

**Change
Agents
In The
Schools**

**» Destroy
Your Children
» Betray
Your Country**

BARBARA M. MORRIS

**Change
Agents
In The
Schools**

**» Destroy
Your Children
» Betray
Your Country**

BARBARA M. MORRIS

**CHANGE
AGENTS
In The
SCHOOLS**

EMISSARY PUBLICATIONS

9010 SE St. Helens

Clackamas, Oregon 97015

(503) 824-2050

**Specializing In Eye-Opening Books on Secret
Societies, History, Economics and Politics**

WRITE FOR A FREE CATALOG

**CHANGE
AGENTS
In The
SCHOOLS**

BARBARA M. MORRIS

**THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT
P.O. Box 756, Upland, California 91786**

Copyright © 1979 by Barbara M. Morris

All Rights Reserved

No material in this book may be copied, reproduced or used
in any way without written permission.

ISBN - 0-931650-00-3

THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT
P.O. BOX 756
Upland, California 91786

Price available on request

To my husband,
for
his incredible patience,
loving encouragement
and unstinting support.
Every parent, who in any
way finds this book of
help, owes him a debt
of gratitude. Not too
many husbands are made
of the rare and wonderful
stuff of which he is made.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 10

FIRST: LET'S UNDERSTAND THIS 11

WHAT IS A CHANGE AGENT? 15

1. HUMANISM: DIMENSIONS OF
THE PROBLEM 16

Socialism And Humanism, 18; Humanism As A Religion, 19; "Christian" Humanism, 21; Humanistic Education, 22; The "Humanist Movement", 25; Humanist "Articles Of Faith", 28

2. "EDUCATIONESE": LANGUAGE
OF CHANGE 37

3. CHANGE: CHANGE AGENTS AND
CHANGE TECHNIQUES 48

The NEA And Change, 50; Change Agents: Their Preparation, Purpose And Duties, 54; Change Agents Behind Closed Doors, 58; Change Agents: The Washington Connection, 64; Change Agents: The Washington Connection Through The National Diffusion Network, 69; Techniques Of Change: Role Playing, 72; Techniques Of Change: Sensitivity Training, 78; Another Road To Change: Accountability, 82; More Change: Through "Early Evaluations" And Snooping Questionnaires, 86; Prying Questionnaires To Uncover Emotional Abuse And Neglect, 91

- 4. VALUES EDUCATION: IN MANY DISGUISES 95**
Values education: It's not Value-Free And It's Not Neutral, 100; Clarification Of Religious Values, 104; Unfreezing, Changing And Refreezing, 107; Values Clarification And Family Alienation, 112; After Values Clarification: Communes and Cults, 116; Character Education: Values Education In Disguise, 120; "Citizenship Education", 124; "Moral Development", 126; Values Education: By Government Mandate?, 141
- 5. SEX EDUCATION AND OTHER SOCIAL DISEASES 143**
Sex Education And The Contraceptive-Abortion Mentality, 154; Incest: The New "Family Fun", 158; What Are Parents To Do?, 162
- 6. "DEATH" EDUCATION? 165**
How A Typical Death Education Course Is Set Up, 169; The Fallout: Suicide, 172; The Logical Extension Of Death Education, 176
- 7. DRUG EDUCATION: TO PROMOTE DRUG ABUSE? 185**
"New" Drug Education - - Cure-All Or Business As Usual?, 199; Teaching Children How To Drink, 202; Drugs And Parental Alienation, 205
- 8. FOR "ONE WORLD": BETRAYING AMERICA 208**
"Citizenship Education", 212; Communist Chinese Education: The Model For U.S. Schools, 217
- 9. BACK TO BASICS: A GRIM FAIRY TALE 221**
The Ultimate Insult, 231; Catching Parents In The Web, 234
- 10. VIOLENT YOUTH: WHY? 237**
Violence Begets Violence, 241
- 11. TALKING BACK TO THE TEACHER 243**
- 12. WHAT CAN BE DONE? 249**

AN IMPORTANT POSTSCRIPT 259

BIBLIOGRAPHY 266

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION 280

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While the efforts of many people went into the “construction” of this book, some special acknowledgements are in order.

A debt of profound gratitude is owed to Jacqueline Lawrence who, over the years, has given unselfishly of her time, resources and brilliant mind for the benefit of children everywhere. As busy as she is, Jacqueline spent many hours helping me decide what information should be included and she provided much excellent material.

I am also indebted to my treasured and supportive friend Joan Masters for her valuable suggestions and willingness to do tiresome and time-consuming proof-reading.

Beth Trotto also assisted with proofreading and in particular I am grateful for her helpful suggestions and the extremely important information she provided on the National Diffusion Network.

These women are among the unsung heroines of our time. While their untiring efforts and unselfish giving of themselves will not be enshrined in history books, they should be, for they are just as deserving of praise and recognition as the many women in our history who sacrificed their lives and fortunes for what they believed in.

And inasmuch as man proposes and God disposes, I recognize with profound humility that not one word of this book could have been written and published unless He had permitted it. For that miracle I am most grateful of all.

FIRST: LET'S UNDERSTAND THIS

Many erudite individuals have written volumes about the problems that plague American education, but very few of those volumes are understandable to "ordinary" parents. This book may not be all that understandable either, but the intent has been to present an easy-to-understand (or, as easy-to-understand as is possible) account of what is happening in government schools, and often, in church and private schools. Therefore, any critic looking for a scholarly or overbearing dissertation should look elsewhere.

This book was written for down-to-earth, peanut-butter and jelly parents who are endowed with extraordinary common sense and a genuine concern for their children and the future of America. The emphasis has been on a presentation of hard evidence with a minimum of personal opinion, because it's evidence and not opinion that carries weight with thinking people.

I think I've untangled the web of deceit that is called "public education" but which is in fact, "government education". And that is the reference used throughout the book - - "government education" - - not to disparage but to be accurate. It's "government education" in spite of the existence of local school systems and local boards of education served by local citizens. At this time in our history, local citizen control of education is a myth, and the sooner we accept this reality, the sooner we will arrive at solutions to all the problems that exist in the schools.

Even the word "education" is a misnomer, for "education" in the traditional meaning of the word is, without exaggeration, the least important aspect of government schooling.

For the sake of simplicity, I've used the word "educator" to include innocent classroom teachers as well as ivory-tower decision makers and change agents. In so doing, my apologies are extended to those well-intentioned teachers and other school personnel whose feelings may be hurt. It has not been my intention to offend the innocent. I can only offer this advice for the comfort it may give: If the shoe fits, then wear it. If it doesn't fit, then don't wear it and there should be no discomfort.

I make no apologies for the overall tone. Some will see it as hopelessly "negative", but then, one man's "negative" is another man's "positive" - - it all depends on whose ox is being gored. I happen to think it's very positive. I cite the problems that exist and offer what should be viewed as the best of all possible solutions.

About my credentials: Parents often write to me and say, "I've shown your book to my child's teacher and she wants to know what your credentials are."

To many so-called educators, truth cannot be accepted as truth unless it has been written or spoken by a suitably credentialed or pedigreed fellow educator. By demanding "proper" credentials from a non-academic critic, it is

easy to automatically discredit and reject any or all offending information.

What are my academic credentials? I am a graduate of Rutgers University College of Pharmacy. It was a tough four years which included organic chemistry, inorganic chemistry, physiology, physics, pharmacology and medicinal chemistry, to name just a few courses most "educators" who demand impeccable credentials would never be able to hack. But as an indication of ability, that kind of background does not satisfy the educators and quite possibly, it shouldn't.

But one can learn, and learn I have - - and how! I've been researching and writing about education since 1969. By any fair standard, the knowledge I have acquired and the expertise I have developed should qualify me for a Ph.D. degree. That I do not have an official piece of paper to show for my efforts means little at a time when many colleges give credits for practical experience and self-taught skills.

There have been times when "proper" credentials would have been helpful, but as far as I am concerned, the matter is no longer a viable issue. Not since the State of Maryland hired as superintendent of schools - - the state's most important education official - - a man who ". . . lacks one important set of credentials: a degree in education or any formal teaching experience." (*The Sun*, Baltimore, Md., September 23, 1976)

Dr. David Hornbeck, the man in question, is so unqualified to fill this post that a court suit to remove him from the job was filed in January, 1977. The suit questioned Hornbeck's academic preparation, saying his two degrees in theology and a law degree did not meet the requirement for "not less than two years of special academic and professional graduate preparation." (*The Sun*, Baltimore, Md., January 12, 1977)

As expected, Dr. Hornbeck was not removed from

his post, which should tell the world that henceforth, lack of "proper" credentials can never again be used to question the capability or credibility of anyone who has anything to say about education.

Finally, about the references used in this book: The references are intended not only to document the material presented, but also to encourage parents to obtain as many of the references as possible from a library, and to use them as a means to increase their knowledge and understanding of what is happening in the schools.

But a note of caution to other authors and researchers who would like to use the references as their own, without mentioning this book as the source: Since typographical errors may exist in spite of careful proofreading, it would indeed be wise to check out each and every reference intended for use to avoid any possible embarrassment. In the past, writers who have used references without double-checking them for accuracy have wound up with egg on their faces. It takes time to do research, but any investigator worth his salt will do his own homework, anyway.

WHAT IS A CHANGE AGENT?

A change agent is a person, organization, or institution that changes or helps to change the beliefs, values, attitudes or behavior of people without their knowledge or consent.

The purpose of most of the activity that takes place in public, and often, in private and church schools, is not to change the child by developing his intellect, teaching him skills and a traditional body of knowledge. Rather, the purpose is to eliminate existing traditional beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviors and to replace them with new beliefs and behaviors that will render the child susceptible to manipulation, coercion, control and corruption for the rest of his life.

To substantiate the above definition, the scope and effect of change agency will be unfolded in many ways throughout this book. It should also be kept in mind that the term "change agent" is not an invention of the author, but the creation of the government and education establishment.

HUMANISM: DIMENSIONS of THE PROBLEM

1

Public Schools?

They don't exist.

“Public” implies belonging to or controlled by the people. “Schools” are thought to be places where children study and learn “the wisdom of the ages” and are exposed to civilizing influences.

Public schools don't fit that description.

If “public schools” are not controlled by the people in a community, and if “public schools” are not primarily places of academic education, then what are they and who controls them?

Who controls them? The government, directly or indirectly, at the state and/or federal level controls the direction and content of local “public schools” through control and disbursement of funds given out for curriculum development, teacher training, materials, research,

etc. The result is that local school systems are mere administrative agencies of state and/or federal governments, and local boards of education are merely window dressing. Therefore, it would be more accurate to call such places "government schools"; or to be even more accurate (as we shall see) they would be better called "government centers of indoctrination".

And what are they, if they are not places of academic learning? They are places where:

" . . . the concept of learning a particular amount of content as a preparation for life is obsolete, and must be abandoned." ¹

If " . . . learning a particular amount of content as a preparation for life is obsolete . . . " then what are schools doing with children between 9 A.M. and 3 P.M. 5 days a week, for the better part of the year? Here is the answer:

" . . . the goal of education is the *facilitation of change* . . . " ²

So, what are government schools? They are administrative government agencies that exist to promote change. What kinds of change? Social change, political change, economic change, cultural change, religious change, change in our form of government. *Total change*.

But specifically, change from what to what? Change from a Christian, sovereign nation to a Humanist/Socialist *interdependent* nation-state in a dictatorship euphemistically called a "global community", with "world citizens" content with enslavement.

In particular, government schools are striving to destroy the status, structure and stability of the family. Strong families make a strong nation and they must be

eliminated if the proposed dictatorship is to be established and maintained. Look at your family and the families you know. How stable are they? The breakdown you see is not "just happening" - - the chaos is planned.

Public schools? They don't exist. But there *are* government schools and that's what this book is all about: the incredible hoax and ultimate tragedy - - government schools that serve as change agents for the destruction of Christian Western civilization and to establish instead, a Humanist/Socialist "new world order".

SOCIALISM AND HUMANISM

There will be more discussion of the schools as change agents, but to start, let's make sure we understand what is meant by Socialism and Humanism.

Under political Socialism, there is collective or government ownership and control of all production and distribution of goods and property. There is also corporate Socialism which to a great degree exists in the United States. For instance, the "new towns" or urban renewal sites - - the land and buildings in those areas are often owned by large corporations. Small private businessmen merely lease space. Opportunities for ownership of private property in such areas are minimal.

Humanism is more difficult to define, primarily because the word has been so misused. Basically, there are two types: humanism with a small "h" and Humanism with a capital "H". Humanism with a small "h" is manifested in "humane"* behavior toward animals and in common everyday behavior between people. This "humane humanism" is a civilizing quality that stabilizes society and could just as easily be called "the golden rule".

