

The Blumenfeld Education Letter



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

Vol. 9, No. 8 (Letter # 96)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

August 1994

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."

Charter Schools: Good or Bad? (Page 3)

NEA Votes to Boycott Florida Orange Juice Because of Rush Limbaugh

NEA conventions are always so full of left-wing, politically correct idiocies that a more appropriate name for this annual con-fab might be the "NEA PC Follies." This militant labor union of about 2.2 million teachers, school bus drivers, cafeteria workers, janitors and anyone else who labors in a public school building is really the backbone of the Democratic Party. Its latest idiocy made the front page of many of the nation's newspapers. The *Boston Globe* (7/5/94) headline read: **Teachers OK juice boycott to protest Limbaugh.** The article states:

The 2.2 million-member National Education Association voted yesterday to boycott Florida orange juice if state officials renew their \$1 million, six-month contract with conservative talk show host Rush Limbaugh.

"This man denigrates teachers, he denigrates minorities, he denigrates women," Arlene Pavey of California said, urging support of the boycott at the NEA's annual convention [in New Orleans].

Jeff Wright, president of the Florida Teaching Profession-NEA, asked the nearly 10,000 teachers and school employees attending the convention to deliver a message to Limbaugh and his supporters. "We must now stand together, shoulder-to-shoulder

and say 'No more. If you choose Rush Limbaugh, we choose not to buy Florida orange juice,'" he said.

But some NEA delegates expressed concern that a boycott would give Limbaugh ammunition to attack the nation's largest teachers' union. Rich Stephenson, an NEA delegate from California, said a boycott would put the NEA "at the mercy of a mean-spirited and opportunistic hate-monger."

The \$1 million paid to Limbaugh is part of a \$17 million advertising campaign for Florida orange juice funded by a tax on growers and shippers. Limbaugh's contract expires in mid-August.

The National Organization for Women, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs are among those who have called for a boycott.

As of mid-June, the Florida Department of Citrus had received more than 26,500 phone calls, letters and faxes about the Limbaugh contract, with opposition running 4 to 1.

No doubt the Florida Department of Citrus will look at the sales figures before deciding whether or not to extend its contract with Limbaugh. But the NEA didn't do its public image any good by taking on Limbaugh who proceeded to ridicule the NEA for its asinine stupidity. *Education Week*

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) 322-4440.

of 7/13/94 reported:

The boycott proposal, adopted on a close vote, angered several delegates, who said the union was again wandering into territory where it did not belong. After an earlier vote on a resolution that appeared to have no direct connection to education, one delegate said the "N.E.A. does not stand for the National Everything Association. It still stands for the National Education Association."

Others said they feared the union was handing Mr. Limbaugh the kind of ammunition that will boost his show's ratings even higher. After the boycott proposal was passed, one union member, who threw up his hands in frustration, said of the talk-show host: "Oh, he's going to love this."

Indeed, Mr. Limbaugh headlined his July 5 radio show with news of the N.E.A. vote, citing it as fresh proof of the union's liberal political agenda. The N.E.A. remained a topic for Mr. Limbaugh and his callers throughout the week; some listeners called in to say they were teachers who took a dim view of the union's political slant.

Hillary Speaks

First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton kicked-off the NEA convention with a strong appeal for support of the Clintons' health-care plan. The NEA, of course, favors the Clinton plan. On matters of education, the First Lady had harsh words for those who oppose the President's education policies. She told the delegates:

There are forces at work in this country who do not believe in you. Those forces want to undo the work represented in Goals 2000.

After Hillary's speech, one delegate who thronged around the First Lady carried a sign reading: "Bill—1996, Hillary—2000."

Meanwhile, NEA president Keith Geiger lashed out at privatization schemes that are undermining the NEA's power. He said:

Today, merchants of greed mask their money-hungry motives with phrases like "school choice." Their privatization schemes would deepen social and economic divisions that are already far too deep.

He asserted that the union was beating the "profiteers" and "proving that Americans want community based—not corporate-imposed—education for their children." Despite "relentless attacks" against the NEA and public education, Geiger was happy to report that the union had hit the 2.2 million mark in its membership.

The 10,000 delegates also voted to continue talks on a possible merger with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) which is affiliated with the AFL-CIO and has about 850,000 members.

