The Blumenfeld Education Report

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."

Vol. 1, No. 6 (Number 6) **EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld** **September-October 1998**

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. The Blumenfeld Education Report carefully documents how America's education system can place our children at grave risk in many ways - from flawed classroom methods and dubious philosophies to special-interest agendas and misguided legislation. Only a well-informed public will be able to reduce such risks.

The Importance of Rote Learning

Among today's educators, particularly those in public schools, rote learning is considered akin to child abuse. It is a form of Chinese water torture that must never be used in the so-called learning process. It is an old-fashioned method of teaching associated with corporal punishment, birch rods, dunce caps and other quaint paraphernalia reminiscent of the strict, disciplinarian, authoritative educational practices of the past. Therefore, in the education of the 1990s and the 21st century, rote learning must be shunned and forever be done away with.

But what is totally ignored by these educators is the fact that rote learning is the easiest and most efficient way to instill knowledge by memorization so that it forms a solid foundation on which to build an intellectual superstructure. There is no substitute for rote methodology in learning the arithemetic facts, for example. That knowledge is essential to being able to perform in one's head or on paper the four functions of arithemetic: adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing. Being given a calculator to perform these functions without having this basic knowledge in one's head gives the child no clue as to whether the answer on the calculator is right or wrong. But then, many educators no longer consider the right answer to be the goal of a math problem.

Rote learning is also important in learning to read, for the most important task in learning to read an alphabetic system is to develop a phonetic reflex which is easy to do by drilling the learner in the letter-sound combinations. This is the way it was done in ancient times and the way it was done decades ago in America when literacy was much higher than it is today.

The best description of how rote learning was used in ancient Rome to teach children to read can be found in the writings of Quintilian, the famous teacher of rhetoric, born in about 35 A.D. He also had a wise message for parents. He wrote:

> I would, therefore, have a father conceive the highest hopes of his son from the moment of his birth. If he does so, he will be more careful about the groundwork of his education. For there is absolutely no foundation for the complaint that but few men have the power to take in the knowledge that is imparted to them, and that the majority are so slow of understanding that education is a waste of time and labor. On the contrary you will find that most are quick to reason and ready to learn. Reasoning comes as naturally to man as flying to birds, speed to horses and ferocity to beasts of prey: our minds are endowed by nature with such activity and sagacity that the soul is believed to proceed from heaven. Those who are

The Blumenfeld Education Report is published monthly.

Subscription: $49.00/12 issues. Address: 2575 Knox Drive, Rockford, IL 61114 (888) 922-3000. www.alpha-phonics.com

dull and unteachable are as abnormal as prodigious births and monstrosities, and are but few in number. A proof of what I say is to be found in the fact that boys commonly show promise of many accomplishments, and when such promise dies away as they grow up, this is plainly due not to the failure of natural gifts, but to lack of requisite care . . . .

Some hold that boys should not be taught to read till they are seven years old, that being the earliest age at which they can derive profit from instruction and endure the strain of learning . . . . Those however who hold that a child's mind should not be allowed to lie fallow for a moment are wiser . . . . Why, again, since children are capable of moral training, should they not be capable of literary education? . . . What better occupation can a child have so soon as he is able to speak? And he must be kept occupied somehow or other. . . . Let us not therefore waste the earliest years: there is all the less excuse for this, since the elements of literary training are solely a question of memory, which not only exists even in small children, but is specially retentive at that age . . . .

It is interesting to note that even in ancient Rome it was acknowledged that man was endowed at birth with the power to reason and that "literary training was solely a question of memory." Thus, in teaching a child to read, Quintilian recommends that the child first be taught the letters of the alphabet both orally and visually. He writes:

As soon as the child has begun to know the shapes of the various letters, it will be no bad thing to have them cut as accurately as possible upon a board, so that the pen may be guided along the grooves. Thus mistakes such as occur with wax tablets will be rendered impossible; for the pen will be confined between the edges of the letters and will be prevented from going astray. Further by increasing the frequency and speed with which they follow these fixed outlines we shall give steadiness to the fingers, and there will be no need to guide the child's hand with our own.

Quintilian well understood that writing is the other side of the reading coin. Literacy requires that a student be able to do both well. He goes on:

Writing is of the utmost importance in the study which we have under consideration and by its means alone can true and deeply rooted proficiency be obtained. But a sluggish pen delays our thoughts, while an unformed and illiterate hand cannot be deciphered . . . .