Then there is Humanism with a capital "H", and it is this Humanism that is promoted in the government

*The word "humane" as used in government schools has yet another definition which is discussed in the section on "Educationese".

schools (and often in private and church schools) and to which our country has already been converted to a great degree. This Humanism is a religious philosophy with "articles of faith" expressed in the *Humanist Manifesto*.³

HUMANISM AS A RELIGION

That Humanism is a religion has been recognized in the courts as well as by Humanists. The reference most often cited is found in the case of *Torcaso v. Watkins* (367 U.S. Reports p. 495 footnote 11):

"Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others. See *Washington Ethical Society v. District of Columbia*, 101 U.S. App. D.C. 371, 249 F 2d 127 . . . "

In the *Washington Ethical Society* case, the Society wanted the building in which it held meetings, to qualify for tax exemption, and contended that a belief in a Supreme Being is not essential to qualify for tax exemption given to a church or religious corporation or religious society. The court held that the petitioner qualified as a religious corporation or society.

In the March, 1978 *Educational Leadership*, James K. Uphoff⁴ cited a "narrow" definition of religion which centers around belief in and worship of a deity. He also gave a "broad" definition of religion which:

" . . . envisions religion as any faith or set of values to which an individual or group gives ultimate loyalty. . . Ethical Culture, secularism, humanism, scientism . . . illustrate this concept of religion."

The author went on to admit that the broad definition:

“. . . applies to all of us . . . we educators have placed our *faith* in the critical thinking process as a means of improving our world, [and] we may have adopted it as a religious value. . . ”

He continued:

“My own *faith* in the value of and need for rationality makes me become a *missionary* and undertake the task with great zeal.”

Humanists in the schools are a dedicated lot who do indeed display as much, if not more zeal in the promotion of Humanism than do Christian missionaries in promoting Christianity. Educator Harold C. Lyon⁵ described a course he gave in “affective education” which he claimed resulted in his students functioning as missionaries. He said:

“The intangible product of the course is fifteen humanistically enlightened individuals who are now either teaching their own humanistically oriented classes or working as missionaries to influence others to deal with feelings in the classroom and in curriculum development.”

Humanists are just as protective of their religion as are Christians, if not more so. In the Winter, 1970 issue of *Religious Humanism*⁶ the author of an article in another magazine was chastised for calling Humanism a “false religion”. Exception was taken to the charge with the exhortation that “Faithful humanists are challenged by these assaults to speak and write in defense of the humanist faith.”

“CHRISTIAN” HUMANISM

The inappropriate use of “humanism” for “Humanism” and vice versa results in a great deal of confusion. To compound the confusion, there are those who claim they are “Christian humanists” or “Christian Humanists”. They, like “ordinary” Christians, see in others the image and likeness of Christ, and love all others as Christ would. But for some reason they prefer to qualify their Christianity with the word “H(h)umanist”. It creates an annoying divisive confusion because it implies they consider themselves just a cut above other Christians - - that they are more deeply caring - - which is not necessarily so. Of course, there is always the possibility that such “Christian H(h)umanists” are really atheistic Humanists and are hiding behind the benign cover of the word “Christian”.

The confusion is further compounded by “official” Humanist insistence that there is no such thing as “Christian H(h)umanism” - - either with a small “h” or with a capital “H”. Humanist Paul Kurtz,⁶ editor of *The Humanist* magazine, insists it is not possible to be both a Christian and a Humanist of any variety. He said:

“Humanism cannot in any fair sense of the word apply to one who still believes in God as the source and creator of the universe. Christian Humanism would be possible only for those who are willing to admit that they are atheistic Humanists. It surely does not apply to God-intoxicated believers.”

Mr. Kurtz is right. “Christian H(h)umanism” is a contradiction in terms. You are either a Christian or a H(h)umanist. You can’t be both.

HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

Schools are said to be promoting "humanistic education" or to be developing "humane" qualities, or other benevolent sounding conditions that bear the prefix "human". To most people, "humanistic education" means schools are exerting a civilizing influence on children. Schools may very well be promoting "humane" qualities (in the traditional meaning of the word "humane") and concern for others, but we should be aware that "humanistic education" is not what it appears.

There are those who would argue that "H(h)umanistic education" means nothing more than the study of the great classics. But such is not the case, according to William Russell⁷, Program Officer for the federally funded National Endowment for the Humanities. In August, 1975, he clarified the matter:

"An initial clarification to make is that the term "humanistic" is not the adjectival form of the noun "humanities": Humanistic education does not mean education in the humanities disciplines."

Another admission that Humanistic education is not "education in the humanities disciplines" appeared in *To Nurture Humaneness*⁸ :

". . . it is not enough that we simply teach the humanities. Instruction in English, social studies, art, music, and drama is not enough. Humanism and the humanities are by no means synonymous."

If we know what Humanistic education *is not*, then what *is* it?

A good explanation was unintentionally provided by California Assemblyman John Vasconcellos⁹. In March, 1974, he wrote:

“. . . humanizing education isn't easy. It's at least controversial, and at most subversive. It's subversive because attempts at truly humanizing the public schools must run smack up against the fundamental social realities . . . It's controversial because it necessarily raises, even challenges, the very deepest held values and assumptions about human beings . . . ”

“It includes the affective and the cognitive domains. It recognizes a child has a mind of his own . . . has feelings . . . has a body - - physical and sexual . . . needing to touch and be touched . . . ”

He elaborated on self-determination and autonomy; the need for children to look inward instead of outward and upward to God or to parents for guidance. He lauded evolution over creation. In essence then, Vasconcellos promoted the major tenets or “articles of faith” as expressed in the *Humanist Manifesto*³ as his idea of Humanistic education.

What is supposed to be the benefit of such Humanistic education? According to educator Morrel J. Clute¹⁰, “Humanistic schools work to free people . . . ” The obvious question is, free people from what? Educator William D. Hedges¹¹ answered the question by giving a “common core of values” that society must adhere to if it is to survive. This “common core of values” projects not Christian values, but Humanist values. He explained:

“. . . this view of humankind requires the

educative process to free people to be themselves. It values autonomy and . . . interdependence. It decries. . . the imposition of constraints and conventions . . . which can retard the individual's growth."

So finally, the answer to the question, "from what do Humanist schools free people?" must be, "from Christian values, from Christian behavior and from Christian constraints and conventions. In a single word, then, Humanist schools free children from *Christianity*."

Indeed, Humanistic education is *not* value-free, and this was readily admitted by educator Harold C. Lyon¹²:

"Humanistic education is *not* "value-free". If it is to be in any way a personal, humanizing experience, one accepts the fact that both students and teachers have a world view or value set through which each interprets facts . . ."

A "world view" is very much a part of Humanist belief, as we shall see. But additionally, the Humanist *interprets* facts - - he does not *accept* facts because for Humanists, facts can change. There are no absolutes. Truth is relative. Truth can mean anything one wants it to mean to suit immediate needs and the situation at hand - - "situation ethics".

As we move along it will become clear in many ways that Humanistic education is not "value-free". It can't be "value-free" because it is not intended to develop the "cognitive" - - the learning of academic skills and information nor to develop any kind of academic competence, but to develop the "affective" - - values, attitudes and behaviors.

THE "HUMANIST MOVEMENT"

"Humanistic Education is a movement, rather than a discipline. It lacks a sound theoretical base, and there is little research to prove, disprove, or improve the efficacy of its techniques. Those of us who are presently working in the field are anxious to see it legitimized."¹³

Humanism in the schools did not "just happen". It is the result of a movement, led and promoted by John Dewey. Humanistic education did not start with John Dewey, of course, but it was he, more than anyone else who has influenced and determined the status of present-day education. A more contemporary missionary of Humanism in the schools is the well known and influential educator, Arthur W. Coombs, who in 1966 defined the "Humanist movement" with a small "h":

"The humanist movement finds expression in many places. Internationally it appears in the rise and independence of the underdeveloped nations, in the United Nations, the World Court, or the freedom of women . . ." ¹⁴

Bear in mind the above appeared in 1966. In 1978, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development published a report¹⁵, credit for which was given to several authors, with Arthur W. Coombs named as chairperson. The introduction to the report, obviously written by Coombs, defined the Humanist (with a capital "H") Movement in a way that was amazingly like his 1966 definition:

"The Humanist Movement came into being very largely in response to this fundamental change

in human problems, such as ecology, starvation, conservation, atom bombs . . . One sees the fruits of this movement in such world-wide developments such as the decline of colonialism, the rise of the have-not nations . . . the world court, the United Nations, UNESCO . . . public education . . . equal rights legislation . . . women's liberation."

So you can see we had small "h" humanism in 1966 and capital "H" Humanism in 1978. Is it significant or a printer's error? More than likely, it is significant. The Humanists are bolder now in all that they do. They no longer feel the great need to mislead. The time is right for them to be out in the open about what they are and what they are doing. It is of interest that the concerns of the Humanist Movement expressed by Coombs are also the concerns expressed in the *Humanist Manifesto*³.

The Humanists are fiercely determined to achieve the aims of their Movement. So determined, in fact, that Arthur Coombs was moved to declare:

" . . . the tide of human affairs is running with us. The humanist movement is inexorable. It will not be stopped. Though habit and tradition may kick up waves of opposition from time to time, these are but surface manifestations. . . those great tides in human affairs . . . are disastrous to oppose. I believe the Humanist Movement is one of those tides and it is coming in." ¹⁶

That was Arthur Coombs speaking in 1966. In 1978, his missionary zeal had not cooled a bit:

"The Humanist Movement is not fad or frill. It is an absolute necessity for our times. If it did not exist, we would have to invent it." ¹⁷

Clearly, the Humanists are determined not to be stopped. There is a viable Humanist Movement and the schools are the primary areas for it to take hold, and in true missionary fashion, for it to flower and grow. Imagine what would happen if Christians were as determined to propagate Christianity in the schools!

But the Humanist Movement is not carried on only by Humanist educators. Humanists are in positions of power and great influence in entertainment, the mass media, and particularly, in our legislatures. We have already seen one example - - California Assemblyman, John Vasconcellos - - an ardent champion of Humanism in education.

Higher up yet, we have California Congressman, Don Edwards, who on October 23, 1973, gave a talk¹⁸ in which he said in part:

“ . . . I wish I was able to . . . tell you that the Humanist Manifesto II has been read by 535 members of Congress, by the Supreme Court, by the CIA, by the Pentagon and by all those various people at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue - - and that further they have declared unanimously that henceforth it would be the cornerstone of American foreign and domestic policy. I wish I could say that, but I can't (sic) does not mean that this very important document is not on Capitol Hill, that it is not going to have a great deal of influence in the dialogue that will go on for many years.”

Perhaps the Supreme Court already considers the *Humanist Manifesto*³ the “cornerstone of American . . . domestic policy”, for hasn't that same Court decreed there shall be no prayer or Bible reading in the government

schools? And what of the abortion decision? In fact, hasn't the Supreme Court made *many* decisions that are supportive of Humanist beliefs?

The Humanists have been very effective with their Movement to "humanize" education. At a convention of atheists in San Francisco, Madalyn Murray O'Hare ¹⁹ claimed the climate for atheism has changed since she won her Supreme Court decision. She exulted:

"Let's face it, there is no way we could have had an atheist convention 10 years ago. Everything today is much better. Part of the reason is public education."

At the same convention Mrs. O'Hare was quoted as describing Vice President Mondale as "an undercover atheist". Does she know something the public doesn't know? In any case, she's right about the improved climate for atheists, and that part of the reason for the improved climate is public education and a lot of help from more than a few important people in important places.

HUMANIST "ARTICLES OF FAITH"

Just as Christians accept the teaching of Jesus Christ and the Bible, so the Humanists have their "bible" in the *Humanist Manifesto II*³. The first *Manifesto* was published in 1933 and was brought up to date in 1973 as the present *Humanist Manifesto II*. It's a very short document which can be understood by anyone of average intelligence. Upon reading it for the first time, anyone who has kept up with current events will immediately see the *Manifesto* as a "blueprint". To a great degree, the "articles of faith" expressed in the *Manifesto* have been worked into every facet of our lives: religion, politics, social and personal mores, and above all, in what is taught or

promoted in the government schools. Let's take a look at the situation as it relates to the tenets of the *Humanist Manifesto*.

