

UPDATE:

from the noxious nineties
through the terrible twos

(You know it's true when it happens to you!)

Since the 1999 publication of *the deliberate dumbing down of america: A Chronological Paper Trail*, we have ushered in a new decade and millennium. The long-awaited 2000s are with us—"the terrible twos." Some legislative initiatives aimed at the year 2000 have had to be renamed or reformulated (*America 2000, Goals 2000*) because they did not meet their target goal of being in effect by the year 2000. We can thank the good Lord and strong-hearted Americans who saw through these proposals for what they were and rejected them out of hand.

During the "terrible twos" we have elected for two four-year terms another George Bush, former Texas governor who ushered in the school-to-work agenda for Texas schools. We have lived through 9/11, the first terrorist attack to take place on American soil. This decade has seen America at war in two different Middle Eastern countries—Iraq and Afghanistan. For the first time in our history we have experienced an effort to federalize the activities of "faith-based" organizations and their charities (communitarianism¹). All of this has taken place in the midst of the federal establishment of educational outcomes. Education in these nebulous, unacademic outcomes has left our young people unable to cope with the ever-present global social upheaval.

In addition to the above, we have, for the first time in our history also, elected our first black President—Barack Obama, a self-professed community organizer who has been taught all of the methods used to move groups of citizens from one position to another. Thus far, during his administration he has attempted to lift the U.S. out of the financial hole this country

found itself in in 2008, allowed the military to find and assassinate Osama Bin Laden for planning and financing the attack on 9/11, and appointed a secretary of education from the failed Chicago school administration, Arne Duncan, who called for paying students for good grades.

Now you know why I have named this Update “from the noxious nineties to the terrible twos”!

For those who wonder if the education change agents have introduced any new programs, methods or ideas during this last decade, the answer is “No.” While we have a new title—*No Child Left Behind*—it is in fact the carefully planned agenda that was spelled out in a small book published by The American Historical Association. This book entitled *Report of the Commission on the Social Studies: Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission* (Charles Scribner’s Sons: N.Y., 1934) was funded by the Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation. Harold Laski, a professor of British Socialism, said of this *Report*: “At bottom and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the *Report* is an educational program for a socialist America.”²

The call for a socialist America, of course, requires that the schools abandon traditional academic “teaching” and substitute “workforce training” or “techademics” to accommodate the needs of a planned economy. The following two quotes pertain to the dangers inherent in such an abandonment of traditional education:

“If education is beaten by training, civilization dies,” he (C.S. Lewis) writes, for the “lesson of history” is that “civilization is a rarity, attained with difficulty and easily lost.” It is the liberal arts, not vocational training, that preserves civilization by producing reasonable men and responsible citizens.

—Gregory Dunn, “C.S. Lewis on Liberal Arts Education,”
On Principle, Vol. 7, No. 2, April, 1999.

In the communist ideology the function of universal education is clear and easily understood. Universal education fits neatly into the authoritarian state. Education is tied directly to jobs—control of the job being the critical control point in an authoritarian state. Level of education, and consequently the level of employment, is determined first by the level of achievement in school. *They do not educate people for jobs that do not exist.* No such direct, controlled relationship between education and jobs exists in democratic countries. [emphasis added]

—Eugene Maxwell Boyce, Professor of Educational Administration,
College of Education, University of Georgia, *The Coming Revolution in
Education: Basic Education and the New Theory of Schooling*
(University Press of America, Inc.: Baton Rouge, 1983).

For those of you who may not have read the original *deliberate dumbing down of america* and for those of you who may have missed the importance of the following entry, in 1984 *The Washington Post* (May 14) published an article entitled “Industrial Policy Urged for GOP.” Some quotes from this article will explain why the quotes from C.S. Lewis and Eugene Boyce are so important:

SAN FRANCISCO (UPI)—A conservative study group founded by supporters

of President Reagan is about to issue a report that advocates Republicans shed some of their deep-rooted antipathy to a planned economy.

An industrial policy accepted by both political parties and by business and labor is essential to revitalize America's dwindling clout in the world economy, according to the study's editor, Professor Chalmers Johnson of the University of California.

"The Industrial Policy Debate" is to be issued today by the Institute for Contemporary Studies, a think-tank founded by presidential counselor Edwin Meese, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and other Reagan supporters.

... "Americans must come to grips with economic policy or go the way of England. We have probably got a decade before it becomes irreversible. ... many Republicans are painting themselves into a corner by attacking the very concept of industrial policy—arguing that it violates the sacred principles of private enterprise and free trade."

He [Johnson] cited as valid and successful national economic policy "the kind of government-business relationship" that has made Japan a leading economic force in the world. "A government-business relationship is needed in a competitive capitalist economy," he said.

"Reaganomics without an accompanying industrial policy to guide it, has been costly," Johnson said.

