



Union of Concerned Scientists

Citizens and Scientists for Environmental Solutions

Restoring Scientific Integrity in Policymaking An Unprecedented Pattern of Behavior

“Is the analysis flawed? That is a legitimate reason for not releasing [a science-based analysis]. But if you don’t like the outcome that might result from the analysis, that is not a legitimate reason.”¹

William Ruckelshaus, the first EPA administrator under President Nixon

“My sense is that, from the beginning of the Bush administration, the White House has constantly injected itself into the way the EPA approaches and decides the critical issues before it. The agency has had little or no independence. I think that is a very great mistake, and one for which the American people could pay over the long run in compromised health and reduced quality of life.”²

Russell Train, EPA administrator under Presidents Nixon and Ford

“The current administration has instituted an unheard-of level of micromanagement in the programmatic and scientific activities of CDC. We’re seeing a clear substitution of ideology for science and it is causing many committed scientists to leave the agency... Ronald Reagan was very uncomfortable with the issue of sex education and the transmission of HIV, which was still largely stigmatized at the time. Nonetheless, with the help of CDC, his administration got factual information out to every household in the country about the problem. His actions stand in dramatic contrast to the sorry record of the current administration on informing the public about issues related to sex education and HIV transmission.”³

According to Dr. Margaret Scarlett, a former CDC staff member who served in the agency for 15 years, most recently in the Office of HIV/AIDS Policy

“I don’t think any administration has penetrated so deeply into the advisory committee structure as this one, and I think it matters. If you start picking people by their ideology instead of their scientific credentials you are inevitably reducing the quality of the advisory group.”⁴

Donald Kennedy, editor of the journal *Science*, former president of Stanford University, and a former FDA commissioner

“I’m not aware that [Nixon] ever hand-picked ideologues to serve on advisory committees, or dismissed from advisory committees very well-qualified people if he didn’t like their views.... What’s going on now is in many ways more insidious. It happens behind the curtain. I don’t think we’ve had this kind of cynicism with respect to objective scientific advice since I’ve been watching government, which is quite a long time.”⁵

Professor Lewis M. Branscomb, director of the National Bureau of Standards (now NIST) in the Nixon administration

“Withholding of vital environmental information is getting to be a bad habit with the Bush administration.”⁶

**REP America, the national grassroots organization of
Republicans for Environmental Protection**

¹ J. Lee, “Critics Say E.P.A. Won’t Analyze Clean Air Proposals Conflicting with President’s Policies,” *New York Times*, July 14, 2003.

² Russell E. Train, “The Environmental Protection Agency just isn’t like it was in the good old (Nixon) days,” *www.gristmagazine.com*, September 22, 2003.

³ UCS interview with Margaret Scarlett, October 2003.

⁴ A. Zitner, “Advisors Put Under a Microscope,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 23, 2002.

⁵ B. Reppert, “Politics in the lab hits US scientific integrity,” *Christian Science Monitor*, January 6, 2004.

⁶ Press release, REP America, July 2, 2003. Online at www.repamerica.org.