National Certification

In the May 1994 issue of *NEA Today*, Keith Geiger waxed enthusiastic over the new Carnegie-inspired National Board for Professional Teaching Standards which will create a national teaching certificate. He said:

Six years ago, we started talking about a national teaching certificate. . . . Beginning this fall, English and language arts teachers, as well as generalist teachers of students ages 11 to 15, can start the assessment process that will lead to Board certification probably next year. The National Board [for Professional Teaching Standards] predicts that certification for all fields will be finalized by 1998. . . .

"The [assessment] process was rigorous and demanded careful analysis and reflection about our teaching practices," says Mary Buss, an eighth-grade Language Arts/Reading teacher and NEA member at Bookcliff Middle School in Grand Junction, Colorado. "We have learned so much." . . .

The enthusiasm these early participants are exhibiting reinforces the enthusiasm I've felt about this program from the beginning. Just imagine—a national board—with a teacher majority—approving standards for teachers written by teachers! . . .

We finally have our chance to be accorded the professionalism that doctors, lawyers, and architects have enjoyed for years. . . . [W]e must make Board certification part of the Association's agenda at all levels.

Of course, doctors and lawyers don't belong to militant labor unions that strike. They belong to professional organizations. And, pray tell, what are the teachers being taught in the certification process? How to become better dispensers of educational malpractice?

As for Goals 2000, NEA lobbyist Dale Lestina considers it only one piece of what makes 1994 "the most important year for education legislation since Lyndon Johnson."

Even so, the NEA was very much disturbed by the show of strength exhibited by homeschoolers who derailed the Miller amendment on certification in H.R. 6. The April issue of *NEA Today* covered the story with the headline: **The Right Runs Amok, Kills Proposal to Enhance Teaching**. It said:

The defeat of Miller's amendment "probably killed any possibility of any meaningful legislation in the area of national certification and licensure," says NEA Government Relations Manager Michael Edward. "But it also goes beyond this single issue."

For one thing, Edward warns, the controversy will cause some members of Congress to shy away from any future bills that might incur the wrath of the right. "It makes our lobbying that much more crucial."

That same issue of *NEA Today* also deplored the "religious right's gay bashing and campaign against gay rights for teachers." NEA has also created a Center for the Preservation of Public Education to centralize and coordinate the NEA's efforts to "counter threats to public education." The Center is divided into four issue areas: vouchers, privatization, charter schools, and the radical right. Political policy analyst Andrea DiLorenzo is director of the Center.

The NEA has also launched a campaign to expand its outreach to senior citizens, many of whom have been voting against school bond issues that raise taxes. Many senior citizens live on fixed incomes and cannot afford to pay higher taxes for schools.

The NEA asks: "Are Seniors Public Education's Enemy # 1?" We thought that the radical, religious right had that distinction!

In 1993, the NEA collected \$26,768,527 in dues from its members. Its total assets were \$135,773,168.

Charter Schools: Good or Bad?

The idea behind the Charter School is to allow independent individuals and groups to create innovative alternative schools which would be financed by the government as experiments in the quest for educational improvement. A group of Christians in Michigan have applied for a charter and are causing quite a controversy. *The Wall Street Journal* of 6/14/94 reported:

The school is recruiting students at conferences of Christian home-schoolers and promising to teach creationism, morals and patriotism. Nonetheless, when the school opens in Ionia, Mich., this fall, it expects to qualify for more than \$4 million in public tax money.

Noah Webster Academy is the first school to receive approval under Michigan's new charter school law encouraging innovative state-funded schools, and it is already generating controversy.

The state's largest teachers' union calls the school a ruse. "It appears to be a way to get public tax dollars into private schools that will be teaching religion," says Beverly Wolkow, executive director of the Michigan Education Association.

State education officials and lawyers are reviewing the new school's charter and plans. So is the American Civil Liberties Union of Michigan, which warns that it will file "a major lawsuit" if the school uses public money to fund essentially religious schooling. "They can't have religious schools with government funds in the state of Michigan under our constitution," says the ACLU's Howard Simon, noting that the organization has previously defended the rights of religious home-schoolers.

The charter school's founder, Lansing attorney David Kallman, insists that Noah Webster won't be a religious school. A legal advocate for religious home-schoolers, he describes the school as a high-tech, distance learning center that will connect home-school-

ers around the state via multimedia computers, satellite video transmissions and toll-free telephone numbers. The school plans to offer a full range of courses, give standardized tests, organize field trips, supply free computers and textbook subsidies and provide family counseling for children from kindergarten through high school, its organizers say. . . .

