

**From:** J. Marvin Herndon [mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2017 9:08 AM  
**To:** j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk  
**Cc:** 'J. Marvin Herndon'  
**Subject:** Formal Appeal  
**Importance:** High

Dear Dame J[ulia] Higgins,

In a week a month will have passed since I filed my Formal Appeal (below). If I have not heard from you by April 26, 2017, I will assume that you have no intention of responding and that you intend to let the Institute of Physics continue to deceive the scientific community and the public regarding the massive spraying of toxic matter into the air we all breathe.

Many men in my father's generation died defending your island nation. Why? So that a new generation of Brits could arise that is so inhumane as to poison the air their own people breathe and deceive the public about it? Where is their courage? Where is their integrity? Where is yours?

As the situation now stands, I allege, you are complicit in deceiving the public and scientific community. That does not have to remain so. As President of the Institute of Physics you should be the moral compass for that organization. Within the next week I trust you will respond.

Sincerely,

J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

**From:** J. Marvin Herndon [mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 26, 2017 5:37 AM  
**To:** j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk  
**Cc:** 'J. Marvin Herndon'  
**Subject:** Formal Appeal  
**Importance:** High

Dear Dame J[ulia] Higgins,

On January 22, 2017 I wrote to you stating, "In your capacity as President of the Institute of Physics (IOP), I bring to your attention allegations, not only of scholarly malfeasance, but of criminal activity by the officers and certain editors of IOP Publishing. I provided details of the circumstances including those of the sham "review" of my rejected response. (The email trail follows below.) You forwarded my complaint to Paul Hardaker, IOP Chief Executive Officer, whose response was every bit as much of a sham as the so-called review.

By his response Paul Hardaker sanctioned IOP being co-opted by a known non-scientist, disinformation agent, Mick West, to deceive the scientific community and the public about a widespread and deliberate activity of spraying particulate pollution, evidenced as toxic coal fly ash, into the air millions of people breathe that risks poisoning Earth's biota including humans and upsetting the delicate balance in nature? Hardaker has likewise sanctioned IOP engaging in sham reviews. He may consider the matter closed, but I do not.

Please consider this email as my formal appeal to you as President of IOP. As a distinguished scientist (FRS, OBE) you know, or ought to know, that science is all about telling the truth. I trust that in deciding this matter that you

**will stand tall in integrity and, unlike those in the actions before, will neither bury your head in the sand nor let your strings be pulled by some puppet-master. Science and humanity are too important.**

Sincerely,

**J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.**

**From:** Paul Hardaker [<mailto:Paul.Hardaker@iop.org>]

**Sent:** Monday, March 13, 2017 9:22 AM

**To:** [mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com)

**Subject:** RE: allegation of American inspired criminal activity at IOP Publishing - Kindly acknowledge receipt

Dear Dr Herndon

Please accept my apologies for the delay in coming back to you on your letters to both myself and Professor Dame Julia Higgins, but I wanted to have the opportunity and time to familiarise myself with your complaint and to talk with the team at IOP Publishing. I now understand that you have already had correspondence over your concerns that you have raised in your recent notes. Having spoken to the team I am satisfied that they have applied our peer review policy and processes appropriately. I can understand your disappointment with the outcome of that however we do now consider this matter closed.

Sincerely

Paul Hardaker

**Professor Paul Hardaker**, FInstP FRMetS CMet

Chief Executive Officer

Institute of Physics

76 Portland Place, London, W1B 1NT

Email: [paul.hardaker@iop.org](mailto:paul.hardaker@iop.org)

Tel: +44 (0)7941 597394

[www.iop.org](http://www.iop.org)

Support IOP's [fundraising campaign](#)

Follow us on [LinkedIn](#), [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [our Blog](#)

**From:** J. Marvin Herndon [<mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com>]

**Sent:** 26 February 2017 18:24

**To:** [j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk)

**Cc:** 'J. Marvin Herndon'; Paul Hardaker

**Subject:** allegation of American inspired criminal activity at IOP Publishing - Kindly acknowledge receipt

**Dear Dame J[ulia] Higgins,**

**On January 22, 2017 I wrote to you stating, "In your capacity as President of the Institute of Physics, I bring to your attention allegations, not only of scholarly malfeasance, but of criminal activity by the officers and certain editors of IOP Publishing. This is a situation, I submit, that as a woman of humanity and**

integrity you should want to rectify with celerity.” Then I provided details of the circumstances. (The email trail follows below.) You forwarded my complaint to Paul Hardaker to address with the subject line “Not my turn yet.” On January 23, Hardaker responded stating, “I have asked my colleagues in IOP Publishing to comment on your concerns and I will write back to you shortly when I have a considered response to the issue that you have raised.” Having received no response, on February 7, I requested his time frame for response. But he never responded. It seems clear that Paul Hardaker’s response is no response at all, which now makes this matter yours to resolve.

