

The Blumenfeld Education Letter



"My People Are Destroyed For Lack Of Knowledge" HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 8, No. 1 (Letter # 77)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

January 1993

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks.
"Without vision, the people perish."

Can Conservartives Thrive in the New Clinton Era?

The answer is a resounding yes — provided conservatives do what has to be done. In fact, it is possible that conservatives will do much better under Clinton than they did under Bush. Why? Because Bush's "kinder, gentler" malarky assured the liberal Democrats that the Republican president would not be confrontational, but conciliatory and compromising. In fact, he was so compromising, so accommodating to the left, that he all but forgot that he was a Republican even though not a conservative Republican.

On only one issue did Bush remain true to the conservative social agenda: abortion. He knew that if he reneged on his pro-life stand he would go down in history as an unmitigated traitor to the conservative cause. He could fudge his way out of betraying his "read my lips" pledge, but not abortion. The former involved only money, the latter millions of unborn lives.

Bush should have realized that the reason the American people gave him a 90 percent approval rating after beating Saddam Hussein was because they liked his decisive, confrontational, no-holds-barred stand against the Butcher of Baghdad. They admired the way in which he mobilized America and the world to evict the Iraqis

from Kuwait. That was a true example of bold leadership, a willingness to take risks in the interest of what he considered to be a just and moral cause.

But when it came to confronting the liberal Congress, where the American people had hoped he'd stand firm and protect their interests, he caved in. He compromised. He became "kinder and gentler." He forgot the lesson of the Gulf, and his approval rating plummeted. Yes, the economy turned sour. But had he stood firm against Congress he could have blamed their insatiable appetite for tax money for the recession. Instead, because of the tax hike he signed, it became Bush's recession and the liberal Democrats were more than happy to put the blame on him at every turn.

Even so, the American people were not fooled. They did not give Clinton more than 43 percent of the vote. Many voted for Perot because he had the courage to stand up to the Washington politicians and tell it like it is in his inimitable folksy style. They wanted someone who would fight for them, not renege on a solemn pledge. Bush, on the other hand, with his patrician calling to "public service," came across like a cold pancake.

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Sources of products and services described are not necessarily endorsed by this publication. They are intended to provide our readers with information on a rapidly expanding field of educational activity. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: Post Office Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. Phone (208) 343-3790.

Actually, Bush had set the stage for his sorry performance when he announced in his inaugural address that he was abandoning the Reagan style of defying the Democratic controlled Congress and ushering in a new era of sweetness and light in dealing with his liberal opponents. The latter carried stilettos behind their backs while Bush extended the stupid hand of friendship. He would be pragmatic, like Darman and Baker, while the liberal media would kick him in the groin. And so what the American people got was a lackluster, uninspiring compromiser unwilling to go to bat for his constituents. They got the pragmatic shaft.

The Trouble With Moderates

The trouble with moderate Republicans is that they really don't know who the enemy is. Some of these "moderates" are undoubtedly New World Order insiders who consider conservatives and fundamentalists to be their real enemy. But the country clubbers are more interested in social advancement and material advantages than ideology or moral absolutes. A photograph with the President is worth more to them than a stand on principle. Which is why the Republican Party cannot be left to the ruinous control of the moderates. To them political power is essentially a form of social climbing and personal enhancement, not the means of defending a Christian civilization or advancing the idea of individual freedom.

A disheartening picture of what a moderate Republican can do to a successful conservative legacy was given by Prof. Benjamin Zycher in *Reason* (Feb. 1993):

George Bush was one of the three or four worst presidents of this century; only a career *apparatchik* like Bush could have displayed for an entire term such exquisite policy ignorance and political ineptitude. Only an executive utterly devoid of judgment could have believed in the skills, foresight, and wisdom of an entourage comprising the likes of James

Baker, Nicholas Brady, and Richard Darman. Only a fool could have believed in the viability of "bipartisanship" among a Republican president, the congressional Democrats, and *The Washington Post*. And only an utter incompetent could have transformed the Reagan bequest — the strongest economy in the world, the collapse of state socialism, the end of the Cold War, the most powerful and broad-based political coalition in more than a generation, and a Democratic Party in disarray — into the political disaster of November 3.