In 1992 President George H.W. Bush signed the *North American Free Trade Agreement* along with the President of Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada. Our "industrial policy" was now in place. In 1993 the Heritage Foundation of Washington, DC, home of many policy-making neo-conservatives, celebrated their twentieth year of operation by publishing an annual report that featured a congratulatory story about Richard Allen, a Heritage policy analyst. An excerpt reads:

The idea of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) originated with Heritage Fellow Richard Allen and has long been advocated by Heritage policy analysts.... The idea of creating a North American free trade zone from the Yukon to the Yucatan was first proposed by Heritage Distinguished Fellow Richard Allen in the late 1970s, refined by then Presidential candidate Ronald Reagan, and further developed in a major 1986 Heritage Foundation study. (p.4)

From 1994 forward, industry has vacated much of the United States, leaving the job market bereft of entry level jobs for many Americans. In the meantime, the educational establishment has continued to convert itself into a workforce training mode, even though there were going to be no jobs available. Since the schools have converted themselves into workforce training centers, some industries are beginning to make their way back to the United States. They will be happy to have the prepared workers join their and other countries' industries that have built facilities here, since benefit packages have been reduced to bare bones and workers are completely trained for the jobs. There is no question that the "deliberate dumbing down" has been successful.

The agenda, initiated by Carnegie Corporation in the early thirties and facilitated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Office of Economic and Cultural Development

(OECD), numerous tax-exempt foundations, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other governmental agencies, has been implemented over the years to the tune of hundreds of billions of taxpayers' dollars. The first ten years of this century have seen full-speed implementation of the above Carnegie Corporation's totalitarian/socialist world government agenda.

A press release dated October 14, 2011, issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development,³ relates to the finalization of the world government agenda through the use of sustainable development, primary weapon to destroy our republic through unconstitutional regional government. Proof that regional government is Communism was made very clear in an article by Morris Zeitlin, a sociology professor at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), in an article he wrote for *The Communist Daily World*, November 1976, entitled "Planning Is Socialism's Trademark." Pertinent excerpts follow:

In socialist countries, metropolitan regions enjoy metropolitan regional government and comprehensive planning. Of the many regions on the vast territory of the Soviet Union, the Moscow Region commands special attention, for it has been, since the 1917 Revolution, the country's economic and political center.

The economic and functional efficiencies and the social benefits that comprehensive national, regional, and city planning make possible in socialist society explain the Soviet Union's enormous and rapid economic and social progress. Conversely, our profit-oriented ruling capitalist class makes comprehensive social and economic planning impossible, causing waste and chaos and dragging the entire nation into misery and suffering as its rule deteriorates and declines.

Zeitlin should be delighted with the HUD action mentioned above. His concerns, back in 1976, regarding the United States refusing to adopt this communist system of central planning seem, in retrospect, to have been unwarranted. We have accepted Communism (state planning and all its attendant evils) hook, line and sinker. The aforementioned press release from HUD's Brian Sullivan follows:

HUD Awards Nearly \$100 Million in new Grants to Promote Smarter and Sustainable Planning for Jobs and Economic Growth

WASHINGTON: For the first time ever, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is awarding nearly \$100 million in new grants to support more livable and sustainable communities across the country. HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan today announced that 45 regional areas will receive funding through a new initiative intended to build economic competitiveness by connecting housing with good jobs, quality schools and transportation.

HUD's new *Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program* will support State, local, and tribal governments, as well as metropolitan planning organizations, in the development and execution of regional plans that integrate affordable housing with neighboring retail and business development. Many of the grants will leverage existing infrastructure and all reward local collaboration and innovation.

“Regions that embrace sustainable communities will have a built-in competitive edge in attracting jobs and private investment,” said Donovan. “Planning our communities smarter means parents will spend less time driving and more time with their children; more families will live in safe, stable communities near good schools and jobs; and more businesses will have access to the capital and talent they need to grow and prosper. In awarding these grants we were committed to using insight and innovation from our stakeholders and local partners to develop a ‘bottom-up’ approach to changing federal policy as opposed to ‘top-down.’ Rather than sticking to the old Washington playbook of dictating how communities can invest their grants, HUD’s application process encouraged creative thinking.”

These grants are part of the Obama Administration’s Partnership for Sustainable Communities, which brings HUD, the US Department of Transportation, and the US Environmental Protection Agency together to ensure that the agencies’ policies, programs and funding consider affordable housing, transportation, and environmental protection together. The interagency collaboration gets better results for communities and uses taxpayer money more efficiently. Coordinating federal investments in infrastructure, facilities and services meets multiple economic, environmental, and community objectives with each dollar spent. The Partnership is helping communities across the country to create more housing choices, make transportation more efficient and reliable, reinforce existing investments and support vibrant and healthy neighborhoods that attract business. At a time when every dollar the federal government invests in jumpstarting the economy is critical, the President’s plan ensures that all these agencies are coordinating efforts and targeting resources with precision. Reflecting this new collaboration, these grants were judged by a multidisciplinary review team, drawn from eight federal agencies and partners in philanthropy.

