A Short *Uncensored* History

of

American Education

Books by Samuel L. Blumenfeld

How to Start Your Own Private School

The New Illiterates

The Retreat from Motherhood

How to Tutor

Alpha-Phonics: A Primer for Beginning Readers

Is Public Education Necessary?

NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education

The Whole Language/OBE Fraud

Homeschooling: A Parents Guide to Teaching Children

The Victims of Dick and Jane

A Short *Uncensored* History

Of

American Education

In Three Parts

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

73 Bishops Forest Drive Waltham, MA 02452
781-899-6468

Introduction

When we think of American history, we tend to think of it in political terms: the Founding Fathers, the Declaration of Independence, The War for Independence, the issue of slavery, the Civil War, the two World Wars. We also think in terms of material progress, of invention, the expansion to the West, the growth of the economy, the waves of immigration, the building of skyscrapers, the flight to the Moon, the Cold War. We also think in terms of great names: Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Kennedy, Reagan, Edison, Rockefeller, and many more.

But there is another layer of history that the American people are only dimly aware of: the history of American education. Yet, it is our education system that shapes the minds of our children and therefore shapes our future. Many Americans have heard of Horace Mann and John Dewey, but that's about it. We know their names but nothing about what they stood for. In other words, most Americans know virtually nothing of the history of American education or of its importance in shaping our culture.

This short book is intended to remedy that situation. Anyone who reads it will come away with a very good sense of the ideas and forces behind our education system and why it lunges from crisis to crisis with no viable solution in the offing. A free society requires an education system that supports its basic belief in individual and economic freedom. But most important of all, a free society requires educational freedom if it is to survive as a free society. The purpose of this book is to help Americans understand the issues involved with government owned and operated public schools, compulsory attendance laws, and the culture of coercion that underpins the entire system.

It is said that ignorance is bliss, but knowledge is power. Ignorance is the easiest way for us to lose the legacy of freedom, for which our Founding Fathers were willing to give their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. It is for this generation to recapture that love of knowledge that leads to the wisdom needed to secure freedom for future generations.

Part I

The history of American education can be divided into three periods with distinct differences in philosophy and worldviews. The first period covers the beginning of colonization to about 1840 when the public school movement was in full swing, a period of about 200 years, in which the dominant educational philosophy was based on the teachings of the Bible. This period might be called the Calvinist period, since Calvinism was the dominant theology of the earliest settlers in New England. Their worldview was God-centered.

The second period, from 1850 to about 1900 was the period in which the government education system was consolidated. We can call this the Hegelian period since it was the statist philosophy of German philosopher Hegel, in which the state is considered to be the ruling sovereign, that came to dominate the ideology of the educational leaders. Their worldview was state-centered.

The third period is the Progressive period, in which secular socialists, strongly influenced by evolution, eugenics, and the new behavioral psychology took control of the government education system and changed it radically to what it is today. Their worldview was man-centered collectivism.

The Calvinist Period

And so we start at the beginning, with the settlement of the Puritans in New England. The Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1620, and in 1630, with the establishment of Boston, began the mass migration of Puritans from England to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. They came to the New World because it offered an escape from the religious oppression of the Old World. They wanted freedom from the monarchy and the established church. Their desire was to build a Bible commonwealth, a new godly society based on biblical law. They wanted to establish a new civilization in the wilderness built on the word of God.

This was a period of great religious, cultural and political ferment. A struggle between Protestants and Catholics for control of the English throne was the dominant political and religious conflict of the time. Queen Elizabeth, a Protestant, had died in 1603 and was succeeded by James I, who ruled until 1625. James had been educated by Protestant ministers in Scotland, even though his mother, Mary, was a Catholic. The King James Version of the Bible was published in 1611. Shakespeare had died in 1616, and the First Folio of his plays was published in 1623, just about the time that the Puritans began migrating to the New World. James I was succeeded by his son, Charles I, who ruled

until 1649. He was immensely unpopular with the Puritans because of his marriage to a Roman Catholic. His attempt to impose an Anglican prayer book on Presbyterian Scotland led to the "Bishops" wars of 1639-40, in which Charles was defeated. In 1642, the Civil War broke out. In 1646 Charles surrendered, was tried at Westminster Hall, found guilty of treason and beheaded in January 1649. In 1653 Oliver Cromwell established the Protectorate which lasted until 1659. Reaction against Puritanism resulted in the Restoration of Charles II in 1660.

Thus, the political turmoil in England became a great incentive to migrate to the New World. The Puritan leaders were well-educated men who held high religious standards for the colony they were building, which, by way of its charter, was self-governing. For the first time, they were able to breathe the exhilarating air of freedom, and they took their self-government quite seriously. This was their long-sought opportunity to create a God-centered way of life far from the corrupting influences of the Old World. As Calvinists, they believed themselves to be God's elect, who found it their duty to resist any king or government that tried to exact any allegiance of loyalty higher than the one they owed to God. Calvin had written:

> We are subject to the men who rule over us, but subject only in the Lord. If they command anything against Him let us not pay the least regard to it, nor be moved by all the dignity which they possess as magistrates—a dignity to which no injury is done when it is subordinated to the special and truly supreme power of God.

(In that statement we can already see the underpinnings of a Constitution that would be written in 1789, in which it was implicitly recognized that God was indeed sovereign over the nation. George Washington, first President under the new Constitution, made that quite clear in his inaugural address.)

The Puritans in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were determined to create a civil government that would indeed serve the higher purposes of religion. To do so, they limited the voting franchise to Congregational church members only, thus guaranteeing a civil government maintained in the hands of the elect. The Bible commonwealth was thereby established as a working partnership between church and civil authority, over which God's law reigned supreme. Incidentally, each church was independent, and each church congregation elected its own minister. There was no church hierarchy or central governing body. Thus, the system was quite democratic.