The lesson of November 3 is quite clear. Conservatives must never permit another "moderate" to lead the Republican Party to another disaster like this. Conservatives must take total control of the party and make it their party whether the moderates like it or not. And then they must field candidates who know how to sell the conservative message and can rebuild the broad coalition Bush tore to pieces. Anyone who has listened to Rush Limbaugh for any length of time knows what a powerful message conservatism can be when expressed with flair, good humor and imagination.

The Trillion-Dollar Mess

In the next four years, the Democrats will be in charge of everything in Washington. Thousands of liberals will take over every post held by conservatives. The liberals will no doubt take credit for anything good that comes out of that city. But since nothing good can come out of Washington they will be responsible for the trillion-dollar budget mess they come up with.

Probably the most negative aspect of the Clinton administration will be its amoral character. The new Commander-in-Chief is a draft-dodger, a prevaricator, and an adulterer who feels quite comfortable with abortionists and homosexuals. It will be very difficult for the American people to see the White House as a beacon of moral leadership. But you can be sure that the media will use its expertise to mesmerize Americans

into a state of moral amnesia.

Where conservatives can thrive in the next four years is in the private sector, and this will be particularly true in education. They must finally, once and for all, get their children out of the amoral government school system. That doesn't mean abandoning their interest in the government schools. As taxpayers conservatives have a responsibility to see to it that the children in the public schools are harmed as little as possible. But as for their own children, they must get them out of the government system and into private, religious, or home schools.

Why? Because the struggle over America's soul is a spiritual and cultural struggle, one in which values and beliefs are at issue. The government schools are humanist schools and there is no way that traditionalists can change that. The humanist ideology is in every textbook, in every teachers college, in every state university, in every graduate school, in every major foundation that funds education, and in every state education bureaucracy. It governs every professional association connected with public education. It is virtually written into every federal law that funds education and the grants that fund educational research and testing.

By patronizing the public schools, conservatives are simply turning their children over to the enemy for an "education." More likely than not their children will emerge from the process as liberal Democrats or New Agers or secular humanists. And by not supporting conservative private education, conservatives will deprive the private sector of the only source of financial support it must count on: the conservative family. Humanist education gets its billions of dollars from the taxpayer, and as long as conservatives send their children to public schools they will have no one but themselves to blame if our Bible-based heritage goes down

the drain.

The values of a culture must be sustained by the people who believe in them, and only conservatives can sustain traditional Biblical values in education. The humanists will not do it for them. As the Bible asks, "If we are not for ourselves, who will be for us?"

Home Schooling Will Grow

There is no doubt that we are going to see a tremendous growth in the home-school movement during the next four years. With the Clinton Education Department completely controlled by humanists, liberals, and socialists promoting deconstruction throughout the system, parents will realize that if they want to protect the sanity and well-being of their children they will have to keep them away from the public educators. The latter, with their whole language, new math, invented spelling, AIDS and condom programs, will be in a position to literally destroy the minds and morals of several generations. Add death education, values clarification, Eastern religion, group learning, multiculturalism, environmentalism and ecology to the mix, and you not only have a recipe for educational disaster but a blueprint for a changed culture: a pagan culture.

Whether Americans know it or not, we are well on our way to becoming a pagan culture. In fact, some people think we are already there. What are the characteristics of a pagan culture? Idolatry, polytheism, pantheism, occultism, witchcraft, perversion, promiscuity, rampant homosexuality, temple prostitutes, drug addiction, violence, low productivity, tyranny, despotism, moral depravity, great disparities between rich and poor, abortion, infanticide, child abuse, slavery, persecution, political control by a small elite, human sacrifice.

There are two forces that stand in the

way of despotic paganism: the Bible and capitalism. Biblical religion is the strongest spiritual force that confronts paganism today, and that is why the attacks on orthodox Christianity have become so pervasive and virulent. But it is the very stridency, malevolence, and blatant unfairness of these attacks that have awakened many Christians to the growing demonic force paganism really is.

The New Technology

But strange as it may seem, the dynamism of American entrepreneurial capitalism, in this case, works as an ally in preserving Christian freedom, for the new technology works in favor of privatization and decentralization. Privatization continues to expose the inefficiencies and wastefulness of government enterprises, and the new technology has made efficiency through bigness of scale an obsolete concept. Thus, decentralization has become the new, efficient, and desired mode of organization.

It is true that the new technology can be used for good or evil, and that is why Biblical religion must prevail in America. Perhaps the best example of a positive collaboration between the new technology, the entrepreneurial spirit, and Biblical values is the Christian home-school movement. Without doubt, that movement is the most important social revolution taking place in America today. It is a profound cultural and spiritual phenomenon that goes against everything the Enlightenment stands for: atheism and secular utopianism.

