

AAAS and *Science* Magazine Promote Anti-Science

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE

Retired UCLA Research Professor (Epidemiology)

President

Scientific Integrity Institute

Los Angeles, CA

**<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/>
jenstrom@ucla.edu**

Doctors for Disaster Preparedness

El Paso, TX

July 7, 2024

Definition of Anti-Science

Anti-Science is a set of attitudes that involve a rejection of Science and the Scientific Method

Science and Anti-Science (1993) by Gerald Holton, PhD
Harvard Professor Emeritus of Physics and History of Science

True Science requires objective collection and assessment of all evidence that is transparent and reproducible.

Anti-Science involves promotion of selective evidence that is not transparent and not reproducible.

AAAS (1848→) and *Science* (1880→) History

<https://www.aaas.org/archives/150-years-advancing-science-history-aaas-1848-1998>

The formation of AAAS in 1848 marked the emergence of a national scientific community in the United States. AAAS was the first permanent organization formed to promote the development of science and engineering at the national level.

AAAS's permanence was not preordained and, despite the many contributions it made during its first 50 years, the Association came close to extinction more than once. Ultimately, an alliance in 1900 with *Science* magazine, which had failed a private venture during 1880-1899, rejuvenated both the magazine and AAAS.

AAAS Membership is open to anyone who share our goals and belief that science, technology, engineering, and mathematics can help solve many of the challenges the world faces today. Currently there are about 120,000 members.

AAAS Mission

<https://www.aaas.org/mission>

AAAS MISSION: Advance science, engineering, and innovation throughout the world for the benefit of all.

Advancing Science, Serving Society.

1. Advance scientific excellence and achievement

2. Foster equity and inclusion for scientific excellence

3. Build trust among scientists and communities

AAAS builds trust among scientists and engineers and broader communities and is a **valued source of accurate scientific information** that is foundational to countering misinformation.

4. Catalyze progress where science meets policy

AAAS provides **actionable evidence for public policy** that serves society and promotes policies that enable quality science.

AAAS Funders

https://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/2024-06/2023%20AAAS%20Annual%20Report_Financial%20Statements.pdf

https://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/2024-06/2023%20AAAS%20Annual%20Report_Full-Donor-List_Final.pdf

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) receives substantial funding from the federal government, including grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements. Key funders include:

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Department of Energy

Google

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Rockefeller Foundation

Chan Zuckerberg Initiative

Tides Foundation

AAAS 2022 IRS Form 990

Filed November 14, 2023

<https://www.aaas.org/about/financial-statements/aaas-irs-990-2022>

	Base	Total
	Compensation	Compensation
Sudip S. Parikh, PhD Chief Executive Officer	\$751,575	\$939,672
H. Holden Thorp, PhD Editor-in-Chief <i>Science</i>	\$619,660	\$697,257
AAAS Net Assets End of 2022	\$124,521,846	
Membership Dues in 2022	\$1,696,142	

2015 Conversation Article by Matthew C. Nisbet, PhD

“Inside America’s science lobby: What motivates AAAS members to engage the public?”

<https://theconversation.com/inside-americas-science-lobby-what-motivates-aaas-members-to-engage-the-public-38065>

AAAS member political awareness and communication behaviors based on data from a 2009 Pew Research Center Survey.

On the whole, AAAS members are strongly left-leaning and politically like-minded.

In 2009, more than half self-identified as either liberal or very liberal, only roughly a third as moderate, and just 9 percent as conservative.

AAAS membership also has a strong partisan political skew with 55 percent identifying as a Democrat, 32 percent as an Independent, and only 6 percent as a Republican.

The like-minded political outlook of AAAS members is consistent with broader trends towards ever greater ideological self-segregation and polarization in U.S. society . . . In comparison with other social groups for which Pew data is available, AAAS members rank among the most like-minded.

2017 Influence Watch Analysis of AAAS

<https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/american-association-for-the-advancement-of-science/>

AAAS has been accused of promoting a broadly left-leaning policy agenda and associating with front groups for the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Many of its leaders have also been criticized for supporting environmentalist policies Since the 1920s, AAAS has been associated with a number of Soviet-aligned groups and radical far-left organizations, some of whose leaders have also been officers in the AAAS.