I do not know whether the Environmental Research Letters (ERL) editor was deceived or blundered or colluded in publishing the Shearer et al. letter, <http://NuclearPlanet.com/erla.pdf>. For reasons set forth in previous correspondence, shown below, that letter is clearly intended to deceive the public and the scientific community. But the fact that my response, <http://NuclearPlanet.com/erlr.pdf>, was rejected twice on the basis of sham reviews, devoid of substantive criticism, is clear evidence that ERL and IOP Publishing knowingly and willingly conspired and acted to deceive the public and the scientific community of activities involving poisoning the air millions of people breathe, activities that many consider crimes against humanity.

Climate scientists, even those who study the atmosphere, have been patently dishonest in failing to mention the near-daily, near-global tropospheric aerial particulate spraying that has the consequence of causing global warming and posing serious risks to human and environmental health:

<http://www.nuclearplanet.com/mw1.pdf>; <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/ag.pdf>;  
<http://www.nuclearplanet.com/2173.pdf>;

<http://www.nuclearplanet.com/indjsrt.pdf>. That I am on the right track is indicated by the disinformation team assault by misrepresentation on two public health journals causing my peer-reviewed and published papers to be retracted without providing verbatim comments for my response:

<http://nuclearplanet.com/explainretractions.pdf>. They smear my reputation and pervert my Wikipedia page. Mick West, admittedly a non-scientist, a co-author of the Shearer et al. ERL letter, is part, if not head, of that disinformation team.

No one has the right to poison the air breathed by millions of people on a near-daily, near-global basis by spraying into the troposphere a pollutant substance, evidenced as coal fly ash. No one has the right to deceive the public about the concomitant health risks. Yet, there have been deliberate efforts, including the ERL letter by Shearer et al., to deceive the public into believing that the observed particulate trails are jet contrails made of harmless ice crystals.

There is good evidence the particulates being sprayed into the troposphere consist of coal fly ash, the toxic waste product of coal-burning utilities. Aerosolized coal fly ash mixes with the air we breathe, becomes trapped for long periods in terminal airways and alveoli where its carcinogens, including arsenic, hexavalent chromium, and radioactive elements, pose risks for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and lung cancer and where its other toxins, readily released with body moisture, have potentially grave human health

implications including increased mortality, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, premature births, reduced male fertility, stroke, and likely even worse consequences. Is this what you would wish for your grandchildren? Any persons or institutions that aid such an activity either by their knowing silence or by their active participation will one day be held culpable for crimes against humanity in the world's courts of law. That day may be closer than many realize.

You are probably aware that physicians and scientists made it possible for Adolph Hitler to make genocide legal in the Third Reich. Hitler, however, never stooped so low as to slowly and insidiously poison the air Germans and other people breathe. Why would you or any scientist of integrity want to become party to harming innocent people, especially the most vulnerable among us, pregnant women, children, the elderly, and the infirmed?

The consequences of the aerial spraying are clear: Particulate matter sprayed into the troposphere inhibits rainfall to change weather/climate which disrupts habitats, heats the atmosphere, retards heat loss from Earth's surface and enhances global warming. Now, there is independent evidence of a different deliberate effort to melt glaciers and hasten global warming:

<http://nuclearplanet.com/cryo.pr.pdf>; <http://nuclearplanet.com/cryo.pdf>.

As Paul Hardaker appears to be unable, unwilling, or afraid to correct this blight on IOP, I request that you do so by publishing my unedited response quickly and conspicuously.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Kindly respond by March 10, 2017.

Sincerely,  
J. Marvin Herndon

\*\*\*

**From:** J. Marvin Herndon [<mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 6:19 AM

**To:** Paul Hardaker ([Paul.Hardaker@iop.org](mailto:Paul.Hardaker@iop.org))

**Cc:** [j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk); 'J. Marvin Herndon'

**Subject:** request time frame for resolution of ethical/moral/scientific/legal dilemma

**Importance:** High

Dear Professor Hardaker,

Two weeks have elapsed since you wrote "I have asked my colleagues in IOP Publishing to comment on your concerns and I will write back to you shortly when I have a considered response to the issue that you have raised."

Kindly advise me as to your time frame for response. This should not be a difficult matter for you to understand. Environmental Research Letters crossed an ethical/moral/scientific/legal boundary. IOP Publishing first published a paper whose clear intent was to deceive the public about a deliberate widespread, activity that has potentially adverse health consequences for millions of people, and secondly by rejecting my response to the article on the basis of sham reviews. The Institute of Physics would be well served to distance itself by promptly and conspicuously publishing my unedited response. No one has the right to slowly and insidiously poison millions of people, and no one has the right

to deceive the public under the guise of science. This should not be a difficult concept for you to understand.

