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ABSTRACT

In this inaugural issue of IJVTPR, the authors have focused on a variety of themes that are intended to highlight some of the ongoing controversies in the vaccine literature, controversies that have been made all the more acute by the emergence of COVID-19. With this pandemic have come societal disruptions that have caused governments around the globe to move rapidly to “state of exception” measures. It is at times such as this, that independent scholarly research is most urgently needed. The current issue is our opening salvo that attempts to bring rigorous independent and unbiased research to the subject of vaccine safety and analysis. The article by Shaw looks at how the process that has governed scientific review for centuries — peer review — has been corrupted in an attempt to sanitize the literature in order to remove studies that do not conform to a corporate line. It seems certain that in the new age of COVID-19, such measures will only increasingly harm and obscure honest science. The paper by Oller et al. follows up on the 2017 article about the apparent distribution of a World Health Organization anti-fertility vaccine represented as a prophylactic for maternal and neonatal tetanus. The article by David Lewis takes an important alternative look at potential etiological factors that might contribute to the rising prevalence of autism, factors that are not per se the direct result of vaccination but that involve some of the pathogens and components from that industry. Next, Sin Hang Lee takes an intensive critical look at the components in Gardasil9. It is a vaccine deploying gene-edited recombinant capsid L1 proteins converted to virus like particles to stimulate immunity against human papilloma viruses of types 6, 11, 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58. In theory it also requires one or more strong adjuvants to jump start the generation of antibodies against the various viruses. Because Lee’s paper addresses an application of gene editing research in vaccine development, it adumbrates our next issue in which we intend to address so-called “dual use” and “gain of function” research with potential pandemic pathogens preceding the present COVID-19 pandemic.
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What this Journal Aims to Accomplish

This first issue of the International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research (IJVTPR) is the beginning of an experiment in independent scientific inquiry, and in publishing the results of such inquiry. It is experimental because the journal seeks to break away from much mainstream publishing because the most expensive and most prestigious journals are, at the time of this writing, generally known to be subject to powerful corporate and governmental interference (Liu et al., 2017; Wong et al., 2017, 2019; Dal-Ré et al., 2019; Niforatos et al., 2020). Specifically, as argued by Shaw in the first paper following this introduction — “Weaponizing the Peer Review System” — mainstream journals in medicine and pharmaceutical theory and research often pre-censor submissions that directly or indirectly challenge the products of the industry, particularly vaccines, which are at its financial foundation, and are at the core of the industry’s governmental power base. The same journals often seem to recoil in fear at legitimate research showing undesirable outcomes of some product or procedure deployed by the vast world-wide medical and pharmaceutical complex. Less well-supported journals may be panicked into retracting articles based on complaints from special interest groups. Such an event very nearly occurred with our 2017 paper (with other co-authors) about human chorionic gonadotropin conjugated with tetanus toxoid in “birth control” vaccines sponsored and promoted by the World Health Organization. Our study showed that some vials of vaccine supposedly aimed at preventing tetanus in Kenyan women and their babies in 2013-2014, contained the WHO “antifertility” conjugate. Our follow up in this issue of the IJVTPR, is titled “Addendum to ‘HCG Found in Tetanus Vaccine’: Examination of Alleged ‘Ethical Concerns’ Based on False Claims by Certain of Our Critics”. That follow-up shows how our work was attacked and why it was not retracted in spite of the false criticisms launched against us and against the publication of our work.

In the following article titled, “The Autism Biosolids Conundrum”, David Lewis examines some largely neglected etiological factors that may have contributed to the rising prevalence of autism. They indirectly involve pathogens in vaccines and other components from that industry. Then, in the final entry for this issue, Sin Hang Lee examines components in Gardasil9. His focus is on the gene-edited recombinant virus like particles manipulated in order to try to stimulate immunity against nine of the 58 known and studied human papilloma viruses. Because he is dealing with aspects of the efficacy and safety of gene editing research applied experimentally in vaccine development, his work anticipates our next issue in which we address the “dual-purpose” and “gain of function” research with potential pandemic pathogens (Kiliński et al., 2016; Loria, 2017; Evans, 2018) that has, in point of fact, preceded the present COVID-19 pandemic and may well have been, by accident or intention, its proximate source.