Messianic utopianism based on the humanist world view is at the heart of American public education. The system is the Enlightenment institutionalized as a process of spiritual, moral and intellectual development based on critical thinking, and as such it has undermined much of what the Reformation did to spread Biblical teaching.

Peter Gay, in his introduction to an anthology, *The Enlightenment* (Simon & Schuster, 1973), writes:

What united them [the "philosophes" or philosophers of the Enlightenment] was the common experience of shedding their inherited Christian beliefs with the aid of classical philosophers and for the sake of a modern philosophy. They were by and large agreed that Christianity, in company of all other supernatural religions, was wrong, and that science, with its dependable results and its principled modesty before the eternal mysteries of mind and matter, was the way to truth and (to the extent that such was at all attainable) to happiness. And what united the philosophes above all was confidence in the critical method.

... The philosophes of all countries and all persuasions were lyrical in their single-minded praise of criticism. They likened it to the surgeon's knife that cuts away the cancer of superstitions, to the fresh breeze that blows down the screen of tradition, to the beam of light that penetrates the gloom of accepted nonsense, to the blow that levels the grim citadel of unreason. ...

The philosophes were destructive because they thought one must clear the ground before one can build; one cannot construct the city of man under fire from the enemy, on rubbish, or on a swamp. The world that religion had shaped for so long was — in the philosophes' language — prey to the wild beasts of fanaticism and enfeebled by the poisonous fruits of the tree of superstition.

The Biblical Commonwealth

Such was the reaction of the intellectuals to the Biblical world view. To them it was all mythology and superstition. Of course, early America was a product of the Reformation. It was founded by Calvinists whose aim it was to establish a Bible-based commonwealth in the new world. Its founding documents reflect the doctrines of a Calvinist world view. The result has been the freest, most prosperous, most dynamic nation in the history of mankind. While in 5,000 years Ancient Egypt built pyramidal monuments to the dead, America in less than 200 years went from the horse and wagon to a flight to the moon and, in less

than a hundred years, from Kitty Hawk to jumbo jets and SSTs.

While many inventors and scientists were not Calvinists, they thrived in a predominantly Christian culture that shunned superstition and encouraged a recognition of objective reality and dominion over raw nature. But as scientists have become more and more hostile to the Biblical world view, their science has suffered. The result is knee-jerk belief in the theory of evolution as fact, a perversion of medicine wherein the murder of the unborn is widely accepted as socially good, irrational and hysterical objections to nuclear power, half-baked environmental theories, and fraudulent studies in human sexuality.

The Calvinist Influence

This nation owes much to the Calvinist spirit that founded it. Concerning its influence, New England minister Granville Abbott wrote in 1873:

[Calvinism] was a theology that attracted to its ranks almost every man, as Froude says, that "hated a lie." It put God before man, and the word of God before tradition. . . . The effect of this theology was wonderful. It made a pious and heroic life its uniform fruit Not to admit the moral effects of Calvinism is to read modern history blindfolded. Take the influence of the theology and polity of John Calvin away from the earth today, and the hands would go back on the dial of progress. There are no factors having the promise of the future as Calvin's doctrines of sin and salvation. These are the two wheels that bear humanity on to better days.

It was the New England Primer that carried the Calvinist message into the minds of New England's children. In teaching the alphabet, its message for the letter A was: "In Adam's fall we sinned all." In other words, at the very outset of the child's formal education, the subject of sin was introduced. That set the moral tone on which the child would be able to conduct and judge his or her own behavior. Knowledge of God, love of God

and fear of God were the indispensable guiding lights of growing up. That was the kind of education that prepared the colonists for the founding of the greatest nation on earth.

What is most important in the Christian home-school movement is its return to Biblical educational principles as spelled out in Deuteronomy. Its most important impact is on family life. We are witnessing the reconstruction of the Christian family based on Biblical teachings. Public education, which drew so much of its utopianism from Enlightenment philosophers, is by its very nature profoundly anti-family. It separates children from their parents and "educates" them to reject Biblical values. This may do no additional harm to children who come from atheist families, but its impact on America as a whole can be seen in the rise of criminal behavior among the young. In addition, public education segregates youth from the larger society in such a manner as to turn them into a large, antisocial, parasitical class. The formation of gangs, which become family substitutes, is a direct result of that parasitical segregation.