Again, kindly advise me as to your time frame for response.

Sincerely,  
J. Marvin Herndon

**From:** J. Marvin Herndon [<mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2017 3:45 PM  
**To:** 'Paul Hardaker'  
**Cc:** 'J. Marvin Herndon'  
**Subject:** RE: Not yet my problem

Dear Professor Hardaker,

Thanks for your email and the assurance that you are on the case, so to speak. You have posed a difficult challenge to your colleagues at IOP Publishing: An appropriate response, I submit, would be that they lost their moral compass; a desirable response would be that they lost it but now have found it and will act accordingly. In the absence of such a response, you might like to help them find the missing moral compass and council them on the importance of its use.

Sincerely,

Marvin Herndon

**From:** Paul Hardaker [<mailto:Paul.Hardaker@iop.org>]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2017 2:28 AM  
**To:** [mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Not yet my problem

Dear Dr Herndon

Many thanks for your note which Dame Julia has asked me to reply to on her behalf. I have asked my colleagues in IOP Publishing to comment on your concerns and I will write back to you shortly when I have a considered response to the issue that you have raised.

Sincerely  
Paul Hardaker

**Professor Paul Hardaker**, FInstP FRMetS CMet  
Chief Executive Officer  
Institute of Physics  
76 Portland Place, London, W1B 1NT  
Email: [paul.hardaker@iop.org](mailto:paul.hardaker@iop.org)  
Tel: +44 (0)7941 597394

[www.iop.org](http://www.iop.org)

Support IOP's [fundraising campaign](#)

Follow us on [LinkedIn](#), [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [our Blog](#)

---

**From:** "J. Marvin Herndon" <[mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com)>

**Date:** 23 January 2017 at 00:11:10 GMT

**To:** <[j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:j.higgins@imperial.ac.uk)>

**Cc:** "J. Marvin Herndon" <[mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com)>

**Subject:** allegation of American inspired criminal activity at IOP Publishing - Kindly acknowledge receipt

January 22, 2017

To: Dame Julia Higgins, President, Institute of Physics

From: J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

Dear Dame Julia Higgins,

In your capacity as President of the Institute of Physics, I bring to your attention allegations, not only of scholarly malfeasance, but of criminal activity by the officers and certain editors of IOP Publishing. This is a situation, I submit, that as a woman of humanity and integrity you should want to rectify with celerity. Here I briefly outline the circumstances with links to crucial documents. Below is the email chain that provides specifics.

On August 16, 2016 Environmental Research Letters, an IOP publication, published a paper by Christine Shearer, Mick West, Ken Caldeira, and Steven J. Davis entitled "Quantifying expert consensus against the existence of a secret, large-scale atmospheric spraying program."

<http://NuclearPlanet.com/erla.pdf> That paper clearly was intended to deceive the scientific community. How can I say that? Because one of the authors, non-scientist Mick West, has for years operated two disinformation websites and is part of an operation (presumably by the U. S. Central Intelligence Agency) that has on three occasions assaulted editors and publishers with an onslaught of lies and misinformation and demands for retraction of my peer-reviewed and published public health papers. In two instances my peer-reviewed and published papers were retracted from public health journals without even giving me the opportunity to see and respond to the complaints. See, <http://NuclearPlanet.com/explainretractions.pdf>

As entirely appropriate for an ethical scientific journal, I submitted a response to the above article: <http://NuclearPlanet.com/erlr.pdf>. The editor of Environmental Research Letters was unable to provide a substantive basis for his decision to decline publication. I responded with a letter to the officers of IOP Publishing. Rather than responding, they send my letter back to the same editor. Not surprisingly his response was the same. I responded with another letter to the officers of IOP Publishing, but there was no response.

Make no mistake. No one has the right to spray toxic coal fly ash into the air millions of people breathe on a near-daily, near-global basis. And no one has the right to deceive the scientific community and the public about that activity.

The appropriate action for the Institute of Physics, I believe, is to publish my rejected response, quickly and publically. If I were in your shoes, I would also apologize to the scientific community for allowing Mick West and his

colleagues to corrupt the scientific integrity of the Institute of Physics and Environmental Research Letters.

You may understand that this matter will not be closed until satisfactorily resolved. Please advise me of the intentions of the Institute of Physics in this matter before the close of business on February 3, 2017.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email.

Sincerely,

**J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.**

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

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

To: [mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto: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](mailto:erl@iop.org)

IOP Publishing

Temple Circus, Temple Way, Bristol

BS1 6HG, UK

[www.iopscience.org/erl](http://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)  
[<mailto:onbehalfof+erl+iop.org@manuscriptcentral.com>]

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

**To:** [mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto: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](mailto:erl@iop.org)**

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

[www.iopscience.org/erl](http://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 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.

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