

**From:** Bruin GOP [mailto:bruingop@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2016 6:14 PM  
**To:** Marcia McNutt <mmcnutt@aaas.org>  
**Subject:** Re: NAS election

Hello Dr. McNutt:

We are sorry for the delay. To address your prior question, we actually are a mainly undergraduate group. We have several graduate students who come on occasion, as well as several faculty who serve as advisers. We are an official UCLA student organization that seeks to unite conservatives through social outings, educational debate, and political activism.

As I said before, we believe in honest debate. If you wish to send a letter, I can read the letter at our next meeting and take a general club vote on whether to endorse or not endorse. We did not initially invite you because we did not think our letter of support would be of much consequence. At UCLA, we frequently send letters of opinion on issues and receive no response. We are happy you did respond.

We are mainly concerned with academic freedom and liberal bias writ large, however Dr. Enstrom presented a very convincing argument and so we decided to take specific action. There was no formal process or hearing because, as I stated early, we are not accustomed to getting any response on our academic opinions, and we knew that to even get our thoughts heard at all we need to send a letter quickly. Again, we are more than happy to present your side of the story to our membership if you so desire. Simply send this email a written statement, or send a representative to our meeting this Tuesday at UCLA at 7pm.

Best,

Bruin Republicans

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marcia McNutt** <[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)>

Date: Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 7:45 PM

Subject: Re: NAS election

To: Bruin GOP <[bruingop@gmail.com](mailto:bruingop@gmail.com)>

PS It is hard to not consider your email an attack, when you took a position without even asking the other side of the story. That does not seem to me to be what someone interested in a fair and balanced position would do. Clearly I am at a disadvantage here not being a member of the UCLA community. Can you please tell me what your organization is and why you are choosing to take a position on the NAS election? How many NAS members do you have in your organization?

Sent from my iPad

Dr. Marcia K McNutt

Editor-in-Chief, Science

1200 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

[\(831\) 915-4699](tel:(831)915-4699) (cell)

[\(202\) 326-6505](tel:(202)326-6505) (work)

[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marcia McNutt** <[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)>

Date: Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 7:41 PM

Subject: Re: NAS election

To: Bruin GOP <[bruingop@gmail.com](mailto:bruingop@gmail.com)>

Thanks for getting back to me. Point 1 below is correct. Point 2 is not. The Science paper has long been superseded by more current work. I agree that suppression of academic opinion happens still, but this is not one of those cases. There is a substantial body of work that has updated and modernized that report from the 50s. The fact that Dr. Enstrom's paper was not reviewed is quite usual at Science. We only review those papers we intend to publish in order to check their technical quality and improve them.

Sent from my iPad

Dr. Marcia K McNutt

Editor-in-Chief, Science

1200 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

[\(831\) 915-4699](tel:(831)915-4699) (cell)

[\(202\) 326-6505](tel:(202)326-6505) (work)

[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)

On Jan 26, 2016, at 5:38 PM, Bruin GOP <[bruingop@gmail.com](mailto:bruingop@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello Dr. McNutt:

Bruin Republicans deeply appreciates your reply. If possible, let us give you some context on our decision. Before I do that, let me clarify:

1. Professor Enstrom in his presentation did tell us the date of the paper he criticized in his own paper. He specifically said that the *Science* article he contests is around 60 years old.
2. Our understanding based on his presentation was that the article he criticizes is still influential and still being cited, and that he was trying to directly contest the influence of such an article.

Given all of this, we made our decision because Dr. Enstrom, and indeed, many professors at UCLA and across the nation, have experience academic suppression when their ideas run contrary to the mainstream. At UCLA, this has been particularly bad, especially with pollution research. Professor Enstrom has successfully uncovered several COIs with professors at UCLA being involved in research and also serving on carbon regulation boards for illegal amounts of time. This is why we are particularly sensitive to the choosing of the next leader of the National Academy, as this person will be influential in grant decisions. We believe that this person should be as meritocratic as possible, and as objective as possible.

