL Comment, and as such is not suitable for publication in ERL.

Letter reference: DSR08

-----Original Message-----

From: onbehalfof+erl+iop.org@manuscriptcentral.com
[<mailto:onbehalfof+erl+iop.org@manuscriptcentral.com>]

Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 8:03 AM

To: mherndon@san.rr.com

Subject: Our decision on your article: ERL-102975

Dear Dr Herndon,

Re: "Another Anthropogenic Cause of Global Warming: Response to the Letter by Shearer et al." by Herndon, J.

Article reference: ERL-102975

Your Comment has now been considered by the Editorial Board of Environmental Research Letters, along with your response to the referee comments. We regret to inform you that the Board has decided that your article should not be published in the journal, for the reasons given in the attached report(s).

This means that we are not able to consider your article any further, and the correspondence is now closed. We are sorry that we cannot respond more positively, and would like to thank you for your interest in Environmental Research Letters.

Yours sincerely

Marric Stephens

On behalf of the IOP peer-review team:

Marric Stephens - Editor

Helen Davis and Lauren Carter - Associate Editors

Tom Slader - Editorial Assistant

Lucy Bell - Production Editor

Guillaume Wright - Executive Editor

erl@iop.org

IOP Publishing

Temple Circus, Temple Way, Bristol

BS1 6HG, UK

www.iopscience.org/erl

2015 Impact Factor = 4.134

We are always looking for ways to improve our service and would appreciate it if you could take five minutes to complete a short survey

<https://freeonlinesurveys.com/s/1ydL899J#/>) about your experience of submitting to IOP Publishing. All of your feedback is incredibly valuable to us, and we would like to thank you in advance for your help.

REFEREE REPORT(S):

Referee: 1 (Editorial Board Member)

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

I have carefully reviewed the comment entitled “Another Anthropogenic Cause of Global Warming: Response to the Letter by Shearer et al.” The article is well-written, and presents an integrated argument to assert that “the main aerosolized particulate matter [in aircraft exhaust] is coal combustion fly ash, by-product waste of coal-burning electric utilities.”

The manuscript submitted combines personal opinion and reflections on the scientific process, including the assertion that “In any event, tabulating opinions is neither science nor “objective science.”” These reflections do not fit the criterion that an ERL Comment be “factually-based,” and would be better-suited to an op-ed or other perspective essay.

The author does present facts drawn from photos and rainwater samples, but in neither case is the evidence presented in a matter that would allow a rigorous evaluation of the data or reproducibility (e.g. dates and places of photos; methodology for rainwater measuring). It is possible that more detailed discussions were presented in past publications, but it appears that at least some of these publications have since been retracted by the journals in which they were published. It is not appropriate to cite retracted papers, or to consider these papers as part of the peer-reviewed literature.

A core concern of the author is whether the expert solicitation methodology of Shearer et al. should be considered “objective science.” The author speculates that federal funding may undermine the scientific objectivity of the surveyed experts. However, the study design of Shearer et al. includes experts from a wide range of countries and institutions, including private companies. As such, the conclusions on which the vast majority of respondents agreed, especially Figures 1 and 2 in Shearer et al., would be consistent with or without federally funded U.S. respondents included in the results.

The submitted comment does not meet the criteria of an ERL Comment, and as such is not suitable for publication in ERL.

Referee: 2 (Editorial Board Member)

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

Elements in the front part of this article are of interest as they relate to jet contrails and are in the journal's scope. But the second part on atmospheric spraying is much more questionable. The article is not suitable for publication as it is, because the first and second halves are not well connected.

Original contributions by the author on the subject of the first part would be welcomed.

Letter reference: DSR09