RELIGION

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: "We believe . . . that traditional dogmatic or authoritarian religions that place revelation, God, ritual or creed above human needs and experience do a disservice to the human species . . . As non-theists, we begin with humans, not God. . . "

How many Protestant denominations or Catholic churches have become totally man-centered, with Jesus Christ accorded no more veneration than would be due just another human brother? In how many ways has your church put "human needs" ahead of worship of God? And in the schools, children are no longer permitted to recite the Lord's Prayer or read the Bible. The schools do "begin with humans not God".

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: "Promises of immortal salvation or fear of damnation are both illusory and harmful . . . There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body."

How many Christians no longer believe sin is possible? How many Christians now believe that regardless of how they live in this life all will be forgiven at the end? As we shall see, Humanistic death education in schools and churches is helping people to accept death as a finality - - helping them believe that this life is all there is and there is nothing to be hoped for or feared at death.

MORALITY

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “. . . Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction . . . We strive for the good life, here and now.”

Because government schools cannot teach or promote Christian morality, Humanist situation ethics is promoted. Many clergymen of all faiths no longer believe it is possible to commit a sin and they too preach and teach the use of situation ethics. Because sin is no longer recognized and because people now live by a personal code of morality, based on situation ethics, our society is in a state of moral anarchy and decline. Many people can no longer recognize right from wrong or good from bad and their confusion is reflected in their behavior and their toleration of uncivilized behavior. Young people taught to live by situation ethics are in a state of despair and alienation because they have no structure or standards to guide them. This is obviously a contributing cause of youthful suicides, but there is an unwillingness to admit it because the right to suicide is a Humanist belief that is accepted and promoted.

INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “. . . We believe in maximum individual autonomy . . . ”

This Humanist belief is actively promoted in government schools and is responsible for the terrifying amount of youthful rebellion, alienation and violence. A child who is encouraged to exercise “maximum individual autonomy” uses situation ethics and he decides what is right or wrong behavior. Parents and other authority figures cannot influence a child who has been led to

believe he has been liberated from laws, rules and regulations established by any authority higher than himself, including God.

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: "The right to birth control, abortion and divorce should be recognized. . . neither do we wish to prohibit by law or social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults . . . individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their life-styles as they desire."

Most parents know that sex education in the schools often extends from kindergarden through grade 12 and that it has caused a furor in many communities. Why do parents object to sex education? Not because it teaches the "facts of life", but because it inculcates Humanist attitudes about sex and sexual activity, which is contrary to traditional morality.

In most states, minors can obtain contraceptives, treatment for venereal disease and have abortions - - all without parental consent or knowledge. Children can be directed to such services by a school counselor or by anyone in the school who by law is allowed "privileged communication" with students.

It's a full circle. Schools teach children they have a right to express their sexual proclivities - - be they homosexual or heterosexual. If as a result of pursuing their "rights" they become infected with VD (many forms of which are becoming increasingly difficult to cure) or if contraception fails or is not used, then such "minor" problems can be fixed with "back-up" services and parents will never know. If this isn't destructive to family relationships, then what is?

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: ". . . the individual must experience a full range of civil liberties . . . This includes . . .

a recognition of an individual's right to die with dignity, euthanasia, and the right to suicide."

Ever wonder why so much legislation has been introduced into state legislatures to legalize "death with dignity", and why there is so much discussion of the merits of positive euthanasia or "mercy killing"? Or why the right to suicide is more openly discussed as a viable option for those who no longer want to live? The reasons are to be found in the beliefs stated in the *Humanist Manifesto* and promoted in the schools and in society at large. In the schools, these "civil liberties" are made acceptable in death education and through other anti-life indoctrination.

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: "All persons should have a voice in developing the values and goals that determine their lives . . . Alienating forces should be modified or eradicated. . . People are more important than decalogues . . ."

This particular "article of faith" is more devastating than realized at first glance. Schools across the country - - be they government, church or private - - are providing "values education", "values clarification", "moral development" and an assortment of other values-changing techniques. The purpose is to help children find their "own" values. In reality, these programs are designed to implement the Humanist belief that "all persons should have a voice in developing the values and goals that determine their lives." In essence, values education declares that parents are no longer permitted to instill their values in their children. If they attempt to do so, the school negates their efforts by teaching their children a process for deciding how they should behave and what they should believe. Values education and moral development

programs respond to the Humanist belief that “alienating forces” (the home and church) “should be modified or eradicated.” Remember also, according to Humanist belief, “people are more important than decalogues”. And what are those decalogues? Why, the Ten Commandments, of course!

EDUCATION

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “ We believe in the right to universal education . . . The schools should foster satisfying and productive living. They should be open at all levels to any and all; the achievement of excellence should be encouraged. Innovative and experimental forms of education are to be welcomed.”

The educators make much of fostering “satisfying and productive living”. But what does it mean? It means that schools, in keeping with Humanist belief, provide students with the bare minimum or “survival skills” that will enable them to merely get by in adult life - - to be satisfied with a government definition of what is considered “enough” and to accept dead-end jobs that provide just enough income to pay for “satisfying living” - - enough food, amusements, sex and shelter. “Achievement of excellence” can mean anything and has no relation to academic excellence. A child can “achieve excellence” in getting along with his peers or in any other non-academic effort.

As for the “innovative and experimental forms of education” - - this is about all that exists in government schools, and failing SAT scores prove it.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “ . . . the best option is to

transcend the limits of national sovereignty . . . we look to the development of . . . world law . . . ”

“We believe in . . . international courts . . . the arts of negotiation and compromise . . . It is a planetary imperative to reduce the level of military expenditures. . . ”

“. . . commitment to all humankind is the highest commitment . . . it transcends the narrow allegiances of church, state, party, class or race . . . What more daring a goal for humankind than for each person to become . . . a citizen of a world community. . . ”

With the help of federal funds and in accord with government policy, schools are indoctrinating children with “peace studies”, “global perspectives” and similar sounding programs - - all with the same intent - - to promote acceptance of “the limits of national sovereignty”. Learning “the arts of negotiation and compromise” are considered “new” basic skills. Expenditures for defense are down to an alarmingly low level. In other words, the U.S. is well into accepting and promoting the Humanist demand for a “world community”.

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “We must expand communication and transportation across frontiers. Travel restrictions must cease.”

To reach this goal, President Carter has announced the intention of his administration to deregulate international air fares. Is it just a coincidence that his intention satisfies the demand of the *Humanist Manifesto*?

THE ENVIRONMENT

HUMANIST MANIFESTO: “The world community must engage in cooperative planning concerning the use of rapidly depleting resources. The planet earth must be

considered a single ecosystem . . . excessive population growth must be checked . . . Exploitation of natural resources . . . must end."

Do you now understand why there is an "energy crisis"? The "crisis" isn't that there aren't enough natural resources - - the "crisis" had to be created to satisfy the Humanist demand for "cooperative planning" to save "depleting resources". Actually, it has been determined by reputable scientists that natural resources are not being depleted. Even if a shortage of energy sources existed, the problem could be remedied by a free, productive nation, such as the United States used to be.

The next time you hear a complaint about the "planet earth" and the terrible fate that is about to befall our "single ecosystem" because of "excessive population growth" and "exploitation of natural resources" - - remember it is propaganda to further the Humanist/Socialist goal of a world dictatorship.

IN SUMMARY

Our society has been built on the Judeo-Christian ethic. Our laws have reflected the admonitions of the Ten Commandments and the God-given rights and guarantees enumerated in the federal and state constitutions.

Gradually, as social standards and religious beliefs were allowed to be cast aside to satisfy the demands of "pluralism", non-theists made great strides. We are now in open conflict. We now have nothing less than a revolution taking place. Schools have become open agents of social change, working steadily to enthrone the "articles of faith" of the religion of Humanism. At the same time, parents, who for the most part are the remnant of Christianity, are fighting to return the schools to institutions

of academic learning. What success they achieve is always short-lived. Attitudes, values and behaviors must be changed for the coming new world order that will involve at the same time, the worship of man and the enslavement of mankind. A terrifying prospect that is already upon us.

There is much more to the *Humanist Manifesto* that can be related to present conditions. Parents are urged to study the entire document.

"EDUCATIONESE": LANGUAGE of CHANGE 2

"This is the essence of psychological warfare. Confuse the meanings of words, infiltrate varied and conflicting concepts into their usage, and you are able to immobilize a foe by booby-trapping his thought processes": Edward Hunter (1)

Before anyone can hope to understand what is going on in the schools it is absolutely essential to understand at least some of the language known as "educationese".

It could be described as an alien language and in some respects, it is. But more accurately, it is nothing more than a deceptive, deceitful abuse of the English language by educators.

Educationese generally works like this: In conversations between parents and educators, quite often the words, terms or phrases used mean one thing to educators and something else to parents. For instance, the teacher may assure a parent, "Johnny is doing very well. He is really learning". The parent hears the word "learning" and assumes it means Johnny is learning academic information. Chances are, however, the teacher used the word "learning" in another sense. She may only mean that Johnny is learning how to get along with other children.

For another example, take the word "education". Most parents assume it means "academic education". However, to educators the word "education" means "change". But this discrepancy is never explained to parents, so parents go on believing that what goes on in the schools is "education" as *they* understand it. This misunderstanding explains why parents are finding it so difficult, if not impossible, to improve or change what is being imposed on their children as "education".

In a nutshell, then, parents can "dialogue" with educators about school problems and student progress, but the dialogue will remain just about meaningless for parents until there can be a common understanding of words and terms.

What follows is a glossary of the more commonly used words and terms that should help clarify and unravel some of the mysteries of "education".

Glossaries are generally placed at the back of the book, but it is essential that this glossary, as brief as it is, be read at this point. A reading of the words and terms given will help in understanding the overall problem.

AFFECTIVE EDUCATION: ". . . our definition of affective education is facilitation of his healthy emotional development rather than facilitation of his cognitive development. The student may well have higher test scores as a result of affective education, but improved grades is not the reason behind this effort.²

Translated, "affective education" aims to develop *how* and *what* a child feels and thinks and how he behaves.

AUTONOMY: Much is made of the necessity for children to become "autonomous". In Humanist terms, autonomy means shedding the restrictions and authority of parental and religious requirements. The child must, according to Humanist belief, decide for himself, what is right and

wrong. Obviously, this contributes to behavior problems and was recognized by educator Thomas B. Gregory: "... seeking autonomy may become the immature action of simply resisting further external control. As a result, seeking autonomy may include experimenting with asocial actions (delinquency)."³

BACK TO BASICS: See chapter on basic education.

CHANGE AGENT: An "Individual who facilitates and/or provokes change within an organization by surveying, training, consulting, nosying about."⁴

A change agent can also be an institution. For instance, as we shall see, schools function as change agents.

COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION (CBE): Because of the decline in SAT scores, schools have begun to establish "minimum competency" requirements which mandate the teaching of "survival skills". Many parents mistakenly think this means schools are getting back to traditional academic education, but such is not the case. CBE merely means students are taught the absolute minimum needed to function at a survival level in society. A CBE program teaches students how to read labels on cans, how to look up a number in the telephone book, read a meter, fill out a job application and other "survival skills" that could be mastered by most elementary school children of even below-average intelligence.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION: This term has no relationship to neighborhood schools. Rather, it is a crib-to-crypt philosophy defined as follows: "When Community educators say that Community Education takes into consideration the total individual and his total environment they mean precisely this; the field of Community Education includes the individual in his total psycho-physical

structure and this entire ecological climate with all its ramifications - - social, political, economical, cultural, spiritual, etc. It seeks to integrate the individual within himself (sic) and within his community until the individual becomes a cosmic soul and the community the world.”⁵

EDUCATION: “The basic goal of education is change - - human change - - in desirable directions. . . This issue of *Educational Leadership* focuses attention upon the school as a change agent - - and the specific focus is on changing people.”⁶

EDUCATIONIST: The educationist is a policy-maker or a decision-maker. He has made his way to top of the ivory tower. He writes articles for important educators’ journals in which he promotes the latest theory of “education”. He is in much demand to speak at educators’ conventions, and above all, the mark of an educationist is that he is overpaid for what he does. An educationist is not to be confused with the classroom teacher who in most cases, is just following orders and really believes he is educating children.

EDUCATIONAL PROCESS: It is common practice to speak of the “educational process”. It is an accurate term when it applies to acquisition of an academic education. However, “educational process” has another meaning. It means learning “process skills” that will enable the learner to engage in decision-making, problem-solving and valuing. A learner who has learned how to use process skills actually becomes a process and in the “process of becoming”, he is continually changing. Process skills teach a learner how to apply situation ethics in all decisions he makes and to all non-academic problems he must solve. “. . . this view of humankind requires the educative process

to free people to be themselves. It values autonomy and . . . interdependence.”⁷

EDUCATOR: Under certain circumstances, an educator may educate, particularly if employed by a school that exists to educate in the traditional sense. But an educator or teacher in a government school and in many private and church schools is now considered a facilitator, a manager of a learning environment, and above all, a change agent. All are apt descriptions because providing academic information is the least important requirement of the educator’s job.