HUD’s inaugural grants under this program will support metropolitan and multi-jurisdictional planning efforts that incorporate housing, land use, economic development, transportation and infrastructure. This holistic planning approach will benefit diverse areas across the US, including \$25.6 million split evenly between regions with populations less than 500,000 and rural places (fewer than 200,000 people). HUD is reserving \$2 million to help all of these areas build the needed capacity to execute their plans [in education, capacity building has meant computerization, ed].

The grants are awarded through one of two categories. One category of grants will assist regional planning for sustainable development where such plans do not currently exist. A second category of funding will support the implementation of existing sustainability plans.

Shelley Poticha, the director of HUD’s new Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities, said, “The response to this program is huge. We were inundated with applications from every state and two territories—from central cities to rural areas and tribal governments. This program was designed by people from local government, and incorporated local input at every state.”

The use of small grant monies to implement the process of causing local, state and regional planning to meet federal standards is reminiscent of the use of federal education dollars to cause changes in curriculum and adopting of standards and “assessments”—the tail wagging the dog. This process

was not successful in the days of the 1970s “Community Development Block Grants” nor in the improvement of public education.

Within the last ten years or so many new tax exempt foundations have copied the Carnegie model. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is one of the largest that is devoted almost exclusively to education and is a strong proponent of technology in education. They are joined by The Gund Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The Broad Foundation, Hoover Institute, The Joyce Foundation, The Spencer Foundation, The John Templeton Foundation, and the Walton Family Foundation. In addition to tax exempt entities, education has attracted the attention of other high profile individuals who plan to profit from the coming emphasis on technology and individualization in education. None other than Rupert Murdoch, “the man who owns the news,” has entered the education market. Murdoch’s organization already owns Wireless Generation and has been in receipt of many contracts in the New York City region. Murdoch’s empire is the second largest media corporation in the world—and could have, in the coming decades, a substantial impact on what technology and curriculum are available to schools.

Another such foundation is the Foundation for Excellence in Education, whose chairman is former Florida governor Jeb Bush—a third member of the George H.W. Bush family. An article by Kathryn Baron appeared on the Silicon Valley Education Foundation blogspot “Thoughts on Public Education”⁴ that describes a meeting recently held (October 14-15, 2011) in San Francisco and featured many of those who are presently involved in education reform supported by most of the foundations mentioned in the previous paragraph. Excerpts from the article follow:

Jeb Bush’s ed reform show in San Francisco
Former Fla. Gov’s summit seeks choice, tests and tech

You could say that the only folks missing from the National Summit on Education Reform at San Francisco’s Palace Hotel were teachers, but that would be wrong, on a technicality; they were outside protesting. Teachers might have a vested interest, or even an interesting viewpoint, in the issues raised during the two-day conference. Stuff like tenure, seniority, testing, Common Core standards, and using technology in education.

But, no, they weren’t invited into the inner sanctum of power brokers, policy makers, and politicians brought together for two days of learning and lobbying by former Florida governor Jeb Bush’s Foundation for Excellence in Education.⁵ It might have been awkward for them to be in the room when Idaho’s schools chief praised his state legislature for eliminating teacher tenure...”

Still, anyone expecting a strict conservative ideology would have been confused. Don’t get me wrong; the only *bona fide* liberal in sight was Ben Austin, director of Parent Revolution,⁶ the Los Angeles-based nonprofit behind the parent empowerment movement. And even Austin is having a hard time maintaining his pedigree these days, at least with the teachers’ unions. Still, he was on the inside with other players who also can’t be pinned down other than to say they’re all “reformers.”

For example, Checker [Chester] Finn, voice of the conservative Thomas

B. Fordham Institute, moderated a panel with Anne Bryant, director of the National Association of School Boards—who playfully quipped that she and Checker disagree about 100 percent of the time—at one end of the dais, and Joel Klein, the former New York City schools chancellor and current Vice President and COO of News Corp’s Education Division, on the other end....

But last night, the keynoter was Melinda Gates, and earlier Thursday attendees heard from Sal Khan, the unassuming Silicon Valley genius behind Khan Academy,⁷ the nonprofit developer of thousands of high-quality online lessons available *free of charge*, who joked that he used to think YouTube was for cats playing pianos, not for serious mathematics....

“My personal belief is there is no one single thing that needs to get done,” said Bush during his opening remarks.⁸ What it will require, he said, is a combination of school choice (vouchers), Common Core standards, rigorous assessments, consequences for anything less than excellence, and using technology to transform education....