So far, Mr. Kallman says, more than 750 students have enrolled in Noah Webster. "It's going nuts," says Mr. Kallman, who has been distributing applications at Christian home-school meetings. He notes that 20 Jewish and 10 Islamic children have also signed up.

Under Michigan's charter law, the school will qualify for \$5,500 a student in state aid, or more than \$4.1 million, provided the funding request is approved by the state department of education.

Robert E. Schiller, Michigan's school superintendent, says he has reviewed the school's charter and that "on the surface it appears to be consistent with the intention of the law." But he calls the school's organizers "careful and crafty," and says, "I think what they've been able to do is creatively taking the legislation to the furthest extent of its limit."

A "Different Twist" on Vouchers

The 38-year-old Mr. Kallman doesn't dispute that his efforts are creative. He freely admits that Noah Webster represents "a different twist" on school vouchers, the controversial idea of providing publicly funded payments to parents to cover private school tuition.

Certainly the way Mr. Kallman obtained the school's charter appears to be crafty. Under the charter law in Michigan . . . citizens can apply for school charters from a smorgasbord of options, including local school districts, community colleges and universities.

Mr. Kallman chose to apply to the Berlin Orange Fractional School #3, a tiny and financially struggling school district in rural Ionia that has a two-room schoolhouse, 23 students, one teacher and a teacher's aide.

Dennis Herron, a prison guard and county court officer who serves as the local school board president, says his district agreed to grant Noah Webster its charter because the school's organizers promised to pay the district 1% of its state funds, or more than \$40,000. Mr. Herron notes that the district whose total budget is about \$100,000, nearly went broke a couple of years ago. The infusion of money will "keep it alive," he says. The district granted the school a 99-

year charter—with automatic renewal—in April.

The arrangement infuriates the ACLU's Mr. Simon, who says Noah Webster's organizers "have very adroitly manipulated the legal system . . . to find the smallest, most easily manipulatable school district that would be eager for what sounds like—is, in essence—a kickback."

Mr. Kallman denies the accusation, saying that the law requires the district to be the school's fiscal agent and that the district therefore deserves to be paid.

Mr. Kallman and the school's other organizers are rushing to get Noah Webster Academy ready to open Sept. 1. They are looking for office space and plan to hire at least a dozen teachers. They also intend to buy at least one 486 multimedia computer and laser printer for each family whose children enroll in the school. And they plan to offer college financial aid to every graduate.

As for the curriculum, Mr. Kallman says it will be "flexible." Parents who want the school to provide all their children's classes will gain access through computers or television. Those who wish to do their own teaching will send in their children's work to be reviewed, he says. Families will also be reimbursed for nonreligious textbooks and other materials.

Mr. Kallman says the science teacher will teach "a combination" of evolution and the Bible-based theory of creationism. "If we have a family that's die-hard evolutionists and they want to teach it as fact, that's up to them," he says. "There are a lot of theories out there, and there should be consideration given to all."

Paul Wieland, the acting headmaster and board president, says the school will also teach "traditional morals and ethics." . . .

In the meantime, officials in Michigan expect that at least four other new charter schools will open in September, with another 35 or so on the way.

As to be expected, the creation of the Noah Webster school has created considerable controversy among homeschoolers in Michigan who fear that the charter school will become a Trojan horse within the homeschool movement by turning independent, private homeschools into public schools at home. The fear is based on the knowledge that government control always follows government money. Eugene C. Newman, president of Christian Home Educators of

Michigan (CHEM) and father of ten home-schooled children, has issued a position paper entitled "Why Charter Schools Should Be Opposed." He writes:

In Webster Mom will have what you and I have plus the advantages that state taxes can buy, including (1) extensive computer technology (and presumably training), (2) tutorial help via "E-Mail", by a mandated, state certified teacher, (3) a post secondary scholarship fund, in the name of her son or daughter, with Webster contributing as much as \$1,200 per year, from grades K through 12, and (4) various educational accouterments from those being planned, such as foreign language courses, to paid field trips.

Inviting, isn't it? It was designed that way from several vantage points. Any tax-supported school that can be structured with no buildings, no buses, no legions of overpaid, unionized teachers, and yet receives the same per capita expenditure of any other public school, is a financial dream-come-true, if nothing else. Conventional public schools should feel threatened in more ways than one.

