

# TO AMERICA'S TEACHERS

by Samuel L. Blumenfeld

Author Of The Explosive Best-Seller  
*N.E.A.: Trojan Horse In American Education*

■ YOU ARE probably a member of the National Education Association, better known as the NEA. Perhaps you didn't want to join, but when you joined your local teachers' group, which was an affiliate of the NEA, you were told that your decision automatically made you a member of the state and national organizations. And that is why your membership dues cost around \$300 a year.

In some school districts you had a choice. You didn't have to join the local NEA affiliate. But by not joining you were told that you would not have liability insurance to protect yourself in the classroom against lawsuits for educational malpractice. Apparently, as teaching has expanded into areas beyond the general subject matter of basic education, teachers have found themselves to be more at risk, more vulnerable. Thus, we are told, they need liability insurance.

Of course, very little of that \$300

paid to the NEA goes to pay for liability insurance. In fact, there are alternative teachers' associations in America that provide the same insurance coverage — and sometimes even greater coverage — for less money. For example, Professional Educators of Iowa provides better insurance coverage with a membership fee of only \$40 a year. Thus, if you and ninety-nine other teachers in your school district decided to organize an alternative teachers' association, you could probably get the same insurance as the Iowa group with dues of only \$40 a year and thereby save yourselves collectively \$26,000.

But perhaps you are one of those teachers who has lost the right to choose. Perhaps you teach in a district with an "agency shop." An agency shop, of course, is the name given to the type of arrangement agreed upon by the local NEA affiliate and the local school board. As a condition of employ-

ment, a teacher in an agency shop must either join the union or pay its dues even without joining. The union makes the claim that since it has negotiated a contract, all teachers must pay its agency fee. But you may have wanted to negotiate a contract of your own with the school board. Unfortunately, that is not permitted under the rule of exclusive representation.

If you are employed under terms of an agency shop agreement, you are deprived of your basic freedom of choice. Your right to work in the government schools on the sole basis of your qualifications as a teacher has been usurped. Apparently, the majority of our nation's teachers don't want that kind of freedom for themselves, nor do they want it for you, because they voted for the agency shop.

What does this tell us? It tells us that there are far too many teachers who will voluntarily vote away their rights as free citizens in a free country. In the interest of going along with the collective, they will give up their rights as individuals. Of course, the NEA calls this democracy. They claim that if the majority wants to vote away *everyone's* freedoms, it has a right to do so. But our federal Constitution was devised to prevent exactly that. It prevents the majority from either voting us into a dictatorship or depriving the minority of its God-given rights. That is why Americans have remained free for as long as we have.

But what is also sad is that local school boards are willing to give up their right to hire teachers on the basis

of quality and merit substituting mere union membership instead. The public schools are financed by the taxpayer. What right do school boards have to set up agency shops without consulting the taxpayers? Do not those who pay for the schools have a right to decide on what basis teachers should be hired or fired?

Fortunately, there are many teachers who have decided to fight the agency shop. They have gone to court to defend their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, and they have been helped by a feisty organization located near Washington called Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism,\* a division of the National Right to Work Committee.

Meanwhile, teachers have been fired for refusing to pay agency shop fees, and some teachers have resigned over the matter. One teacher in Fremont, California, who had been voted the best foreign language instructor in that entire state, resigned rather than accept the agency shop. She wrote to her students: "My employer is confiscating my wages without my permission. This is the status of a slave. How can I return to you in September and teach you to stand tall as a free man or woman if I cannot?" This is a question that all teachers in an agency shop should be asking. What is frightening

---

\*Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism (8001 Braddock Road, Springfield, Virginia 22160) is a coalition of educational professionals — faculty, administrators and governing officials — who are totally opposed to forced unionism.

is that the NEA wants an agency shop in every school district in the nation, a virtual educational dictatorship run by this one organization. Is this what the teachers of America want?