Not everyone who came to Massachusetts agreed with this arrangement. The earliest and most notable dissenter was Roger Williams, a devout Calvinist who believed that the path to heaven was so straight and narrow that no community could possibly be made up entirely of true believers. Therefore, he concluded, the best policy was not to mix church and state. Needless to say, the Massachusetts magistrates disagreed with him. One of them remarked: "The prosperity of church and commonwealth are twisted together. Break one cord, you weaken and break the other also." In 1635 Williams was banished from the colony. He then migrated southward, where in the following year he established

the colony of Rhode Island based on complete religious tolerance and a clear separation of church and civil government. He also established the first Baptist Church in America.

The problems that these early settlers faced are still with us today: the separation of church and state, the independence of the church, the relationship between the church and civil government. You can follow the thread of cultural and doctrinal change from the Puritans of New England to the present Supreme Court in Washington.

The Founding of Harvard College

In the same year that Williams was banished, barely six years after the first settlement of Boston, the Massachusetts legislature, known as the General Court, began to lay the foundation of another important institution of the Bible commonwealth, its education system. It appropriated 400 pounds toward the establishment of what was to become Harvard College. Considering that there were only about 5,000 persons in the entire colony at the time and that the grant was larger than all of the taxes levied on the colony in a single year, it indicated how essential education was considered in the Bible commonwealth. Calvin had stressed the importance of an intelligent, learned clergy, knowledgeable in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, familiar with the writings of the Church Fathers, the Scholastic Philosophers, and the Reformers. He had also stressed the secular and economic benefits of education. All of this greatly appealed to the Puritan leaders, among whom were a large number of graduates of Oxford and Cambridge.

Incidentally, if you ever get a chance to read some of the sermons of the early Calvinist ministers who graduated from Harvard, you will be amazed at their erudition, oratory skills, and intellectual prowess.

In 1638, John Harvard, one of the founders of the college, died, leaving to the new institution the sum of 778 pounds and a library of over three hundred books, a considerable legacy in those days. In appreciation of this, the college was named after him. In 1640, the legislature granted to the college the income from the Charlestown ferry, and in 1642 the Governor, along with the magistrates, teachers, and elders, were empowered to establish statutes and constitutions for the infant institution. In 1650, a charter was granted.

The kind of teaching that Harvard was to provide was spelled out in its "Rules and Precepts" as follows:

> Let every student be plainly instructed, and earnestly pressed to consider well, the maine end of his life and studies is, to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life, John 7:3, and therefore to lay Christ in the bottome, as the only foundation of all found knowledge and learning. . . .

Harvard historian Samuel Eliot Morison writes:

> The Harvard student's day began and ended with public prayer; daily he heard a chapter of Scripture expounded by the President; Saturday was given up to catechizing and other preparations for the Sabbath, which was wholly devoted to worship and meditation.

"In Christi Gloriam" appeared on the college seal of 1650. "Veritas" on the original design of the college arms meant divine truth.

The First Law

Meanwhile, in 1642, the General Court enacted the first law concerning the education of the colony's children. The text of the law summed up the colonists' concerns:

> Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoof and benefit to any commonwealth; and whereas many parents and masters are too indulgent and negligent of their duty in this kind:
> It is therefore ordered by this Court and the authority thereof, That the selectmen of every town, in the several precincts and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbors, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families, as not to endeavor to teach, by themselves or others, their children and apprentices as much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue, and knowledge of the capital laws, upon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect therein; also, that all masters of families do, once a week, at least, catechise their children and servants in the grounds and principles of religion, and if any be unable to do so much, that then, at the least, they procure such children or apprentices to learn some short orthodox catechisms, without book, that they may be able to answer to the questions that shall be propounded to them out of such catechisms by their parents or masters, or any of the selectmen, where they shall call them to a trial of what they have learned of this kind. . . .

The selectmen were expected to exert a quasi-ecclesiastical discipline over their communities in matters of education. This was quite in keeping with Calvin's idea of church discipline. "All who either wish the discipline were abolished, " wrote Calvin, "or who impede the restoration of it, whether they do this of design or through thoughtlessness, certainly aim at the complete devastation of the Church. For what will be the result if everyone is allowed to do as he pleases? But this must happen if to the preaching of the gospel are not added private admonition, correction, and similar methods of maintaining doctrine and not allowing it to become lethargic. Discipline, therefore, is a kind of curb to restrain and tame those who war against the doctrine of Christ, or it is a kind of stimulus by which the indifferent are aroused."

Again, we see a modern problem as old as Calvin's concern. How can orthodox religion maintain its orthodoxy in the face of pressures to change? After all the pressures are accommodated, is there any religion left? That's the problem religionists deal with today

on such issues as abortion, gay marriage, and acceptance of gay ministers. Calvin saw the abolition of church discipline as leading to the "complete devastation of the Church."

In addition to the education law of 1642, the following School Code was enacted in 1647. It was the first public school law to be passed in the English colonies:

> It being one chief project of that old deluder, Satan, to keep man from the knowledge of the Scriptures, as in former times, keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these latter times, by persuading from the use of tongues, so that at least the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded and corrupted with false glosses of deceivers; and to the end that learning may not be buried in the grave of our forefathers, in church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors;
> It is therefore ordered by this Court and authority thereof, That every township within this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him, to write and read, whose wages shall be paid, either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supply, as the major part of those who order the prudentials of the town shall appoint; provided that those who send their children be not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other towns.
> And it is further ordered, That where any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, they shall set up a grammar school, the masters thereof being able to instruct youths so far as they may be fitted for the university, and if any other town neglect the performance hereof above one year, then every such town shall pay five pounds per annum to the next such school, till they shall perform this order.

Thus, the emphasis on education was twofold: to encourage learning in general and religious study in particular. In a community committed to doctrinal purity, compulsory education was as much a religious discipline as it was as a means of ensuring literacy. None of the other English colonies, except Connecticut, enacted such education laws. They were settled by a variety of religious sects and governed by charters that gave the crown and the Church of England greater power and influence than they had in New England.