Compare this to a private homeschool in Michigan: (1) all curricula and tutorial expenses must be paid by the parents with after tax dollars; (2) the use of computer technology in the home is still the exception, not the rule; (3) college scholarships are not automatically provided; (4) parents cannot avail themselves of local public school facilities without harassment and discrimination from local boards; and finally, to add insult to injury, parents of all private school children must still pay public school taxes with no relief.

If you were considering home education as an alternative, and your choice was between private education and a public school like Webster, which would you be tempted to choose first?

Make no mistake. Schools like Webster, experimental as they are, must do everything they can to succeed, or they run the risk of being written out of the code governing what a charter school can or cannot be. Others will be watching to see how Webster does. Thus, what we can expect to see here, is a deliberate attempt to lure families away from private education to public education. Is this good for families, Christian or otherwise?

The arguments for home based charter schools will appear as noble, visionary and an opportunity to redirect in a positive way, the failings of the public school system. . . . But the effort is fundamentally wrong if not naive. Consider the following.

First, it affirms in a new way, the illegitimate role the state plays in education. This is a real reversal

for home educators in general and for Christian home educators in particular. . . .

Dependency, any dependency on state programs, in any area, will always be at the expense of the private moral duty of citizens. How so? When we (as Christians) ask the state to do what Scripture sees as the duty of the individual or the family (cf: Deuteronomy 6), our moral character is diminished, if not defiled, because we are no longer responsible for obeying God's law, (a perfect reflection of His will) in that area of life. . . .

Second, even "well intentioned" people are *corrupted* [sic] by statism. Homeschoolers are no exception. This is one reason most of our Founding Fathers envisioned a small and limited civil governmental sphere, and created a brief and limited Constitution, fitted to their Biblical understanding of man's essential depravity and his propensity to abuse political power. They knew that both the giver and receiver of the public's largesse are denigrated thereby.

Third, public education isn't necessary and it's destructive of the moral fabric of our society. The charter school merely obscures this basic fact.

The state has *no compelling interest in education*. From the biblical perspective the family has a compelling interest, and perhaps other spheres, such as the church or business, but not the state. The state's compelling interest is in preserving retributive justice for lawlessness in the social order, but only *in terms of God's law-word*; the terms of which are limited, and reflect the ameliorative purposes of the Creator. To assert that the state has a compelling interest in the multitude of human activities, such as education, which impact some mutable and alien notion of "justice," or which may in some similar manner influence the social order is to argue for totalitarianism. . . .

Why should home educators give such a modern state even more opportunities to enlarge its influence?

Fourth, when we are forced to pay for private schooling, home or otherwise, we have a vested interest in giving the proper attention to education. This economic incentive is removed in the public charter school. It would be folly to think that parents who are "given free" a school program will value it as if it were their own property. . . .

Fifth, for every student enrolled, the state rationalizes the need for *increased* taxes. So home educators become accomplices in the growth of the state, and secondly, for surrendering to the state a proscribed activity.

Sixth, home education, as we know it today, cannot survive if the *private* sphere erodes to nothing. Home based charter schools will accomplish precisely this end, if thousands of private home educa-

tors are in effect, *bribed* with their own tax dollars, to subordinate themselves to the "public," i.e. regulations of the Department of Education or the Legislature.

The idea of the *private realm* is disappearing as statism grows. And the growth of the state has paralleled the growth of statist education. The alternative to totalitarianism is to preserve the many private associations and institutions that once characterized this country. . . .

Seventh, Webster is living on borrowed time. No law or regulation permitting genuine educational liberty will be allowed, once the Department of Education or the Legislature figure out how a *conservative* home based charter school can circumvent the system.

Does any knowledgeable person believe that a home based charter school will be permitted to substantially depart from or be independent of Department of Education or Legislative policy, when such freedom is denied to conventional public schools? . . .

Eighth, should home based charter schools capture a significant percentage of Michigan's private family base, the state will have every reason to argue that "public home schooling" is acceptable and therefore legitimate.

Should Webster become the norm, then those of us who insist on our privacy and independence and non-dependence on the state, will be seen as the exception; we will be seen as the fringe, and the state will successfully argue that a minority group cannot evade prevailing public policy and legislative control. We will be forced to accept statist control since enough homeschoolers will have repudiated, by their charter school, the political, economic and religious basis of independent, private home education, and the right of exclusive parental control.

Ninth, a home based charter school places the physical location of education at the kitchen table, so to speak. This is an enormous threat for all traditional families. . . .

