

From: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>  
To: "'Alberts Bruce'" <Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu>  
Cc: "'Peter Wood'" <pwood@nas.org>,  
      "'O'Bannon Yolanda'" <Yolanda.OBannon@ucsf.edu>  
Subject: More Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent  
Date: Fri, 18 Dec 2015 14:43:33 -0800

December 18, 2015

Dear Professor Alberts,

I helped Peter Wood prepare his December 9 email letter "Concerns about the National Academy of Sciences and Scientific Dissent" ([https://www.nas.org/articles/nas\\_letter](https://www.nas.org/articles/nas_letter)). It is tremendous that you responded to Peter because you were Editor-in-Chief of *Science* during 2008-2013 and President of NAS during 1993-2005. To further illustrate the dissent problem, I want to bring to your attention one example of the scientific bias in *Science* that occurred during your editorial tenure: "The Climate Change Debates" by Philip Kitcher in *Science* 2010; 328: 1230-1234 (<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/328/5983/1230.1.full>). This five-page Essay Review includes these sentences "In their fascinating and important study, **Merchants of Doubt**, Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway offer convincing evidence for a surprising and disturbing thesis. . . . The extraordinary story of deliberate obfuscation that Oreskes and Conway document begins with the delight of the tobacco companies in recruiting Fred Seitz and with Seitz's own connections to 'scientists in their twilight years who had turned to fields in which they had no training or experience.'" This book review and **Merchants of Doubt** are defamatory attacks on Frederick Seitz, a renowned solid-state physicist who was President of NAS during 1962-1969 ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick\\_Seitz](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Seitz)). Because Seitz died in 2008 and was unable to defend himself, S. Fred Singer, a renowned atmospheric physicist, did refute the attacks on both Seitz and himself ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fred\\_Singer](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fred_Singer)). Unfortunately, Singer could not get his five-page "A RESPONSE TO 'THE CLIMATE CHANGE DEBATES'" published in *Science*. Singer's response was published in *Energy & Environment* 2010; 21(7): 847-851 ([https://www.heartland.org/sites/default/files/kitcher\\_response\\_to\\_ee2010.pdf](https://www.heartland.org/sites/default/files/kitcher_response_to_ee2010.pdf)). Also, Singer has written recent criticism of *Science* and Editor-in-Chief McNutt, which is part of the third weblink within Peter's letter ([https://www.nas.org/images/documents/Climate\\_change.pdf](https://www.nas.org/images/documents/Climate_change.pdf)).

I hope you can spend some additional time examining the three examples of suppression of scientific dissent described in Peter's letter. I am personally involved with the second (PM2.5) issue. Please let us know if you are willing to discuss these important issues over the phone with Peter or me.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute  
[jenstrom@ucla.edu](mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu)  
(310) 472-4274  
(310) 210-7145 cell

**From:** Peter Wood [mailto:pwood@nas.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2015 3:40 PM  
**To:** 'Alberts, Bruce' <Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent

Dear Bruce,

The deadline for additional nominations had passed by the time I wrote and I was not agitating for a write-in candidate. At that point, Dr. McNutt's election was assured and the voting merely a formality. The election, however, provided an occasion to consider the pattern in how *Science*, under her editorship, treated dissent from well-established scientists writing on matters within their expertise and on topics of broad public significance. We seem to have reached a point where the work of such scientists is routinely marginalized. Whether Dr. McNutt bears personal responsibility for any of this, I cannot say, and I am not sure it matters. As for the number of scientists who hold with the orthodoxy on climate change, I know it is large—although the often cited 97 percent claim is a fiction. “Consensus” is, however, a poor guide to good theory or impartial evaluation of evidence. The consensus behind Aristotle's physics and biology stood for nearly two-thousand years before Bacon, Galileo and others starting to gum up the works.

As it happens, I don't take any position at all of the various global warming controversies. My stake is entirely in the issue of scientific openness and integrity of observations and experimental results. The effort to use consensus to shut down the dissenters concerns me not because I think the dissenters are necessarily right but because their work meets the threshold standards for being taken seriously. *Science* and *Science* hurt themselves by refusing to engage.