The New Charter

The Puritan oligarchy governed Massachusetts until their charter was revoked by Charles II in 1684. His father, Charles I, had been beheaded by a Puritan-dominated Parliament. Charles II, brought to the throne by a reaction against the Puritans, had no love for the latter. In 1691 a new charter was procured for the colony, which greatly diminished the power of the Congregationalists. Henceforth, the governor would be appointed by the king and the voting franchise would rest upon property rather than membership in a Congregational church. It spelled the legal end of the Bible commonwealth and the legal end of self-government.

Under the new charter, the General Court tried to reinstate all of the laws in effect before the colony lost its charter. But the king's Privy Council vetoed the action. In 1692, the General Court reenacted the compulsory education law of 1647, but now the measure was resisted and ineffectively obeyed. In 1701, the law was stiffened. But it had no great effect. In 1718, fines on scofflaw towns were raised to new heights. But towns found a variety of loopholes to get around compliance with the law.

In all, the Bible commonwealth lasted no more than sixty years. The growth of the colony, the development of trade, the influx of other religious sects, the increased general prosperity, the emergence of religious liberalism, and the revocation of the original charter greatly weakened the hold of the austere Puritan orthodoxy.

New secular interests began to take the place of religion as the main topics of thought and conversation. Private academies run by educator proprietors sprang up to teach the more practical commercial subjects. By 1720 Boston had far more private schools than public ones.

As for the other colonies, all of the Protestant sects placed high value on education. Colleges were founded in Virginia (1693), New Jersey (1746 and 1766), New York (1754), Pennsylvania (1755), Rhode Island (1764), and New Hampshire (1770). Yale had been founded by orthodox Calvinists in Connecticut in 1701 as a reaction against the growing liberalism at Harvard. In fact, a protracted struggle at Harvard between liberals and Calvinists began in earnest when John Leverett, a religious liberal, was elected president in 1707 and set the college on its course away from Calvinist orthodoxy.

Liberalism and the Great Awakening

That the liberalism of the Harvard elite did not reflect the true feelings of the average man in the colonies became quite apparent during the Great Awakening, which began in the 1730s. In September 1740, George Whitefield, the fiery evangelical revivalist, arrived in Boston and addressed 15,000 people on Boston Common. He was invited to Harvard, where the students were eager and attentive but the faculty was rather cool. On a subsequent visit to the Boston area, Whitefield was not even invited to Harvard. Henceforth, he and his followers began to denounce Harvard as a house of impiety and sin. As a result, Harvard experienced a decline in enrollment. But Harvard had the backing of the rich merchant class that had embraced religious liberalism, and thus was able to weather the evangelical storm.

As every schoolboy knows, or should know, the Revolutionary War for American independence broke out in 1775 with the battles at Lexington and Concord. The Declaration of Independence was signed on July 4, 1776, thus officially severing America's political ties to Great Britain and the British crown. It was the high literacy of the colonists that made it possible for the revolution to take place, for this was a revolution of pamphlets, books, letters, sermons, newspapers, and Committees of Correspondence. It was a revolution propelled by the written word.

As for the founding fathers, they were all highly literate and well educated. According to Professor Lawrence Cremin, the 89 signers of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution were the products of the colonies diverse forms of education. Many had attended the provincial colleges, and others represented every conceivable combination of parental, church, apprenticeship, school, tutorial and self-education. They were not the products of a centralized, state-controlled, compulsory public school system.

Therefore, it should surprise no one that education was not mentioned in the new U.S. Constitution. The framers left education up to the parents, communities, churches, proprietors of private schools, and the individual states. There were a few statesmen, like Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who favored free, state-supported education on a very modest scale. But they were in the minority. Thus, at the beginning of the American nation, education, except for some tax-supported common schools in New England, was on a completely laissez-faire basis.

In 1780, Massachusetts drafted a new constitution in which was inserted an article that both confirmed the special status of Harvard and emphasized the commonwealth's continued interest in public education. John Adams framed the article, and its strongest support came from the Harvard-Boston establishment that wanted to maintain the link between government and education.

In 1789, Massachusetts entered the Union and enacted the first comprehensive state school law in the new nation. Although many towns in the commonwealth had abandoned the common schools entirely during the Revolutionary War and there were many citizens who would have liked to be relieved of tax-supported education altogether, the legislators decided to reinstate the common school system. If there were any common schools still in existence in 1789, it was by force of law rather than by popular will.

First Public School System

In 1789, the city of Boston passed its own education act, thereby laying the foundation of the first system of public schools in any American city. But before the law was passed, there was a heated battle over the issue of control. The conservatives advocated the same direct control of the schools by the town selectmen and their appointees as was the case prior to 1789. However, a more democratically oriented faction wanted the schools to be controlled by an elected committee, not an appointed elite. The democratic faction won. Its success was mainly due to the efforts of its leader, Samuel Adams, the fiery revolutionary.

But if Boston had a public school system, it was hardly a comprehensive one. All primary education was still private, and a child had to know how to read and write in order to be eligible for the public grammar school at age seven. The crowning glory of the system was the elitist Boston Latin School, which provided, at public expense, the classical preparatory training needed by those intending to study at Harvard. Some of its

students came from the wealthiest families in Boston. Thus, the purpose of the public system was not to insure literacy for all or to provide special educational opportunities for the poor. Its purpose was simply to perpetuate a government institution and its tax-funded cash flow, mainly for the benefit of educators, textbook writers, publishers and suppliers.

Meanwhile, a fascinating view of education and literacy in the new American republic was given in 1812 by Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours, the founder of the Du Pont chemical company, who escaped the French Revolution and emigrated to the United States. He wrote:

> The United States are more advanced in their educational facilities than most countries. ... Most young Americans, therefore, can read, write and cipher. Not more than four in a thousand are unable to write legibly—even neatly. ...
>
> In America, a great number of people read the Bible, and all the people read a newspaper. The fathers read aloud to their children while breakfast is being prepared—a task which occupies the mother for three quarters of an hour every morning. And as the newspapers of the United States are filled with all sorts of narratives ... they disseminate an enormous amount of information.