In the modern era, the AAAS has become more involved in promoting left-wing “science-activism,” ideological activism performed in the guise of promoting science. It has involvement in the “March for Science,” which was organized in opposition to the election and policies of President Donald Trump in 2017.

<https://www.science.org/content/article/trump-catalyzed-march-science-where-it-now>

<https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/trump-dominates-chatter-at-aaas-meeting/2500429.article>

<https://www.aaas.org/news/aaas-announces-partnership-2018-march-science>

Science Politicized Against Trump in 2020

September 16, 2020 Wired Article by Adam Rogers “America’s Top Science Journal Has Had It With Trump” (<https://www.adam-rogers.net/>)

<https://www.wired.com/story/americas-top-science-journal-has-had-it-with-trump/>

January 10, 2020 *Science* Editorial by Thorp “Stick to Science”

DOI: 10.1126/science.aba7714 – Attack on the proposed EPA Transparency in Regulatory Science Rule (that required transparency and reproducibility in studies used by EPA)

September 18, 2020 *Science* Editorial by Thorp “Trump Lied About Science”

DOI: 10.1126/science.abe7391

Attack on President Trump and Dr. Scott Atlas for challenging 2020 US Covid-19 Policies, which have now been shown to be very flawed.

October 14, 2020 *Science News* “WEATHERING THE STORM”: Disastrous. Damaging. Catastrophic. Those are just some of the more polite terms that many U.S. scientists use to describe the policies of President Donald Trump

<https://www.science.org/content/article/trump-has-shown-little-respect-us-science-so-why-are-some-parts-thriving>

2015 National Association of Scholars Article: *Science* Editor Marcia McNutt Rejected Criticism of AGW, LNT, and PM2.5

https://www.nas.org/blogs/article/nas_letter

AGW—Anthropogenic Global Warming is Promoted as an Urgent Problem
Science promotes the consensus model of climate change and excludes any contrary views. June 26, 2015 *Science* article by Thomas Karl “Possible artifacts of data biases in the recent global surface warming hiatus” was heavily criticized by AGW skeptics but *Science* refused to publish the criticism.

LNT—Linear No Threshold Dose-Response Model is Promoted as Valid
The prominence of the LNT Model for risk assessment and risk management stems from June 29, 1956 *Science* article “Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation”. *Science* refuses to publish any criticism of the LNT Model.

PM2.5—Claim that Fine Particulate Matter Causes Death is Promoted
Science has consistently supported the EPA claim that fine particulate matter (PM2.5) causes death and refuses to publish any criticism of this claim.

AAAS Climate Change Resources

<https://www.aaas.org/news/aaas-climate-change-resources>

How We Respond – Communities and Scientists Taking Action on Climate Change

AAAS Program Work on Climate Change

Public Engagement: Climate Change Communication

<https://www.aaas.org/pes/climate-change-communication>

THE REALITY, RISKS, AND RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

The overwhelming evidence of human-caused climate change documents both current impacts with significant costs and extraordinary future risks to society and natural systems. (2013-2015)

<https://whatweknow.aaas.org/whatweknow.html>

Based on the evidence, about 97% of climate experts have concluded that human-caused climate change is happening. What We Know helps us understand the science behind the realities, risks and response to the climate challenge.

https://whatweknow.aaas.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/whatweknow_website.pdf

Science Ignores Strong Evidence of NO Climate Crisis and Does Not Publish Findings of AGW Skeptics

For instance, NO Mention of Books Skeptical of AGW:

“Unsettled: What Climate Science Tells Us, What it Doesn’t, and Why it Matters” (2021) by Steven E. Koonin

<https://www.amazon.com/Unsettled-Climate-Science-Doesnt-Matters/dp/1950665798>

**“Climate and Energy: The Case for Realism” (2024)
edited by E. Calvin Beisner and David R. Legates**

<https://www.amazon.com/Climate-Energy-Realism-Calvin-Beisner/dp/1684512670/>

Instead, *Science* Attacks AGW Skeptics, such as, February 23, 2015 Article:
“Smithsonian asks legal watchdog to investigate climate skeptic’s disclosure practices”

<https://www.science.org/content/article/smithsonian-asks-legal-watchdog-investigate-climate-skeptic-s-disclosure-practices>