The Importance of Fathers

The rejection of public education by Christian home schoolers represents a profound repudiation of the system's anti-Biblical, anti-family philosophy. The most significant development in the Christian home-school family is the re-emergence of the father as the spiritual leader of the family. The children in such families are mightily blessed. Contrast their moral and spiritual upbringing with that of a child born of an unwed teenage mother in the drug-infested inner city, living on welfare, destined to be lobotomized by the local public school and recruited into a gang. The Bible-based family will thrive economically and spiritually. The unwed welfare mother and her child will

exist in poverty and fear, dependent on government social services for survival.

Since we know that government education cannot be improved because it is so anti-God, it stands to reason that more and more parents will seek private alternatives. After all, if the new President and his wife have chosen a private school for their daughter, isn't that a message that even many liberal parents will take to heart? Yes, conservatives can and will thrive in the new Clinton era, and the new First Family is already showing the way!

Chelsea Clinton to Attend Private Quaker School

Bill and Hillary Clinton, longtime advocates of public schools, have decided to send their daughter to a private school in Washington. Chelsea Clinton, a 12-year-old eighth-grader, now attends a public magnet school in Little Rock. She will enroll at Sidwell Friends School, a coeducational college preparatory school, when her family moves to Washington, according to an announcement by the office of the president-elect.

"As parents, we believe this decision is best for our daughter at this time in her life based on our changing circumstances," the Clinton family statement said.

The Clintons have been long associated with public education reform, and colleagues say they anguished over the decision, but concluded after much discussion that their daughter, moving away from all her friends and the only home she has ever known just a month before her 13th birthday, would be better off in the private Quaker school.

Chelsea will be the first presidential child of school age to live in the White House since Amy Carter, who as a fourth grader was enrolled in the Stevens Elementary

Public School near the White House after her father took office in 1979.

The Sidwell Friends School has educated the children of other presidents. Theodore Roosevelt sent his son there and Richard Nixon, a Quaker, sent his two daughters to the school which now charges an annual tuition of more than \$10,000. The school has a reputation for academic rigor and is regarded as one of the most exclusive private schools in the capital. Among its students are the children of prominent officials, diplomats and journalists, and virtually all graduates go on to college, most to elite private colleges.

At Sidwell Friends last year there were about 13 black graduates out of a class of about 100. According to the school, 17 percent of the current student body is black, 7 percent Asian and 3 percent Latino.

Public school officials were disappointed and had openly lobbied for the chance to educate Chelsea in hopes that her presence would lead to improvements in Washington's public schools.

Keith Geiger, president of the National Education Association, expressed support for the decision. "That is the Clintons' personal and private decision for their daughter," he said. He was not asked how many top officials of the NEA send their own children to private schools.

The American Federation of Teachers offered its support for Clinton. "It took a lot of courage for Bill Clinton to do what was best for his daughter," said union spokeswoman Ellen Shearer.

Washington Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly, who sends her daughters to the private National Cathedral School in Washington, said she understood the Clintons' decision.

Vice President Gore also sends his children to private school. His daughters attend the National Cathedral School. His son goes to the St. Albans School for Boys.

The Institute for Justice, a conservative group in Washington that favors school vouchers that would allow parents to send their children to private or public schools, accused Clinton of hypocrisy.

"Bill Clinton the parent looks to the best interest of his daughter," said Clint Bolick, vice president of the institute. "But Clinton the president won't buck the special interest lobby that would deny choice to others." (*Boston Globe*, 1/6/93)

Comment:

Even the liberals make conservative choices in their private decisions. It is only in their quest for power that they mouth liberal solutions for everyone else. They know in their heart of hearts that public education doesn't work and cannot be made to work. But as long as the American people can be persuaded that the public schools can be saved, billions of tax dollars will continue to flow into the coffers of the liberal education establishment. Public education is the largest river of tax-funded cash flow in America. And it is the politicians who keep it flowing at flood tide. Unfortunately, nothing will change until a majority of the American people make it change.

U.S. Marxists Ponder the Future

More than 500 Marxist scholars and active socialists gathered last November for a three-day conference at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) to discuss the future of socialism and plan future strategy.

"It's definitely a down moment," said Bertell Ollman, standing outside one of the conference rooms handing out leaflets on his latest book, "Dialectical Investigations." "A lot of people have taken the wrong lessons from the collapse of so-called socialist systems, and that's propagated by the capitalist-owned media," said Ollman, a politics

professor at New York University. "But it's not a moment to be defeatist. Things can turn around very quickly."