In other words, the high level of literacy in the United States was apparent to any perceptive newcomer. Meanwhile, as Boston was developing its new education system, something else of even greater importance was taking place: the emergence of the Unitarian heresy among the Boston-Harvard elite. In 1785, under the ministry of Harvard-educated Unitarian James Freeman, the congregation of King's Chapel in Boston purged their Anglican liturgy of all references to the Trinity, thus establishing the first Unitarian church in America.

Unitarians Take Over Harvard

In 1805, the Unitarians were able to take over Harvard. Although this event is rarely mentioned in the history books, it is no doubt the single most important intellectual event in American history. The circumstances that signaled the takeover were the election of liberal theologian Henry Ware as Hollis Professor of Divinity and the subsequent retreat of the Calvinists to a new seminary of their own in Andover.

The issues at stake in this struggle between Calvinists and Unitarians were fundamental: the nature of God and the nature of man. The liberals, brought up in the moral, benevolent atmosphere of a free, prosperous, ever-expanding society, could no longer accept the Calvinist worldview, which placed the Calvinist interpretation of the Bible at the center of spiritual and moral understanding. The liberals found the Calvinist doctrines of innate depravity, predestination, election, and reprobation particularly repugnant. Calvin's was a God-centered worldview in which a man's life is determined by his personal relationship to an all-powerful God who had expressed his will in the Old and New Testaments. The Ten Commandments were the essence of God's law. They

provided protection to life and property and codified commitment to God and family. They were the restraints that would save men from becoming the victims of their own innate depravity.

The Unitarians rejected all of this. They could not believe in the existence of an unfair, unjust God who elects a few and rejects others, a God who favors some and condemns the rest. Calvin was the first to admit that these doctrines seemed unjust and repugnant, but he answered that God had placed a limit on what man is permitted to know and that man had no choice but to accept God's will as revealed in Scripture and also by the cold facts of life. These facts include the existence of evil, the sufferings of the innocent, the triumph of tyrants, the general difficulties of the human condition in a world ruled by an omnipotent God who, despite all of this, was still a benevolent God because he created man to begin with and gave him the mental tools to take dominion and make a good life for himself.

The Unitarians accepted God's creation of man. But they insisted that man was given the freedom to make of his life whatever he wanted. It is man himself who can decide, through his life on earth, whether he will go to heaven or hell. He is not innately depraved. He is, in fact, rational and morally perfectible. As for the existence of evil, they believed that it was caused by ignorance, poverty, social injustice, and other environmental and social factors. Education, the Unitarians decided, was the only way to solve the problem of evil. Education would eliminate ignorance, which would eliminate poverty, which would eliminate social injustice, which would eliminate crime. Moral progress was as attainable as material progress once the principles of improvement were discovered and implemented.

Unitarian Social Action

Hence, it was only natural that the Unitarians would shift their practice of religion from prayer and the worship of a considerably diminished God of limited powers to the creation of institutions on earth to improve the moral character of man and thereby solve the social problems that were the cause of evil. They believed that virtue, if not salvation itself, was more attainable through learning and culture, than through religion. The one institution that the Unitarians decided could be used to carry out their moral crusade was the public school. Their first organized effort was the campaign in 1818 to create primary public schools in Boston.

A survey of children's education in Boston, conducted by Charles Bulfinch, the noted architect, revealed that there was no need to expand the public school system. An astonishing 96 percent of the town's children were attending school. Over 4,000 children were in private schools at considerable cost to their parents. As for the 4 percent who were not in a private primary school, there were charity schools they could attend if their parents wanted them to. Thus, there was no economic reason to create public primary schools.

Bulfinch raised important moral issues. He claimed that public primary schools were unnecessary because most parents who sent their children to private tuition schools did not look upon the expense as a burden: they paid the cost out of love and a sense of duty. This in turn made them better parents. They were more likely to devote their attention to the business of education "where a small weekly stipend is paid by them for this object, than where the whole expense is defrayed by the public treasury." Bulfinch further implied that moral degeneration would result if public taxes usurped the province of private responsibilities. "It ought never to be forgotten," he argued, "that the office of instruction belongs to parents, and that to the schoolmaster is delegated a portion only of the parental character and rights."

Enter Robert Owen

So with public opinion clearly not in favor of expanding the public system, why did the Unitarians press ahead with their agenda? Because at around that same time, a man in Scotland had proudly broadcast to the civilized world that he had discovered the basic principle of moral improvement. His name was Robert Owen, and we know of him today as the father of socialism. Owen was a self-made manufacturer who became a social messiah when he "discovered" what he considered to be the basic truth about human character: that a man's character is made for him by society through upbringing, education, and environment—not by himself, as religionists taught. Children in a cannibal society grow up to be adult cannibals. Children in a selfish, competitive society, grow up to be selfish and competitive. No one is innately depraved or evil. An infant is a glob of plastic that can be molded to have whatever character society wishes him to have.

Owen started publishing his ideas in 1813 and, to prove that he was right, in 1816 established his famous Institution for the Formation of Character at New Lanark. Through a secular, scientific curriculum coupled with the notion that each pupil must strive to make his fellow students happy, Owen hoped to turn out little rational, cooperative human beings, devoid of selfishness, superstition, and all of the other traits found in religious, capitalist man.

All of these ideas were music to the ears of the Boston Unitarians, who wanted confirmation that man was indeed perfectible through the process of education. But Owen had stressed that the earlier you started training the child the better chance you had to mold his character, which is why the Unitarians launched their campaign to create public primary schools. And this was only the first step, for in 1816 Owen had published an essay outlining a plan for a national system of education whereby the character of a whole nation could be molded to the good of all. He wrote in *A New View of Society*:

> At present, there are not any individuals in the kingdom who have been trained to instruct the rising generation, as it is for the interest and happiness of all that it should be instructed. The training of those who are to form the future man becomes a consideration of the utmost magnitude; for, on due reflection, it will appear that instruction to the young must be, of necessity, the only foundation

> upon which the superstructure of society can be raised. Let this instruction continue to be left, as heretofore, to chance, and often to the most inefficient members of the community, and society must still experience the endless miseries which arise from such weak and puerile conduct. On the contrary, let the instruction of the young be well devised and well executed, and no subsequent proceedings in the state can be materially injurious. For it may truly be said to be a wonder-working power; one that merits the deepest attention of the legislature; with ease it may be used to train man into a daemon of mischief to himself and all around him, or into an agent of unlimited benevolence.