As regards syllables, no short cut is possible: they must all be learnt, and there is no good in putting off learning the most difficult; this is the general practice, but the sole result is bad spelling. Further, we must beware of placing a blind confidence in a child's memory. It is better to repeat syllables and impress them on the memory and, when he is reading, not to press him to read continuously or with greater speed, unless indeed the clear and obvious sequence of letters can suggest itself without its being necessary for the child to stop to think.

Repetition, better known as drill, helps create the phonetic reflex which is necessary if a child is to be able to read automatically, without having to stop and think of the letter sounds. In fact, drilling the child in the syllables was the way reading was taught in this country for at least the first hundred years of its existence. An examination of any primer published in the early 19th century will show the columns of syllables, such as *ba, be, bi, bo, bu* and *ab, ed, ib, ob, ub* which learners were required to memorize before they were permitted to read words. That was exactly the sequence Quintilian recommended when he wrote:

The syllables once learnt, let him begin to construct words with them and sentences with the words. You will hardly believe how much reading is delayed by undue haste. If the child attempts more than his powers allow, the inevitable result is hesitation, interruption and repetition, and the mistakes which he makes merely lead him to lose confidence in what he already knows. Reading must therefore first be sure, then connected, while it must be kept slow for a considerable time, until practice brings speed unaccompanied by error.

Concerning memory, Quintilian writes:

The skillful teacher will make it his first care, as soon as a boy is entrusted to him, to ascertain his ability and character. The surest indication in a child is his power of memory. The characteristics of a good

memory are twofold: it must be quick to take in and faithful to retain impressions of what it receives.

And what comes after learning to read? Quintilian writes:

> As soon as the boy has learned to read and write without difficulty, it is the turn for the teacher of literature . . . . The study of literature is a necessity for boys and the delights of old age, the sweet companion of our privacy and the sole branch of study which has more solid substance than display.

Thus, almost 2,000 years ago Quintilian had it right while today our educators have it all wrong. In the Summer of 1998, *Partisan Review*, America's leading intellectual publication, conducted a symposium on education in which Jon Westling, president of Boston University, said the following:

> American higher education is, of course, not unaware that large numbers of students are admitted to college unable to write well and that many of these students graduate four or five years later still unable to craft a coherent paragraph, let alone a graceful essay . . . .
>
> We have reached an even more arid desert, one in which most American children have a profoundly attenuated sense of how language can be used . . . . What we lack is language that is available to the average high-school graduate to express thoughts that the average young adult should be able to think. Ease of thought on difficult matters can never be achieved if an individual's repertoire of language is stunted.
>
> American rhetoric has been stunted in numerous ways. . . . Once-familiar grammatical and rhetorical forms have also all but disappeared . . . . The mind, deprived of rhetorical skills, does not thereby move more freely among the essentials of the human condition. Far from attaining authenticity, the rhetorically uneducated mind is confined to banality and cliche.
>
> Training the memory, as Father Ong has reminded us, was for centuries a recognized, honored, and highly elaborate sub-discipline of the art of rhetoric. But we no longer teach children to memorize, a powerful intellectual tool now wrongly and endlessly denigrated throughout our schools as "rote learning."
>
> To read well, we observe too late, also requires mastery of some of the rhetorical arts.
>
> For many people the mere possibility of language reaching to something higher, better or truer in the human condition has been sealed shut. We have created on America's campuses a world where students have very little occasion to engage in serious conversation with adults. Campuses often resemble late-adolescent ghettos. . . . Colleges and universities in this century have more and more defined themselves merely as transmitters of information rather than shapers of the minds and character of the young . . . .
>
> Rhetoric rightly conceived is skill at joining language to thought. . . . Successfully restoring rhetoric to the curriculum will require the long-sought and seemingly endlessly delayed reform of public schools.
>
> The individual student must still be our central focus and, unless we succeed one by one with the formation of the mind and the character of the students, all else is lost.
>
> I agree . . . about the terrible situation that exists, particularly in our inner cities, where we have millions and millions of young people who've barely been touched not only by the educational system but by our civilization except through the mass media. I think this is one of the great tragedies of our time and we will be judged for not having done enough. I myself, however, do not have a solution.