One of the motivations for the creation of this journal has been an increasing number of coerced involuntary and unjustified retractions. While the mainstream journals engaging in the practice commonly claim that their retractions are validly based on the standard criteria of plagiarism, fraudulent misrepresentation, and the like, the still increasing volume of retractions, very few of which are due to unintentional errors (Bosch et al., 2012; Steen et al., 2013; Dal-Ré & Ayuso, 2019; S. Y. Kim et al., 2019; Lyons-Weiler, 2019; Nair et al., 2020), are merely because results or conclusions were inimical to the marketing objectives of the vested interests and the often backgrounded
governmental power base. That medical governmental complex protects itself by denial and, in some well-documented instances, by deceitful reporting of known falsehoods as demonstrated in recent the well-researched but vilified documentaries, Vaxxed: From Cover Up to Catastrophe (2016; also see Barry et al., 2015) and Plandemic Part 1 (Willis, 2020). We are not claiming these documentaries are correct in all respects, but we are saying that suppression of such alternative views is coming from vested interests. In this journal, we will trust our readers to make up their own minds. Because researchers and the readership at large are more interested in discovering truth than in being indoctrinated by vested interests and their advertisers, the authors and publications branded “RETRACTED” in large red letters, are apt to continue being read and cited as often, or even more often, than ones not retracted (Bolboacă et al., 2019; Rubbo et al., 2019). Putting the cat back in the bag to suppress critical thinking does not seem to work well if at all.

As Shaw points out in his opening article in this issue, the authors of research on post-retraction citations do not systematically distinguish articles retracted for apparently legitimate reasons, such as demonstrable fraud or crucial but honest errors, from those removed by intimidation of the authors, publishers, and users whom the attackers seek to silence and ban from the research literature. Nor do the researchers examining rejections or “misconduct” policy, or the lack thereof (Sox & Rennie, 2006; Trikalinos et al., 2008; Bosch et al., 2012; Bosch, 2013, 2014; Resnik & Master, 2013; Šupak-Smolečić et al., 2015; Resnik, 2019) focus attention on the fact that the attacks in many instances are transparently motivated by monetized conflicts of interest on the part of those aiming to force the retraction (Wong et al., 2019; Inoue et al., 2019; Copiello, 2020; Karanges et al., 2020).

The paper following Shaw’s article about the “peer review process” by the same team of collaborators who discussed the development of the World Health Organization “birth control” vaccines published earlier in OALib (Oller et al., 2017; Litten, 2017) also elaborates some of the backstory behind the weaponization of the peer review process and the premeditative attacks motivated and sponsored by vested interests. The story in that paper leads, as noted in the original article, from the notorious Tuskegee syphilis experiments on Black share-croppers (Thomas & Quinn, 1991; Gamble, 1997; Washington, 2008; Park, 2017), about half of whom were given sugar-coated placebos while being led to believe they were being given medicine to treat the disease that was killing them, to the present-day anti-fertility and population control aims of the WHO, Planned Parenthood, and some of its wealthy and powerful corporate and governmental sponsors (National Security Council, 1975, 2014; Gates, 2010; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2020). Was it a coincidence that the Tuskegee experiment was halted in 1972 at the very time the anti-fertility initiatives leading to the present-day Planned Parenthood “population control” agenda was just beginning to emerge from its own embryonic stage?

Partly in response to the above issues, ones generally involving the mainstream high impact medical and pharmaceutical journals, we note with approval that there seems to be a growing recognition of the need for open access to scientific research and many open access journals are being created (Willinsky, 2006; Björk et al., 2010; Edgar & Willinsky, 2010; Lyons-Weiler, 2019; Gul et al., 2019; Teixeira da Silva et al., 2019; Asai, 2020; Copiello, 2020). Also, at least some of those open access publications are not subject to control by vested medical and pharmaceutical interests, though efforts by the mega-publishers to gain monetary control of the growing open access industry in

order to maintain their existing hegemony over the traditional subscription and hard-copy journals market is also well-documented (Schifini & Rodrigues, 2019; Teixeira da Silva et al., 2019).

Nevertheless many dedicated scholars are either starting or enthusiastically contributing as editors, authors, and as independent researchers willing to publish in and cite the new journals as they rise in importance and prominence to meet the growing demand for uncensored outlets. A chief advantage of low-cost open access publishing, in many instances available at very low cost to researchers and none at all to readers and the consuming public, is precisely, ease of access. From the research side of openly accessible papers, all else being held equal, citations by other scholars seem to exceed those in the high cost subscription journals. Interestingly, with respect to “misconduct” policy and the placement of the increasingly common red stain of “RETRACTED” on papers already published, especially in high impact medical and pharmaceutical journals (Sox & Rennie, 2006; Grieneisen & Zhang, 2012; Steen et al., 2013; G. Li et al., 2018; Dal-Ré & Ayuso, 2019; Erfanmanesh & Teixeira da Silva, 2019), a study from 2012 found that only a third of the 399 prestige journals that were examined, with an average impact factor of 6.5, had a publicly available statement of their misconduct policy (Bosch et al., 2012). Subsequent works citing that 2012 complaint by Bosch et al., however, do not report much if any improvement in the public announcement of journal policies concerning misconduct (Bosch, 2013, 2014; Resnik & Master, 2013; Šupak-Smolčić et al., 2015; Resnik et al., 2017; Resnik, 2019) of which the flip side, presumably, is research integrity (Resnik et al., 2017; Godecharle et al., 2018; Misra et al., 2018; Misra & Agarwal, 2020; Teixeira da Silva, 2020).