Mary Thompson, respected education researcher and writer, wrote an article in 1972 (See June 11, 1972 entry in this version of *the deliberate dumbing down of America*.) opposing the national piloting of Planning Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS, systems management/TQM, etc.) in the California public schools. There was significant opposition amongst public school teachers who understood that the system represented total control over what and how they taught. Americans are fortunate indeed that Mary is still around and able to submit her comments regarding the implementation of the system she opposed so long ago. Mary’s remarks regarding the Jeb Bush article follow:

Difficult to know where to begin with this one with all the information, documentation and validation of what some have been saying for a long time about who is orchestrating the “brave new schools” and moving rapidly to Distance Learning. It is a well oiled and orchestrated partnership between neocons, old line bureaucrats and the old line foundations (Chester Finn, Fordham Foundation, etc.) who have been steering the deliberate dumbing down of America for decades, and the “newbies” on the street such as Gates Foundation, venture capitalists, tech oligarchs, and Alinsky organizer such as Ben Austin with the Parent Trigger agenda. Quite a nest of change agents in high places all together in one place to plot the final “refreezing” of the system since the “unfreezing” has been successfully accomplished. Thank you, RAND corporation, for the descriptive terminology: the planned process. The “refreezing” is to be modeled as a system of global Distance Learning. The warning bears repeating that teachers had better leave their concentration on the minutia of each maneuver in the process being carried by all of the above and others, to concentrate on the big picture of plans afoot for the function of teachers being planned and programmed for extinction or demotion to becoming tutors, monitors, or overseers to keep students on task in front of their computer screens with “direct instruction” being imparted from anywhere in the world. I repeat, wake up teachers, your jobs are about to be “offshored” just as manufacturing, engineering and other professions have been. Your unions won’t be able to counteract it any more than industry unions were able to do for the unemployed of empty factories and lost professional positions. Students will be phased into “programmed”

curricula designed to produce worker bees for global economies. The authority of those selected to represent the voters and taxpayers is already being undermined as charter schools, with their unelected boards, are being used as a transmission belt to the final objective.

As schools increasingly substitute computer learning for traditional textbook learning, as illustrated in the article regarding Florida's former governor Jeb Bush's Foundation for Excellence in Education meeting in San Francisco and Mary Thompson's reactions, the following quote from Dustin Heuston of Utah's World Institute for Computer-Assisted Teaching (WICAT) from "Discussion: Developing the Potential of an Amazing Tool" in *Schooling and Technology* (Vol. 3, Planning for the Future: A Collaborative Model, an Interpretive Report on Creative Partnerships in Technology—An Open Forum, Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement: Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 1984) becomes more and more relevant—if not plain scary:

We've been absolutely staggered by realizing that the computer has the capability to act as if it were ten of the top psychologists working with one student... you've seen the tip of the iceberg. Won't it be wonderful when the child in the smallest county in the most distant area or in the most confused urban setting can have the equivalent of the finest school in the world on that terminal and no one can get between that child and that curriculum? We have great moments coming in the history of education.

The following quote from an article in the *New York Times*, October 12, 2011, written by Matt Richtel of Los Altos, California entitled "A Silicon Valley School that Doesn't Compute" is a classic example of how an elite, over the past one hundred years (see Rockefeller-Gates entry, 1913), has wanted one thing for their children and something entirely different for the children of the underprivileged and the middle class in our nation:

The chief technology officer of eBay sends his children to a nine-classroom school here. So do employees of Silicon Valley giants like Google, Apple, Yahoo and Hewlett-Packard.

But the school's chief teaching tools are anything but high-tech: pens and paper, knitting needles, and, occasionally, mud. Not a computer to be found. No screens at all. They are not allowed in the classroom, and the school even frowns on their use at home.

Schools nationwide have rushed to supply their classrooms with computers, and many policy makers say it is foolish to do otherwise. But the contrarian point of view can be found at the epicenter of the tech economy, where some parents and educators have a message: computers and schools don't mix.

This is the Waldorf School of peninsula [sic], one of around 160 Waldorf schools in the country that subscribe to a teaching philosophy focused on physical activity and learning through creative, hands-on tasks. Those who endorse this approach say computers inhibit creative thinking, movement, human interaction and attention spans.

In my own state of Maine, which has been used for national piloting of radical education and social change programs for half a century, we have

recently implemented the Reinventing Schools Coalition (RISC) which states in one of its publications that

The RISC Approach to Schooling is a revolutionary approach to education that represents a dramatic shift in the educational process. The RISC approach is the first comprehensive school reform framework set up as a performance-based system [outcomes-based/results-based/Skinnerian mastery learning/direct instruction, ed.] rather than a Carnegie unit or time-based system....