HUMANE: “. . . to be humane in school would mean no more than that we not torture the children, physically or psychologically. . . The activist meaning of “humane” is expressed in . . . value clarification and values education; “affective” education . . . and the various movements that seek social justice through passionate activity . . . activist humanists emphasize autonomy . . . They act by forming groups of “True Believers”: communes, encounter groups, quasi-religious groups, and the mystical groups.”⁸

It is important to keep in mind that schools claim to make children “humane” and at the same time, the schools provide values education - - thereby giving the word “humane” a different definition than most parents would give.

HUMANIST: “Humanists call themselves by many names - - transactionalists, existentialists, self-psychologists, phenomonologists . . . ”⁹

HUMANISTIC EDUCATION: “An initial clarification to make is that the term “humanistic” is not the adjectival form of the noun “humanities”. Humanistic edu-

cation does not mean education in the humanities disciplines.”¹⁰

“Many educators committed to the goal of humanizing education have been fearful that the accountability and “back to basics” movements could turn back the advances in humanistic education that have been made . . . ”¹¹

“For the humanist, the basic principle of learning is this: *Any information will affect a person’s behavior only in the degree to which the learner has discovered the personal meaning of that information . . . education must be affective or else there is none at all!*”¹²

HUMANISTIC OBJECTIVES: “If education is to meet the current and future needs of our society, humanistic objectives and humanist thought must operate at the very heart of every school and classroom in the nation.”¹³

INDIVIDUAL: Educators talk a lot about encouraging individualism. Parents should understand that developing independent individuals is not a goal of government education, and this becomes apparent only with an understanding of the educators’ view of an individual: “The emerging modern individual places his confidence not in society’s norms, nor religion’s rules, nor parents’ dictates, but in his own changing experience. He is, in a very deep sense, his own highest authority. He chooses his own way.”¹⁴ In truth, the only kind of individual government schools want to develop is the collectivized individual: “He will be capable of sustaining many allegiances, without contradiction, on both a national and international scale, and be closer to being, especially through the concept of global perspectives, a world citizen.”¹⁵

INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION: Most parents really like the sound of “individualized instruction”. It makes them think their child is getting special attention and help. Actually, individualized instruction, or

individually guided education or similar sounding terms have no relation to learning academic information. The term means the child is having his "needs" met. He has been "diagnosed" by a "diagnostic prescriptive learning clinician" (also known as a teacher) and a program is designed to meet the diagnosed needs. The diagnosis includes not only an estimation of what academic information the child needs, but more important, his affective needs. The diagnosis has determined "where the child is" in his attitude and value formation so he can be manipulated to "where he ought to be".

INQUIRY: It is common practice for history or social studies to be "taught" using the "inquiry method". ". . . the most important result of learning through inquiry is a change in attitudes toward knowledge. As they engage in the dialogue of inquiry, they begin to view knowledge as tentative rather than absolute, and they consider all knowledge claims as being subject to continuous revision and confirmation."¹⁶ But " . . . what if they "discover" through their own devices, that which is inaccurate or contrary to what actually took place? To force them to reach the "correct" conclusion is inconsistent with inquiry approaches."¹⁷ In other words, the "inquiry method" is the enemy of truth, but in government education, truth is not important!

INTELLECTUAL SKILLS: This term is often used by educators and has a "back to basics" sound to it. But what does it really mean? Perhaps it is better to ask what it *doesn't* mean: "The term *intellectual skills* . . . seem not to mean skill in specific operations, such as spelling a word, adding two fractions, diagramming a sentence, or balancing a chemical equation. They are likely to conceive of intellectual skills . . . as observing, classifying, measuring, communicating . . . "¹⁸

LEARNER: Children are no longer called “students” which makes sense. Students “study” which isn’t required anymore. Children have become “learners” who don’t need facts and information. As a learner, a child is a “discoverer, an inquirer, an experimenter, an innovator . . . the teacher . . . is no longer the instructor, but the guide, helping children effect changes in themselves.”¹⁹

LEARNING: Most people assume “learning” refers to acquisition of academic or factual information. That is no longer true. When a child is said to be “learning”, it means he is learning process skills that will enable him to become effective in “interpersonal relationships”, or he is learning how to develop his “own” values and solve problems. The following definitions will help clarify: “Learning understood from the humanist point of view, calls for concentration on processes more than behaviors.”²⁰ “. . . learning may be defined generally as “change in behavior”. . . learning as the purpose of school curriculum does not mean just any change in any behavior. [It means] . . . particular changes in student behavior that . . . are discernible . . . complex . . . gradual, long term growth and development toward certain *human* characteristics . . .”²¹

PERSON: As used in government schools, “person” has a non-Christian meaning: “He is not governed by the “shoulds” and “oughts” of conformity, nor necessarily governed by the rules of his institution, if they conflict too deeply with his own values.”²² Thus, the Humanist “person” is not the same as the Christian person. The Humanist “person” is not bound by anything or anyone. He is tyrannized by his selfish whims and desires. The Christian person follows the tenets of Christianity. He is fully human in every sense of the word and he knows

it. The Humanist "person" is in a constant, frustrating "process of becoming", always seeking to reach a nebulous "full human potential".

PROBLEM SOLVING: The term "problem solving" is usually thought to refer to the solution of mathematics problems. However, it also means something else. In government schools, the "learner" learns that life is a series of problems for which there are no certain or standard solutions. Regardless of whether the problem is personal, political, social or religious, the learner is taught he must find a "creative" solution that is drawn from his ever-changing value system. The problem is, parents teach children there are standards to guide them in the solution of problems. Then, the school teaches "process skills" for solving problems that require utilization of situation ethics. This "push and pull" between home and school contributes to much of the alienation that exists between parents and children.. It is a by-product of "The progressive movement, which rose in protest to the lock-step, memory-based, conservative schools . . . to teach the students to solve problems so they could choose their own values more correctly."²³ Learning to solve problems is such an important skill that it is considered to be ". . . the most important collection of intellectual skills that the schools single out as learning objectives."²⁴

PUPIL PERFORMANCE: Again, this has a "back to basics" ring about it, but in fact, may have nothing to do with basic education. "If schools are to be accountable for the performance of their pupils, the question . . . is, What performance? A direct answer to this question is, The performance you've been trying to teach."²⁵ Obviously, "pupil performance" can mean anything at all - - academic or non-academic.

SCHOOLS: “. . . the school as an institution cannot help but reflect a value system. . . The school must strive diligently to overcome the effects of those social factors which inhibit the growth and development of the individual.”²⁶ The obvious question is, *what* social factors does the school perceive as inhibiting the growth and development of the individual? The translation of this excerpt is that the place called “school” is actually an agent of social change.

SELF-ACTUALIZATION: “ ‘*Self-actualization*’ - - The common broad goal of these programs is full humanness; not “the educated man”, not “normality”, but the best that man can become, the fully alive, authentic, “becoming” person.”²⁷ Achievement of “self-actualization” is a goal of Humanist belief and a goal of government schools. Humanist belief teaches that promises of immortal salvation and fear of damnation keep people from achieving “self-actualization”. Thus, for the government schools, the task is to convince children there is no salvation to be desired nor damnation to be feared. So the child who becomes self-actualized has had his conscience destroyed. Nothing will stand in his way of achieving the good life, here and now, as the *Humanist Manifesto* urges.

SELF-CONCEPT: “Self-concept is a vital part of the learning process and truly effective education must be humanistically oriented toward student self-concepts.”²⁸ The school spends a great deal of time nurturing the child’s self-concept. It sounds very nice - - children *should* have a good self-concept. However, the school does not nurture an *individual* self-concept. The child must be made to feel good about himself as a member of his peer group, functioning *interdependently*. In the new world order there will be no room for the independent individual. All must find their identity within a controlled group.

TEACHER: It is not considered difficult to find teachers capable of providing a traditional education. But "To find those who are sophisticated in the processing capabilities and who are models of the image of humankind . . . will require dramatic changes in criteria for teacher education and selection. We might start by attracting some rebels to our ranks."²⁹

TEACHING: ". . . teaching is applied psychology. . . the basic science of education, and the basic preparation of teachers is, or should be, psychology."³⁰

The above definitions, descriptions and explanations of words and terms used by educators represent just a few of the semantic deceptions that prevent parents from understanding what schools are doing to their children, and which prevent parents from obtaining the changes they want. Actually, there are very few words and terms used by educators that are not deceptive. Parents should learn to question every word spoken or written by them.

CHANGE: CHANGE AGENTS AND CHANGE TECHNIQUES

3

Educators do not deny that the purpose or goal of “education” is to bring about change. Of course, they do not admit it for general public knowledge, but they do admit it in their journals and books. The problem, however, is that parents generally do not have the time nor inclination to read such publications. If they did, here is an example of what they might find:

“The basic goal of education is change - - human change in desirable directions. . . This issue . . . focuses attention upon the school as a change agent - - and the specific focus is on changing people.”¹

If uninformed parents were to read such an incredible definition of the goal of “education”, surely they would have many questions. *What kind of change are they talking about? What do they mean by “human change in desirable directions?” What do they mean when they call the school a “change agent”?*

One of the most influential change agents in education is Carl Rogers. Here is his view of the goal of education:

“. . . the goal of education must be to develop individuals who are open to change . . . The goal of education must be to develop a society in which people can live more comfortably with *change* than with *rigidity*. In the coming world the capacity to face the new appropriately is more important than the ability to know and repeat the old.”²

Again, a puzzled parent might ask, *Change from what to what? Why must schools develop people who are “open to change”? For what purpose? Should the goal of education be to develop society or to educate individuals? Why must people feel more comfortable with change than with rigidity? What is meant by “rigidity”? How can educators claim to know what kind of people the future world will require?*

A common theme expressed in the writing of educators is the need to wipe out tradition, to eliminate the past or to minimize its importance:

“We need to de-emphasize tradition and the past . . . Educators can no longer afford to deplore and resist change. Too many teachers are still insisting that things must be done the “right way”. . . Messiness, noise, confusion and mistakes, out of which may come originality, creativity and genius, are suppressed in favor of neatness, quiet, order and “being right,” out of which can come conservatism, . . . rigidity . . . ”³

Again, a parent might ask, *Why must tradition be de-emphasized, which is to deny our culture, our heritage and our roots?* The answer is that knowledge of our history and emotional ties to the past deters the establishment of the new world order. Furthermore, the educators would have us flounder in noise, confusion, disorder, messiness and mistakes because they know full well it is only under such stress and chaos that the changes the one-worlders seek is possible.

The above excerpt also tells us that teachers must be changed; that we must now have a new kind of teacher, and indeed, as we shall see, the desired "new breed" is being turned out of the universities. To add to the confusion, they are still called "teachers", but in fact they are considered "facilitators", "managers of the learning environment" and just plain "change agents".

THE NEA AND CHANGE

The most powerful lobby forcing change in the schools is the National Education Association (NEA). The goal of the NEA is not to improve the quality of academic education, but to bring about social and political change and financial security for its members. If parents were to read even a few of the publications churned out by the NEA, they would have no difficulty understanding the role that has been and continues to be played by this change agent operation. Over the years, the NEA journal, *Today's Education* has provided an inside track on revolutionary events to come in the schools. The reading of the NEA book, *Schools For The 70's And Beyond* would convince any doubting parent that promotion of traditional academic education is about the last goal of the NEA.

But the NEA doesn't just write books. It is also actively involved in teacher training, textbook writing

and revision and in particular, in curriculum development. For instance, in celebration of the U.S. Bicentennial, the NEA made available to schools a one-world propaganda program titled *A Declaration of Interdependence: Education for a Global Community*. The NEA did not wait for schools to ask for the program -- 17 different projects were launched to implement it, according to NEA advertising.

In spite of the educators' insistence that every facet of education must be non-political, the NEA is very much involved in politics. In 1974⁴ it was reported that the (then) 1.5 million member outfit expected to spend about \$4 million through its local, state and national affiliates to elect candidates who would support NEA programs. In 1976⁵ the NEA admitted it had 169 members serving as full delegates to the Democratic National Convention and 89 serving as alternates.