Science Supports Validity of Linear No-Threshold Dose-Response Model and Ignores Contrary Evidence

October 4, 2018 *ScienceInsider* article by Kelly Servick “Is a little radiation good for you? Controversial theory pops up in Senate hearing on EPA transparency plan—Proposal embraces idea that low doses of toxins or radiation could be healthful”

<https://www.science.org/content/article/little-radiation-good-you-controversial-theory-pops-senate-hearing-epa-transparency>

“People are constantly exposed to low doses of radiation But how these low doses affect our health and risk of disease is not well understood. As a result, regulators often support a precautionary approach

[Witness Edward] Calabrese, however, believes EPA’s approach to dose-response is based on shoddy evidence.

[Witness] Rush Holt, CEO of AAAS, which publishes *ScienceInsider*, was critical of the EPA [transparency] proposal Holt also was skeptical that EPA’s proposal would lead to a greater acceptance of hormesis.”

July 16, 2018 AAAS Letter to EPA urging rejection of the proposed Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science Rule

<https://www.aaas.org/resources/letter-aaas-ceo-rush-holt-acting-epa-administrator-andrew-wheeler-regarding-proposed>

Edward Calabrese Identified LNT Misconduct in Four *Science* Articles

“LNTgate: How LNT benefited from editorial actions” *Chem-Bio Interact* August 1, 2022 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbi.2022.109979>)

“the acceptance of the linear non-threshold (LNT) dose response model was unethically advocated and advanced both by key scientists within the radiation genetics community, and by editorial practices in *Science*” → four flawed articles

H.J. Muller, “Artificial transmutation of the gene” *Science* July 22, 1927
DOI: 10.1126/science.66.1699.84—article contains no data

D.E. Uphoff & C. Stern, “The genetic effects of low intensity irradiation” *Science* June 17, 1949 DOI: 10.1126/science.109.2842.609—unreviewed data used for LNT

BEAR I Genetics Panel, “Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation” *Science* June 29, 1956 DOI: 10.1126/science.123.3209.1157—unethical decision to claim LNT

E.B. Lewis, “Leukemia and ionizing radiation” *Science* May 17, 1957
DOI: 10.1126/science.125.3255.965—geneticist misused radiation epidemiology

May 20, 2024 Enstrom eLetters for these four articles have not been posted

Edward Calabrese Found LNT Misconduct in *Science* Editorial Decisions

“Societal Threats from Ideologically Driven Science” by Edward Calabrese
Academic Questions October 30, 2017 (DOI: 10.1007/s12129-017-9660-6)

National Academy of Sciences (NAS) created its Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation (BEAR) I Genetics Panel in 1955 and announced its seminal recommendation to switch to linearity in June 29, 1956 *Science* article. This was actually the big ideological payoff for all the past efforts to ensure the success of the LNT.

The findings by Calabrese reveal that the BEAR I Genetics Panel misrepresented the research record in the journal *Science* on several key matters, all of which were needed to get their policy views accepted.

Editor McNutt Ignored August 2015 Cutler & Calabrese Emails asking *Science* to Retract or Correct June 29, 1956 *Science* article.

Latest Calabrese: “Recent discoveries . . . Shedding light on the limits of LNT”
Science of Total Environment May 31, 2024 (DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.173676)

Science Immediately Rejected 2016 Enstrom Reanalysis That Found NO PM2.5 Deaths in ACS CPS II Cohort

<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/CPSIIRej122716.pdf>

Manuscript (aah4744): Submitted July 5, 2016 & Rejected July 8, 2016 by Andrew Sugden, Ph.D., Deputy Editor, Science (expertise in ecology and anthropology and based in UK)

“Thank you for submitting your manuscript "Fine Particulate Matter and Mortality in Cancer Prevention Study Reanalysis" to *Science*. Because your manuscript was not given a high priority rating during the initial screening process, we have decided not to proceed to in-depth review. The overall view is that the scope and focus of your paper make it more appropriate for a more specialized journal.”

Science Advances also rejected Enstrom Reanalysis without in-depth review.

