



**Opponent Testimony: HB 486
Ohio House Education Committee**

October 21, 2025
Dr. Christina Collins, Executive Director
Honesty for Ohio Education

Chair Fowler Arthur, Vice Chair Odioso, Ranking Member Brennan, and members of the House Education Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide opponent testimony regarding House Bill 486.

My name is Dr. Christina Collins. I serve as the Executive Director of [Honesty for Ohio Education](#). As our organization's name makes clear, we aim to ensure all students receive an honest, accurate, high-quality education that will prepare them for a successful future. We, therefore, have grave concerns about the content of HB 486 and how it would be implemented. I will highlight just a couple key issues for you today.

First, we are deeply troubled by the fact that HB 486 appears to use "religion" and "Christianity" almost interchangeably. The bill is clearly intended to allow educators to provide instruction on the positive aspects of Christianity specifically. The Christian faith [is referenced at least four times](#) throughout the bill, while no other major religions or deities appear to be mentioned.

Obviously, a bill promoting the values of only one religion in public schools would be proselytization. If the sponsors argue that this was not their intent, then HB 486 will need to be heavily amended to address its current glaring lack of other religions and religious figures.

If the bill's intent is truly to highlight the impacts of all religions on American history, would educators then have the freedom to choose which religions to highlight? Would the bill sponsors support educators who use the freedoms provided under this law to teach mainly about the positive impacts of Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, and Buddhism?

I will also note that, if the bill's intent is merely to highlight the impacts of all religions, then this bill becomes unnecessary. Current Ohio Learning Standards for Social Studies require students to study the influences and impacts of religion on American history, government, and policy.

Second, HB 486 declares a series of statements to be true under Ohio law (lines 387-397). One such statement reads that "an accurate and historical account of the influence of Christianity on the freedom and liberties ingrained in our culture is imperative to reducing ignorance of American history, hate, and violence within our society."

This declaration raises several flags regarding its practical implementation. For example, a truly [accurate](#) and [historical account](#) of the influence of Christianity on our current freedoms and liberties would require discussion around [the use of Christianity to justify](#) the slave labor necessary to physically build the nation we enjoy today. This discussion would likely not meet the bill's stated goal of reducing anti-Christian sentiment in today's society.

We then have to ask if the bill's true goal is not, in fact, to teach "an accurate and historical account" of the impacts of Christianity, but instead an account that has been cherry picked to paint one particular religion in a positive light. This concern is bolstered by the fact that the bill lays out several pages of examples that educators could use to highlight the positive aspects of Christianity and religion, while ignoring any of the negative historical data points.

My point is this: It is clear that HB 486 was not well thought out or heavily researched before its introduction. It is a reactionary response to a notable political death that would lead to incredible controversy, headaches, and potentially lawsuits if actually passed into law.

Please, take the time to read this bill carefully and think through all possible outcomes. I believe you will find that it requires intensive edits and may in fact not be worth pursuing at all.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of today's testimony.