Rita Kramer, a participant in the symposium and author of *The Miseducation of America's Teachers*, said:

> As for those who would teach older students, those in junior high and secondary school, many of them must also be described as among the good in the sense that they are idealists. They aim to change the world, and they are smart enough to know that the way to do it is to influence the minds of the young. They themselves are taught by the tenured radicals whose favorite text is *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* [by Brazilian Marxist and promoter of socialist revolution Paulo Freire]. They have never read *The Federalist Papers* . . . .
>
> And so . . . most students in America today are deprived of any serious acquaintance with the Western tradition, with the treasures and trials of our civilization, and with the means of carrying on the culture.
>
> This is the crux of the situation: the transformation of the schools from transmitters of a common culture to agencies of social change. The schools of education have effectively been politicized in the name of the values of the sixties counterculture . . . and everything in education schools reinforces these values and these attitudes, honed by the followers of John Dewey and promulgated by such founts of progressive education

philosophy as Columbia University's Teachers College.

It's seldom that we hear common sense iterated by members of the education establishment. But as Dr. Westling ruefully admits, conservative members of the establishment can offer no realistic solutions to the cultural and social problems that the liberals have created. That is why conservatives in Congress are powerless to stop the left-wing education juggernaut. If the conservatives so much as try to shut down these federal programs, Democrats scream that Republicans want to destroy education, and they have the National Education Association to help them.

That is why homeschooling has become the only viable solution for hundreds of thousands of parents totally frustrated by the public schools and unable to get local school boards to implement the kinds of reforms that parents want. In other words, if you want to teach rhetoric, or use rote memorization in arithmetic and reading, you will have to do it at home. ■

Psychology's Best Kept Secrets

Have you ever wondered why establishment psychologists or the U.S. Congress have never really wanted to find out once and for all which is the best way to teach children to read based on scientific evidence? Although much research has been done by psychologists on the nature of human cognition--how children learn--these same psychologists have shown virtually no interest in the greatest learning problem plaguing American education: the teaching of reading. Much money is being spent investigating the genetic causes of dyslexia, but no effort is being made to investigate the harm being done by faulty teaching methods.

Which brings us to the Center for Cognitive Studies at Harvard University. The chief architect of the Center was Jerome Bruner who tells us in his autobiography, *In Search of Mind*, that cognitive psychology was born in 1956 at a symposium on the cognitive sciences held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Two of the key participants in that symposium were behavioral psychologist George Miller and linguist Noam Chomsky.

It was that symposium that convinced Miller to leave B. F. Skinner's behaviorist camp at Harvard and join Jerome Bruner in developing cognitive psychology. Three years later, in 1959, Chomsky was to give the coup de grace to the behaviorist theory about language by a devastating review of Skinner's book, *Verbal Behavior* (1957). Skinner had sought to explain language development in humans as a form of conditioned stimulus-response behavior similar to the way that animals in psych labs can be trained through conditioning techniques. Pavlov's famous experiment on dogs in Russia was the best known example of such experiments, the results of which were to permit psychologists to devise techniques that could be applied in changing and molding human behavior.

J. B. Watson, the father of American behaviorism, wrote in 1924:

> Behaviorism . . . holds that the subject matter of human psychology is the behavior of the human being. Behaviorism claims that consciousness is neither a definite nor a usable concept . . . .
>
> Let us limit ourselves to things that can be observed and formulate laws concerning only those things. Now what can we observe? We can observe behavior--what the organism does or says. And let us point out at once: that saying is doing--that is, behaving . . . .
>
> [The behavioral psychologist] must describe the behavior of man in no other terms than those you would use in describing the behavior of the ox you slaughter . . . .

Chomsky argued that the behaviorists' attempts to explain language development in terms of stimulus-response conditioning were fundamentally flawed. He demonstrated that the human child is born with a brain that contains a certain innate language faculty that permits the child to learn language rapidly and instinctively, without direct instruction from anyone. The child's ability to master the phonological structure of the spoken language, the abstractions of sound symbols, as well as syntax and grammar so rapidly and effortlessly

convinced Chomsky that man's genetic makeup provided him with this innate language capability.

In 1960, Miller and Bruner set up their Center for Cognitive Studies at Harvard with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It was obvious that the new interest in the mind had been spurred by the new computer technology. For, as Bruner wrote, "You cannot properly conceive of managing a complex world of information without a workable concept of mind." The result is that the Center brought together the ideas and theories of scholars and scientists working in many associated fields and drew graduate students from MIT, Harvard, and elsewhere.