TRADITIONAL VS. RISC PHILOSOPHY

<u>20th Century Classroom</u>	<u>RISC 21st Century Classroom</u>
Movement based on time	Movement based on performance
Students sitting in rows	Controlled chaos
Driven by textbooks	Driven by a shared vision
Commercial bulletin boards	Student boards
Teacher-controlled class	Students are navigators
10% student engagement	100% student engagement
3R's	Global curriculum
Teacher is the judge	Self, peers, business leaders, and teachers judge students' work

An April 16, 2002 *Washington Post* article by David Broder entitled "Remote school district lights path to success" discussed Richard DeLorenzo's revolutionary education agenda. Broder's article states in part:

Last week, the Chugach (Alaska) superintendent, Richard DeLorenzo, stood before a ballroom full of high-powered executives, explaining how little Chugach (Alaska) had won the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, an honor that in the past has gone to companies such as Cadillac and Ritz-Carlton as a signal of their success in providing customer satisfaction....

Broder also reveals that with the RISC plan, K-12 academics will change from the traditional competitive, academic, content-driven curriculum to a non-competitive, individualized, non-graded, take as long as is necessary to graduate at 14 or at 21[!], computerized workforce and values re-training agenda. This is a good description of the communist system of education/workforce training referred to earlier by Professor Boyce.

Implementation of this radical, socialist agenda has been relatively smooth due to the accomplishment of values destruction and dumbing down which took place between passage of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* and 1999, the date of publication of *the deliberate dumbing down of america*. How our schools, and in turn our nation, including corporations, have been restructured using Total Quality Management—and other large organizational management techniques popularized by Peter Drucker and others—for a socialist future without the American people rising up in rightful indignation, can be attributed to a combination of factors that I refer to as "The Devil's Seven-Pronged Fork":

1. **Gradualism:** implementing world government agenda gradually, over many years (two steps forward, one step back) so that succeeding

generations are unaware of what has happened in the past and unable to question or apply reason to current events or future events (heating up the water gradually until the frog is cooked). Or, in the words of Florida's former Associate Commissioner of Education Cecil Golden, "...like those assembling an atom bomb, very few of them understand exactly what they're building, and won't until we put all the parts together" [PPBS, ed.]. You'll know it's true when it happens to you!

2. **Hegelian Dialectic:** in order to get what change agents want it is necessary first for them to create the problem—such as high taxes. When citizens resist, suggest a solution. Example: move education funding and control to the state level, a solution citizens would never have accepted had problem with high taxes not been deliberately created. This can be called reaching common ground, coming to consensus and compromise.
3. **Semantic deception:** redefining terms to get agreement without understanding. Example: use of words that mean one thing to parents and another thing to change agents. Parents define "basics" in education as reading, writing, mathematics, history, science, etc. The education change agents' definition of "basics" is: education stressing the fact that the *U.S. Constitution* is outdated; education stressing the need for non-judgmental/non-absolutist attitudes and values; education stressing an environmental/sustainable development agenda, including the need for land use regulations, etc.; and workforce training.
4. **100% conservative and liberal media control:** the importance of *the deliberate dumbing down of america* can best be measured by its across-the-board censorship since its publication in 1999, not just by the usual culprits (establishment media), but by respected old line conservative media as well.
5. **Endless supply of money:** Federal Reserve, non-profit foundations, grant funding, and partnering with industry.
6. **Brainwashing in the schools and our communities, using psychological techniques:** Pavlov, Lewin, Skinner, Bloom, Chisholm, and others.
7. **Keeping the public unaware that both political parties (Republican and Democrat) espouse the same values:** these underly the international socialist/world government agenda. Most disheartening is that researchers have added to this unsavory alliance many Christian churches and organizations who formerly could be counted on to go up against the secular humanists and globalists and their values-destroying programs. These groups have been infiltrated by members of the corporatist/globalist leadership, and can no longer be counted on to support the free enterprise system, the *U.S. Constitution*, or religious principles which place God above man.

One example of the tragic falling away of the Christian community is highlighted by researcher Sarah Leslie in a blurb she wrote concerning Peter Drucker:

Peter Drucker first came on my radar screen when I was researching Rick Warren, the popular evangelical pastor who authored the bestselling book, *The Purpose Driven Life*. I learned that Drucker, known widely as a business “guru,” had mentored Rick Warren. I discovered that Drucker invented the term “knowledge capital” to refer to human value (“human capital”), an assessment of economic worth based on one’s education and training. Drucker promoted a futuristic vision for society based on German mysticism (his parents were a part of the Vienna Circle), which included community, society and family performance-based standards and outcomes. I was shocked to realize that Rick Warren’s term “purpose driven” meant “outcome-based”! No wonder there was virtually no opposition from evangelical Right leaders to OBE! Thousands of evangelical pastors were trained by Drucker through an organization known as Leadership Network during the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, and were perfectly on board for education reform when it came to full fruition in *No Child Left Behind*.¹⁰

An understanding of “The Devil’s Seven-Pronged Fork” is helpful in combatting the cognitive dissonance all of us are experiencing at this point in time—the inability to sort out facts and alien values which are 100% in conflict with our former way of life and thinking in America. Although basically all components of the agenda were either planned or implemented in the last century, there are some components within the agenda which may seem new to the public and even to some education researchers. They are: school choice; co-opting of the Christian community; and Marxist curriculum (Paulo Freire, International Baccalaureate, etc.).