Professor Enstrom stated that you or your subordinates did not even review the article he sent in. he was not mad that you did not publish, but simply that you refuse to review any of the data, or to even consider a rebuttal to an old article.

We were not aware that the reasoning was because a person is not around to defend their work. However, it would seem to us that a paper that has become influential should be able to be critiqued regardless of the status of the authors. I could see how this might be problematic in some rare technical situations, but when the article has received such wide recognition and influence, would there not be many other professors or researchers willing to defend the original paper in the place of the original authors?

Is there a policy that forbids critiques of old articles? Or is this a procedural rule that you or your administration has implemented? This does make a difference from our perspective.

Finally, although you may not be directly responsible for what is published, as editor in chief, you are responsible for the process by which your subordinates choose what to publish.

I hope you do not consider this attack. Our questions are meant to help clarify the situation. If you so desire, we can also take down a statement from you or hear a representative of yours at our next meeting. Then we can have a full vote of all members on the issue. Currently, our letter was on behalf of our elected board, not our full membership.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Sincerely,  
Bruin Republican Board

On Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 12:56 PM, Marcia McNutt <[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)> wrote:

I understand that “Bruin GOP” has come out against my candidacy for the NAS presidency without giving me the courtesy to respond to baseless accusations from detractors.

Wood and Enstrom don’t mention that the “NAS Report” published in Science that they wanted me to reexamine was published when I was 2 years old. All of the authors are dead. There is no due process possible. If there are any scientists in “Bruin GOP” who publish, they should imagine how pleased they would be if journals started retracting their scientific legacy after they passed away when they are no longer around to defend themselves. Science doesn’t even allow technical comments on papers more than a few years old.

And Science does publish papers with contrarian views to climate change and air quality. Just not bad papers. Ninety four percent of submissions are rejected. No surprise that there are many papers that are not published. I have no role in such editorial decisions. To pretend that I make decisions on what is published is entirely wrong and misleading.

Don’t let Bruin GOP be used by Wood and Enstrom who have a clear COI in this matter as disgruntled authors.

AAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAAS

Dr. Marcia K. McNutt  
Editor-in-Chief, *Science* journals  
American Association for the Advancement of Science  
1200 New York Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
[\(202\) 326-6505](tel:(202)326-6505) (w)  
[\(831\) 915-4699](tel:(831)915-4699) (c)  
[mmcnutt@aaas.org](mailto:mmcnutt@aaas.org)

AAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAASAAAS

Below is original Bruin GOP email letter to Wessler. Wessler never responded. She simply forwarded Bruin GOP email (it appears) to McNutt.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bruin GOP** <[bruingop@gmail.com](mailto:bruingop@gmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 12:28 PM  
Subject: Regarding the election of Dr. McNutt  
To: [susan.wessler@ucr.edu](mailto:susan.wessler@ucr.edu)

Dr. Wessler,

After consideration we, the Bruin Republicans of the University of California: Los Angeles, do not endorse the election of Dr. Marcia K. McNutt to be the next president of the National Association of Sciences.

After reading the article written by Dr. Peter Wood and Dr. James Enstrom, we feel there is significant evidence that stands in the way of her election. In regards to the article written by Dr. Peter Woods, there are three main issues with the election of Dr. McNutt: The first is Dr. McNutt's rejection to re examine the evidence in a paper titled, "Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation", authored by the NAS Committee and published in *Science* and not considering recusing herself to allow others to examine the paper. The second is Dr. McNutt's failure to publish scientific criticism of the scientific idea of fine particulate air pollution. The third is her failure to publish contrary and dissenting views to the issue of climate change.

As a group, we believe in the fundamental ideals of transparency and freedom of speech and opinion, especially with dissenting views, and we feel Dr. McNutt has not exemplified those ideals.

We also hope Dr. Susan R. Wessler of University of California: Riverside, responds to the contact requests of Dr. James Enstrom.

Thank you and in liberty,

The Bruin Republican Board