All that being said, authors who submit to IJVTPR should have no fear of capricious retractions. Rather, instead of the panicked retractions increasingly seen in the mainstream journals (Carlisle, 2017; G. Li et al., 2018; Dal-Ré & Ayuso, 2019), our intention is to return the retraction tool to its proper historical use — that is, where the grounds for retraction are falsification of data or references, misrepresentation of sources or plagiarism, and undisclosed, unjustified, needless duplication of previously published material. Apart from these standard criteria, all articles submitted will receive the same sort of stringent peer review and, if accepted for publication, will be safe from hostile attempts to force gratuitous repeated reviews after publication not to mention the extreme of intimidation tactics aiming to force an injurious retraction. This is not to say that we will not allow spirited critiques of published articles, to be responded to with corresponding rebuttals, but the editors will not bow to corporate or other pressures from vested interests. Nor will we entertain letters or articles that originate ad hominem rhetoric or slander. This journal is about verifiable facts, not feelings, and not unsupported opinions. Nor is it about the preferences and invented claims of advertisers and promoters of medical and pharmaceutical products.

For those who might want to apply the epithet “anti-vax”, a pejorative aimed at suppressing independent critical thought and research on the subject of vaccines, let them be advised in advance that doing so only reveals the absence of any valid counter arguments to the sound theory and research presented in the papers contained and cited here. Critics who engage in the biased service of some marketing agenda are warned in advance that all such attacks will only call attention to the IJVTPR along with its evidence-based presentations. Those who attacked the documentaries Vaxxed: From Cover Up to Catastrophe (2016), and Plandemic Part 1 (Willis, 2020), along with their many distinguished researchers and contributors, should have learned by now that doing so only heightens
interest in the very facts the naysayers are trying to suppress and even erase from human consciousness.

Ultimately, the journal’s success will rest on sound theory applied to the investigation of experimental facts by scientists, researchers, and theoreticians. We welcome those who would like to publish with us and the audience that will read their words. We welcome fair criticism grounded in sound reasoning and material evidences. Our aim will be to correct any genuine errors promptly and with appropriate acknowledgment. The journal is an experiment in open access publishing joining a rather large and still growing movement (Willinsky, 2006; “Accessing Medical Information: Dr. John Willinsky Makes the Case for Open Access,” 2007; Björk et al., 2010; University et al., 2014; Gul et al., 2019; Lyons-Weiler, 2019; Hyland et al., 2020). It aims to make scientific information more accessible to a wider readership in the interest of speeding the process of learning and the advancement of knowledge. It is experimental in the best sense of that term and its success must be judged by outcomes. We hope and believe that it will be possible by discovering and presenting sound theory in agreement with experimentally attained, or attainable factual outcomes, to help in the reshaping, and redirecting, and recovery of a promising industry that has, for reasons to be presented in the pages of this journal, actually lost its way.
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Legal Disclaimer

The information on the website and in the IJVTPR is not intended as a diagnosis, recommended treatment, prevention, or cure for any human condition or medical procedure that may be referred to in any way. Users and readers who may be parents, guardians, caregivers, clinicians, or relatives of persons impacted by any of the morbid conditions, procedures, or protocols that may be referred to, must use their own judgment concerning specific applications. The contributing authors, editors, and persons associated in any capacity with the website and/or with the journal disclaim any liability or responsibility to any person or entity for any harm, financial loss, physical injury, or other penalty that may stem from any use or application in any context of information, conclusions, research findings, opinions, errors, or any statements found on this website or in the IJVTPR. The material presented is freely offered to all users who may take an interest in examining it, but how they may choose to apply any part of it, is the sole responsibility of the viewer/user. If material is quoted or reprinted, users are asked to give credit to the source/author and to conform to the non-commercial, no derivatives, requirements of the Creative Commons License 4.0 NC ND.