School choice (charter schools, vouchers, etc.) has been initiated and supported primarily by corporations and the neoconservative movement and is necessary for socialist workforce training in the planned economy. Conservative support for this unconstitutional school choice agenda brings to mind the following advice from Francis Bacon, British statesman and philosopher (1561–1626): “A false friend is more dangerous than an open enemy.”

The public schools were deliberately dumbed down so that people would accept “any” substitute, no matter how lethal (the dialectic at work). Charter schools are NOT private schools since they are federally and state funded. They must administer the federal National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), of which at least 50% of the questions deal with attitudes and values. Chester Finn, Jr., former assistant secretary of education, U.S. Department of Education, presently president of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, is a strong supporter of school choice proposals and charter schools. Finn was very clear about the dangers involved in public funding of private education when he stated in an article entitled “Public Support for Private Education” published in *American Education*, May, 1982:

Short of scattering money in the streets or handing it out to everyone who wants some, the funding agency must define eligible recipients....

This means, in a word, “regulation,” the inevitable concomitant of public financial support.

The other side of the coin, Finn says, is “the obligation of private schools to recognize certain limits to their differentness and certain ways they must conform to the norms and expectations of a society that values and supports them.”

Charter schools are unconstitutional and certainly violate traditional government practices since they do not have locally *elected* school boards. The Georgia Supreme Court recently ruled that only local school boards have the power to create charter schools, striking down a law that created Georgia’s Charter Schools Commission. An article in *The Atlanta Journal/Constitution* on May 16, 2011 stated that

The Supreme Court of Georgia ruled 4-to-3 to strike down as unconstitutional a 2008 Act that authorized creation of a new kind of state charter school called “commission charter schools.” The high court decided that the charter schools did not fit the definition of “special schools” as envisioned in the state Constitution. The landmark case is the first to rule on the constitutionality of an alternate authorizer of charter schools that has already opened campuses that are educating students.

Under the current Constitution, which voters approved in 1983, local school boards have the exclusive authority to create and maintain K-12 public education, Chief Justice Carol Hunstein writes for the majority. The Constitution only allows the state government to create “special schools.” [schools for the deaf, blind, etc., ed.] Yet in the 2008 Act, the State authorized the “Georgia Charter Schools Commission,” whose members are appointed by state officials, to approve petitions for a new type of general K-12 public school known as a “commission charter school.”

Contrary to Georgia’s Supreme Court’s ruling, at an October 22, 2011 Roundtable at Stanford University in California entitled “Education Nation 2.0: Redefining Education before It Redefines Us,” Reed Hastings, CEO of Netflix and former president of the California State Board of Education, stated the following:

Technology and Charter schools—two big change vectors. Technology will allow us to go around and through the system. It will allow software-based individualized tutoring.... hugely transformative in the next twenty years. Charter schools are non-profit public schools... Problem is not with people. There are great people... If corporations had elected boards, they would operate as mediocre as most school districts. Problem is the elected school board. The solution is getting into non-profits, like Stanford.

Most dangerous of all is the possibility that if Americans accept the legitimacy of charter schools, they will be going down a very slippery slope which may well lead to the unraveling of our representative, constitutional form of government. This is called “taxation without representation.” We can be sure that the highly-trained socialist change agents in our state capitols—who have been so successful in pushing regionalism (a pillar of communist government structure) on our local communities, will be work-

ing night and day to get Americans to accept unelected councils (soviets) to run government at all levels! The deliberate dumbing down has been so complete that it is very likely Americans will say, “If our public schools can be run by appointed councils, why not appoint our local Board of Selectmen (Commissioners), why not appoint citizens to town councils, to the Legislature, to Congress, to the White House?”

Education researcher, Debbie Niwa of Arizona, shared the following with the author:

“School choice” furthers the reforms envisioned a century ago by peddlers of progressive education. Through school choice—or more accurately “controlled choice”—progressive reforms are cleverly marketed as special programs to targeted groups. Programs can be implemented as magnet themes, smaller learning communities, and charter schools, to name a few.

On the surface, the programs may appear to differ, but internally they share similar non-academic (affective) goals and Marxist education theory and praxis. Specifically, a focus on values, attitudes, and feelings—is categorized under the “affective domain.” These non-academic issues are referred to today by a host of labels: workplace skills, soft skills, skills for the 21st century, or profile of a global citizen among others.

