

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 1:10 PM
To: Alfred Harms, Jr. <aharms@lhps.org>
Cc: Derek Daly <ddaly@lhps.org>; Lynn Math <lmath@lhps.org>;
Subject: RE: Update

Dear Al

Thank u very much for your response. Given that response, and as u might have imagined ☺, I have the following 2 sets of follow up questions. I figured I'd submit them in writing to you, as a face to face (with sufficient time to thoroughly explore them) seems unlikely in our mutually busy schedules.

1. U mentioned a new oversight process re: the GOA courses generally: "whenever an LHPS student requests to participate in a GOA course, our Upper School Assoc. Director for Curriculum and Instruction will review the course content. If we believe it *does not meet our academic standards or our school's values/mission*, we will notify the student's parents accordingly, and inform them that LHPS will not award academic credit for the course." [Italics added]

-Question: What is your (personal) and/or LH's (public) position as to whether, specifically, the GOA Gender Studies Course curriculum does or does not "meet [LH's] academic standards or [LH's] values/mission"? Are there other GOA course raising concerns in this respect?

-Question: Was the GOA Gender Studies course actually reviewed in the last 6 months, given the concerns, evidence and arguments I raised in my June 2019 letter regarding its stated content and pedagogical design and agenda? If reviewed, by whom? With what, if any, results, conclusions or plans going forward?

-Question: What, if any, concerns do you and/or LH have, specifically, with respect to the GOA Gender Studies Course curriculum/content and overall pedagogical agenda as outlined in my June, 2019 letter? Do you share any of my concerns? If so, which ones specifically?

-Question: Regardless of whether the GOA Gender Studies course does/does not meet LH's academic standards and/or values/mission, and regardless of any concerns you or LH have (again, if any), is it the case that the GOA Gender Studies course will remain a part of the curriculum, actively promoted by LH to students and parents, in the foreseeable future?

2. In reviewing LH's upper school hard science courses, I noted that only Biology and Chemistry appear to be *mandatory* classes for all LH students. All other courses—and in particular, Anatomy & Physiology and Psychology—are *elective*. Moreover, judging from my reading of the 2019-2020 course content in both the natural and social sciences curriculum of LH, and specifically the course descriptions for both the *mandatory* (biology and chemistry) courses, as well the *elective* courses (anatomy/physiology, psychology, etc.) it does not appear that in any of these hard science classes, nor generally in any other social science classes, that the LH student is:

(i) specifically taught the well-established scientific literature *directly debunking the intersectional doctrine* of social constructivism central to the Intersectional pedagogy (i.e. the assertion that there are no differences between male and female homo sapiens; that all such differences are solely “assigned” socially; that females and males are **not** inherently distinct genetically, biologically, anatomically, physiologically, neurologically, neurochemically, psychologically and psychometrically); nor is the LH student

(ii) specifically taught the fundamental reasons for *rejecting the intersectional doctrine* of “group identity” (i.e. in which students are trained to interpret all meaning and social relationships in history and in their lives according to their assigned identity and membership in a particular racial, sexual, gendered, or class *group*, as opposed to the classic Christian/Enlightenment conception that views each human being as a *unique individual*, separate and independent of their particular race, sex, gender or class).

And so, since LH does continue to offer the GOA Gender Studies course (which expressly teaches both the social constructivism and group identity dogmas of intersectionality, among other dogmas) and since the academic environment of almost every college and university today is dominated by this same intersectionality pedagogy (affirmatively educating the student in both social constructivist and group identity dogmas, among other dogmas), I have the following second set of questions:

Question: Will the GOA Gender Studies course continue to be offered without a mandatory prerequisite education in these scientific subdisciplines specifically refuting the intersectionalist social constructivist claims (as suggested by my June 2019 letter)?

Question: Do you agree with my contention (as stated in my June, 2019 letter and again here) that the intersectionalist social constructivism and group identity doctrines are the prevailing orthodoxy within the academic environment of colleges and universities today?

Question: If so, what, if anything, are you/LH doing to prepare every LH student for their inevitable encounter with these (and other) intersectional dogmas in that environment?

Question: Will you construct a mandatory course (or course content incorporated within existing curriculum) educating every LH specifically in the scientific literature debunking the social constructivist doctrines (as suggested by my June 2019 letter)?

Question: Will you construct a mandatory course (or course content incorporated within existing curriculum) educating every LH specifically in the divisive social effects of interpreting all of history, all social relationships, and themselves thru the intersectional interpretative lens of racial, sexual, and class “group identities” (as suggested by my June 2019 letter)?

As always, I appreciate your time and attention to my questions and concerns AI. I look forward to your response.

Thanks again!