Bruner concentrated on early childhood mental development which brought him into contact with the work of Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget, whose pioneering work in the field had contributed greatly to an understanding of how the child's mind grows. Piaget saw the child as an egocentric individual, gradually modifying his egocentrism as he adapted himself to the reality of others.

But Bruner, a socialist, was not entirely satisfied with the Piagetian view which seemed to favor the development of individualism. "Piaget's children," writes Bruner, "are little intellectuals, detached from the hurly-burly of the human condition." He was far more attracted to the work of Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky (1896-1934), the Soviet cognitive psychologist. Bruner wrote:

> Vygotsky published little, and virtually nothing that appeared in English before 1960; indeed, until the late 1950s, most of what he wrote in Russian was suppressed and had been banned after the 1936 purge. . . . His objective was to explore how human society provided instruments to empower the individual mind. He was a serious intellectual Marxist, when Marxism was a starchy and dogmatic subject. This was his undoing at the time of the Stalinist purges. . . . Though I knew Piaget and never knew Vygotsky, I feel I know Vygotsky better as a person.

The man who introduced Bruner to Vygotsky was Alexander Luria, the Soviet psychologist whose book, *The Nature of Human Conflict, An Objective Study of Disorganisation and Control of Human Behavior,* had been translated into English and published in the United States in 1932. Luria wrote in the preface:

> The researches described here are the results of the experimental psychological investigations carried on at the State Institute of Experimental Psychology, Moscow, during the period of 1923-1930. The chief problems of the author were an objective and materialistic description of the mechanisms lying at the basis of the disorganisation of human behaviour and an experimental approach to the laws of its regulation. . . . To accomplish this it was necessary to create artificially affects and models of experimental neuroses which made possible an analysis of the laws at the basis of the disintegration of behaviour.

Pavlov himself, Luria's mentor, had proudly summed up the results of his famous experiments in a book, *Twenty Years of Objective Study*, published in 1935. These experiments on animals had enormous implications for experiments on human beings. Pavlov wrote:

> The power of our knowledge over the nervous system will, of course, appear to much greater advantage if we learn not only to injure the nervous system but also to restore it at will. It will then have been really proved that we have mastered the processes and are controlling them. Indeed, this is so. In many cases we are not only causing disease, but are eliminating it with great exactitude, one might say, to order.

Thus, Pavlov had already done considerable experimentation on the causes of behavioral disorganization. Luria writes:

> Pavlov obtained very definite affective "breaks," an acute disorganisation of behaviour, each time that the conditioned reflexes collided, when the animal was unable to react to two mutually exclusive tendencies, or was incapable of adequately responding to any imperative problem.

Apparently, there were many behavioral psychologists at that time working on the same problem. Luria writes:

> We are not the first of those who have artificially created disorganisations of human behaviour. A large number of facts pertaining to this problem have been contributed by contemporary physiologists, as well as by psychologists.
>
> I.P. Pavlov was the first investigator who, with the help of exceedingly bold workers, succeeded experimentally in creating neuroses with experimental animals. Working with conditioned reflexes in dogs, Pavlov came to the conclusion that every time an elaborated reflex came into conflict with the unconditioned reflex, the behaviour of the dog markedly changed . . . .
>
> Although, in the experiments with the collision of the conditioned reflexes in animals, it is fairly easy to obtain forms of artificial affect, it is much more difficult to get those results in human experiments . . . .
>
> K. Lewin, in our opinion, has been one of the most prominent psychologists to elucidate the question of the artificial production of affect and of the experimental disorganisation of behaviour. The method of his procedure--the introduction of an emotional setting into the experience of a human, the interest of the subject in the experiment--helped him to obtain an artificial disruption of the affect of considerable strength. . . . Here the fundamental conception of Lewin is very close to ours.

Who was K. Lewin? Why he was the very same Kurt Lewin who came to the United States in 1933, founded the Research Center for Group Dynamics at M.I.T. (which later moved to the University of Michigan), and invented "sensitivity training." Shortly before his death in 1947, Lewin founded the National Training Laboratory which established its campus at Bethel, Maine, under the sponsorship of the National Education Association. There, teachers and administrators were instructed in the techniques of sensitivity training and how to become effective change agents.