School choice options that have gained promotional traction claim to deliver a global or multicultural dimension to education (with a socialist twist!). UNESCO-connected¹¹ International Baccalaureate (IB) programs are a popular venue; likewise various culture-oriented “studies” based on ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

The 1985 booklet entitled *Back to Basics... or OBE Skinnerian International Curriculum*¹² describes the central goals of global/international/multicultural (socialist) education. Today, most, if not all the issues covered in *Back to Basics Reform* are concentrated in International Baccalaureate programs.

As of August 2011, nearly 3,300 IB programs are authorized globally with more than 1,300 in use in the United States where the vast majority exist in public schools. Thus, taxpayers at the local, state, and federal level are paying for the many extra costs incurred by IB. Yet, in general there is very little public notification.

In the globalist paradigm, there must be deconstruction of the appreciation for national heritage, allegiance, governance and traditional social norms. Various forms of “critical theory”—delivered under the guise of “critical thinking”—are increasingly used in the classroom to achieve these ends.

Given that so many of the troublesome and destructive education programs that parents and teachers have resisted have as their origin “human relations” training and all of its cohorts, we should probably explore some of the origins of these programs Niwa has referenced. In 1946 *Time* magazine (November 16) wrote an article about a man named Col. H. Edmund Bullis who was conducting a “new program in preventive psychiatry” in classrooms in Delaware. These programs were sponsored by the Delaware State Society for Mental Hygiene. Col. Bullis called them “human relations in the classroom.” In 1949 Col. Edmund Bullis wrote a paper that was presented at a Joint Session of the American School Health Association and the Maternal and Child Health, Public Health Nursing, and School Health

Sections of the American Public Health Association at the 75th Annual Meeting in New York (October 27, 1949). The paper was published in the *American Journal of Public Health*, September 1950 (pp. 1113-1117). Some important excerpts follow:

If our Human Relations Class project continues to be as successful as our experience to date indicates, we hope that from their better understanding of their own emotional strengths and weaknesses, most of these boys and girls completing three years of weekly Human Relations Classes may progress toward emotional maturity.

The theory on which these Human Relations Classes are operating is that little can be learned about personality problems except through emotional experiences and that ordinary teaching or lecturing or giving advice fall far short in providing the kind of insights that come out of life encounters with emotional problems. While it is impossible to furnish children in classrooms with real life situations to discuss, to learn, and to understand, our efforts and techniques are to endeavor to create as nearly as possible these actual "life situations."

Our weekly class generally starts with the teacher reading a stimulus story which features emotional problems. The students are then encouraged to discuss freely the emotional problems presented in the stimulus story, to give an appraisal of the solutions effected in the story, to speculate on the motivations lying back of the behavior of the individuals in the story. In this retelling of emotional experiences—often bringing out in to the open problems they have never discussed before—a better understanding of their actions often results. The students also gain insights by listening to their classmates tell freely of how they met certain emotional problems.

We have been pleased to find out that that the instructions given in our lesson plans are practical enough so that teachers who have never witnessed one of our demonstration classes have no difficulty in successfully conducting our Human Relations Classes.

Col. Bullis's book *Human Relations in the Classroom—Course I*, published in 1947, contained the following excerpts in the preface:

In 1932 the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching said to Dr. C.M. Hincks, distinguished Canadian psychiatrist and to me, "You in the mental hygiene field are making little real progress with educators with your philosophical lectures, pamphlets and books. Our teachers need something to help them meet the every day pupil adjustment problems of their classrooms. They need simple mental hygiene manuals and practical lesson plans to help their students to gain insights regarding their emotional problems."

In 1940 I resigned as Executive Officer, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, to endeavor to work out practical means of introducing the teaching of positive mental hygiene principles to normal children in public schools. I wished to develop and try out positive mental hygiene lesson plans, which from the beginning I called Human Relations Lesson Plans.

At this time, Dr. M.A. Tarumianz, outstanding psychiatric leader of Delaware, invited me to come to Delaware to start this experimental work under the auspices of the Delaware State Society for Mental Hygiene. Shortly after, the Committee on Research in Dementia Praecox (financed by the

Supreme Council, Scottish Rite Masons, Northern Jurisdiction)¹⁴ and Mrs. Henry Ittleson of New York City also made grants to my work. This combined financial support made it possible for my capable teaching assistant, Emily E. O'Malley, and I to carry on our experimental work in a number of schools in the State of Delaware in Nassau County, New York, and in Brooklyn, New York. We had enthusiastic cooperation from the Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, the New York City Board of Education, Hofstra College, the University of Delaware and the superintendents, principals and teachers of the schools in which we were trying out our Human Relations classes....

Present indications lead us to believe that starting in September of 1947, a large percentage of the sixth grade classes in the public schools throughout the state of Delaware will have weekly Human Relations Classes based on the lesson plans in this book. During the coming year we expect to develop and try out Human Relations in the Classroom—Course II, for those classes which have had Course I. In addition, we hope to experiment with Human Relations Classes in primary grades, in youth organizations and in religious education.