Yours sincerely,

Peter

**From:** Alberts, Bruce [mailto:[Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu](mailto:Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2015 6:02 PM  
**To:** Peter Wood <[pwood@nas.org](mailto:pwood@nas.org)>  
**Cc:** O'Bannon, Yolanda <[Yolanda.OBannon@ucsf.edu](mailto:Yolanda.OBannon@ucsf.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent

Peter, I have been completely removed from the NAS election process for many years. I know that there has long been a procedure for write-in candidates, but I am sure that the deadline has long passed for such a candidate to be nominated by a group of NAS members (in 1994, the NAE president who was elected was in fact such a write-in candidate). But for as long as I can remember, there has only been one official nominee from the NAS Council. Changing that would require a change in the NAS By Laws.

I of course know Marcia McNutt, but I cannot comment on the specific issues that you raise about her, as I have had no contact with them. However, I think it is fair to say that the climate change issue (which you raise in #3) is not disputed by the vast majority of scientists with expertise. It is very unfortunate that the issue has been so highly politicized by non-scientists. This likely makes it difficult for Science magazine to do much more than present strong consensus views.

With my best wishes,

Bruce

**From:** Peter Wood <[pwood@nas.org](mailto:pwood@nas.org)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at 2:30 PM  
**To:** Bruce Alberts <[Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu](mailto:Bruce.Alberts@ucsf.edu)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent

December 15, 2015

Dear Professor Alberts,

I am resending the letter below to make sure you have received it. I welcome your thoughts in reply to the matters I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Wood

December 9, 2015

Professor Bruce Alberts  
National Academy of Sciences Member  
University of California, San Francisco

Dear Professor Alberts,

This is an NAS to NAS letter—which requires some “disambiguation.” I am president of the National Association of Scholars, founded in 1987, and whose organizers apparently didn’t give much thought to the space already occupied by those initials by the National Academy of Sciences, founded 124 years earlier. I’ll defer to the Academy’s seniority by reserving NAS in what follows for the body of scientists who incorporated during President Lincoln’s tenure. The National Association of Scholars is a broad-based group of academics that includes professors in the humanities and social sciences (I’m an anthropologist) as well as the natural sciences.

The occasion for this letter is Dr. Marcia K. McNutt, Editor-in-Chief of *Science*. We are concerned that she is the only official candidate to be the next NAS president. To be clear, the National Association of Scholars does not oppose Dr. McNutt’s candidacy. We simply believe

that members of an important national organization like NAS should have at least two candidates to consider when voting for your next president. Indeed, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), which publishes *Science*, always has two candidates for president and its other elected positions. Other scientific organizations also have two candidates for their elected positions.

Also, we want to bring to your attention our serious concerns about the current state of discourse in the sciences. Dr. McNutt has played a significant role in three active controversies involving national regulatory policy that deserve attention in themselves and that are also part of a larger problem. The larger problem is how the scientific establishment, particularly *Science* and NAS, should evaluate and respond to serious dissent from legitimate scientists. This is an especially important consideration for NAS, which was established to provide “independent, objective advice on issues that affect people's lives worldwide.”

The three controversies are:

1. The status of the **linear no-threshold (LNT) dose-response model** for the biological effects of nuclear radiation. The prominence of the model stems from the June 29, 1956 *Science* paper, “Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation,” authored by the NAS Committee on the Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation. This paper is now widely questioned and has been seriously critiqued in many peer-reviewed publications, including two detailed 2015 papers. These criticisms are being taken seriously around the world, as summarized in a December 2, 2015 *Wall Street Journal* commentary. In August 2015 four distinguished critics of LNT made a formal request to Dr. McNutt to examine the evidence of fundamental flaws in the 1956 paper and retract it. However, on August 11, 2015 Dr. McNutt rejected this request without even reviewing the detailed evidence. Furthermore, Dr. McNutt did not even consider recusing herself and having independent reviewers examine evidence that challenges the validity of both a *Science* paper and an NAS Committee Report.

This is a consequential matter that bears on a great deal of national public policy, as the LNT model has served as the basis for risk assessment and risk management of radiation and chemical carcinogens for decades, but now needs to be seriously reassessed. This reassessment could profoundly alter many regulations from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Environmental Protection Agency, and other government agencies. The relevant documents regarding the 1956 *Science* paper and Dr. McNutt can be examined at [www.nas.org/images/documents/LNT.pdf](http://www.nas.org/images/documents/LNT.pdf).