The NEA has a predictable liberal bias on every controversial issue that comes along. In 1975 the NEA's 127-member Resolutions Committee met in Washington, D.C. to forge the future orientation of the organization. The proposed radical resolutions drafted by the committee included approval of homosexual teachers and it was resolved that no person should be "dismissed or demoted because of . . . sexual orientation."⁶

The resolution in favor of keeping homosexual teachers on the payroll is an indication of the hostility the NEA bears toward parents who oppose sex education, which, as we shall see, includes favorable treatment of the "alternate lifestyle" of homosexuality. The NEA publication, *Working With Parents*⁷, a guide for teachers and other educators, advised teachers that using a citizen advisory committee at every stage of planning a sex education program " . . . can be a strong force in quieting parent protests." But the publication also cautioned that in spite of very careful preparation, some

parents and citizens “. . . whose personal attitudes are warped, may complain or may try to sabotage the program.” This is a typical NEA defensive posture. Any intelligent protest or questioning of any program is immediately construed as the result of “warped” attitudes. Unfortunately, such subtle questioning of the sanity of parents is usually sufficient to cause the more faint-hearted types to back down.

The NEA has another “dirty trick” that often works very effectively to silence opposition. Recognizing that many people crumble and give up when subjected to a name-calling attack, parents are often labeled “extremists” or “right-wingers”. In the February, 1970 NEA publication *The National Elementary Principal*⁸, principals were urged “. . . to resist the biased and unreasonable attacks of extremist groups.” This tactic is particularly effective with parents who have no particular orientation - - who in fact pride themselves on being “middle of the road” and who cherish an unblemished social reputation. They fold up the fastest, and the educators know it.

The true aims and goals of the NEA could not have been more clearly articulated than they were by former California Governor Ronald Reagan⁹. Speaking before a Florida rally, he charged the NEA really wants “a federal educational system, a national school system, so that little Willie’s mother would not be able to go down and see the principal or even the school board. She’d actually have to take her case up to Congress in Washington. I believe this is the road to disaster and the end of academic freedom.” He continued his charge, comparing the NEA goals to the system that existed in Nazi Germany. In Hitler’s Germany, he explained, “where they had a nationalized school system . . .when he (Hitler) said ‘Burn the books’ they burned the books.”

The fact is, U.S. education has already become so

nationalized that "little Willie's mother" and many other mothers have found it necessary to go to Congress to protest funding of programs that in effect are "nationalized programs" because as a result of federal funding they are disseminated to schools across the country with little differences among them.

And heaven help "little Willie's mother" and all the other mothers who protest. They may well end up on a blacklist of those who criticize NEA-style education. As with any other organization with revolutionary goals, the NEA is sensitive to criticism, to put it mildly. The NEA brochure titled *Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities*¹⁰ lists among the purposes of the Commission, the intent to "Gather information about the various individuals and groups who criticize or oppose education, and make resumes of their activities." Now remember, this is not the CIA, but the National Education Association that will not hear or tolerate any criticism of "education".

The "storm trooper mentality" of the NEA is made chillingly clear in an *Inquiry Report*¹¹ prepared as a result of the revolt that took place in West Virginia after parents realized what was going on in the schools. Parents should read this document to get a good idea of the viciousness that can be employed by the NEA when its kind of "education" is questioned. The NEA is determined to protect its "turf". Proposed 1977 NEA resolutions included the following warning to dissidents:

"The public school system is not expendable. Any movement that would diminish this vital asset will be opposed by the Association."

Very ominous, indeed.

CHANGE AGENTS:

THEIR PREPARATION, PURPOSE AND DUTIES

If the purpose of "education" is to change people and society, then teachers must be change agents. The kind of teacher parents remember is no longer wanted or needed in government schools. The older teacher who wants to teach is an undesirable anachronism. This was made clear in the NEA book, *Schools For the 70's And Beyond*.¹²

" . . . teachers who conform to the traditional institutional mode are out of place. They might find fulfillment as tap-dance instructors, or guards in maximum security prisons or proprietors of reducing salons, or agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation - - but they damage teaching, children, and themselves by staying in the classroom."

The above statement is an accurate description of the situation that exists. Teachers who want to teach in the "traditional mode" are definitely undesirable. They are replaced as quickly as possible by "clinicians" as described in the *Feasibility Study: Behavioral Science Teacher Education Program*¹³ commonly known as the B STEP program. This study was published with federal funds by Michigan State University in January, 1970. The program has three major goals and the first is as follows:

"Development of a new kind of elementary school teacher who . . . engages in teaching as clinical practice. . . and functions as a respon-

sible agent of social change.”

Note the reference to “clinical practice”. Such medical terminology is rampant in the writings of educators. In the January, 1969 NEA publication, *Today's Education*¹⁴, educators June and Harold Shane echoed the idea that in schools in the 70's, teachers would function as “learning clinicians” and that schools would become “clinics” to provide psycho-social ‘treatment’ for the student . . . ”

The mental health approach of the change agents goes back a long way. In 1946, G. B. Chisholm¹⁵ wrote the following:

“The re-interpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of the old people, these are the belated objectives of all effective psychotherapy. Would they not be legitimate objectives of original education? . . . ”

Chisholm also stated:

“Can such a program of re-education or a new kind of education be charted? . . . the sciences of living should be . . . taught to all children . . . while the study of such things as trigonometry, Latin . . . should be left to the universities.
“Only so . . . can we help our children to carry their responsibilities as world citizens. . . ”

Only now it is becoming clear to many parents that universities do not train traditional teachers to teach basic skills and to impart academic information. It has become

common knowledge that many young "certified" teachers cannot adequately read or write nor are they competent in their chosen fields. Then how, it might be asked, can they become certified? The simple answer is that "certification" has little to do with accumulation of knowledge or teaching ability. Teachers who have become certified to teach are those who have received the required change agent training. And only those who continue to be processed through "inservice training" retain their certification.

The change agent "learning clinician" who engages in "clinical practice" - - what are some of the duties that go with the job? According to *Social Studies for the Seventies*¹⁶, which is a "volume . . . intended primarily for the pre-service education of teachers from kindergarten through grade eight," the change agent teacher must serve as a diagnostician, goal-setter and developer. The would-be teacher learns that "If children are to change and grow and become, then someone must know about them as they are and as they can become."¹⁷ What that really means is that the teacher must learn "where they are" in their attitude and value formation so they can be manipulated to "where they ought to be".

The teacher is given 31 ways of ". . . discovering a great deal about the children we teach" and includes such manipulative and prying techniques as the following:

- * Encourage role playing "and seeing children's reactions."
- * Read stories without any ending and have children complete the stories.
- * Visit homes of children.
- * Keep diaries.

After the teacher has diagnosed and discovered all

that she can about a child, and has set the desired goals, then she must put on another hat - - that of developer:

“In a sense teachers are social engineers . . . but it cannot be done without the previous steps of discovery and diagnosis as well as of goal-setting.”¹⁸

The social engineering begins the day the child enters school for the first time. It must begin at once because:

“. . . the basic personality patterns may have been formed before children ever enter school. They can be changed but the later that is postponed, the more difficult is the process.”¹⁹

Of course “basic personality patterns” are formed before children enter school, and obviously, these “basic personality patterns” are a reflection of the personality patterns of parents. Therefore, it is the parental influence the arrogant, elitist change agents want to eradicate.

To be more explicit, those “basic personality patterns” that must be changed are seen in:

“The child of suburbia [who] is likely to be a materialist and somewhat of a hypocrite. He tends to be a striver in school, a conformist, and above all a believer in being “nice,” polite, clean and tidy. . . He is often conspicuously self-centered. In all these respects, the suburban child patterns his attitudes after those of his parents.”²⁰

We are also told that “If we do not alter this pattern . . . our society may decay.”²¹

If teachers are to keep track of the progress of their social engineering, then they must keep files. In *Social Studies for the Seventies*²² teachers are cautioned:

“One last word of warning . . . all records which teachers have of children should be kept confidentially and placed in a safe place where no one can find them . . . Attention to this . . . can save teachers many a bad moment and in some cases their jobs.”

When teachers function as “social engineers”; when they change “basic personality patterns”; when they must hide “confidential records” - - all of this must go on behind closed doors, and that’s what we’ll look at next.

CHANGE AGENTS

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

“When a teacher closes the classroom door in the morning and is alone with the students, the real curriculum begins. . . eventually the time of reckoning may come with cries and community furore.”²³

Chances are that most parents will go on believing that “teachers” “teach” and that schools provide an “education”. Belief in this fantasy will continue because the change agents have become so skillful with deceptive “educationese” and adept at the art of using the “closed classroom door”.

Recognizing the existence of resistance to change, guidelines were drawn to help the teacher function as an effective change agent without parents or even other teachers knowing about what was going on. In an article,

*How Teachers Can Innovate And Still Keep Their Jobs*²⁴, ten guidelines were proposed including the following:

* *“Keep the door closed . . . The successful teacher . . . innovates quietly and without fanfare.”*

* *“Use a special vocabulary. . . Avoid ‘change,’ ‘fun,’ . . . ‘new,’ . . . ‘sensitivity,’ ‘students’ rights,’ ‘students’ choice,’ . . . Publicly stress instead ‘mastering basics,’ ‘students’ responsibility,’ ‘hard work,’ ‘respect,’ ‘traditional values,’ ‘proven,’ ‘discipline,’ and ‘results’.”*

(Can there be any doubt *they know* what parents expect of them?)

* *“Enlist the students in your game plan. . . . Make a rule and gain students’ agreement that they will not ask other teachers why they do not do what you are doing . . . ”*

* *“Carry a book around . . . potential blockers will give you more latitude to operate if you appear to know what you are doing. . . ”*

* *“Name your program as early as you feel you can . . . Use titles which will not alienate the general public.”*

In the final paragraph, teachers were given this hucksterish challenge: “You too can become a change agent.”

Hopefully, all parents can understand the significance of the above guidelines. What they advise “educators” to

do, in a word, is LIE about what they are doing. This is the payment parents and the public receive for the trust that is obviously misplaced.

Any lingering doubt that educators do indeed consider themselves "undercover" change agents was dispelled by the March 22, 1974 *Newsletter* of the Prince George's County Educators' Association Inc. (Maryland). In that issue teachers were warned to oppose pending legislation that would have given parents access to their children's textbooks. Teachers were ordered, "OPPOSE SB 196 the PARENTAL RIGHTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN. Tell legislators that this legislation is not needed. May render schools ineffective as change agents since it would place all curriculum in the hands of parents."

And wouldn't that be just too terrible?

The change agents and their cohorts are determined to eliminate any parental participation that is seen as a deterrent to efforts to change children.

In 1976, legislation to establish parental rights to review educational materials again surfaced in the Maryland legislature. As would be expected, the education establishment was in opposition, and they had quite a bit of support. On March 3, 1976, the Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland sent a letter to the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers in which he stated:

"We applaud the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers position in opposition to SB 165 and HB 470, pertaining to public access to educational materials. . . we believe that the provisions for public hearings present a serious threat to freedom of inquiry and expression. The primary problem with regard to textbooks

is not denial of parental access but dullness, lack of variety and avoidance of controversy. We hope that we may be able to work with you in the future against other threats to academic freedom.”

Can you see the significance of all of this? What parents want for their children is of absolutely no importance. The only concern of the educators is that they have “academic freedom” to function as change agents. Obviously, they cannot do “their thing” out in the open, so they rely on the protection of the closed classroom door, the elimination of any legislation that would hamper their efforts, and upon more than a little help from their friends.

Every “good” change agent recognizes the value of the closed classroom door. Values educator Sidney Simon has declared that teachers have had “major success by closing their doors and doing things they believe in.”²⁵ Simon also recalled that when he was teaching at Temple University :

“I always bootlegged the values stuff under other titles. I was assigned to teach Social Studies in the Elementary School and I taught values clarification. I was assigned Current Trends in American Education and I taught *my* trend.”²⁶

More “behind closed doors” guidelines were published in 1977 in *Social Change*²⁷ a newsletter from the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. Here are just a few of them:

* “The more visible change is, the more threatening it becomes, and the more it will be resented.”

* "Couch the language of change in the language of the status quo."

* "Emphasize the new program's similarity to familiar programs."

* "Use the stated objectives of the status quo. They are almost broad enough to encompass innovation."

* "Unobtrusively change one unit; the innovation, if successful, will spread."

Parents should not underestimate the value educators place on being able to function autonomously after the classroom door is closed. In spite of all the educators' rhetoric about wanting parental involvement, it should be understood that the only kind of involvement educators want is on *their* terms and only when *they* want it.

Parents should not automatically assume they are welcome or that they have an absolute right to visit their child's classroom. For instance, parents are not welcome in classrooms in at least one school district (Renton) in the state of Washington. Parents there can ask to be admitted to a classroom to observe three times a month, but the request does not have to be granted. Before a parent, Mrs. Anita Smith, went to court over the matter, a teacher didn't have to admit a parent at all.