Thus, socialism began as an educational movement to reform the character of man into "future man"—like Lenin's Soviet Man. Leaving education "to chance" meant leaving it private or in the hands of parents. And that is why in 1818 the Unitarians insisted on creating public primary schools rather than subsidizing pupils to attend private ones. It was also the beginning of the organized movement that was to culminate thirty years later in the creation of a compulsory public education system.

Harvard Unitarians Promote Government Education

From the very beginning, the Unitarians and socialists were the prime movers and leaders of this long-range sustained effort. Between 1823 and 1825, James G. Carter, a Harvard Unitarian, published a series of essays deploring the general trend away from the common schools to private schools, advocating the expansion of public education and the creation of state-supported teachers' seminaries. Owen had stressed the need for such seminaries and in his book called them "the most powerful instrument for good that has ever yet been placed in the hands of man." The Harvard-Unitarian elite gave Carter's proposals their strongest endorsement and widest circulation.

In 1825, Robert Owen came to America to establish his communist colony at New Harmony, Indiana. The experiment received a great deal of newspaper publicity and attracted a large number of followers. It was called "an experiment in social reform through cooperation and rational education." But in less than two years it failed. The problem, Owen said, was that people raised and educated under the old system were incapable of adapting themselves to the communist way of life no matter how much they professed to believe in it. Therefore, the Owenites decided that rational education would have to precede the creation of a socialist society, and they subsequently launched a strong campaign to promote a national system of public education.

The Owenite Conspiracy

Owen's son, Robert Dale Owen, and Frances Wright, the Owenite feminist, set up headquarters in New York, helped organize the Workingmen's Party as a front for Owenite ideas, published a radical weekly paper called the *Free Inquirer*, and lectured widely on socialism and national education. However, their anti-Christian views turned so many people away from Owenism, that they were forced to adopt covert techniques to further their ends. One of the men attracted to their cause was Orestes Brownson, a

writer and editor, whose remarkable religious odyssey took him from Calvinism to Universalism to Owenite socialism to Unitarianism and Transcendentalism and finally to Catholicism. Years later, describing his short experience with the Owenites, Brownson wrote:

> The great object was to get rid of Christianity, and to convert our churches into halls of science. The plan was not to make open attacks on religion, although we might belabor the clergy and bring them into contempt where we could: but to establish a system of state,--we said national—schools, from which all religion was to be excluded, in which nothing was to be taught but such knowledge as is verifiable by the senses, and to which all parents were to be compelled by law to send their children.
>
> But the more immediate work was to get our system of schools adopted. To this end it was proposed to organize the whole Union secretly, very much on the plan of the Carbonari of Europe, of whom at that time I knew nothing. The members of this secret society were to avail themselves of all the means in their power, each in his own locality, to form public opinion in favor of education by the state at the public expense, and to get such men elected to the legislatures as would be likely to favor our purposes. How far the secret organization extended, I do not know; but I do know that a considerable portion of the State of New York was organized, for I was myself one of the agents for organizing it.

So now we know that as early as 1829, the socialists had adopted covert techniques to further their ends in the United States, techniques that they continued to use for decades.

It was also in 1829 that Josiah Holbrook launched the Lyceum movement to organize the educators of America into a powerful lobby for public education. While there is no fully documented evidence that Holbook was a covert Owenite, there is much interesting circumstantial evidence that he was. And if the socialists decided to further their cause by working through the instrument of public education, we can then understand why the system has had such a pro-socialist bias for as long as any of us can remember. Indeed, public education was to become the socialists' primary instrument for promoting socialism.

In promoting socialism one also promoted the State, for the secular State was to be the primary political instrument for exercising man's rational power. When Frances Wright lectured in the United States for a national system of education, she left no doubt that the State was to be the ultimate beneficiary of such a system. She wrote in 1829 in the *Free Enquirer:*

> That one measure, by which alone childhood may find sure protection; by which alone youth may be made wise, industrious, moral, and happy; by which alone the citizens of this land may be made, in very deed, *free and equal.* That measure—you know it. It is national, rational, republican education; free for all at the

expense of all; conducted under the guardianship of the state, at the expense of the state, for the honor, the happiness, the virtue, the salvation of the state.

The Free Market Favored Private Academies

But while Josiah Holbrook, with active help from the Unitarians, was organizing the educators through the Lyceum movement, and the Owenites were agitating for a national system of education, the American people were going in the opposite direction. The free market favored private education, and new private academies were springing up all over the country, particularly in Massachusetts, where the town-supported common schools were being abandoned by the middle class.

Thus, had free-market forces been permitted to operate in the educational field without ideological opposition, the common schools would have either disappeared or been reduced to their most rudimentary function as dispensers of free elementary education to a dwindling constituency. In the long run, it would have been more economical for the towns to pay for the tuition of poor children to attend private schools than for the towns to maintain free schools. So the problem was never one of economics; it was, from the very beginning, philosophical. In other words, the aim of the change agents was social control.

If both the socialists and Unitarians embraced educational statism as the future way to human moral progress, it was for two reasons: first, they rejected the Biblical, Calvinist view of man; and second, they rejected the Biblical view of history. Man as sinful and depraved was replaced by man as rational, benevolent, innately good, and perfectible, and the State replaced God as the ultimate Sovereign. But the American form of limited government with its elaborate checks and balances had been created on the basis of the Calvinist distrust of human nature. The Calvinists did not believe that power corrupts man, but that man corrupts power. Man is a sinner by nature and therefore cannot be trusted with power. Only a true fear of God, they believed, could hold sinful man in check.

