



Jones, Stephanie

From: Lynn Kohler <lmkohler@wysdgmail.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 27, 2021 9:06 PM
To: ED, State Board of Ed; sethgrove@pahousenews.com; senatorkristin@pasen.gov; Todd Davies
Subject: [External] New Science Standards

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

I am writing to you regarding the New Science Standards that are being proposed for the public education system in Pennsylvania.

The vast majority of the standards I have no objection to. The portion I do object to would more realistically belong in a political science context.

I am one of 4,500 school directors in PA who have the responsibility for approving curriculum and textbooks in our school district. I am a believer in the public education system and I personally have witnessed the good that is taking place in our schools.

What I object to is the political bias that has been inserted into textbooks and curriculum. More importantly, the bias that some teachers have brought into the classroom. I won't go any further here as that is a different topic for another day.

What I do believe in and the focus I take as a Director is that it is our responsibility to teach our students "How" to think and not "What" to think. I believe that school should be the place for all ideas to be expressed and free for debate. Those days no longer exist in most places in America. A single political ideology now controls 90% of the education system in America.

Most schools talk about critical thinking. Quite frankly, where does a student go to find information that varies from popular thought? The internet? No, that is designed to hide information that is counter to conventional thinking. Mainstream media? Ok, that is another topic for another day.

I believe in more and not less information.

Now, considering this system is supported almost entirely by taxpayer dollars, I have a real concern with the control of thought in public education. Especially, in my district that is funded at 77% local taxes and the vast majority of constituents feel they have lost control of what is taught to their children.

My specific concerns are with the standards that fall under Environment and Ecology, Earth and Space Science. Weather and Climate, Human Impacts.

The specific points are as follows:

- 1) Factors that have caused the rise in global temperatures over the past century.
- 2) Analyse and interpret data on natural hazards to forecast future catastrophic events and inform the development of technologies to mitigate their effects.
- 3) Apply scientific principles to design a method for monitoring and minimizing human impact on the environment.
- 4) Construct an argument supported by evidence for how increases in human population and per capita consumption of natural resources impact Earth's systems.
- 5) How flow of energy into and out of Earth's systems result in changes in climate.
- 6) Analyse geoscience data and the results from global climate models to make an evidence based forecast of the current rate of global or regional climate change and associated future impacts to Earth's systems.

I will defer to Professor Gregory Wrightstone for a lot of my responses to these so called standards. As Professor Wrightstone quotes Voltaire-It is dangerous to be right in matters where established men are wrong.

To Standard 1 Why are we only looking at the rising temperatures of the last century? I believe it is because of "confirmation bias". The temperature on Earth has actually been rising since the 16th century. But that is an inconvenient fact because that doesn't match with the increasing CO2 levels on Earth. So are we only going to talk about the last century? Hmm.

If you look at all the warming periods in mankind history, Minoan, Roman, Medieval and current history, each of these periods were marked by great advancements and prosperity. Thank God we are living on Earth at this time. We are able to grow more food on Earth now than any other time in history. High CO2 levels and warm temperatures are the main reasons for that. We should be celebrating.

To Standard 2 There is a huge assumption here, that man is causing the temperature increase and that man can somehow create a system to mitigate our current climate. Professor Wrightstone is so right. He uses the same scientific evidence to show how flawed the mainstream agenda is. Climate change scientists leave out data that doesn't serve their purpose. This is like our students watching a trial in which they only get to see the prosecutor give their case. Who is providing the defense case? Where do students find other opinions on what the establishment has determined to be the standard? If you analyse the data, droughts, storms and wildfires are no more prevalent nor severe now than they were 100 years ago. The data is clear, regardless of what Al Roker says. It is sad that the scientific community completely ignores the greatest period of no major hurricanes to hit the continental US. This happened in the last 25 years and that period lasted 10 years. No, No we aren't going to talk about that.

To Standard 3 First of all this completely ignores the fact that our air and water are cleaner now than anytime in my lifetime. It ignores the fact that the Earth heals itself. Remember the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. That oil will be with us for decades. It was gone within six months. All the media coverage went on to another story. Let's be honest here, the Environmental movement has always been an Anti-Capitalism movement. Minimizing impact on humans is codeword for "control". Government knows what is better for you.

To Standard 4 Also, deals with politics. The unfair distribution of natural resources. The big bad USA doesn't play fair with the rest of the world. Another argument for another day. Redistribution of Wealth!

Standard 5 Here is an attack on fossil fuels which the claim is the "evil" behind climate change. The best idea the world could see would be for China and India to embrace clean coal technology over the next 50 to 100 years. That would have the greatest impact on our environment. Contrary to the political scientists, fracking has proved to be an entirely safe and cost effective process. It would also be beneficial if wild claims were not sold to our students. For instance the UN has predicted that millions of species would become extinct due to CO2 levels, changing climate and natural habitats. The facts simply don't support this claim. Over the last forty years we have only averaged two extinctions per year.

To Standard 6 Hold onto your hats! There is no scientific data that supports the theory that man's activity is significantly changing temperatures or climate here on Earth. Please folks, let's leave provable science in the Standards and political science in Government or Social Studies class. Now I know you are saying 97% of scientists agree about climate change. No they don't. Read Mark Steyn's book, he does an excellent job debunking this overused line. Please don't be offended by what I'm about to say. I realize that many of you work in the education industry and some of you may be scientists. I am sure you all go about your work with fidelity. The vast majority of the world's scientists involved with climate change get their funding from the Government. If you want more funding you give the Government the data that they want to receive. In addition, think about all the unemployed scientists there would be without this concept of climate change. This is a multi trillion dollar operation.

If you are still with me, let me ask you this. How do you want to be remembered for your impact while on this Earth? Did you encourage the pursuit of free thought? Did you support students with different opinions. I always believed that you should be able to successfully argue the major points of the opposing side in a good argument. There is little value in that today. I can make a compelling argument that the truth behind climate change has been buried so deep that a reasonable argument is even possible. Am I a Denier?

So I ask you as members of the State Board of Education in PA with the power to impose science standards that our elected officials in the General Assembly Have no control over. What will be your legacy? Will you choose political science standards or fact based standards?

Thank you,

Lynn Kohler
West York Area School District
School Director
717-676-2396