Echoing a popular view expressed at the conference, Ollman suggested that the collapse of the Soviet Union provided a new opportunity for purer Marxist theories to thrive in academia and in society.

"We never endorsed that kind of Marxism. For us, it's kind of an albatross that's been removed from our political and theoretical necks," said Stephen Cullenberg, an economist at the University of California at Riverside and an editor of the five-year-old journal, *Rethinking Marxism*, sponsor of the conference which drew more than 1,000 attendees.

The seminars included such subjects as "Deconstructing Columbus" and "Archeology and Marxism." But the central question among the Marxist economists, sociologists and political theorists was whether their life-long academic pursuits have become almost totally irrelevant in the modern world.

"Some of us had hoped in the '60s that we would be living in a more socialist world right now," said Douglas Kellner, a professor at the University of Texas at Austin, one of those who argued that Marxism was far from obsolete. "But the concept of revolution still has some legitimacy," he said, suggesting that forms of oppression such as homophobia, racism and sexism needed to be upended, even within the parameters of a capitalist system.

"We don't have history to confirm our politics, but we can look back at some of the failures... and try to reconstruct our Marxist politics. That's what Marxism has always been about," Kellner said.

Clinton Inspires Hope

"One of the ideas that Bill Clinton is putting forward is economic security. That

resonates with some socialist ideas," said Cullenberg. "Capitalism is endemically crisis-prone: good times are followed by bad. But most people don't want wild and wooly capitalism. They want health care and their jobs guaranteed."

Others said that a Marxist revolutionary model was needed to reverse the environmental destruction being wrought by international corporations. "We don't have 50 years, given the depletion of the ozone layer," said Linda Thompson, a professor of women's studies at Southern Connecticut State University. She predicted that "either we're going to have a revolution in this country or we're going to have fascism."

But several scholars seemed more ready to throw in the theoretical towel. The Marxist experiment in terms of actual political and social practice "is fundamentally historically over," said Ronald Aronson, a professor at Wayne State University. "Marxism has traveled around the world and exhausted a number of possibilities," Aronson said. "These possibilities have had their historical moment, and I would argue that they are now eclipsed." He said that Marxism was a useful tool for analyzing certain trends in society, but that its manifestation as a practical political system was unlikely at best.

Several other participants urged their audiences to adapt Marxist theories to the real, and increasingly centrist, world.

"If people on the left want to sit around and remain purists, let's just hang it up right now and go off and live by ourselves," said Ellen Messer-Davidow, a panelist from the University of Minnesota. A Marxist-socialist agenda could be pressed with the new Clinton administration, she said.

Still, the atmosphere at the conference suggested that many Marxist academicians were unwilling to let go of the revolutionary ideals extolled by Karl Marx, the 19th-century German-born philosopher who envi-

sioned a world where workers controlled their own fate through a dictatorship of the proletariat.

T-shirts proclaiming that "Marxism is a class act" were for sale. Revolutionary newsletters and Marxist analyses of the Gulf War, Madison Avenue and the Clinton victory were laid out on tables in the conference hall. Theories of post-modern deconstructionism were earnestly exchanged in Italian and Spanish as well as in English. There weren't many neckties, but lots of beards. And if the recognition was unavoidable that there are more Marxists on college campuses than in American factories, few seemed to mind. (*Boston Globe*, 11/14/92)

Comment:

Socialist ideas have become such an intrinsic part of liberal thinking that many Americans assume that they are expressions of mainstream thinking. The whole drive toward socialized medicine is a case in point. Many citizens now believe that every American has an unalienable right to free health care. Did we have that right in 1776? Obviously, not. An unalienable right is not something you can suddenly acquire through legislation or by claiming it. No medical doctor will accept the notion that you have an unlimited claim on his services free of charge. What the new unalienable right means is that the taxpayers must pay everyone else's medical bills whether they want to or not.

The Marxist professors who attended the conference at Amherst are merely the tip of the socialist iceberg. Virtually none of the socialist programs enacted in America since the institution of the income tax in 1913 have been repealed. In fact, as long as the income tax, a Marxist device for funding unlimited government expansion, is in force, we shall continue as a society to move in the direction toward socialism. Only a repeal of the income tax will reverse this trend in earnest.