### **NEA is a Political Force**

But there are other reasons why many teachers don't like the NEA. They know that the NEA is more than just a union. It is clearly a political organization with a decidedly leftist social agenda that is undermining traditional American values. And the last thing these teachers want is their money used to support such a program.

However, far too many teachers are unaware of the NEA's stand on political and social issues. They simply don't bother to read NEA materials and thus do not realize how far to the left their union is.

For example, the NEA favors pro-choice on the abortion issue. As far as the NEA is concerned, unborn infants have no unalienable right to life, and the mother's social convenience is more important than the child's life. Isn't it odd that a teachers' organization, so concerned with finding new jobs for teachers, should condone the murder of 15 million unborn children who could have filled the schoolhouses of America? The NEA speaks loudly for students' rights, but it is silent on the right of the unborn to live. The NEA claims to be concerned with the health and welfare of America's children, and supposedly, that is why it advocates lowering the compulsory

school attendance age to four. Yet it expresses no concern over the brutal slaughter of 1.5 million unborn children each year. Is this an organization that truly cares for the welfare of children?

The NEA also favors the Marxist Sandinista government of Nicaragua which, with the help of America's deadliest enemies, is leading that Central American nation into totalitarian Communism. The NEA has no sympathy for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters who want for their country the same kind of freedoms that Americans enjoy.

The NEA also advocates a nuclear freeze that would lock us into a position of inferiority vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, thus making us vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by the Communists. The NEA is so keen on creating anxiety among American school children concerning the nuclear threat that it is distributing a ten-lesson course on the subject for the 10- through 14-year-old age group entitled *Choices: A Unit on Conflict and Nuclear War*. The course doesn't even present America's strategy of peace through strength that has effectively managed to deter nuclear war for the past 40 years. Instead, it works on the fears and anxieties of the children. It shows them ghastly pictures of charred bodies and disfigured victims of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The NEA doesn't tell teachers that the nuclear freeze movement was started by the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council in 1980 for the purpose of creating nuclear

hysteria in the West so that our people would mindlessly demand unilateral disarmament.

The NEA condemns the government of El Salvador that is fighting Communist terrorism, but it is silent on Soviet genocide in Afghanistan. It condemns apartheid in South Africa, but says nothing about the Marxist Mugabe government in neighboring Zimbabwe that is terrorizing and murdering its own black citizens who voted for political parties other than Mugabe's.

The NEA also opposes school prayer, educational vouchers, and tuition tax credits. It opposes the teaching of creationism even as an alternative view to the theory of evolution. It advocates state regulations of church schools and home schools in clear violation of everyone's God-given right to freedom of religion, and of parents' unalienable right to educate their children without interference from the state. It wants to extend state control over every facet of child development and education in America.

### **Secular Humanism**

While the NEA opposes the imposition of sectarian religious practices in the public schools, it promotes the religion of secular humanism through its strong advocacy of the humanist credo which includes values clarification, sex education, death education, sensitivity training, globalism, and other related programs. Yet, in a pamphlet entitled "The Radical Right Attack on the NEA," published in March 1985,

the NEA has the gall to state: "The whole notion of secular humanism is, in fact, entirely the invention of Radical Right leaders, writers and fund-raisers. They've conjured up the concept, defined it, villified it, and then attributed it to teachers."

The NEA is either lying or is so abysmally ignorant that it doesn't even know what it is doing. Having debated NEA officials on several occasions, this writer can testify that NEA personnel exhibit both deficiencies.

But you, a teacher, need not take my word for it. You can find out for yourself who is telling the truth. After all, there is a philosophy of education guiding our public schools. No one, not even the NEA, would deny that it is a secular philosophy, a philosophy that excludes traditional religion from the public school curriculum. But is it "humanist"?

The humanist philosophy was first formally set down in 1933 in a document known as the *Humanist Manifesto*. It was signed by 34 prominent humanists, including early NEA leader John Dewey. But even before 1933, humanists within the NEA had begun promoting this atheistic and materialistic creed. Only in recent times has the NEA clearly spelled out its goal, as it did, for instance, in its 1970 publication *To Nurture Humanism*. One passage from that book states: "If schools are to move toward humanism, then humanism must become important to all of us, students, teachers, administrators and the general public."