A Reverse Philosophy of Human Nature

As the orthodox faith waned in the 19th century and faith in rational man grew, Western culture began to accept a reverse philosophy of human nature. To explain why man does the evil things he does, they turned from theology to psychology. The first pseudo-scientific attempt to explain the origin of criminal behavior was phrenology. It was developed by a German physician, Franz Joseph Gall, who in the course of treating the insane became convinced that the brain was the organic seat of personality development. He worked out a map of the brain claiming that he could identify the specific organic locations of such personality traits as "combativeness, destructiveness, love of approbation, benevolence, conscientiousness" and other such traits. Gall's teachings had considerable impact on the thinking of many 19th century educators, including Horace Mann.

As for the Biblical view of history, the Romantic movement projected a new heroic image of man as conqueror and innovator, and mankind was viewed in a universal sense as one big progressive family. Thus was born the myth of moral progress: the idea that man was always getting morally better and better.

The prime modern promoter of this idea was the German philosopher Georg Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), who formulated the dialectical process of human moral progress, a process liberated from the strictures of the Old and New Testaments. He replaced the objectively real God of the Bible with a subjective pantheism in which man is revealed as the highest manifestation of God in the universe. Rational, heroic, perfectible man was elevated to godlike status, and his secular state was expected to dispense a justice and equality not to be found in the Scriptures. Liberated, unrestrained rational man would create, not unlimited evil as Calvinists believed, but unlimited good.

The Prussian Idea of Education

It was only natural, therefore, that the Harvard-Unitarian elite would look toward Prussia for their statist models. And they found exactly what they were looking for in the Prussian state system of compulsory schooling, with its truant officers, graded classes, and uniform curriculum. That system had been set up in 1819, and Robert Owen claimed in his autobiography that the Prussian system was built on his ideas. Of course, Luther had advocated public schools at the time of the Reformation. But the Prussian system was a model of centralized control, and it had the one feature that Owen considered indispensable for a successful state system: state training schools for teachers. It was acknowledged by the Prussians that you really cannot control education until you control the teachers and their indoctrination. In other words, teachers were to become the front-line troops for statism.

Members of the Harvard-Unitarian elite had acquired a taste for German education while studying at German universities, but Americans had no interest in adopting such a system for themselves. However, in 1833, a French professor of philosophy, Victor Cousin, published a lengthy report on the Prussian system for his own government, which was subsequently translated into English and published in the United States. It was exactly what the public school movement needed, and it was distributed widely among American educators, who began to arrive at a consensus that the Prussian system was the way to go.

The fact that Cousin had written the report added to its prestige, for Cousin was the main transmission belt of Hegelianism to the Harvard elite. His series of lectures on Hegel's philosophy of history was widely read among the Harvard Unitarians, many of whom became Transcendentalists.

Enter Horace Mann

Thus, by the time Horace Mann entered the scene in 1837 as the first secretary of the newly created Massachusetts Board of Education, the groundwork had been thoroughly laid by the Owenites, Unitarians, and Hegelians. Mann, a talented lawyer-legislator, was

chosen by the Harvard-Unitarian elite to bring educational statism to Massachusetts because he had demonstrated that when it came to legislation, he could give the liberals whatever they wanted. They had enormous confidence in him, and he never disappointed them.

If any single individual can claim credit for changing America's social, academic, and ultimately political direction from a libertarian to a statist one, the credit must go to Horace Mann, for it was Mann who was able to overcome the considerable opposition to statism, while others could not. The key to his success was in his peculiar sense of mission, combined with his practical political experience as a legislator and the strong financial, cultural, and social backing of the Harvard-Unitarian elite.

He hated Calvinism with a passion and fought Calvinist opposition with a ferocity that disturbed some, but delighted most of his Unitarian backers. But he succeeded mainly because he knew how to divide the opposition. By the mid-1830s, even some Trinitarian Protestants were being swayed by German religious liberalism. Also, Protestant leaders like Calvin Stowe and Lyman Beecher, who were based in Ohio, saw in the Prussian educational system a model they could use in their own efforts to maintain the Protestant character of American culture in the face of massive Catholic immigration.

In any case, the backbone of the opposition to educational statism was made up primarily of orthodox Calvinists who feared the long-range antireligious effects of secular public education and favored the decentralized common-school system as it existed before the Board of Education came into being. One of them, Edward Newton, summed it up in these words in the *Christian Witness* in 1844: "We do not need this central, all-absorbing power; it is anti-republican in all its bearings, well-adapted perhaps, to Prussia, and other European despotisms, but not wanted here."

Despite considerable and continued opposition, all attempts to stop the growth of educational statism failed. Thus, from its very inception educational statism was the promoter of political statism itself in America. To Mann, the symbol of the triumph of statism was the creation of the first state Normal School. The Normal School was the state-financed and -controlled teachers' college. No sooner had Mann been appointed secretary of the Board of Education by Gov. Edward Everett, than he got to work setting up the first Normal School in Lexington. It was done through the financial help of a prominent Unitarian industrialist, whose funds were matched by the state legislature. It was established in 1838 as an experiment. Opposition to the idea of state-controlled teacher training remained strong, until 1845 when the opposition was finally overcome.

The Normal School

In March 1845, the Massachusetts legislature voted to appropriate $5,000 in matching funds to the $5,000 raised by Mann's Harvard-Unitarian friends to build two additional normal schools. In describing the dedication ceremony at one of the schools, Mann wrote this in the *Common School Journal* (October 1, 1846):

> What constituted the crowning circumstance of the whole was, that the Legislature, in making the grant, changed the title or designation of the schools. In all previous reports, laws, and resolves, they had been called "Normal Schools." But by the resolves for the erection of the new houses, it was provided that these schools should thereafter be known and designated as *State* Normal Schools,--the State thus giving to them a paternal name, as the sign of adoption, and the pledge of its affection.

To Mann, who believed the normal school to be "a new instrumentality to the advancement of the race," the linking of State power to teacher education was indeed a crowning circumstance, creating what James G. Carter had described in 1825 as a powerful "engine to sway the public sentiment, the public morals, and the public religion, more powerful than any other in possession of government." Carter was perfectly right, for once the philosophy of statism is firmly entrenched in a nation's teachers' colleges, that philosophy will very soon permeate every other aspect of society.

