

Concerted Efforts to Unwarrantedly Cause Retractions of Peer-Reviewed and Published Public Health Scientific Papers

J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.*

Only about 1 in 15,000 scientific papers that are peer-reviewed and published are subsequently retracted by journals, usually because they are fraudulent or have been published before. When I began to publish scientific papers providing evidence on the identification of the poisonous matter being sprayed into the lower atmosphere for weather/climate modification, there were not one, but three attempts (two successful) to cause retraction of my peer-reviewed, published public health scientific papers. For the two retractions, the editors/journals never provided me with the verbatim criticisms for my response. Those are the ethics of the Spanish Inquisition, not the ethics of supposedly scholarly journals.

The retraction efforts, I allege, were a well-organized effort (CIA?) to deceive the medical, environmental and public health communities, and the general public about the now near-daily, near-global tropospheric geoengineering, which poisons the air we breathe and the biota of our environment, as well as altering our weather/climate with potentially devastating results. Those concerted efforts to cause said retractions prove that the high officials who ordered the spraying know very well that they are poisoning humanity and want to hide that fact.

In the following, I describe briefly the three known retraction efforts, provide links to related communications and documents, and list persons known to have been involved, which may provide starting points for investigations.

Failed Retraction Attempt: “Aluminum Poisoning of Humanity and Earth’s Biota by Clandestine Geoengineering Activity: Implications for India” (Current Science)

When the tropospheric spray-trails became a near-daily occurrence in San Diego, I had concern for the health of my family. But no information was available from public officials, or in the scientific literature. But there was much information (and disinformation) on the Internet. Many citizens had rainwater samples analyzed, but without knowing which elements to specify most had specified only aluminum, a few also requested barium, and rarely also strontium. Those elements and many more are readily leached from coal fly ash with water. Moreover, coal fly ash is a major waste product in the more-or-less ideal grain-size that is necessarily captured in Western countries because it is highly toxic to both plants and animals, including humans. So, I compared posted rainwater analyses for those three elements with laboratory leach-data and published the first paper in the scientific literature providing

evidence on the identity of the substance being sprayed and the environmental and public health warnings of one of its leach-products, chemically mobile aluminum: <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/2173.pdf>.

Very soon after the paper was published, the Current Science editor received a communication loaded with criticisms and a demand for retraction. This editor, being a man of integrity, sent me the verbatim comments for my written response, see <http://nuclearplanet.com/erle.pdf>. The Current Science editor intended to publish the remarks of the complainer, identified as **Andras Szilagyi**, together with my response, but Szilagyi refused to give consent.

First Successful Retraction Action: “Evidence of Coal-Fly-Ash Toxic Chemical Geoengineering in the Troposphere: Consequences for Public Health” (International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (MDPI))

Following publication of the above Current Science paper, I submitted a more lengthy manuscript to the MDPI journal. It was reviewed, revised, accepted and published. Then the disinformation team struck. They were so successful at deceiving journal personnel that my paper was retracted without providing me with verbatim comments or giving me the opportunity to respond. One individual, **Jay Reynolds**, even bragged on Facebook that he had traveled to have a face-to-face meeting with the editor, presumably to convey disinformation without leaving a paper trail. The only information as to specific criticisms was published by the editor as his basis for retraction and appears to be composed of the misrepresentations provided by the disinformation team. I posted the complete record of communications, including the editor’s remarks and my responses:

http://www.nuclearplanet.com/public_rejection.pdf.

Second Successful Retraction Action: “Human Environmental Dangers Posed by Ongoing Global Tropospheric Aerosolized Particulates for Weather Modification” (Frontiers in Public Health)

Just as in the first case, the manuscript went through review, revision, and publication. Then the disinformation team struck. They were also so successful at deceiving journal personnel that my paper was retracted without providing me with verbatim comments or giving me the opportunity to respond. I posted the lengthy correspondence: <http://www.nuclearplanet.com/retraction.html>. Although not allowing me to see the comments, it did allow the individuals responsible to make public comments where the retraction notification was posted that all could see.

The first comment was made by **Andras Szilagyi**, the very person who wrote the false criticisms to Current Science. One of those making the Frontiers comments, **John**

Boyd Reynolds, also known as **Jay Reynolds**, is the individual who bragged on Facebook about traveling to meet the editor of the MDPI journal described above as the first successful retraction. These are the connections: **Andras Szilagyi** is linked Current Science and to Frontiers, while **John Boyd Reynolds**, aka **Jay Reynolds**, is linked to Frontiers and MDPI.

From the above links, clearly others are also allegedly involved, including journal personnel and **Mick West**, who operates the disinformation website, metabunk.org, which has spread the disinformation team lies to thousands of viewers, and who also tried to deceive the Frontiers' editor.

No one has the right to slowly and insidiously poison the air millions of people breathe. No one has the right to hide the medical, environmental, and public health risks from the public.

***© J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D., 2017 Creative Commons License, which means free non-profit use provided text is not changed and attribution is given.**