The right to visit became an issue a couple of years ago when Mrs. Smith asked to sit in on a class. Her child had been out sick and upon returning, had difficulty understanding a week-long game the class was playing. Thinking she could help her child if she watched the classroom activity, Mrs. Smith asked for and was denied permission to observe. When she asked why her request was denied, she was told her presence "would be disruptive". Mrs. Smith asked to be told why it was assumed

her presence would be disruptive, but the teacher would not explain. She wrote letters to the principal, superintendent and the school board, asking the same question. Her letters went unanswered.

Was Mrs. Smith a chronic complainer, a "troublemaker? Hardly. She had visited a classroom only once in three years. She had served as president of the PTA and had been given an award by the PTSA for service to youth and the community. She is one of those people who likes to work within the system and observe rules and procedures.

But regardless of her record of cooperation and service, she nevertheless found it necessary to go to court. She lost her case - - the court ruled it was a matter to be decided by the legislature.

Legislation was subsequently introduced that would have established the right of all parents to visit their child's classroom, but predictably, the Washington Education Association lobbied against the bill and it died in committee.

In the meantime, the local education association took the school board before the Public Employees Commission for an assortment of unfair practices charges. One of those charges was that in response to the court suit, the board of education had established "three times a month" (but with strings attached) visitation privileges. The education association protested the policy on visits was established without negotiation!

The education association took the position that visits negatively affected working conditions. Mrs. Smith countered that they weren't dealing with the manufacture of cars or washing machines, but with children, who do not belong to the state. Backed up to the wall, the educators flatly stated parents did not have a right to visit classrooms. It was a privilege that could be withheld or granted.

At the time this is written that's where the matter stands. After the expenditure of several thousand dollars and a lot of aggravation, parents still do not have the unqualified right to visit classrooms.

If educators were teaching children what parents want taught and which taxpayers pay for, there would be no reason to object to parental visits. Clearly, in light of all the evidence that exists, it is understandable why the change agents want to keep their activities hidden behind closed doors and the classroom off limits to those who might be "disruptive".

CHANGE AGENTS:

THE WASHINGTON CONNECTION

Much is made of education being controlled by local school boards that reflect the wishes of the local community. Local control may have existed at one time, but today it is a fantasy. Just about all of local education is controlled by the federal government through money funneled to government agencies such as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). In turn, the NSF, NEH and other government agencies contract with change agent curriculum developers who produce curricula that win the approval of federal bureaucrats who control the purse strings. For instance, it was through a NSF contract with the Education Development Center that we now have the infamous *Man: A Course of Study* (MACOS) curriculum. A grant from NEH assisted development of the values-changing curriculum *Ethical Quest in a Democratic Society* currently being piloted in Washington state schools and slated for use nationwide. Another NEH-funded curriculum, developed by the Center For Global Perspectives is called *Global Perspectives: A Humanistic*

Influence On The Curriculum. It is being piloted in several areas around the country preparatory to being used in schools nationwide. This program and others very much like it satisfy the *Humanist Manifesto* call for “. . . each person to become, in ideal as well as in practice, a citizen of a world community.”

Federally funded change agent programs and curricula were ushered in soon after passage of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965. By 1969 the federal government had published *Pacesetters in Innovation*^{27a}, a nearly two-inch thick volume of all innovative projects in operation in schools as of February, 1969. Here are a few examples of projects listed in *Pacesetters in Innovation* that deal with changing teachers and children:

Project ES 001 996: Describes how “experienced teachers from the model school will serve as change agents” through staff rotation.

Project ES 001 783: Describes teachers as “in-house change agents” who participate in “a 5-day resident laboratory in human relations/sensitivity training. . . ”

Project ES 002 010: Describes how workshops will be established to train selected teachers as change agents.

Project ES 002 230: Explains how emphasis will be placed on creating behavioral change in students through a combination of guidance counseling and occupational training.

It is interesting that resistance to change was anticipated, and that it would not be tolerated:

Project ES 002 230: "Forces which block the adoption of new ideas will be identified and ways to overcome these forces will be explored."

Other evidence of the schools functioning as change agents with the help of the federal government can be found in information offered by the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). This federally funded operation of the U.S. Office of Education provides materials to help educators function as change agents. For instance, it sells such documents as ED 056 345: *Humanism: The Counselor's Role as a Change Agent*; ED 058 664: *Change Agent Teams Changing Schools: Case Studies*; ED 054 513: *Emotional Arousal and Attitude Change During Simulation Games*.

In a document titled *Report To The President's Commission on School Finance*²⁸, the concern was expressed that the majority of our youth hold the same values as their parents and that this pattern must be altered. The report also stated that the use of "conventional wisdom as a basis for decision-making is a major impediment to educational improvement."²⁹ For educational improvement, the report recommended ". . . that the change agent is the decision-maker about the innovation. That is, it is assumed that he decides what the adopter will change to." But there is concern expressed about willingness of people to change: ". . . people cannot be forced to change until they are psychologically ready."³⁰

To help make people psychologically ready for the change, U.S. government grants have been given to universities for the training of change agents. In August, 1973, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) awarded \$5,900,000 to 21 institutions to train 500 educational personnel to become leaders of educational change.³¹

It should be clearly understood that such "leaders of educational change" do not engage in value-free activity. Gerald Zaltman and Robert Duncan in *Strategies for Planned Change*^{31a} challenged the "value-free" position as a myth. They said:

"The issue becomes what values and therefore whose values are to be served by change. There is a natural tendency for the change agent to promulgate his values, and in such circumstances we must ask whether these values are representative of those possessed by the target system."

Zaltman and Duncan then asked the question parents ought to ask of every change agent educator:

"Is the change agent really concerned about the welfare of the target system, or does the change activity satisfy his or her needs for power and control? If the latter motives are operating, this might cause the change agent to be more manipulative in dealing with the target system."

If you look at the scope of the change process in the schools, it is evident that the change agent is not "really concerned about the welfare of the target system". The "target system" is *the children*. Children are to be changed for a particular purpose with a particular goal in mind. When the federal government spends millions of dollars to train "leaders of educational change" it is obvious the purpose is not to perpetuate the status quo. The purpose is to satisfy the desire of the government to amass power and control in order to facilitate the Humanist new world order. And how could any of it be done without the government school curriculum?

Indeed, the curriculum - - be it math or home economics, vocational training or guidance counseling - - must be a tool for change. Therefore, curricula cannot be designed or developed by those who think in the "traditional mode" or who use "conventional wisdom". Funding goes only to those curriculum developers who do not block the adoption of new ideas, but in fact, facilitate change.

" . . . A curriculum . . . whether it is a textbook, a complete set of materials and activities, or a whole school program - - must have some ends in view. It must be constructed in relation to some purposes. Ideally, these should be formulated in terms of the change in students the curriculum is intended to bring about."³²

Why aren't more parents aware of the "change in students the curriculum is intended to bring about"? Because they are not aware of the mechanics and facets of the change process - - the use of misleading "educationese"; the federally funded curricula; the federally funded programs that transform teachers into zealous missionary change agents. Most of all, parents are not aware of the "change in students the curriculum is intended to bring about" because they really don't want to know what is happening behind those impenetrable closed classroom doors. If they "invaded" the alien territory of the classroom where they are not wanted, they might be forced by conscience to act upon what they see and hear. Sadly, many parents would rather not fight, not even for the welfare of their own children.

Increasingly, the degree and scope of change agent activity that goes on behind closed classroom doors will be decided in Washington, D.C., by a carefully chosen panel of 22 elite change agents. We'll look at that next.

CHANGE AGENTS:
THE WASHINGTON CONNECTION
THROUGH THE
NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK

Even though passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 enabled the federal government to promote federally developed curricula and thus, in effect create a federalized school system, federal control of school programs did not begin in earnest until the creation of a National Diffusion Network (NDN).

"In the early 1970s . . . state and federal officials, working with programs funded under Title III, ESEA, jointly agreed that approximately \$9 million available from fiscal year 1974 discretionary funds should be used to promote the dissemination of exemplary programs across state lines.

"Thus, the idea of NDN was born. . ." 32a

It has not been made clear who those state and federal officials were who agreed to use federal funds to promote "exemplary" programs across state lines; nor has the criteria for selection of such "exemplary" programs been made public.

What has been revealed is that 22 members of a Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the NDN - - 11 each from the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education ". . . are chosen by agency heads for their ability to analyze the effectiveness of educational programs." 32b

The 22 change agents then select and fund programs whose effectiveness "must be proved to the satisfaction of Panel members."

To assure the dissemination and implementation of "exemplary" programs (which include a wide range of purposes from improved reading to behavior modification) in non-public as well as government schools, State Facilitators - - at least one in most states, with eight states having more than one, are employed. State Facilitators aggressively promote programs across state lines, help schools determine needs and stay with the programs to assure successful adoption.

"Currently, 199 programs have passed the Panel. Of that number, 109 were funded for the 1977-78 school year . . . " ^{32c} At the time this is written, such programs are in 36 states.

Do you understand the significance of this National Diffusion Network? It means that an elite corps of 22 change agents in Washington decide what federal programs will be promoted and disseminated throughout schools - - government and non-government alike. The 22 change agents, who are chosen ". . . for their ability to analyze the effectiveness of educational programs" ^{32d} have the power to select and fund, without benefit of public participation or parental involvement, without any accountability - - what programs will go into schools.

An example of "exemplary" programs hustled through the NDN is the "Meeting Modern Problems" curriculum which includes at the high school level, "The New Model Me" program. According to a Summary of Project Activities made available by the Lakewood (Ohio) Board of Education, (where the New Model Me has produced widespread parental objection), the Meeting Modern Problems curriculum has resulted in 3,090 educators trained in workshops, with 31 states having educators trained in curriculum philosophy and content. Additionally, at this writing, 26 states have adoption commitments with many additional pilot implementations. Also, an estimated 215,000 high school students have been exposed

to the curriculum with 95,000 copies of "The New Model Me" and 244,000 copies of all levels of the curriculum purchased.

Why has "The New Model Me" caused such an uproar? The supposed purpose of the program is to correct various behavior problems. Parents who have investigated it have condemned it as psychotherapy, claiming students are required to waste valuable time with role playing, psychodrama, encounter sessions and simulation games, while teachers function as unqualified psychotherapists.

"The New Model Me" is indeed psychotherapy and a whole lot more. It uses values clarification, produces parent-child alienation and promotes the worst kind of political indoctrination.

Certainly not all programs disseminated by the NDN can be soundly condemned. Those that deal with basic skills may well be truly "exemplary". But the point is this: These programs are selected and awarded funding by an elite minority - - 22 change agents who apparently are not accountable to anyone. The current 199 selected programs represent just the beginning of a totally nationalized school system. The mischief that goes on behind closed doors at this time is bad, but the worst is yet to come.

A selling point of the NDN is that programs are merely offered to schools - - they are not forced upon school districts. What this claim conveniently ignores is the purpose of the State Facilitator who is trained to "sell" NDN programs. Since NDN programs are intended to be used as widely as possible, to think that every effort would not be made to get schools to use them is unrealistic.

Now is the time for parents to demand access to classrooms and to investigate programs and activities used in classrooms to change children, such as role playing, which is examined next.

TECHNIQUES OF CHANGE:

ROLE PLAYING

Many parents, perhaps most, send their children to school imbued with certain values and beliefs. These are often rooted in religious teaching that requires children to behave in a particular way, and often with a great deal of restraint. For instance, parents teach their children it is always wrong, or that it is a sin, to lie, cheat or steal and because it is *always* wrong, they must *never* commit these offenses, for any reason. But Humanist belief teaches that certain circumstances permit lying, cheating or stealing, and government schools (and often, church and private schools) just happen to teach, or permit children to believe the same. Why do schools reinforce Humanist beliefs? Because the new world order is being built on a foundation of atheistic Humanism and the schools are the means to bring about the change.

So you can see the magnitude of the problem faced by the change agent educators: How to eradicate those values, beliefs and behaviors instilled at home or church that conflict with Humanist belief and how to do so with as little parental resistance as possible.

There are many effective tools or techniques educators use to change children. One very effective technique is role playing.

Many parents think role playing is a harmless pastime used to fill a void in the daily routine. Nothing could be more inaccurate. By whatever name it is called - - role playing, or psychodrama or sociodrama - - it is a psychotherapeutic technique, and as such, has no proper place in the classroom.

Role playing originated with Dr. J. L. Moreno who found that when children acted out their problems in a

psychodrama, the activity produced therapeutic results. As a result of Moreno's work, psychodrama has been used for resolving problems in mental hospitals, correctional institutions and in private psychological practice.