The simple truth that experience has taught us is that the most potent and significant expression of statism is a State education system. Without it, statism is impossible. With it, the State can, and has become everything.

The Conservative Failure

In March 1840, a Bill was introduced in the Massachusetts House of Representatives abolishing the Board of Education and the Normal Schools. In presenting the Bill, the House Committee on Education also submitted a report explaining its reasons for the Bill. Tney recognized that these new ideas had been imported from Europe. They wrote:

> Your Committee have already stated, that the French and Prussian system of public schools appears to have been devised, more for the purpose of modifying the sentiments and opinions of the rising generations, according to a certain government standard, than as a mere means of diffusing elementary knowledge. .
>
> The right to mould the political, moral, and religious, opinions of his children, is a right exclusively and jealously reserved by our laws to every parent; and for the government to attempt directly or indirectly, as to these matters, to stand in the parent's place, is an undertaking of very questionable policy.

In other words, the legislators understood fully the implications of a Prussian type system imposed on the people of Massachusetts. But the liberals were prepared for the attack and accused the conservative legislators of acting in fear of imaginary evils. But what finally led to the defeat of the conservatives was the fact that some prominent Protestant leaders, Calvin Stowe in particular, had decided to join the statist bandwagon. Stowe had also visited Prussia and was impressed with its system. Of the orthodox who opposed the new nonsectarian system, Stowe wrote:

> I pity the poor bigot or the narrow-souled unbeliever, who can form no idea of religious principle, except as a sectarian thing.

When the Bill was finally defeated, Horace Mann, lecturing in New York, was informed of the victory. He wrote in his journal:

> Heard yesterday from Boston that the bigots and vandals had been signally defeated in their wicked attempts to destroy the Board of Education.

But if truth be said, it was the anti-Catholic bigotry of the Protestants that led them to join forces with the Owenites, Unitarians, and liberals in destroying educational freedom.

Part II

The Hegelian Period

In Part I, we showed that the natural trend in education among the American people was toward greater freedom and choice, while the trend among the intellectual elite was toward greater government control. American parents preferred the private academies. The intellectual elite not only wanted a government controlled system of public schools, but also government owned teachers' colleges.

All of the problems that plague education today were in some way present from the earliest times: compulsion, religion, curriculum, control, taxation. The year 1844 saw the eruption of a full-scale war in Boston between conservative traditionalists and progressive liberals on the matter of curriculum.

Horace Mann Battles Conservative School Masters

Horace Mann had visited Prussia in the summer of 1843 and came back to Boston to write a glowing account of the Prussian schools in his Seventh Annual Report, published in 1844. To the Association of Boston Masters, this was the last straw. For seven years they had silently endured Mann's nonstop criticism of the Boston schools and their teachers. Mann had to do this in order to justify the reforms he wanted to implement.

In self-defense, the Masters produced their famous critique, *Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education,* published in August 1844. The Masters took particular issue with Mann over methods of teaching reading. The Masters preferred the time-tested alphabetic phonics method, while Mann preferred the whole-word method, which had been invented by the Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, the teacher of the deaf and dumb in Hartford, Connecticut. Because the deaf could not learn to read via a phonetic system, which required hearing language sounds, Gallaudet devised a whole-word or sight method whereby words and pictures were juxtaposed with one another so that the deaf reader would associate the printed word with the picture. Gallaudet had a modicum of success with this method and thought it could be adapted for use by normal children. He produced a little book, *The Mother's Primer*, which taught the student about fifty sight words—words learned without any knowledge of the letters or letter sounds—after which the letters in the words were identified.

What Gallaudet was unaware of is that teaching a child fifty sight words produces a holistic reflex, that is, an automatic view of printed words as whole configurations. The child cannot see the phonetic structure of the word because he has not been taught the letters or the letter sounds. Once the child develops this holistic reflex, it becomes an

obstacle to learning to read phonetically, and therefore produces reading disability. This is exactly what happened in Boston when Gallaudet's method was adopted by the Boston primary schools in 1837 and caused the reading problems that the Boston Masters were complaining about in 1844. One of the Boston Masters, Samuel S. Greene, wrote a scathing critique of the whole-word method, which was included in the Masters' *Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report.* That critique is as valid today as it was in 1844. That critique was published in this writer's book, *The New Illiterates.*

The Boston Masters were also critical of Mann's adulation of Phrenology, the theory that all of man's emotions and propensities are located in specific areas of the brain. It was an early, primitive form of behavioral psychology. Mann had seen to it that both the whole-word method of teaching reading and phrenology were required subjects in the Normal Schools, indicating that educational quackery got its start in the very first governmental teachers colleges.

In the end, the Boston Masters, representing sound conservative educational principles, were defeated in favor of the new doctrines and theories of the progressives who had the backing of the wealthy and influential Harvard-Unitarian elite. A press campaign of ridicule and vituperation against the Masters permitted Mann to survive the assault. But the conservatives had the last word in the debate. They said:

> Education is a great concern; it has often been tampered with by vain theorists; it has suffered much from the stupid folly and the delusive wisdom of its treacherous friends; and we hardly know what have injured it most. Our conviction is, that is has much more to hope from the collected wisdom and common prudence of the community, than from the suggestions of the individual. Locke injured it with his theories, and so did Rousseau, and so did Milton. All their plans were too splendid to be true. It is to be advanced by conceptions, neither soaring above the clouds, nor grovelling on the earth,--but by those plain, gradual, productive, common-sense improvements, which use may encourage and experience suggest. ...
>
> We have uttered our testimony—we have spoken in earnest but not in anger. We love the Secretary, but we hate his theories. They stand in the way of all substantial education. It is impossible for a sound mind not to hate them. Every good man will hate them, in proportion as he reverences truth and loves mankind. We hope to see them laid as low in the dust as we are.