Enstrom Reanalysis was published March 28, 2017 in *Dose-Response*
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1559325817693345>

Science Advances Published July 17, 2020
PM2.5 Death Claims by Harvard Chan Authors

Evaluating the impact of long-term exposure to fine particulate matter on mortality among the elderly

by X. Wu, D. Braun, J. Schwartz, M. A. Kioumourtzoglou, F. Dominici
DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aba5692

This 2020 *Science Advances* article (the first SA environmental epidemiology article) was used by EPA to tighten the PM2.5 NAAQS

Medicare data on 69 Million Americans necessary to reproduce the findings and conclusions in the article is NOT available. Providing NO access to underlying data is contrary to stated *Science* policy.

Dominici and Wu have ignored Misconduct Allegations by Enstrom

2022 Enstrom Scientific Misconduct Allegations Against Senior Author
and Harvard Chan Biostatistics Professor Francesca Dominici
(<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/JEEDominici010422.pdf>) and
Lead Author Xiao Wu (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/JEEWu020222.pdf>)

1. Deliberate falsification of research findings of NO PM2.5 deaths
2. Opposition to Transparency & Reproducibility in EPA Research
3. All Challenges to Validity of PM2.5 NAAQS Ignored
4. Smith 2021 reanalysis of Di 2017: NO PM2.5 deaths $<12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
5. Service on NASEM NAAQS Committee violates Its COI Policy
6. Very Low US PM2.5 Levels Obviate need to tighten PM2.5 NAAQS
7. Misuse of Medicare records for unjustified **causal** conclusions
8. No Informed Consent for Use of 69 Million Medicare Records
9. 30+ Chinese co-authors are concern for Medicare confidentiality

April 18, 2022 *Science* Editor-in-Chief Holden Thorp
Rejected Enstrom Request to Publish in *Science* About
Lack of Transparency Regarding PM2.5 Death Claims
(<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/ThorpJEE041822.pdf>)

April 1 Enstrom to Thorp: “Thank you very much for speaking with me today about the EPA Transparency Rule. Please examine the following two links. . . . Please let me know how you decide to proceed on this matter, particularly whether you will consider a Policy Forum, Letter, or eLetter from me on this subject.”

April 18 Thorp to Enstrom: “I have reviewed all of the files and discussed with the editors. We have decided not to do anything further on this. I know that is not the answer you hoped for, but at least you got a response. I realize you may state publicly that we did not engage.”

Science Advances Published September 28, 2022 Research Article
“**How low can you go? Air pollution affects mortality at very low levels**”
by Scott Weichenthal & 16 other Canadian authors using Canadian data
DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abo3381

“Our findings reveal a supralinear concentration-response relationship between outdoor PM_{2.5} and mortality at very low (<5 µg/m³) concentrations [in Canada, not the US]. Our updated global concentration-response function incorporating this new information suggests an additional 1.5 million deaths globally attributable to outdoor PM_{2.5} annually compared to previous estimates. The global health benefits of meeting the new WHO guideline for outdoor PM_{2.5} are greater than previously assumed and indicate **a need for continued reductions in outdoor air pollution around the world.**”

Science Published November 24, 2023 Article on Coal PM2.5 Deaths by Henneman of George Mason University

“Mortality risk from United States coal electricity generation”

Lucas Henneman, Christine Choirat, Irene Dedoussi,
Francesca Dominici, Jessica Roberts, Corwin Zigler

DOI: [10.1126/science.adf4915](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adf4915)

Abstract: “We estimated the number of deaths attributable to coal PM2.5 from 1999 to 2020 using individual-level Medicare death records representing 650 million person-years. . . . A total of 460,000 deaths were attributable to coal PM2.5. . . .”

Implications: “Our findings have implications for current air pollution risk assessments, which incorrectly assume equal toxicity for ambient PM2.5 from all sources and for all locations. The research platform that we used . . . can support more efficient regulatory efforts . . .”