2. Extensive evidence of scientific misconduct in the epidemiology of **fine particulate air pollution** (PM2.5) and its relationship to mortality. Since 1997 EPA has claimed that lifetime inhalation of about a teaspoon of particles with diameter less than 2.5 microns *causes* premature death in the United States and it established a national regulation based on this claim. *Science* has provided extensive news coverage of this issue and its regulatory significance, but has never published any scientific criticism of this questionable claim, which is largely based on nontransparent research.

Earlier this year, nine accomplished scientists and academics submitted to *Science* well-documented evidence of misconduct by several of the PM2.5 researchers relied upon by EPA. The evidence of misconduct was first submitted to Dr. McNutt in a detailed June 4, 2015 email

letter, then in a detailed July 20, 2015 Policy Forum manuscript “Transparent Science is Necessary for EPA Regulations,” and finally in an August 17, 2015 Perspective manuscript “Particulate Matter Does Not Cause Premature Deaths.” Dr. McNutt and two *Science* editors immediately rejected the letter and the manuscripts and never conducted any internal or external review of the evidence. This a consequential matter because many multi-billion dollar EPA air pollution regulations, such as, the Clean Power Plan, are primarily justified by the claim that PM2.5 is killing Americans. The relevant documents regarding this controversy can be examined at <https://www.nas.org/images/documents/PM2.5.pdf>.

3. *Science* promotes the so-called **consensus model of climate change** and excludes any contrary views. This issue has become so polarized and polarizing that it is difficult to bring up, but at some point the scientific community will have to reckon with the dramatic discrepancies between current climate models and substantial parts of the empirical record. Recent evidence of *Science* bias on this issue is the June 26, 2015 article by Dr. Thomas R. Karl, “Possible artifacts of data biases in the recent global surface warming hiatus”; the July 3, 2015 McNutt editorial, “The beyond-two-degree inferno”; the November 13, 2015 McNutt editorial, “Climate warning, 50 years later”; and the November 25, 2015 AAAS News Release, “AAAS Leads Coalition to Protest Climate Science Inquiry.”

Dr. McNutt’s position is, of course, consistent with the official position of the AAAS. But the attempt to declare that the “pause” in global warming was an illusion has not been accepted by several respected and well-informed scientists. One would not know this, however, from reading *Science*, which has declined to publish any dissenting views. One can be a strong supporter of the consensus model and yet be disturbed by the role which *Science* has played in this controversy. Dr. McNutt and the journal have acted more like partisan activists than like responsible stewards of scientific standards confronted with contentious claims and ambiguous evidence. The relevant documents and commentary regarding the Karl paper and McNutt editorials can be examined at [https://www.nas.org/images/documents/Climate\\_Change.pdf](https://www.nas.org/images/documents/Climate_Change.pdf).

All three of these controversies have arisen on issues in which a strong degree of scientific consensus became intertwined with public policy and institutional self-interest. That intertwining can create selective blindness.

Dr. McNutt has in her career found herself faced more than once with the challenge of what to do when an entrenched orthodoxy meets a substantial scientific challenge. The challenge in each case could itself prove to be mistaken, but it met what most scientists would concede to be the threshold criteria to deserve a serious hearing. Yet in each case Dr. McNutt chose to reinforce the orthodoxy by shutting the door on the challenge.

The three areas that I sketched above, however, seem to have such prominence in public policy that they would warrant an even greater investment in time, care, and attention than would be normally the case. In that light, Dr. McNutt’s dismissive treatment of scientific criticisms is disturbing.

I bring these matters to your attention in the hope of accomplishing two things: raise awareness that the three issues represent threats to the integrity of science arising from the all-too-human tendency to turn ideas into orthodoxies; and suggest that it might be wise for NAS to nominate as

a second candidate for president someone who has a reputation for scientific objectivity and fairness and who does not enforce orthodoxy.

I welcome your responses. The National Association of Scholars will present an open forum on these matters with a section reserved specifically for NAS members. Furthermore, I will put you in contact with NAS members who are concerned about Dr. McNutt becoming the next NAS president.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Wood

President  
National Association of Scholars  
8 W. 38<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 503  
New York, NY 10018  
[www.nas.org](http://www.nas.org)  
(917) 551-6770