When the family *home* is substituted as the normal place wherein a "public activity" is occurring, then the state has the right to control that public activity, defined as an activity that is totally or substantially supported by tax dollars, (and where the activity is voluntary). . . .

. . . Thus, the wall that should separate a home from the intrusions of the state, is punctured. . . . Webster will be the agent of the state or it will forfeit its charter.

Tenth, Webster's reliance on computer technology in every home, linked to a central data bank, is too Orwellian a prospect for anyone to *not* take seriously.

Under what legislation now or proposed, will the state not have access to this data, if similar data access is legal in conventional public schools?

Charter schools are legally "governmental agencies," as stated in Senate Bill 896, the Act that authorizes charter schools, or "public school academies." In its articles of incorporation, Webster was compelled to state that it was a "governmental entity." . . .

Imagine what the state or federal government could do with access to your child's lessons, reports, tests, surveys, successes and failures? Even if you *could* trust the principals behind Webster how do they know if their database isn't being tapped? What is legal within a conventional public school, or what can be clandestine in a conventional public school, is possible at Webster.

Eleventh, having established the legal basis for this school, in what way will a home based charter school be immune from *federal government coercion and policies* that are applied equally to all public schools within the state's jurisdiction? . . .

Remember: The Grove City College Supreme Court ruling which gave the federal government nearly unlimited control over an entire private school, when any of its students accept government insured loans to cover tuition; and most recently the attempt by the federal government to withhold millions of Medicaid dollars if Michigan *does not violate its own public laws* against paying for Medicaid abortions.

The possibilities are truly endless, but all with the same pernicious results. Why should conservative and Christian parents, or any parent who values their family's liberty, support a public home based charter school?

Conclusion

A home based charter school cannot provide one positive thing extra that a private home school couldn't provide, *given the same amount of money*.

There is nothing about a tax dollar that makes for a better school. If more money is the pivotal issue, then what we need are to find ways to put more money into the hands of more Michigan families, and one of the best ways to do that is to truly lower taxes by diminishing the need for tax dollars in the first place. . . .

Will the Websters of the world be effective in significantly reforming the conventional public school system? Do they provide the kind of "competition" the public schools need? Absolutely not. How can they? They will never escape the statist oligarchy that controls public education because charter schools *are* public schools! They are the system, they are not outside it! . . .

To see leading conservative and Christian lead-

ers endorse Webster is frustrating and disappointing. Were these not some of the same individuals that rejoiced over the *DeJonge* Supreme Court victory? Did we not praise God for a decision that affirmed the *independence and liberty* essential to a religiously motivated home school? Didn't thousands of homeschooleders rejoice precisely because the State, having had to affirm our right to *private* home education, was no longer allowed to harass us with impunity? Why are we now embracing the very system that for over a decade, we worked so hard to be free *from*? . . .

If not home based charter schools, what then?

First, we can work to *privatize* a school apparatus that is failing to teach, deliberately producing illiteracy and debauching our children, all at the same time, instead of tax shifting. Michigan families wanted true school reform. We're not getting reform, we're getting a charade. We have leaders who know better and we should expect more.

Second, we can insist that those who choose a private school alternative, whether at home or conventional, can claim a *tax exemption*, not a credit or voucher.

A creditor voucher keeps intact the state's claim that it has the right to collect and disburse (all?) education expenditures. Today, the government is simply making an arbitrary, they would say "gracious," decision to only enforce collections for those expenditures used in "public" institutions. Its ultimate goal is to erase the line between public and private. Thus the compromise, as such, that we can direct vouchers to follow the student wherever he or she goes, is but a disingenuous step in the erosion of the private sphere, since, like the home based charter school, wherever a tax credit or voucher goes, there follows the "public interest" and its regulations.

I believe that in the tax exemption we have a Biblically sound plan that is fair. We should not use the system for *any* partisan or religious purpose. Consequently, we should oppose the use of tax dollars, public funds, for activities that are inherently political or religious in nature. Education is certainly one area that is uniquely susceptible to political and religious influence or bias. It should remain private.

If anyone would like to correspond with Mr. Newman concerning the issues so ably discussed above, please write to: P.O. Box 2357, Farmington Hills, MI 48333.

