

closed minds are the intellectual climate change

by Roger Koopman

Recently, I wrote an op-ed criticizing Montana school districts that allowed their students to skip class to participate in an openly partisan political protest. The “Climate Strike” was a nationwide, Trump-hating, far left event promoting the radical “Green New Deal” and its “down with capitalism” socialist agenda. Public school approval of student participation amounted to sanctioned politically correct truancy.

My message was simply this. People don’t pay taxes to have their public schools encourage radical political activism during the school day. Students are free to do that on their own time, but school is for teaching, not politicizing. I also pointed out that when schools do this, they embrace – with public dollars -- only one side of the political spectrum. A Right to Life march or pro-Second Amendment demonstration would be out of the question.

Frankly, I also wanted to have some fun, knowing that if I dared to question the scientific validity of the world-coming-to-an-end narrative, I would be verbally tarred and feathered for my cognitive sins. I wasn’t disappointed. Dozens of letters poured into various newspapers (even ones not running the column) that ignored my main points, engaging instead in a frenzy of ad hominin attack, demanding that I be removed from the PSC and my views banned from the papers. The letters were laden with the usual climate lingo (like the totally debunked “97% of scientists” claim), demonstrating how little these folks consider the other side or think for themselves.

I do not question that the climate is changing (it always has), and that human activity may have an effect on that. The question is how much effect, and to what end: positive (earth-greening) or negative (ice-melting.) Unfortunately, an honest, respectful, two-sided conversation on climate change questions no longer exists in our schools or across our nation. It’s been replaced by a herd mentality that considers only one side, and then declares the matter officially “settled.” For those who want to do their own thinking, I suggest you look into one of the many informative science-based blogs and websites (cfact.org, sepp.org, judithcurry.com, cornwallalliance.org, friendsofscience.org, etc.) and nourish your brains with information the consensus-claiming herd would just as soon you never see. Then think for yourself.

To quote from the very popular (now deceased) author/screenwriter Michael Crichton, *“Let’s be clear: the work of science has nothing to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with consensus.”*

I’m quite certain Galileo, Pasteur, Newton, Curie, Edison, Einstein and a few thousand other scientific pioneers and luminaries would fully agree. These brash individualists broke free of the prevailing orthodoxy of their day, struck out on their own, and lifted the human condition in more ways than we can even fathom. And I’ll bet not one of them ever carried a sign down main street or joined a mass protest to be politically correct.

Koopman is serving his seventh year on the Montana Public Service Commission, is a 37-year former small businessman and was elected to two terms in the Montana State House of Representatives from Gallatin County.