The "mental health" aspect of role playing was clearly exposed in a book titled *Roleplaying in Psychotherapy* by Raymond J. Corsini³³ in which "group psychotherapy" is defined as:

"A treatment method in which a number of patients meet with a therapist for the purpose of achieving desired personality changes. The roleplaying technique may be used in group as well as in individual therapy."

In the Foreward to *Roleplaying in Psychotherapy* Dr. Rudolph Dreikurs stated the following:

"Roleplaying is the most naturalistic of all the forms of psychotherapy. In the safety and privacy of an office, psychiatrists and psychologists can guide patients in more competent ways of living, helping patients to see in action how they behave."

On p. xi author Corsini further defines role playing:

"When used in psychotherapy, roleplaying . . . is a procedure for . . . diagnosing and understanding a person by watching him act out in a spontaneous manner a near-veridical situation . . . a person roleplaying himself is known as psychodrama - - a word which is often used as the generic term for therapeutic roleplaying."

And on pp. 10-11:

“Roleplaying is a natural method of learning and unlearning various reactions to complex life problems. . . It seems to have some logical inherent advantages over other methods of psychotherapy since it simultaneously attacks modes of thinking, feeling, and behavior - - the entire province of psychotherapy.”

If you re-read the excerpts just cited, it is crystal clear that role playing, regardless of where it is conducted is *psychotherapy* and therefore has no place in government schools where attendance is compulsory. Furthermore, for such a complex psychotherapeutic technique to be used in a classroom by a teacher untrained, unqualified and unlicensed to practice psychotherapy is outrageous, yet it goes on daily in schools across America, without as much as a weak complaint from parents in most cases.

To understand the classroom uses of role playing, parents must read *Value Exploration Through Role Playing* by Robert C. Hawley³⁴. In reading this book, the following will become clear:

1. Role playing is a tool to promote the principles of the religion of Humanism. Ample evidence is provided that role playing is an excellent means to promote the use of Humanist situation ethics and maximum individual autonomy. In short, it will be seen that role playing is in fact, a tool for change.

2. Role playing facilitates change in the attitudes, values and behaviors of children by getting them to talk about and act out their feelings. The author explained it this way:

“Once we have helped students to explore their values and determined what things are important to them, then the final concern is to help the students plan for change.”³⁵

3. Role playing is a device to encourage peer group dependence and loyalty over and above dependence upon and loyalty to the child's own family. This is in evidence over and over again.

4. Role playing can place children at psychological risk by leading them to expose more of their inner selves to the group than they might have intended at the start of a role playing session. It can be such a dangerous technique that the author admitted some teachers won't use role playing because:

"A . . . reason that some teachers may decline to use role playing is that they fear the possibilities of unleashing emotional forces which they feel inadequate to deal with."³⁶

If a teacher decides to use role playing in spite of his warning, the author tells the teacher what to do if a child reveals more than intended:

"The teacher should be sure to give the student every opportunity to talk about his or her feelings in the post-role play discussion; the teacher should also be on hand, if possible, after the class for advice and consultation."

and:

"When the teacher views his or her role as a facilitator, a coordinator, and a provider of learning experiences, then the question of "what to do when things go wrong" becomes one for the whole class to share in; it is no longer a burden for the teacher alone."³⁷

Isn't that incredible advice? The teacher initiates

the role playing session, facilitates it, and then when things get out of hand, the responsibility is dumped on the entire class. Apparently, the teacher's individual responsibility is limited by the depth of his or her conscience. Imagine suggesting that a teacher merely "be on hand" after class only "if possible" to mop up a messy psychological situation! It's really beyond belief. The child, a captive in the classroom is expected to participate and then must accept the burden of any psychological harm brought about by an inept teacher using a sophisticated psychotherapeutic technique!

5. Role playing enables children to "try out" new behavior. Many films are shown in schools, particularly at the junior high level (when children are thought to be most susceptible to deliberate change) which depict children in hostile role playing episodes with their parents. More often than not, such films show parents as unreasonable, demanding, old-fashioned, unfair or uncaring monsters. Many films portray ugly parent-child confrontations, complete with the grossest kind of dialogue, in situations with which the young child can often identify. After seeing such films, children role play their own upsetting family relationships, which can result in intensified hostile feelings toward their own parents over real or imagined injustices. Such films, alone or with role playing can result in very damaging family relationships that often go from bad to worse as children grow older and are manipulated into seeking the Humanist goal of maximum individual autonomy - - "doing your own thing".

The "trying out" of new behavior often results in parents scratching their heads in dismay and asking, "Where did they ever learn to do that?" or "Why do they act that way toward us - - what did we do to deserve it?"

The fact is that role playing is an anti-family troublemaker and the author inadvertently made this clear:

“Role playing is an excellent tool to highlight the hidden influences . . . or . . . the hidden commandments of the family . . . ”³⁸

Change the word “highlight” to “destroy” and you have a more accurate description!

The devastating breakdown in respect for legitimate authority as a result of “trying out” new behavior was unintentionally revealed in *Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*³⁹:

“Along with this concrete realization that authorities are not all wise and all powerful, a new perspective of society as a whole comes with the developing ability to put oneself in the place of another. When one puts oneself in another’s place, one gains . . . a view of the other as being fundamentally equal to oneself . . . as an individual equal to others. If authorities make mistakes, then they are like him. . . If we are all alike, why should one person have more rights than another?”

If we are all alike, why should one person have more rights than another? Isn’t this kind of thinking the stuff of which parent-child hostility is made? Or hostility toward any legitimate authority? By acting out parents, police or even God, children become their equals and therefore, can’t be expected to respond to any “unequal” demands or restrictions!

In *Value Exploration Through Roleplaying*³⁴ the author anticipated that children may have been warned by parents not to participate in role playing sessions, and he fortified teachers with a list of put-downs that can be used to embarrass a child who may protest that “This is stupid. Why don’t we get back to doing our regular work?”

The teacher can reply:

"I was only using role playing to liven up the class. I certainly hope that most of you appreciate that."⁴⁰

While the author concedes it's not a satisfactory reply, he admits to "probably" having used a variation of it at one time or another. Clearly, role playing is not a simple harmless game to "liven up the class". It is an effective, psychotherapeutic technique used to bring about change in attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors, and any other explanation is downright dishonest.

But what else would we expect?

TECHNIQUES OF CHANGE:

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Sensitivity training is also known by a lot of other names including "group dynamics," "encounter," "human potential training," "T groups," etc. Regardless of the name, sensitivity training is training in "human relations". The intent is to bring about specific, "positive" change in attitudes and behavior. However, as experience has shown, sensitivity training often has adverse results ranging from hostility and alienation to severe psychiatric problems.

Perhaps the best way to explain sensitivity training is to give an example of how it is applied in the classroom.

For instance, sixth graders at one Maryland school were taught how it "feels" to be rejected and ignored because of their physical characteristics.

A teacher placed all blue-eyed blonde children in the back of the classroom for a week. She instructed the rest of the class not to communicate or associate

with them. The purpose of the isolation technique was to render the blue-eyed blondes so sensitive to, or emotionally disturbed by their classmates' rejection that they in turn would be reluctant to inflict such emotional trauma on others. The strategy would not be effective, it was argued, unless the isolated blue-eyed blonde children "felt" some degree of discomfort or stress from sitting alone and rejected in the back of the classroom.

Isolation is used to develop a "correct" attitude toward the physically handicapped and minorities. The above incident is an example of the emotional awareness training and mental healing teachers are experimenting with to develop in children programmed attitudes toward social problems.

Using an emotional involvement exercise is quite different from conducting a classroom discussion about how it would feel to be handicapped or an ethnic minority. In such a discussion, the teacher could adequately make the class more sensitive to the needs of others without subjecting students to simulation games. To put a child in the stress situation of isolation in the back of the room places him at risk. No one knows how much stress a sixth grader might experience under such a condition.

Similar emotional awareness courses are conducted for teachers at the National Training Laboratories (NTL), a network of training centers specializing in behavioral science and group therapy. In the NTL Program Calendar for 1977, teachers were cautioned as follows:

"No person concerned about entering a stress situation should participate in NTL programs . . . There is no effective means of predicting . . . reactions or screening out or otherwise identifying those predisposed to such reactions. . . It is important . . . that participants take responsibility for 'self-screening'. . . "40 a

Though the NTL claims a small percentage of stress reactions, it admits that there is clearly a risk of psychological damage, even for consenting adults.

It follows that classroom children would be at much greater risk than teachers and other consenting adults in such programs. It is clear, therefore, that parental consent should be required before children participate in these exercises. The government schools should not be permitted to experiment with children who are held captive in an institution whose attendance is compulsory.

The adverse effects of sensitivity training in the classroom were plainly articulated by educator Clifford H. Edwards⁴¹ in the December, 1970 *Educational Leadership*. He explained how individual values can be exchanged for group values; the effect of peer pressure and of particular interest to parents, how family alienation can result from sensitivity training.

During these sessions, an individual with a "problem" is often attacked by the group in an effort to get the problem more completely out into the open so it can be more adequately "understood". In the process, the individual's defenses are stripped away, resulting in trauma, possibly even severe trauma. Edwards bluntly stated that those ". . . advocating participation by youngsters in this kind of experience are openly courting trouble." He went on to explain that teenagers do not have fully developed value systems, nor do they have carefully defined reasons to support their beliefs and behaviors. This leaves the young person defenseless to the attack of the group that is supposedly "helping" to solve his "problem".

Edwards continued to explain that in the early stages of value development, criticism by the group, of the home, family, religion, attitudes and beliefs "produces disillusionment and value disintegration, and encourages acceptance of group values." What follows is that ". . . the person may then suffer disassociation from

parents and others as a consequence of his altered beliefs.”

With this explanation it can be better understood why children often completely turn their backs on everything their parents believe in, resulting in shattered family relationships.

Just one more word about sensitivity training. In another article in the same issue of *Educational Leadership*, Stephen M. and Eleanor K. Corey⁴² answered commonly asked questions about sensitivity training. One question, “Do people who advocate sensitivity education have common values or a common life-style?” The revealing answer included this:

“. . . A majority, though, seem to be much concerned with getting as much pleasure as is possible from the “here and now”. . . ”

The goal of living for the “here and now” - - does it sound familiar? It should. It’s an article of faith of Humanist belief expressed in the *Humanist Manifesto*. Which brings us to the reason for all the change efforts we have discussed in the foregoing pages: change to implement the *Humanist Manifesto*.

The following quote opened this chapter on change:

“The basic goal of education is change - - human change in desirable directions. . . This issue . . . focuses attention upon the school as a change-agent - - and the specific focus is on changing people.”¹

If it sounded incredible at the beginning, it should be chillingly clear at this point that the words mean what they say. But more evidence is yet to come.

ANOTHER ROAD TO CHANGE:

ACCOUNTABILITY

With high school graduates unable to adequately read, write or do simple arithmetic, the idea of holding educators accountable for what they teach or do not teach has great appeal, and thus, the word "accountability" has become very popular.

Many educators say they approve of "accountability" and it has been mandated by many state legislatures. Taxpayers who are tired of seeing tax dollars wasted on experimentation and other non-education nonsense welcome "accountability" as a cure-all. Parents who are anxious to have their children get an honest-to-goodness education see "accountability" as the answer to their prayers.

But alas, "accountability" is not all that it appears to be.

Most people think that accountability, as the word is applied to education, means teachers will have to answer for what Susie or Johnny learns or doesn't learn about reading, writing and arithmetic. But there is much more.

The real meaning and intent of accountability was unintentionally exposed in a booklet titled *Accountability: Can It Be Done?*⁴³, the published text of talks given by educators at a conference sponsored by a division of the New York State Education Department in 1975.

The foreword to this publication, given by the conference chairman, Dr. Bruce Bothwell, "told it how it is". Other participants said some interesting things, but for openers, Dr. Bothwell made the educators' view of accountability very clear.

He began by assuring everybody that as school leaders “. . . we reject the notion that schools should be accountable . . . ” only in the areas of reading and math. He felt students should also be tested in such areas as “attitude development,” “human relations,” and “self-concept”.^{43a} He cautioned:

“There is a genuine danger that if we allow accountability and testing to be restricted to knowledge items . . . both educators and citizens . . . will conclude that these are the only important learning areas.”^{43a}

Dr. Bothwell grudgingly conceded that knowledge is important. However, as he saw it, “. . . the most urgent problems of our civilization are not those of ability to read or compute at some advanced level.” More important, he felt, was learning “. . . to resolve conflicts; set priorities; overcome prejudices; make wise decisions about consuming and allocating increasingly scarce resources and protecting the health of fellow humans in an increasingly hostile environment.”