Comment:

Perhaps one of the best public arguments against the charter school concept is that it will add to an already heavy tax bur-

den that all citizens must bear. One of the great arguments that homeschoolers have had in championing their cause is the fact that homeschooling decreases the tax burden on the taxpayer. That argument will be lost if homeschoolers begin accepting public funds. Also, the issue of educational freedom is bedrock for the homeschool movement. By accepting a charter school arrangement, homeschoolers will be saying that freedom is no longer important to them. The Founding Fathers fought and died for freedom. The Pangelinans and the Shippys went to jail to defend their freedom to homeschool. And homeschoolers all across the nation rose up to stop the Miller amendment in H.R. 6 which would have required homeschoolers to be certified. The all-powerful state will not pay homeschoolers to be free. They will pay them to become slaves. Considering the kind of educational legislation that is coming out of Washington these days, it looks as if the days for educational freedom are numbered—unless homeschoolers do all in their power to resist the encroachment of the state. If homeschoolers are foolish enough to accept the government shackles of the charter school, they will have kissed educational freedom goodbye.

On Calvinism

The following quotations are taken from an article entitled "Calvin and Calvinism" published in the July 1873 issue of the *Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review* (Vol. 30, pp. 401-421), written by Rev. Granville S. Abbott of Watertown, Mass.

[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. . . .

"If we look at those nations," says Rev. Andrew Fuller, "where Calvinism has been most prevalent, it

will be found that they have not been distinguished for their immorality, but the reverse." The expounder of original sin was the most determined opponent of actual transgression. He interdicted vice and crime. He was no Antinomian, but insisted rigidly on obedience to the law of God. So far from being impractical, his theology took powerful hold of man's temporal, as also of his eternal interest; having the promise of the best things in the life that is, as well as in that which is to be. Not to admit the moral effects of Calvinism, is to read modern history blindfolded. Take the influences of the theology and polity of John Calvin away from earth to-day, 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. . . .

Great as were his labors in theology, his labors in civil law were greater still. These gave him higher title to renown than his Institutes. God overruled his early studies for the legal profession in the fitness he thus acquired for heading the movement of civil and religious freedom. . . . With plastic hand he moulded the republic of Geneva into the model republic of its time. The polity which revolutionized Scotland was imported there by John Knox, direct from Calvin's instruction. Calvin gave advice to Moravia, to Hungary, and to Poland. He prepared the Dutch for the heroic defence of their national rights. He nerved the French Huguenots. . . . He founded English Puritanism. He impressed New England's early character. His own dearly-purchased civil and religious rights were the precious freight conveyed in the Mayflower to the Western world. . . . George Bancroft says: "He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American liberty." . . .

Calvinism can never be at a discount, without threatening ill. Let it never be lightly esteemed; for it has been associated with all the religious and social and intellectual emancipations of the last three hundred years. It has been the key-note to which almost every great soul in all this period has vibrated. It still continues to brand the fear of doing wrong upon the consciences of men. Its end is not yet; for it appears and reappears, of necessity, in history; teaching that God is strict to mark and to punish all iniquity and wrong. Modify it or impugn it as we may, it lies on an enduring basis of apostolic thought, on foundations deeper than the Alpine mountains, and firm as the throne of God.

Recall Drive in Vista, CA

A parents' group in Vista, California, has obtained enough signatures to place on the November ballot a recall proposal aimed at ousting two members of a self-described "Christian literalist" bloc on the local school board. The three-member conservative bloc garnered national attention last year by approving a policy that encourages the teaching of "scientific alternatives" to evolution.

The Vista Teachers Association said last month that a parents' group had collected 12,000 signatures on a recall petition. To place a recall measure on the ballot requires 9,145 validated signatures. (*Education Week*, 7/13/94)

A "Must Read"

Secret Records Revealed: the men, the money and the methods behind the New World Order by Dennis Lawrence Cuddy, Ph.D., The Plymouth Rock Foundation, P.O. Box 577, Marlborough, NH 03455, 1-800-210-1620.

If you are interested in the Rhodes conspiracy for world government, this 50-page booklet by Dennis Cuddy is must reading. Dennis has done a superb job of pulling together information about Rhodes scholars from many sources giving the reader, for the first time, an idea of how these men and women, including President Clinton, have become the elite rulers of the English-speaking world and are now in a position to fulfill Cecil Rhodes's dream of a New World Order. As Rhodes said in 1890, "The only thing feasible to carry out this idea is a secret society gradually absorbing the wealth of the world, to be devoted to such an object." Once you've read this booklet you'll understand why no Rhodes scholar should be elected to office in the United States.