

Summary of Findings to Date Regarding Marcia K. McNutt, *Science*, and National Academy of Sciences, and Their Connection to Suppression of Scientific Dissent

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.

February 8, 2016

Incestuous relationship exists between *Science*, AAAS, NAS, and California—last five *Science* Editors-in-Chief dating back to 1985 (McNutt, Alberts, Kennedy, Bloom, Koshland) are NAS and AAAS members with careers in California; Alberts was also NAS President; new AAAS President Schaal selected NAS President-Elect McNutt; AAAS Board is dominated by UC faculty or graduates; NAS President Cicerone and NAS Executive Officer Darling had long careers at UC and know about the extreme regulatory policies and liberal bias in California.

NAS officials (Cicerone, Darling, and Hinchman) and key NAS members (Schaal and Wessler) have refused to release any details about the January election of McNutt, the only candidate for new NAS President. They have refused to identify all members of the Presidential Nomination Committee, the number of votes for and against McNutt, or the total number of votes by state.

Of the 2,095 active U.S. members of NAS, 618 (29.5%) are from CA, 823 (39.3%) are from five other liberal states (MA, NY, NJ, MD, IL), and there are only 138 (6.6%) from the 24 states with 1-14 members each, and 8 states have no members. Based on public information about 113 NAS members in Los Angeles County, NAS is overwhelmingly and increasingly dominated by Democrats. Among 61 members born before 1945, 14.8% are Republicans; among 52 members born since 1945, 7.7% are Republicans.

Only two of the ~600 NAS members who received the December 9, 2015 National Association of Scholars letter by Wood have expressed concern about McNutt or suppression of scientific dissent on three important regulatory-related issues (LNT, PM2.5, AGW), which are described in the letter. These two members have experienced retaliation because of their “politically incorrect” views on other science. NAS member Lindzen has published that environmental activists like Cicerone, Holdren, Hanson, and Gleick, were admitted to NAS via a special ad hoc committee. NAS member Gardner has published evidence that USGS Director McNutt failed to investigate his misconduct complaint. Other concerns about McNutt are forthcoming.

McNutt issued a February 5, 2016 retraction of the May 7, 2004 *Science* Report by Lina A. Gugliotti and May 28, 2015 retraction of the December 12, 2014 *Science* Report by Michael LaCour. However, she absolutely refuses to peer-review or investigate in any way the massive evidence submitted to her since June 2015 of scientific misconduct regarding three *Science* papers involving LNT, PM2.5, and AGW. If *Science* and/or qualified NAS members peer-reviewed this misconduct evidence, found it to be accurate, and published it, this evidence could lead to major changes in related U.S. regulatory policy, primarily coming from EPA.

Since McNutt, *Science*, and NAS refuse to evaluate or publish evidence of scientific misconduct, the broader scientific community, the general public, and Congress should evaluate the evidence. If the evidence is valid, McNutt, *Science*, and NAS must be held accountable for failure to act.