

LOVE'S FILTER MANIFESTO IMPLODES

On January 9th, 2017 at 9:07 am, Dr. Love received the following email from the Editor, about her Flint filter manifesto paper.

Dear Dr. Love:

...I regret to inform you that the manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in ES&T Letters...the reviewers all expressed serious reservations regarding the suitability of your manuscript for publication. Their major concerns were:

1. The finding that bacterial numbers are initially elevated in water from a filter is not novel or important. This has been well known for many years, and numbers of bacteria alone tell you nothing about the safety of the water.

2. The finding that the filters are working as expected is not particularly a novel result. <Given that such a paper would stimulate>...fears of bacterial "contamination" (which may or more likely may not be harmful), rapid publication of an incomplete story is a concern.

In an instant, Love's plans to unveil her paper at the January 10 EPA data summit and January 11, 2017 Town Hall meeting imploded. Even worse, all four anonymous reviewers had the exact same opinion that had been expressed to Love by the relief agencies for 6 straight months.

[Love later wrote her co-authors:](#)

I'm not surprised by the reviews since, as Shawn knows, I was uncomfortable with parts of it...this gap was obvious to the reviewers...I know we had a strategy for why we wanted this paper out quickly and by January 10...Going forward, I only want to put papers in when the data are ready...

The mourning over the rejection of their *ES&T Letters* filter manifesto manuscript dream was apparently brief. With renewed vigor, the team launched a delusional crybully tale, in which Edwards was the villain responsible for their paper being rejected, and Love was a “silenced” victim heroically fighting for Flint residents. Despite the fact that there were 4 anonymous reviews on the paper, [Dr. Zervos later recommended that the group should](#) “**resubmit <the filter paper> somewhere else and ask for Edwards not to be a reviewer because there is a conflict of interest.**”

[The death threats and emails declaring Edwards’ soul to be eternally damned](#), for somehow silencing Dr. Love’s alleged discovery of abnormal bacteria on the Flint POU filters, literally started the day after her filter manifesto manuscript was rejected by *ES&T Letters*. Ironically, when he opened the first emails, he was sitting in a Chicago meeting where the FACHEP faculty were publicly stating one position, while their rumormongering to Flint residents was communicating the exact opposite position.

DR. LOVE IN THE DRAFT BOOK “FLINT FIGHTS BACK”

Pauli’s [draft book chapter](#) once again provides revelatory insights into the lies FACHEP told themselves and Flint residents. First, there is not one word in the book chapter, about FACHEP’s POU filter fearmongering being soundly rejected in a peer-reviewed article submitted in late December 2016.

Pauli was a co-author on the manuscript, so this omission should not be due to lack of knowledge on his part; however, we found no record he ever read or approved the *ES&T Letters* manuscript. The very fact that a social scientist, [specializing in anarchy and radicalism](#), was co-author of a peer-reviewed technical paper is also a mystery, except that he was deftly using Love’s filter manifesto as a prop in his Flint anarchy experiments.

In relation to the January 6th phone call between Love, McElmurry, and Edwards that is meticulously documented with emails herein, Pauli writes ([read the last page here](#)):

Worried that Edwards was “backing himself into a corner” by rushing to judgment before all the <POU filter bacteria> data were in, McElmurry and Love tried to get him to reconsider his position on a conference call in the lead up to the Chicago <January 10th 2016 EPA data> summit.

“That just failed,” Love recalls. “He just didn’t wanna hear it.” Instead, at the summit Edwards accused FACHEP of causing “much of Flint” to lose faith in the filters, offering only anecdotal evidence.

If anyone was backed into a corner, it was Dr. Love, who with no significant experience, took a *scientific position on POU filters contrary to a unified consensus position of WHO, FEMA, CDC, EPA, MDEQ, MDHHS, GCHD and Dr. Edwards during a water emergency.* And who on earth was “*rushing to judgment*,” if not Dr. Love, who drove colleagues to give up their holidays, to submit a rush job paper she was “*uncomfortable*” with using data that was not “*ready*”?

And the clear purpose of that phone call was to tell Edwards the data were all in, the *ES&T Letters* paper was coming, and that **VT should start telling Flint residents to boil filtered water.**