November 24, 2023 *Science* Research Findings by Henneman are Deliberately Exaggerated



Top Center of *Science* Cover “Excess deaths caused by coal”

Two-Page “Epidemiology” Editorial by Robert Mendelsohn and Seung Min,
Two Environmental Engineers Not Trained in Epidemiology

“Measuring the impacts of air pollution: Reduced air pollution from coal power plants decreased mortality more than expected”

DOI: 10.1126/science.adl2935

Alarmist Press from GMU & Harvard Chan SPH & New York Times “Deaths From Coal Pollution Have Dropped, but Emissions May Be Twice as Deadly”
(<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/23/climate/coal-exhaust-air-pollution-deaths.html>)

Unposted December 4, 2023 Enstrom eLetter to *Science* re Henneman Submitted as March 5, 2024 Misconduct Allegation to AAAS

March 5, 2024 Email to *Science* Misconduct <science_data@aaas.org>

Enstrom Unposted December 4, 2023 eLetter containing Allegation of Research Misconduct (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Henneman120423.pdf>) in the November 24, 2023 *Science* Research Article “Mortality risk from United States coal electricity generation” by Henneman et al. (DOI: 10.1126/science.adf4915)

My Allegation involves research misconduct in fine particulate matter (PM2.5) epidemiology: Falsification of the Research Record, Misuse of HIPAA-protected Medicare Data, Violation of Epidemiologic Standards, and More. (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Henneman030524.pdf>)

On March 11, 2024 *Science* Editor Dismisses Without Review Enstrom Misconduct Allegation re Henneman

March 11, 2024 “Your letters” Email Message from *Science* Editor Thorp dismissed my March 5, 2024 Misconduct Allegation

Dr. Enstrom,

I’m of course very familiar with your disagreements about PM2.5 epidemiology. We have responded to your concerns multiple times over the years. We will be doing nothing further on this matter at this time.

Holden Thorp

(<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Henneman031124.pdf>)

Also, Editor Thorp has not accepted my multiple email and phone invitations to comment on the validity of my DDP Talk.

Georgia Institute of Technology Dissertation Committee Ignores Enstrom Complaint re Henneman

June 5, 2024 Enstrom Email to Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT)
Dissertation Committee for 2017 PhD Dissertation of Lucas RF Henneman:
“Air pollution accountability: Assessing regulatory impacts on emissions and air
quality” (<https://repository.gatech.edu/entities/publication/e003d293-e623-4619-9401-772a006fe578>)

Armistead G. Russell, PhD GIT Civil and Environmental Engineering
Committee Chair & Former EPA CASAC Member & NASEM NAAQS Co-Chair

James A. Mulholland, PhD GIT Civil and Environmental Engineering

Patricia L. Mokhtarian, PhD GIT School of Civil and Environmental
Engineering

Athanasios Nenes, PhD GIT Earth & Atmospheric Sciences

Paige E. Tolbert, PhD Emory Rollins School of Public Health

George Mason University Provost Kenneth Walsh Ignores Enstrom Complaint re Henneman

June 6, 2024 Enstrom Email regarding Allegations against Henneman to Kenneth Walsh, PhD, who is GMU Interim Provost, Executive Vice President, and Civil Engineering Professor
<https://civil.gmu.edu/profiles/kenwalsh> gmuprov@gmu.edu

I request the opportunity to discuss with you my Allegation of Research Misconduct in the November 24, 2023 *Science Research Article* “Mortality risk from United States coal electricity generation” by GMU Assistant Professor Lucas Henneman.

No response to my email request and phone calls.

April 2024 Freedom of Information Act Request to GMU for Records about Henneman Article in *Science*

GMU FOIA record request #24-2024088 made on my behalf for Henneman Article. Manuscript was submitted to *Science* on October 28, 2022, accepted on October 2, 2023, and published on November 24, 2023.

GMU response to FOIA was 42 **redacted** records dated January 25, 2023 to October 2, 2023: NO records before January 25, 2023, NO original or revised manuscripts, NONE of the four peer reviews, NO author responses to peer reviews, NOTHING addressing human subjects protection re Medicare records.

October 2, 2023 Email Exchange between Lucas Henneman (LH) and Francesca Dominici (FD) on “Acceptance of your Science Manuscript adf4915”

LH to FD: “An immediate policy implication is that by our results EPA is undervaluing the power plant climate rule it proposed a few months ago”

FD to LH: “Lucas, this paper will give you the tenure!”

April 2024 GMU FOIA re *Science* Article by Henneman: No Public Access to Medicare Data as per *Science* Policy

GMU FOIA record request #24-2024088 re Article Editor Caroline Ash, PhD
(Microbiology, University of Leeds, UK) (CA)

CA to LH 091923: “please ensure that Data are made freely available now . . . We require all data underlying the results in published manuscripts to be publicly available. . . . Science will cover the cost of publishing the data publicly . . .”