After Lewin's death, his colleagues continued to develop his sensitivity-training sessions which became known as t-groups (t for training). The t-group became the basis of the encounter movement in which participants get in touch with their feelings.

Carl Rogers, one of the chief practitioners of the t-group, considered sensitivity training to be "perhaps the most significant social invention of this century." All of this spurred the development of humanist "Third Force" psychology by Rogers, Abraham Maslow and others, which has had an enormous influence on the affective curriculum of public education.

Lewin had started his career as a social psychologist in Berlin where he organized a "collective" in which he and his students pursued the experiments which Luria later recognized as highly effective. Some of Lewin's students were Russians who studied under him in the early 1920s and returned to the Soviet Union to teach and continue their researches at the University of Moscow. In 1929, Lewin attended the Ninth International Congress of Psychologists at Yale where, according to Harvard psychologist Gorden Allport, his work "was decisive in forcing some American psychologists to revise their own theories of the nature of intelligent behavior and of learning."

In 1932, Lewis M. Terman, head of the psychology department at Stanford, invited Lewin to spend six months as a visiting professor at Stanford. Lewin had been recommended by Edwin G. Boring, director of the psych lab at Harvard, who had been greatly impressed with Lewin at the Yale conference. After the stint at Stanford, Lewin decided to return to Germany via the Pacific and the Trans-Siberian railroad. In Moscow he was able to confer with his fellow psychologists, including Luria. Hitler had just come to power in Germany, and in August 1993, Lewin left Germany for good.

The importance of Lewin is that he represented the socialist, collectivist mentality in the psychological community which had its own socio-political agenda. Certainly, the psychologists who were experimenting with artificially induced behavioral disorganization in their labs in Germany, the Soviet Union, and the U.S. had a reason for their experiments: the control of human behavior. Alfred J. Marrow, Lewin's biographer, writes:

> Students of progressive education also saw the need for studies of group behavior. This was stimulated by the educational philosophy of John Dewey. To carry out Dewey's theory of "learning by doing," teachers organized such group projects as student self-government and hobby-club activities. This called for

> the development of leadership skills and collective setting of group goals. . . . Lewin's pioneering research in group behavior thus drew upon the experience of educators in deciding upon and developing topics for research and in establishing a strong interest among social psychologists and teachers.

One of Lewin's most significant experiments was aimed at determining the behavioral effects of frustration on children and how these effects are produced. Marrow writes:

> The experiment indicated that in frustration the children tended to regress to a surprising degree. They tended to become babyish. Intellectually, children of four and a half years tended toward behavior of a three-year-old. The degree of intellectual regression varied directly with the strength of the frustration. Change in emotional behavior was also recorded. There was less smiling and singing and more thumbsucking, noisiness and restless actions. Aggressiveness also increased and some children went so far as to hit, kick and break objects. There was a 30 percent rise in the number of hostile actions toward the experimenter and a 34 percent decrease in friendly approaches . . . .
>
> The authors summarized their main findings as follows: "Frustration as it operated in these experiments resulted in an average regression in the level of intellectual functioning, in increased unhappiness, restlessness, and destructiveness, in increased ultra-group unity, and in increased out-group aggression. The amounts of increase in negative emotionality were positively related to strength of frustration."

Clearly, what Lewin had discovered was an effective way to create behavioral disorganization in the classroom, which would later be diagnosed by future psychologists as Attention Deficit Disorder. We know that whole-language reading instruction can cause so much frustration that children begin to exhibit the kinds of behavior that Lewin identified in his experiments. Lewin also favored the look-say, whole-word method in the teaching of reading. Marrow writes:

> Lewin's students had unusually wide latitude in choosing their particular fields of study. Sara Forrer, for example, decided to investigate Ovid Decroly's method of teaching retarded children to read. . . . The Belgian teacher had postulated that children retain sentences more easily than single words and words more readily than single letters. Lewin stated, in referring to Forrer's experiment, that "the findings confirm the marked advantage of the 'global' method of reading and writing. To a child taking no joy in learning to write an alphabet, a change of valence (attractiveness) occurs more quickly when he is allowed as soon as possible to write meaningful communications in sentence form."