In 1973, humanists updated their goals and their thinking with *Humanist Manifesto II* signed by 372 prominent individuals. Among them can be found prominent educators, psychologists, liberal ministers, and ethical culturists. The list includes such well-known names as Isaac Asimov, Theodore Brameld, Lionel Abel, Alan F. Guttmacher, B.F. Skinner, Betty Friedan, Sol Gordon, A. Philip Randolph, and others.

What does the *Manifesto* say? First, it denies the efficacy of faith in God or prayer. It states:

*As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers and to be able to do something about them, is an unproven and outmoded faith. Salvationism, based on mere affirmation, still appears as harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival.*

How can it be said that a faith that has served millions of people over a period of 5,000 years is "unproven"? How can it be said that such a faith is "outmoded" when it provided the impetus for the settlement of a vast wilderness and the creation of the freest and richest nation in all of human history? How can it be said to be "harmful" when it provided man with a moral

code that permitted him to flourish in safety and freedom in a civilization of unparalleled achievement? How can it be accused of "diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter" when it has created an economic system of abundance and unlimited progress while atheistic philosophies that promise utopia instead of heaven have given their victims nothing but hell on earth?

Further, the *Manifesto* denies the divine origin of moral values. It states:

*We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction. Ethics stems from human need and interest.*

In other words, God's law does not exist, and the Ten Commandments are an outmoded statement of moral prejudices. There is no sin.

And that is why the schools teach situational ethics and values clarification. That is why they concentrate so heavily on sex education. The *Manifesto* states:

*In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion, and divorce should be recognized. . . . The many varieties of sexual exploration should*

*not in themselves be considered 'evil.' . . . Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their lifestyles as they desire."*

And this is what the schools have been telling American children for years, with the result that we now have more teenage pregnancies than ever, more venereal disease than ever, and more sexual perversion than ever before.

As we have already shown, and could additionally fill many pages with more evidence from its various publications, the NEA has been promoting all of the components of secular humanism. In an article entitled "The Teacher — Agent of Change," published in *NEA Journal* of January 1962, we also read that the "National Training Laboratories of NEA initiated a program for classroom teachers. . . . The training lab is an intensive learning experience . . . in which a staff of social scientists help translate research findings into classroom practice."

Then in the September 1970 edition of NEA's *Today's Education*, the successor to *NEA Journal*, we learn some specifics about what the change-agent teacher is supposed to be doing. We read: "The change-agent teacher does more than dream, however; he builds, too. He is part of an association of colleagues in his local school system, in his state, and across the country that makes up an interlocking system of change-

agent organizations. This kind of system is necessary because changing our society through the evolutionary educational processes requires simultaneous action on three power levels."

If that isn't a conspiracy to change America according to the humanists' plan, I wonder what else it could be called. Perhaps as a teacher you've been led into becoming a change agent. Do you know where it will all lead? It will lead to a world government and an end to American independence. *Humanist Manifesto II* boldly states: "Thus we look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based on transnational federal government." This is also the goal of Communism which has always sought to create a world government where all nations will have lost their sovereignty and freedom, and where God-given "unalienable rights" will be made a thing of the past.

You may find it difficult to believe that organizations like the NEA are diligently working for such a goal. But they most certainly are. The humanist-Communist world government they seek will be built on atheism which allows for no recognition of a Creator Who endows all of us with rights. If they succeed, rights and freedoms will be reduced to mere privileges dispensed by a government run by men.

Is this the kind of world you want to live in? Is this the kind of world the teachers of America should knowingly or unknowingly be attempting to create in their roles as change agents in the schools?