LH to CA 092023: “Could you please confirm whether the citations and language regarding data availability in the Acknowledgements are sufficient?”

CA to LH 092023: “Your data statements in the Acknowledgements look generally fine to me.

Acknowledgement in published article does not indicate public data access: “Data and materials availability (partial): Medicare datasets, in accordance with the data use agreement, must be acquired from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (28).”

November 24, 2023 *Science* Research Article by Henneman Received Massive Government Funding

No Action Taken on Enstrom Complaints filed with GMU RIO, GMU Department Chair, GMU Provost, GIT Dissertation Committee, NIH, *Science*

Funding from 14 Research Grants May Explain why *No Action Taken*

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (grant NIHR01ES026217 to C.Z. and grants R01MD012769, R01ES028033, 1R01ES030616, 1R01AG066793, 1R01MD016054-01A1, 1R01ES 034373-01, 1RF1AG080948, and 1R01ES029950 to F.D.); the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (grant 835872 to C.Z., F.D., and L.H.); EmPOWER Air Data Challenge (L.H., C.Z., and J.R.); the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (grant G-2020-13946 to F.D.); and The Health Effects Institute (HEI) (grant R-82811201 to L.H. and grant 4953 to C.Z.).

Richard A. Meserve, PhD, JD

AAAS Center for Scientific Evidence in Public Issues Advisory Council

<https://www.aaas.org/programs/epi-center/advisory-council>

Richard A. Meserve, who served as chairman of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission from 1999 to 2003 following many years as a partner at Covington & Burling, is currently senior of counsel to the firm.

Chairman of the Board, Health Effects Institute

<https://www.healtheffects.org/about/board/richard-meserve>

Meserve rejected my July 22, 2022 Request to investigate evidence of scientific misconduct by the Health Effects Institute regarding the Pope 1995 analysis of ACS CPS II and the claim that PM2.5 causes deaths.

Meserve gave a “No need to investigate” response to my May 20 & 30, 2024 Requests containing Calabrese’s evidence of *Science*’s unethical promotion of LNT and Enstrom’s evidence of false claims of PM2.5 deaths by Henneman.

AAAS President Elect Theresa A. Maldonado, PhD
UCOP Vice President for Research & Innovation
Ignores Enstrom Request re Integrity of *Science*

<https://www.aaas.org/governance#bod>

<https://www.ucop.edu/research-innovation/leadership-staff/vp-ri.html>

She is a leader of the California Climate Action Initiative

<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/university-california-adopts-new-stronger-climate-action-goals>

No response to my May 29, 2024 request to examine
Calabrese's evidence of *Science's* unethical promotion of LNT
and Enstrom's evidence of false claims of PM2.5 deaths.

April 5, 2024 *Science* Perspective--Epidemiology

“Assessing the health burden from air pollution”

by Torben Sigsgaard (Denmark) & Barbara Hoffmann (Germany)

DOI: 10.1126/science.abo3801

“Human health is affected by air pollution, **causing** cardiometabolic, respiratory, and neurological disease and increased mortality.”

“Hence, while maintaining focus on the highest-polluted areas, the very real effects of air pollution in low-exposure areas should be addressed with equivalent commitment.”

Obligatory Photo of air pollution (haze) in Los Angeles in February 2023



Conclusions

AAAS and *Science* Magazine Promote Anti-Science

Several independent sources find that AAAS and *Science* Magazine have a strong liberal political bias that dates back 100 years.

AAAS and *Science* Magazine are biased in three important policy-related areas. They promote of Human-caused Climate Change, the Linear No-Threshold Dose-Response Model, and Deaths Caused by Air Pollution.

AAAS and *Science* Magazine suppress contrary evidence in all three of these contentious areas and they refuse to attempt resolution of conflicting evidence using the scientific method. *Science* Editor Thorp has declined my offers to engage in a dialog and most of the relevant scientists have not responded at all. The validity of my evidence has not been disputed.

Thus, I conclude that AAAS and *Science* Magazine Promote Anti-Science.