

January 15, 2016

Barbara A. Schaal, Ph.D.  
Chair, Presidential Nominating Committee  
National Academy of Sciences  
President Elect  
American Association for the Advancement of Science  
Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and  
Mary-Dell Chilton Distinguished Professor of Biology  
Washington University, St. Louis  
[schaal@wustl.edu](mailto:schaal@wustl.edu)  
[schaal@biology.wustl.edu](mailto:schaal@biology.wustl.edu)

Dear Professor Schaal,

I am writing again to request that you respond to my January 7, 2015 email letter regarding the National Association of Scholars email letter by Dr. Peter Wood to you and numerous other members of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) “Concerns about the National Academy of Sciences and Scientific Dissent” ([https://www.nas.org/articles/nas\\_letter](https://www.nas.org/articles/nas_letter)). Based a January 11, 2016 message from NAS Home Secretary Susan R. Wessler, NAS voting for Dr. Marcia K. McNutt will continue until January 25, 2015, after which time I assume the election of Dr. McNutt as the next NAS President will be officially confirmed.

I am disturbed about several aspects of this election: 1) Dr. McNutt is the only candidate for NAS President; 2) you and Dr. Wessler have not expressed any concern that the National Association of Scholars email letter will not be seen by all NAS members; and 3) you have not revealed to me the names of the other NAS Presidential Nominating Committee members.

Also, I am disturbed that you are have expressed no concern about my December 22, 2015 letter to UC Riverside Professor Wessler (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/wessler122215.pdf>). This letter makes clear that *Science* Editor-in-Chief McNutt has been directly involved with suppressing dissent on three important scientific issues (linear no threshold dose response, fine particulate matter epidemiology, and anthropogenic global warming). All three issues are having an adverse socioeconomic impact on the greater Riverside area, indeed on all of California, because of draconian California air pollution regulations that are based upon “consensus” views on these scientific issues.

Thus, in addition to you, I am reaching out to the February 11-15, 2016 AAAS Annual Meeting Program Co-Chair France A. Córdoba, a former UC Riverside Chancellor, and to current NAS President Ralph J. Cicerone, a former UC Irvine Chancellor. Both of these distinguished scientists are familiar with the three scientific issues and their impact on California because of they have had important careers in California. I hope that all three of you will encourage discussion of the National Association of Scholars letter at the AAAS Meeting.

One opportunity is the February 12, 2016 session on “[Peer Review for Public Trust](#).” The organizers of this session, *Science* Editor Brad Wible and Dr. McNutt, are the very scientists who **refused** to peer review massive and meticulously documented evidence of scientific misconduct in fine particulate matter epidemiology, which was submitted to them on July 20, 2015 by nine distinguished academics. Panelist and former Deputy Editor of *NEJM* and *JAMA* Drummond Rennie should be particularly concerned about refusal to peer review massive evidence of scientific misconduct.

A second opportunity is the February 14, 2016 session on “[Fostering Integrity in Science: An Action Agenda](#).” Panelist and Georgia Tech Professor Robert M. Nerem will be discussing the new National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine report *Integrity of Science*, which “examines the most significant challenges facing the research enterprise in fostering integrity and develops an action agenda for researchers and other stakeholders.” Evidence of suppression of scientific dissent should be of great interest to this panel.

A third opportunity is the February 14, 2016 session on “[Integrating Science into Policy: What Works and Why](#).” Panelist and Arizona State Professor Daniel Sarewitz will be discussing the very divisive issue of climate change, particularly a dispute over attribution of climate impacts between President Obama's science advisor John Holdren and University of Colorado climate scientist Roger Pielke, Jr. The suppression of climate change dissent by Dr. McNutt, as described in the National Association of Scholars letter, is highly relevant to this dispute.

I hope that those of you who receive this message take it seriously, because it involves the scientific integrity of *Science*, AAAS, and NAS. As stated in the summary of one of the above sessions “Erosion of public trust in science due to such issues [transparency, reproducibility, and falsification] has the potential to be devastating.” If the leadership of *Science*, AAAS, and NAS does not address scientific integrity and suppression of scientific dissent, these issues will be addressed in other forums, particularly during this year.

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

cc: Susan R. Wessler <[susan.wessler@ucr.edu](mailto:susan.wessler@ucr.edu)>  
Geraldine L. Richmond <[richmond@uoregon.edu](mailto:richmond@uoregon.edu)>  
France A. Córdova <[fcordova@nsf.gov](mailto:fcordova@nsf.gov)>  
Ralph J. Ciceroni <[rcicerone@nas.edu](mailto:rcicerone@nas.edu)>  
Drummond Rennie <[drummond.rennie@ucsf.edu](mailto:drummond.rennie@ucsf.edu)>  
Robert M. Nerem <[robert.nerem@me.gatech.edu](mailto:robert.nerem@me.gatech.edu)>  
Daniel Sarewitz <[Daniel.Sarewitz@asu.edu](mailto:Daniel.Sarewitz@asu.edu)>  
Peter Wood <[pwood@nas.org](mailto:pwood@nas.org)>