

# The Relentless Attack on America

*{If you were referenced to this document from [here](#), start on the last paragraph of Page 2.}*

To genuinely solve any major societal problem, we need to have a big picture understanding of what is going on. Let's try this...

America was founded on the profoundly important principle that the government should be: **of the people, by the people, and for the people**. *But that is currently not even remotely the case!*

Instead we have a government run by special interests, for special interests. This radical departure, of course, is not acknowledged. Instead the government (and their beneficiaries) goes to great lengths to pretend that citizens are in control of the government (e.g., *via* so-called honest elections), and that government policies are still about doing what is in the best interests of citizens. *Both are provably false.*

As horrific as the COVID-19 matter is (some one million Americans dead — **most unnecessary**), the silver lining may be that it finally rips the scab off this charade.

Basically, here is our current situation...

Various government factions have knowingly lied to the public regarding a wide variety of major technical matters ranging from climate change to COVID.

Their reason for their deceptions is for them to get more power and control — i.e., to undermine America and the premises it was founded on.

They know they can get away with smoke and mirrors, as the public is technically challenged — so most people will not be aware that they are being misled.

The ignorance of the citizenry was no accident, as anti-Americans have worked for years to undermine what had been our reasonably competent education system.

Eroding Science education is the specific primary target of these special-interest parties, as our modern society is almost entirely based on Science.

To appreciate the extraordinary lengths these saboteurs have gone, and the extreme precariousness of our current position, we need to grasp what is happening to Science.

Scientist Dr. Carl Sagan famously (and accurately) [said](#): “We live in a society dependent on Science — in which hardly anyone knows anything about Science!”

Over thousands of years we have worked out a **methodology** for discovering the technical truths of our universe — which is what the field of Science is all about. The short, on-point definition of Science is: [Science is a Process](#).

The understanding that Science is a Process is **critically important** for our evaluating government policies that are supposedly *based* on Science. The question always is: *did they follow the Process?*

What is the **Process**? The short answer is: the **Scientific Method**. The [Scientific Method](#) is a step-by-step problem-solving method (process), and is the heart of Science.

Believe it or not, the roots of the Scientific Method go back some **4000 years** (e.g., see [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#))!

It may not be readily apparent, but anti-Americans literally **hate** Science. The reason is that Science is a gatekeeper that exposes the nonsense of their self-serving political proposals (COVID, climate, energy, etc.).

*Of course none of these haters would publicly come out and say that they detest Science!* These bad actors know that they can not oppose Science directly, as it is too popular with the [public](#). Their clever solution is to claim that they fully support Science — while clandestinely trying to dilute it, so that it ends up being merely a paper tiger. It’s an illusion that (so far) has worked out disturbingly well.

A superior example of their effort is to look at what is transpiring in our education system. Their long-range strategy is that if they can produce academic graduates who have a distorted understanding of Science, then in short order, the citizenry will also reflect that corruption. In that way, the gatekeeper will have been effectively dealt with.

So how is this happening? We need to be clear on one more major factor, before the answer will be understandable. The Scientific Method is premised on a key element: **Critical Thinking**. Imbedded in that is **skepticism**. (The first part of this [article](#) makes a good layperson explanation of the connection. Here’s another good [commentary](#) on these two interwoven elements.) Critical thinking is one of the most important [life skills](#) that an individual will *ever* learn. It is beneficial in ALL phases of life.

Back to the US education system. The [Next Generation Science Standards](#) (NGSS) are marketed to be state-of-the-art, [PreK-thru-12 Science Standards](#). To put their influence into perspective, they have been fully or mostly implemented by some [44 US states](#)!

The question is: **do the NGSS promote real Science *and* Critical Thinking?**

Astoundingly, the short answers are: **No *and* Hell No!**

The gory details of these deplorable developments are too lengthy to go into in this commentary, so here is just a quickie overview to each question.\*

### **1 - Sample evidence that the NGSS is not about teaching real Science.**

Look no further than the Scientific Method. Without explanation to students, the Scientific Method has been **eliminated** from the Pre-K thru 12 NGSS: **it is not even mentioned once!** The fact that it has been exceptionally beneficial to us for some 4000 years, is now irrelevant. A few “progressives” at the [National Academies of Sciences](#) (NAS) deemed it to be passé (*not woke enough?*), and summarily [scrubbed it](#).

In its place they substituted “[Science and Engineering Practices](#).” The audacity of this is breathtaking! Clearly the self-appointed NAS icons know much more than the Aristotles, Galileos, Newtons, Curies, Einsteins, etc. who were unfairly burdened with the “linear” Scientific Method. (I’ll explain the key difference between the Scientific Method and their new-fangled, contrived “Practices” in a minute.)