The NEA started its crusade for world government back in 1942. In 1946, *NEA Journal* editor Joy Elmer Morgan wrote:

*In the struggle to establish an adequate world government, the teacher has many parts to play. He must begin with his own attitude and knowledge and purpose. He can do much to prepare the hearts and minds of children for global understanding and co-operation. . . . At the very top of all the agencies which will assure the coming of world government must stand the school, the teacher, and the organized profession.*

Thus, the NEA has been promoting the idea of world government for at least four decades. *Humanist Manifesto II* of 1973 affirmed that stand when it stated:

*We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate.*

Thus, one easily identifiable goal of the NEA, that clearly promotes the cause of humanism, is to end American sovereignty and freedom.

## **NEA Wrongly Uses Teachers**

So it is obvious that the NEA is more than just a teachers' association devoted to improving the lot of teachers. It is the nation's single most powerful and active engine of political and social change. And your dues are helping to run that engine. The members' money, to the tune of \$500 million per year, is being used to lobby Congress and 50 state legislatures, support an army of 1,170 full-time professional organizers, and publish and distribute thousands of books and curriculum materials promoting NEA's political and social agenda.

The NEA even has a training program to instruct teachers in how to combat the so-called New Right. Is this proper? Do not the teachers of America serve children from all kinds of homes, regardless of the religious or political affiliations of their parents? An association of public school teachers ought to be politically neutral since the education system must serve the public at large without bias or prejudice.

Apparently the NEA does not agree. It is determined to oppose any Americans who resist or criticize its program to change America from a God-believing, free-enterprise, individualistic society to an atheistic, socialist, collectivist society in a world government. In short, NEA is prepared to oppose the vast majority of Americans who want traditional American values and do not want a humanistic world government.

The simple truth is that the NEA has been controlled by the radical left since World War I when it established

its permanent headquarters in Washington. The radical left has worked hard over the years to forge the NEA into a political instrument through which it could use teachers to take power in America and impose its program on the American people. As early as 1932, another early NEA leader, Professor George S. Counts of Teachers College, Columbia University, wrote: "That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction."

In 1967, NEA Executive Secretary Sam Lambert proclaimed: "NEA will become a political power second to no other special interest group. . . . NEA will organize this profession from top to bottom into logical operational units that can move swiftly and effectively and with power unmatched by any other organized group in the nation." In 1973, NEA President Helen D. Bain told NEA members: "The muscle of teacher organizations must be used to become politically effective in every election throughout the country." And in 1974, NEA President Helen Wise said: "Teachers individually and collectively can change the direction of government."

Is the mission of America's public school teachers to change the direction of our nation's government? What would you think if the policemen of America organized to "change the direction of government"? What would you think if any other group of government employees decided that its mission was to "change the direction of

government"? You'd be alarmed, especially if the direction being sought is anything like the one sought by the NEA. And that is why so many Americans are alarmed at what the NEA is using the teachers of America to accomplish.

There was a time when teachers were looked up to, respected, and loved by students and parents alike. They were virtually placed on a pedestal. Today, much of that trust and respect is gone. The teacher has become an enemy of the parent, a Pied Piper leading children into a new deadly world of pagan immorality, a skilled deceiver of the public using tax dollars to undermine the traditional values that have made this nation great.

There are many good teachers who know this and, despite the NEA, are doing what they can in the public schools to educate and help children. Many of these teachers have left the NEA and joined alternative associations. While they must still teach in schools dominated by humanism, they are at least not supporting an organization that represents the political ambitions of the radical left.

If you want to restore the love and trust that Americans once had for their teachers, then you too must repudiate the philosophy and goals of the NEA. If you do, you will have the immediate thanks of countless numbers of parents. And in the near future, you will also have the grateful appreciation of former students who will be raising children of their own in a truly free and God-fearing nation. ■ ■

Additional reprints of this copyrighted article, are available at one to 99 copies, 4 for \$1.00; 100-499 copies, 20¢ each; 500-999 copies, 18¢ each; 1,000 or more copies, 15¢ each. Please include postage and handling as follows: orders totaling less than \$10.00, add \$1.00; orders for more than \$10.00, add ten percent of the total order amount.

Order From American Opinion, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178