Another participant at the conference, Dr. Raymond Bernabei from the Bucks County, Pennsylvania school system, gave his definition of accountability:

“. . . accountability is a logical and systematic means for collecting data about children K-12 or any portion thereof . . . ”^{43b}

He said that information would be used to determine whether to retain a particular program, modify, replace or eliminate it. Please notice that in his definition, there is no mention of holding anyone accountable for what a child learns about basic skills, history, science or whatever. What Dr. Bernabei appeared to be talking about was

PPBS - the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System as a tool to collect data about children and to use that data to turn out a particular type of child - - a controllable robot.

Having given his definition of accountability, Dr. Bernabei went on to deny educators understand the meaning of the word. He said:

“There is public clamor for accountability, yet the public doesn’t know what accountability means and neither do we, the educators.”

While rank and file teachers may not truly understand what is meant by “accountability”, educators like Dr. Bernabei know, and they apparently have no scruples about projecting the idea that accountability means something it isn’t.

Another participant in the conference, Dr. R. Gary Bridge, a resident consultant at the Rand Corporation was very concerned about measuring beliefs, feelings and values, which is known as the “affective domain” of the child. He saw parents as a roadblock to proper affective education because of the early training they instill in their children. He made this incredible remark:

“When the kids come to us at age four, five, or six, they already have these beliefs set. We have to unwind them and start over, and even then, we get them only a few hours a day.”^{43c}

Thus, we see “accountability” as a tool to “unwind” children from parental influence, so they can be changed into the robots designed by the change agents.

You can always tell when educators know they are up to “no good”. They become very defensive, as did another participant, Dr. Robert Kelly. He warned:

“You ought to be forewarned that the idea of measuring children’s affect causes considerable reaction on the part of parents. “Affect” means “feeling” and “feeling” means “sensitivity training” to many people . . . If you think sex education can upset a community, you should see what measurement of the affective domain does . . . Do everything you can ahead of time to avoid any possibility that your efforts will be equated with sensitivity training.”^{43d}

Dr. Kelly did, however, make an important point which concurs with parental concern about teachers acting as psychotherapists:

“When you begin to make affective measurements, a small percentage of the teacher population suddenly become psychiatrists. They want to analyze, and to get involved in therapy with children . . . it can blow the whole community wide open. So be careful.”

Indeed, it is wise for would-be change agents to be careful. The next time you hear educators talk about “accountability”, ask yourself - - accountability for what and to whom and for what purpose? Don’t let the ivory-tower change agents, operating under the guise of providing accountability, fool you into thinking they are doing something wonderful for your children when in fact they are not. Remember, the primary purpose of government education is not to educate - - it is to change children so they will fit into the world of 1984 and beyond. “Accountability” is one more tool for change.

MORE CHANGE:
THROUGH "EARLY EVALUATIONS" AND
SNOOPING QUESTIONNAIRES

A first cousin to accountability is "evaluation". Every time your child is given a questionnaire to answer, even if it appears perfectly harmless, you should be asking, "For what purpose?"

Educators admit the purpose of education is to change children. In the section just presented on accountability, you saw that "When kids come to us at age four, five, or six, they already have these beliefs set. We have to unwind them and start over . . ." ^{43c}

But before educators can "start over", they must know what your children's beliefs are. It has to be determined where your children are "right now" in their emotional, spiritual and social development so they can be changed to where the educators want them to be. It's as simple as that. Therefore, "getting at" the child as early as possible must start as soon as possible. How is that done? One way is through "early evaluation".

For instance, in Maryland, a law enacted in 1973 required every child entering any primary grade in public school for the first time to be evaluated for learning disabilities. The law is short and to the point and sounds harmless enough. To most parents it probably would seem desirable. After all, if little Johnny has problems that will interfere with his ability to read and write, it would be well to know about it as soon as possible so he can be helped.

But there is more to uncovering Johnny's "learning disabilities" than meets the eye. And of course, it is

necessary to understand the meaning of "learning disabilities".

A letter was sent to parents of children about to enter local schools for the first time. On the surface, there was little in it to cause concern. As a matter of fact, it sounded assuring. However, you would have to understand "educationese" to understand what the letter really said.

For instance, it stated that "children will be evaluated to determine if they have any problems which may interfere with their learning." Since the primary purpose of "education" is to change children, and since "learning" has a non-academic definition, it would be logical to ask, "What kinds of problems are they looking for in relation to learning what?" and "Does the use of the word "learning" refer to learning traditional academic skills and information or does it mean "learning" human relations skills?"

Also according to the letter, "The emphasis of the program is to identify the children's strengths . . . to establish a pattern of successes early in their school life." That sounds good too, but what does it really mean? What does establishing a "pattern of successes" have to do with the child's ability to achieve academically? There is a difference between achieving "success in school life" and "academic achievement", and while most parents want their children to be successful in school life, they also want them to achieve academically - - to become educated individuals.

There was nothing in the letter or in the accompanying brochure that told or even indicated that the purpose of the identification program was to help the child achieve academically! The result of the child's evaluation would just enable the school to design an "appropriate educational program . . . to meet individual needs" and to make each child a "happy and successful learner."

Perhaps you've noticed children aren't "students" any more - - they are called "learners". The reason is that students study while learners are little robots who have programs plugged into them. They become "successful" through individualized programs and behavior modification techniques that assure the development of a uniform, controllable, predictable, manipulatable, socially useful product.

If there is any doubt about the non-academic orientation of such a program, a look at some of the questions asked of parents should tell the story: "What age did your child walk?" "Were you concerned?" "When did your child say his first word?" "Were you concerned?" "When did your child put his first two words together?" "Were you concerned?" Whatever the answers to such questions may tell, if anything, about the academic ability of the child, they certainly would tell a lot about the emotional stability of the parents.

Questions, questions, questions. This is where it begins and continues throughout the entire school experience. Find out "where they are" so they can be manipulated to "where they ought to be". Questionnaires are administered to determine which children are developing the desired attitudes about race, sex, authority, religion, women's rights, drugs, death, values, etc. etc. When it is found the proper attitudes are not "taking", children are re-cycled - - subjected to behavior modification and mind manipulation - - tested and re-tested for as long as it takes to effect the desired changes.

Knowledgeable parents often caution their children not to answer open-ended questions because they know such questions generally produce revealing answers. Therefore, when children are asked personal, open-ended questions, they often deliberately give misleading answers. The change agents are aware of this, and to get around the

problem, questions are worded accordingly. For instance, instead of asking first-person questions such as, "If I stole a piece of candy I would . . ." and "If I broke a window I would . . .", such questions would be changed to read, "If Mary stole a piece of candy she would . . ." and "If Tim broke a window he would . . ."

The child who may give a misleading answer to an "I" question will often give a "correct" answer when it's a "Tom" or "Mary" question. Using third-person questions to assure a true response is an accepted and recommended technique:

"In responding to the direct instrument, the subject is fully aware of the self-revelatory and possibly evaluative nature of his responses. Because of this his response represents 'the level of behavior at which the individual permits society to look at him' . . . The projective questionnaire, in contrast, is devoid of personal references, and thus affords a truer measure of respondents' beliefs."⁴⁴

Sneaky rascals, aren't they? Do you really think your immature children are a match for them? And by the way, an "instrument" is educationese for "questionnaire".

But they can be even more sneaky with their "instruments". Open ended questionnaires are considered time-consuming and often difficult to read, so to make certain they are not missing anything, they find it is often helpful to:

". . . construct a questionnaire which forces the respondent to choose among alternative replies. This in turn expedites and adds objectivity to the processing of responses."⁴⁵

And because of the tricky wording of these "forced choice" questionnaires, it's often difficult, if not impossible, for children to hide their attitudes, values and beliefs from the change agents.

Increasingly, on-going evaluation through the grades is taking the place of academic testing. Educators do not like to *test*. They like to *evaluate*, and somehow they are able to convince parents that evaluation is the same as testing.

For example, a child may be evaluated in social studies. What does it mean? In *Social Studies for the Seventies*⁴⁶ we are given a good idea:

"We want to observe gains in behavior. We want to see improvement in attitudes. . . Our job is to bring about changes and we should be concerned with evidence that we have accomplished this task."

On the following page under a section headed "What Should Be Evaluated?" we learn ". . . the main aspects of social studies teaching and learning which need to be considered" include:

"Behavior of pupils . . ."
"Attitudes, values, beliefs, goals."
"Personality."

Educators know they have no business evaluating a child's attitudes, values, behavior and personality. They know and recognize that what they are doing is a serious invasion of privacy:

". . . affective objectives . . . unlike achievement competencies, are considered to be a private rather than a public matter. A person's

attitudes on social issues, his religious beliefs or lack of them, his political preferences are private concerns, this privacy guaranteed by our Constitution."⁴⁷

Quite an admission of guilt. They know what they are doing is wrong, nevertheless, the snooping will continue as long as schools are to serve as agents of social, political and cultural change.

PRYING QUESTIONNAIRES TO UNCOVER

EMOTIONAL ABUSE AND NEGLECT

On January 31, 1974, Public Law 93-247, the federal "Child Abuse and Prevention Act" became effective. This legislation defined "child abuse and neglect" as "physical or mental injury, sexual abuse, negligent treatment, or maltreatment of a child under the age of eighteen . . ." The law also established a National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect whose purpose included the publication of training materials for personnel who are engaged in ". . . the prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect."

Soon thereafter a rash of similar legislation began appearing in state legislatures in order to bring state laws into compliance with the federal law, and to assure the federal funding provided by the federal law. Additionally, in order for states to obtain the funding provided under P.L. 93-247, the abuse or neglect need only be "suspected". Furthermore, the federal law stipulates that state legislation must provide "immunity for persons reporting instances of child abuse and neglect from prosecution. . ."

Almost as if by magic, there soon followed a plethora of "child maltreatment" curricula in schools around the country.

For instance, in 1976, the Montgomery County, Maryland school system came up with a federally funded 279-page child abuse/neglect curriculum titled "Understanding Child Maltreatment"^{47a}. What would it cover? On page viii we read:

"The curriculum guide has been designed for maximum flexibility in use. Within the Montgomery County school system, the curriculum guide may be utilized in the following ways:

1. As a complete nine week mini-course on child maltreatment at the junior-senior high school level, where students have that option
2. As a set of instructional units on child maltreatment to be used individually as appropriate within specific courses . . .
3. As the structural basis for teachers in the development of instructional units on child maltreatment to be integrated with many subject areas, K-12
4. As the instrument for inservice training of teachers, administrators and other staff in the understanding of child maltreatment. . .
5. As a course for the public in the on-going program of the Department of Adult Education . . .

In the prevention of child maltreatment through the educational process, Montgomery County will assume a national leadership position and become a model for other school systems to follow in the optimal utilization of this curriculum guide."

Most people can recognize physical abuse, but neglect is more difficult to pin down. Therefore, the Mont-

gomery County Department of Social Services^{47b} defined a neglected child as follows:

- “ 1. Malnourished; ill-clad, dirty, without proper shelter or sleeping arrangements; lacking appropriate health care.
2. Unattended; without adequate supervision.
3. Ill and lacking essential medical care.
4. Denied normal experiences that produce feelings of being loved, wanted, secure. Emotional neglect.
5. Unlawfully kept from attending school.
6. Exploited, overworked.
7. Emotionally disturbed due to continuous friction in the home, marital discord, mentally ill parents.
8. Exposed to unwholesome and demoralizing circumstances, including sexual exploitation.”

Do you permit your children to wear the “uniform” of the youth culture - - ragged, faded, dirty jeans and tops or bizarre “fashions” that might render them “ill-clad”? Are they denied “normal” feelings of being loved? Are they overworked with chores you require them to do at home? Could you be considered mentally ill for any reason? In Montgomery County, Maryland classrooms, the above conditions of “neglect” can be uncovered through a required “Interpersonal Relationships” curriculum, when children are asked questions such as:

“Under what circumstances have you felt unloved, unwanted, lonely, shy or fearful?”

“What do you expect of your father and mother?”

“What happens if you refuse to cooperate?”

“Role play an increase in conflicts with parents.”

Obviously, a carefully prepared “instrument” can identify the child who is considered, by government definition, physically or emotionally neglected or abused. As the problem of child abuse, which certainly exists, becomes more visible as a serious issue, probing questionnaires will be used more and more to uncover not only abuse but neglect of all definitions. In their own best interests, parents would be wise to investigate the extent to which questionnaires are administered in their children’s school, and to ascertain not only *why* they are used, but *how* they are interpreted.