It was strange for Lewin to have had this view of reading instruction since the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union had rejected the whole-word, or "global," method in 1932 and restored intensive phonics in Soviet primary education mainly through the work of Luria and Vygotsky, Lewin's own colleagues. Lewin must have been aware that the whole-word method would cause the kind of frustration that would lead to an acute disorganization of behavior since the whole-word method would inevitably create a conditioning conflict with the alphabetic method.

Lewin also believed in the Marxist doctrine that the end justified the means. In his book, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, published posthumously in 1948, he wrote:

> In regard to a change toward democracy this paradox of democratic leadership is still more pointed. In an experimental change, for instance, from individualistic freedom (laissez faire) to democracy, the incoming democratic leader could not tell the group members exactly what they should do because that would lead to autocracy. Still some manipulations of the situation have to be made to lead the group into the direction of democracy . . . .
>
> To instigate change toward democracy a situation has to be created for a certain period where the leader is sufficiently in control to rule out influence he does not want and to manipulate the situation to a sufficient degree. The goal of the democratic leader in this transition period will have to be the same as that of any good teacher, namely, to make himself superfluous, to be replaced by indigenous leaders from the group.

In other words, during the transition period from individualism to "democracy" (i.e., collectivism) the end can justify the means, because the "end" is the greater good. The whole-word method may be needed during the transition period in order to

make Americans less literate and thereby less independent as individuals. This would indeed be a necessary strategy for moving the nation toward a socialist, collectivist society. And, of course, it was totally in keeping with Dewey's own views on reading instruction outlined in his essay, "The Primary Education Fetich," published in 1898.

Vygotsky died in 1934 and Lewin died in 1947, but Luria, who knew them both, continued his work. During World War II he did painstaking research on brain-injured people, discovering many facets of how the brain works. He had worked closely with Vygotsky from 1924 to 1934, the period in which they had worked on early childhood development and the artificial means of creating behavioral disorganization. During that period Vygotsky also worked on the problems of Soviet education, applying psychology to the problems of massive illiteracy which, according to James Wertsch, his biographer, "has been almost completely overcome today." How were the Soviets able to achieve this? By using an alphabetic-phonics method of reading instruction.

The Bruner-Luria connection was a very close one. Bruner attended psychological conferences in Moscow and, in 1960, Luria visited the Center for Cognitive Studies. Bruner writes:

> Luria and I became fast friends almost immediately. We were compatible temperamentally and very much in agreement about psychological matters. . . . He was the czar of Russian psychology, but a more benign czar would be hard to imagine!

Why were they so compatible? Because as a student at Duke University, Bruner had become a member of the Communist Party. He tells us that after graduation, the Communist Party lost interest in him. But nowhere in his autobiography does he indicate any loss of interest or belief in socialism or Marxism.

On matters of education, Bruner was instrumental in creating in 1965 the famous--or infamous--social studies curriculum for ten-year-olds, *Man: A Course of Study*, better known as MACOS. Bruner writes:

> [A]fter a year or two of very favorable notices . . . and widespread adoptions, the course came under attack from the extreme-right-wing John Birch Society in league with the newly emerging "creationists," opposed to the teaching of evolution. Between them they mounted the now familiar right-wing harassment of any school district proposing to use the course. . . . Governor Reagan of California, whose state sheltered the core of the John Birch Society, came out squarely against the course.

We know that America has experienced a serious decline in literacy, despite the fact that cognitive psychology has grown as an academic discipline. Obviously, something is terribly wrong with the way psychologists influence the thinking of educators. But then, as we pointed out in *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education*, American education has been taken over by the psychologists and they are the ones who have decided what is to be taught and how it is to be taught.

The only way for American parents to get out from under the control of the psychologists is to leave the public education system. There is no other way out.

Separation of School & State Conference to Launch Exodus Drive

The upcoming fourth annual conference of the Separation of School & State Alliance in Colorado Springs, Colorado, November 12-14, promises to be the most dynamic and controversial to date. At this conference Robert Symonds and Ray Moore will officially launch their movement to get 20 million Christian children out of the public schools. The lineup of speakers includes this author, as well as John Taylor Gatto, David Noebel, John Eidsmoe, Marhsall Fritz, R.C. Sproul, Jr., Douglas Dewey, Cathy Duffy, Brian Ray, and many others. The conference will be held at the Antlers Doubletree Hotel (719-473-5600). For conference information and registration call: 209-292-1776.