### **2 - Sample evidence that the NGSS is not about teaching Critical Thinking.**

In the entire set of *Next Generation Science Standards* (Pre-K thru 12), the phrase “critical thinking” **does not appear a single time!**

If the NGSS was truly promoting Critical Thinking, their standards would lay out relevant facts about important topics, **objectively** and **comprehensively** — and then let students draw their own conclusions. *Is that what is going on here?* **Absolutely not!**

Let’s start with one example: the Scientific Method.

If the NAS, etc. scholars actually believe that they have an iron-clad case as to how their “[Practices](#)” are far superior than the tried-and-true Scientific Method, then they should make it so that teachers and students can do a **Critical Thinking** assessment.

No such discussion is advocated or possible, as their “justifications” for dismissing the Scientific Method are not part of NGSS, so are not even brought up. Apparently they are concerned that if critical thinking was done, then their case against the Scientific Method would collapse — *and the rest of the NGSS house of cards along with it.*

Let’s look at some other relevant national issues: Fossil Fuels, Carbon Dioxide, and Climate Change. The question is: do the NGSS cover these important topics **objectively** and **comprehensively** — and then ask our children to do critical thinking about them? **Absolutely not.** The NGSS (NAS, etc.) has *pre-decided* what is politically correct, so in each of these examples, only a one-sided story is presented to students.

For example, only **negative** aspects of fossil fuels are laid out — even though there are significant [positive benefits](#) from fossil fuels. The same situation exists with CO<sub>2</sub>: *few benefits are identified*, even though there are [several](#). Likewise with Climate Change. This is unequivocally **not** a scientifically resolved issue, yet it is falsely presented as **dogma**. (In scientific terms the Climate Change matter is a *hypothesis* [e.g., [here](#)].)

If NGSS was truly promoting critical thinking, they would present the arguments on both sides — **objectively** and **comprehensively** — and let students decide. *None of that is happening.* Rather, students are treated as lemmings and being force-fed political pablum.

What are the key differences between the Scientific Method and the NAS/NGSS “[Practices](#)”?

What the NGSS is subtly promoting as an *alternative* to critical thinking, is **computer modeling**. In other words, their plan is to convince students about the merits of letting computers doing the work. That’s disconcerting, as what that is really about is to persuade students to **substitute** *computer results* for *their critical thinking*. It’s somewhat akin to solving math problems using a calculator rather than with a student’s brain.

Why is computer modeling the vehicle adopted by “progressives” for students to have faith in? As a person who has created some hundred thousand lines of code, the answer is self-evident: **it’s child’s play to bury multiple significant unproven assumptions into almost indecipherable computer programs.** The objective of the Science opponents is for citizens to mindlessly worship computer projections, in lieu of having a society of Critical Thinkers.

What’s also revealing is that the same educators who dismiss [rote learning](#) as a form of [child abuse](#), have no problem buying into it when it coincides with their political opinions.

What students are being taught *via* the NGSS is *political* science, which is **not** real Science and it is **not** based on critical thinking. It is **rote teaching**: memorizing what the NAS, *et al* are telling them, and regurgitating it back in a test. This is blatant propagandizing, and no critical thinking is required, or desired.

---

Another profound matter snuck into the NGSS is that the powers-that-be have now lumped Engineers in with Scientists. The reality is that Science and Engineering are both worthy — *but very different* — fields. An insightful explanation of the differences is [here](#).

Goals, processes, etc. are **not** the same. Another distinction (as this [good writeup](#) explains), is that Science uses a bottoms-up approach, while Engineering is top-down. *What could be more different?*

Due to these significant professional differences, to come up with an accurate uniform process that depicts what both Scientist and Engineers do, is an impossibility. So when the NAS, *et al* try to replace the *Scientific Method* with *Science and Engineering Practices*, they are, in effect, trying to pound a square peg into a circular hole.

The bottom line is that the NGSS replacing the **Scientific Method** with a *Science and Engineering Process* — as if Science and Engineering processes are the same — is simply wrong. (Note that I identified this attempt to undermine Science, over a decade ago: see \* and check out issue #11.)

---

I could go on, but hopefully you get the picture: US Pre-K thru 12 students are not being taught genuine Science **or** to be Critical Thinkers. Instead they are being purposefully propagandized to buy into unscientific agendas. This allows lobbyists to dictate government policies that are contrary to the interest of citizens or the country. **This will continue (and get worse) until enough parents, teachers, legislators and scientists strenuously object.**

john droz, jr.    physicist    aaprjohn at northnet dot org    8-10-22

\*For a more in-depth discussion about the *many* attempts to undermine Science, please see my online slide presentation at [ScienceUnderAssault.info](#). Note that although I warned about this over ten years ago, little has been done, and so (not surprisingly) the situation is now worse (e.g., the NGSS officially promoting anti-Science ideology).