

Scientific American is no longer trustworthy

For decades, starting in the 1960s, I subscribed to the Scientific American (SA). One real pleasure each month was to read the articles authored by people in very diverse fields. Starting around the 1980's, something changed. I think what happened is the hippies of the sixties graduated college and moved into positions of responsibility for a number of American institutions including scientific American, hence the birth of the woke culture. But for whatever reason, the magazine started to emphasize social justice throughout their magazine. Worse was that some of the articles were one-sided or often even dishonest. I did not like it and I let my subscription lapse. I no longer trusted what I read.

The article you cited is a good example of the problem with Scientific American.

https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/covid-has-created-a-perfect-storm-for-fringe-science/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=today-in-science&utm_content=link&utm_term=2021-04-26_featured-this-week&spMailingID=70027932&spUserID=NDg4NTIxMjgyOTEwS0&spJobID=2103854996&spReportId=MjEwMzg1NDk5NgS2

Authors like this permeate the pages of many popular science magazines these days. I know nothing about this author. But during my career I have encountered people who remind me of the way he writes. The people I knew started in a non-science field, usually political and or travel adventures or something like that and then migrated to science of one sort or another. An outstanding feature of these people was that they were always more concerned about what their peer group thought of them than they were about informing anyone about a particular scientific issue. They didn't love the science, they loved the affirmation. It was scientific preening and was anything but science as I know it. This SA article starts by dismissing any benefit of Ivermectin as a therapeutic for COVID-19 without any justification. Compare that with an article on the efficacy of Ivermectin published in a peer reviewed journal:

https://journals.lww.com/americantherapeutics/fulltext/2021/00000/review_of_the_emerging_evidence_demonstrating_the.4.aspx

These latter authors make a strong case that Ivermectin is of considerable benefit as a therapeutic to for the COVID-19. The SA article calls studies like this fake. I could go on. The SA article dismisses the possibility that the virus originated in a Wuhan lab. The director of our own CDC has opined that it is likely the source. So have numerous other highly regarded officials like the director of Britain's M16. But rather than investigate this issue or present both sides, the SA article just calls it fake. And then there is the adulation of WHO, etc. You get the point. If it is the party line then it is true. Otherwise it is fake.

The problem with articles like this SA one is that they provide ammunition to those who try to squelch legitimate inquiry. In the two examples above big tech has brought the hammer down on anyone who deviates from the official government line. I think articles like this one in SA damage the country and should not be promoted.