

From: "Peter Wood" <pwood@nas.org>
To: "James Brown" <jhbrown@unm.edu>
Subject: RE: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent
Date: Mon, 4 Jan 2016 14:54:37 -0500

Dear Professor Brown,

I agree there is no practical course of action with regard to Dr. McNutt's candidacy. Her election is a foregone conclusion, and I wrote really because it provided an occasion to open discussion on the broader problem of how American science now deals with dissent from "settled" orthodoxies.

The one you draw attention to in your email happens to be among those I am familiar with. I am a friend of Stuart Hulbert, who has kept me up to date on the efforts to get a hearing—or at least a booth—at AAAS. On this issue and most others of climate change, I have adopted a position of strict neutrality on the substance of disputes, the better to advance my procedural argument that all sides that abide by scientific standards of arguments and evidence, receive a fair hearing.

The obstacles to achieving this are, as you point out, formidable. But there is growing discontent and a little effort to organize that discontent may prove effective. Or so I hope. I will keep in touch.

Yours.

Peter

From: James Brown [mailto:jhbrown@unm.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2015 1:18 PM
To: Peter Wood <pwood@nas.org>
Subject: RE: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent

Dear Professor Wood:

Thanks for your letter. I should start by saying that I abhor the politics of science at the highest levels, including NAS. I am not good at it and I avoid it as much as possible. Your concerns about Dr. McNutt's candidacy for President of NAS seem sufficiently well-founded to be taken very seriously. It is unfortunate that there is not an open contest between at least two candidates with different backgrounds, perspectives, and agendas. But I am not sure what I might do, individually or in concert with others at this point.

I do have very serious concerns about the more general issue of the "orthodoxy. It is leading to the politicization science by a relatively small cadre of influential scientists, who seem too willing to go along with and even to support powerful, deeply entrenched political and economic agendas. Our own research on "human macroecology" challenges a number of entrenched positions and interests in areas that are critical for the future of our human species and civilization. These include population and economic growth, depletion of fossil fuels and other resources, "sustainability", food security, and human behavior. Our papers have frequently been rejected by major journals, including Nature, Science, and PNAS (two of my member-contributed papers were rejected, and the rejection rate for these is about 4%). This work has eventually been published elsewhere (I attach a few PDFs). So far, to my knowledge, our basic data, analyses, and interpretations have never been seriously challenged. But our work and similar studies and warnings by others (e.g., Paul Ehrlich) are simply ignored. The establishment simply goes on saying that there is still time to address the critical problems of human ecology, everything will be OK if we can just marshal the technology and political will to do the right thing. I have supported the effort of an organization, "Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization" (SEPS), which has tried unsuccessfully for at least two years to get permission for a booth at the annual meeting of AAAS. The above concerns obviously also apply to the whole complex area of climate change, where I have not worked, but where I, too, worry about the dangers of group-think and group-speak.

I write this not to gripe about our work being ignored, but to agree with your larger point that the present scientific system, both in the US and internationally, is too powerful and seriously biased. The course of science seems to be influenced more by the market economy, military-industrial complex, and political correctness than by the individual scientists working away in their laboratories and the field. The power and influence of the establishment is entrenched in our scientific societies, journals, grant agencies, and representation on national and international panels. Dissenting voices and scientifically well-supported warnings are not appreciated. I suspect that the current system is too big and powerful to change, and I fear for the future of my grandchildren.

Thanks for listening. Please keep me posted if your efforts gain traction. I will see there is something I might be able to contribute.

Sincerely,

Jim Brown

James H. Brown

Distinguished Professor of Biology Emeritus, University of New Mexico
636 Piney Way, Morro Bay, CA 93442; phone 805-225-1326

From: Peter Wood [<mailto:pwood@nas.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2015 12:54 PM
To: James Brown <jhbrown@unm.edu>
Subject: Concerns about NAS and scientific dissent

December 30, 2015

Professor James H. Brown
National Academy of Sciences Member

Dear Professor Brown,

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*, who is the only official candidate to be the next president of the National Academy of Sciences. The National Association of Scholars does not oppose Dr. McNutt’s candidacy. We are, however, concerned about the current state of discourse in the sciences. And Dr. McNutt’s candidacy provides a good occasion to bring these forward. That is because she 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.

2. Extensive evidence of scientific misconduct in the epidemiology of **fine particulate air pollution** (PM_{2.5}) 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 PM_{2.5} 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 PM_{2.5} 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.

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. 38th Street, Suite 503
New York, NY 10018
www.nas.org
(917) 551-6770