

The Common Core (CC) educational program introduced in U.S. schools a few years back presents a module for teaching about the climate and about the various natural and anthropogenic factors that influence climate. The section labeled **ESS3-5** provides guidance to educators for framing the global warming concept for students at the middle school level. In the guidance statement, an assumption was made that global temperatures have risen over the past century and that the increase was due both to human activities, fossil fuel consumption in particular, and natural processes, e.g. incoming solar radiation and volcanic activity. Explicit in the guidance statement was – **“Emphasis is on the major role those human activities play in causing the rise in global temperatures.”** But the assertion that humans play a major role in global temperature increases (if there are increases) is questionable. To examine the validity of the assertion, it is illuminating to go back in time, say 6,000 years, and consider the climate and landscape of that part of the north American continent that is the region of the Great Lakes, an area where Algonquin peoples settled and live today. This time falls within a 4,000-year-long period of distinctive Native American culture that archaeologists and anthropologists have called the Archaic Period. A climatic event known as the Hypsithermal Period was in full swing at the time and air temperatures were 1-2°C higher than they are today. The Laurentian ice sheet that once had covered much of North America was decaying rapidly and the Great Lakes were significantly diminished both in areal extent and in depth than they are at present. The 6,000-year datum is approximately 4,500 years before the first European colonists stepped foot on the continent. Human population was comprised entirely of Native Americans, with gross estimates of numbers between 100,000 and 1,000,000 individuals. Their green-house gas emissions that would have led to elevated levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere had to have been negligible. And the lumbering mastodons that had long found a home in the Great Lakes region were in the final throes of extinction. Climate change, perhaps? The point here is that if we are going to teach our future leaders’ important facts about the environment (and we certainly should) then we should stick to scientific facts that can be tested, and where relevant contrasts are available, present them. Otherwise, we are not teaching, we are indoctrinating and, in so doing, “dumbing down” the audience with ideological control the apparent goal. The target audience here is highly suggestive of that motive. Our future leaders deserve better.

Relevant portions of the above text have been extracted from the book *Assault on a Culture*.

Each time I read of the concept known as Critical Race Theory (CRT) I go to my computer and google the term. And each time I scroll between different URLs, I get a different answer. That result makes me believe that the theory is complex and subject to various interpretations. What is clear in all the definitions of CRT is that it is based on the premise that America is inherently racist, yet race is the prism through which all humans and their activities should be viewed. In amazingly simple terms, it is a playing-field leveling process by which systemic racism, often characterized as white supremacy, can be managed. Practitioners of CRT seek “antiracism” by the elimination of meritocracy, acceptance of objective truth, and the adoption of race-based policies. Rather than promoting antiracism, these activities would seem, in my opinion, to promote racism and if presented in schools at the K-12 level would expose young minds to concepts that diminish or totally abrogate the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as specified in the Declaration of Independence, replacing them with something the proponents call equity. Because the precepts of CRT do not offer positive outcomes that can be proven in any rigorous way and in fact may be harmful to young developing minds, the subject does not seem appropriate for public school curricula.

Charles E. Adams, Jr.

July 2,2021