Obviously, Col. Bullis and his fellow Mental Hygiene Society members have been very successful. Some of the “Human Relations Lesson Plans” bear a strong resemblance to teaching strategies contained in federally-funded and developed Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems (*The New Model Me*) and other controversial National Diffusion Network programs resisted by parents in the 1970s to the present. These programs were so damaging and outrageous that the U.S. Senate passed unanimously the *Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment* and subsequent regulations for enforcement—which due to change agent chicanery and opposition—were never enforced at the local level.

For over sixty years those who have wanted to experiment with our children in classrooms all over the country have had tools produced with support from tax-exempt foundations, the government, and, at least once, a Masonic organization. Did we know? Did we inadvertently support experimentation with our children and their emotional health in public school classrooms, youth organizations and in our churches?

In closing this chapter, I would like to share with you some thoughts from our Librarian of Congress James Billington. In Billington's book, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith* (Basic Books, Inc.: New York, 1980) in chapter 4 he explains some of the problems we have had:

The story of the secret societies can never be fully reconstructed, but it has been badly neglected—even avoided, one suspects—because the evidence that is available repeatedly leads us into territory equally uncongenial to modern historians in the East and the West.... In what follows I will attempt to show that modern revolutionary tradition as it came to be internationalized under Napoleon and the Restoration grew out of occult Freemasonry; that the early organizational ideas originated more from Pythagorean mysticism than from practical experience; and that the real innovators were not so much political activists as literary intellectuals, on whom German romantic thought in general—and Bavarian Illuminism in particular—exerted great influence....

This author is concerned that many of the problems we have encountered in education in this country may have many of the same roots.

As this book goes to press, our nation is experiencing demonstrations and protests by “student-led” groups angry over “capitalist oppression.” These demonstrations, which are spilling into the streets of foreign cities as well, call to mind James Billington’s *Fire in the Minds of Men* and his remarks (above) related to the origins of revolutionary movements. As we stated in the preface to *the deliberate dumbing down of america*, “The United States is engaged in war . . . it has been fought in secret—in the schools of our nation, targeting our children who are captive in classrooms.” We may be seeing, in these demonstrations, the results of this war against our children’s consciences and intellects. As Edward Hunter, the man who coined the term “brainwashing” and wrote *Brainwashing: The Men Who Defied It*, said of this war, and in regard to finally standing on principle and actively going up against evil: “There is no ‘behind the lines’ any longer.”

Endnotes:

- 1 In *Webster’s New World Dictionary* (1976) a communitarian is “a member or an advocate of a communistic community.” [See the first entry under 1997 which contains information on the National Commission on Civic Renewal for the quote “Communitarianism is the social philosophy of the Skinnerian Walden II experimental commune at Los Horcones, Mexico,” ed.]
- 2 This important book can be accessed at: <http://www.americandeception.com>.
- 3 To access the US Department of Housing and Urban Development website, please go to [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/2010/ HUDNo.10-233](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/2010/HUDNo.10-233).
- 4 This article can be found on the Internet at: <http://toped.svefoundation.org/2011/10/14/jeb-bushs-ed-reform-show-in-san-francisco/>.
- 5 The website for Jeb Bush’s Foundation for Excellence can be found at: <http://www.excelined.org/>.
- 6 The Parent Revolution website can be found at: <http://parentrevolution.org/>.
- 7 The Khan Academy can be accessed at: <http://www.khanacademy.org/>.
- 8 Jeb Bush’s entire speech at the opening of the conference can be accessed at: <http://toped.svefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Speech-by-Jeb-Bush-National-Summit-on-Education-Reform.pdf>.
- 9 Please access a monograph written by Lynn D. and Sarah H. Leslie, and Susan J. Conway entitled *The Pied Pipers of Purpose: Part 1: Human Capital System and Church Performance* (Conscience Press, 2004) at: <http://www.discernmentministries.org/PurposeDriven.pdf>.
- 10 Please access the Stanford Roundtable discussion at: <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2011/october/2011-roundtable-education-102211.html>.
- 11 Important information regarding the original directors of UNESCO follows: Out of a total of fifteen directors, fourteen were communist officials from the Soviet Union, Hungary and Poland, and one was from France. This information was published in the mid-nineteen sixties by “Project Each Reach One,” (P.O. Box 494, Redondo Beach, California).
- 12 Please access [deliberatedumbingdown.com](http://www.deliberatedumbingdown.com) for the pdf booklet for *Back to Basics... or OBE Skinnerian International Curriculum*.
- 13 See *International Baccalaureate (IB) Unraveled* by Debra K. Niwa, September 2009 (updated March 2010), pp. 5-7 at: <http://www.freedomadvocates.org/images/pdf/IB%20Unraveled%203.28.10Niwa.pdf>.
- 14 These organizations over time have been folded into the United Way.