Meanwhile, disagreement between orthodox and liberal Protestants over joining the public school movement revolved around the issue of religion in the schools. To the orthodox, nonsectarian education was secular education, and it was unworthy of the sons of the Puritans. But the majority view was expressed in a report written in 1849 for the General Association of Massachusetts, the leading Protestant organization in the state. It reflected its basic queasiness in joining with the Owenites and Unitarians in the creation of a secular education system. They wrote:

> The benefits of this system, in offering instruction to all, are so many and so great that its religious deficiencies,—especially since they can be otherwise supplied, do not seem to be a sufficient reason for abandoning it, and adopting in place of it, a system of denominational parochial schools. . . . On the whole, it seems to be the wisest course, at least for the present, to do all in our power to perfect so far as it can be done, not only its intellectual, but also its moral and religious character.
>
> If after a full and faithful experiment, it should at last be seen that fidelity to the religious interests of our children forbids a further patronage of the system, we can unite with the Evangelical Christians in the establishment of private schools, in which more full doctrinal religious instruction may be possible.

In other words, the assent of the Protestants was conditional. If the public schools turned out to be harmful to the religious interests of the children, they would leave the system. Now, the experiment has gone on for over a hundred years, and it is obvious that it has been a colossal failure, not only from a religious point of view, but also moral and academic. That is why new Christian schools are springing up every day, and hundreds of thousands of Christian parents are home schooling their children.

Of course, the orthodox more or less predicted what would happen. But they were not heeded. The liberals, on the other hand, wanted the public schools for another reason: as a means of countering the massive immigration of Catholics. The public schools were needed to proselytize Catholic children. So what did the Catholics do? They created their own parochial school system, which exists to this day. Bishop John Hughes of New York said in 1840:

> To make an infidel what is it necessary to do? Cage him up in a room, give him a secular education from the age of five years to twenty-one, and I ask you what he will come out, if not an infidel?

Compulsory School Attendance

In 1852, the Massachusetts legislature passed the first statewide compulsory school attendance law in the U.S. The new law required every child between the ages of 8 and 14 to attend public school for at least 3 months every year; six of those weeks had to be consecutive. Any parents who kept their children out of school were subject to a fine. The law exempted children with mental or physical ill health and children receiving equivalent education by other means.

The orthodox argued against the Bill in that it threatened parental rights. But the liberals prevailed by contending that the massive immigration by Catholics threatened the social stability of society and that compulsory school attendance would turn their children into useful citizens. As one prominent liberal explained, "Unless they are made inmates of our schools, many of them will become inmates of our prisons."

The Educators Organize

In 1857, the National Education Association was founded at a meeting in Philadelphia called by the presidents of ten state teachers associations. One of the organizers, Thomas W. Valentine, president of the New York Teachers Association, told the gathering:

> What we want is an association that shall embrace all the teachers of our whole country, which shall hold its meeting at such central points as shall accommodate all sections and combine all interests. And we need this not merely to promote the interests of our own profession, but to gather up and arrange the educational statistics of our country, so that the people may know what is really being done for public education, and what yet remains to be done. I trust the time will come when our government will have its educational department just as it now has one for agriculture, for the interior, for the navy, etc.

The glories of the Prussian system had been broadcast far and wide by the promoters of centralized, compulsory public schooling and American educators wanted what the Europeans had, a Ministry of Education to oversee a national education system. That's what the Owenites had called for.

Initially, the organization was called the National Teachers Association, but in 1870 it was changed to National Educational Association and its doors were thrown open wide to include "any person in any way connected with the work of education." This immediately enhanced the commercial benefits of the organization, for now book publishers, salesmen and suppliers could also join.

But more importantly, the NEA became the national forum in which all of the vital educational issues of the time were aired: public versus private education; secularism versus religion; the role of government in education; teacher training and philosophies of education; curriculum content; discipline; school financing—problems that are still with us today and just as insoluble now as then.

Many of these problems were caused by the government's very intrusion into education. The educators found themselves defending and promoting an institution that had to have a recognizable public mission to justify its claim on public funds. Even in the early days of public education, a consensus view justifying the new and developing system was never really achieved for one very simple reason: it could not satisfy the needs and values of all the citizens. In fact, it never has and never will.

Opposition to Government Education

The argument in favor of private education was perhaps best expressed by Edward Hitchcock in 1845 when describing the virtues of the private academy. He wrote:

> My chief objects are, to bring prominently before you the principle, that systems of education ought to be wisely suited to the character and condition of the people among whom they are introduced; and then to proceed to show that the system of American academies is well adapted to the character, habits and wants of this country. . . .
>
> In most European countries, the education of the people is almost entirely under the control of the government, and is used as an engine of tremendous power for the support of the government. . . . Now this may be best for men living under arbitrary, or aristocratic forms of government. But in this country the government presumes that every parent is intelligent and judicious enough to judge what sort of an education it is best to give his children; and, therefore, it leaves the community to establish such seminaries as it pleases; extending to them only its protection and occasional pecuniary aid.

I quote the opponents of government education so that the reader will know that there was considerable opposition to the imposition of a Prussian style education system on this country. There was also opposition to the increased taxes needed to finance the government system of education. In 1849, a group of citizens in New York State petitioned the legislature to repeal a law establishing free public schools throughout the state. They wrote:

> We consider said law to be worse than the enactments of Great Britain, which caused the American Revolution, for they were enforced by a despotic foreign power, but this School Law is enforced upon us unjustly, by our neighbors, whom we heretofore considered and treated as friends. . . . We are alarmed at the rapid increase of taxation, and rely upon the wisdom of the Legislature for the arrest of its progress; and fondly indulge the hope that we shall not be compelled to endure the humiliating transition from the elevated position of Free Man, to the deplorable condition of free slaves."

Of course, the law was not repealed. By 1885, one educator could write:

> The fundamental principle that "the property of the State must be taxed to educate the children of the State," now finds general acceptance in all parts of our Union. The sentiment that the "perpetuity of the republic requires intelligence and virtue in the masses," is very generally received.

Obviously, the philosophy of statism had come to be generally accepted by many Americans. The Civil War had increased the power of government, as every war does, and the educators took advantage of the public's growing reliance on government to solve the nation's problems. Hegelianism had become the religion of the educational leadership. This was the philosophy developed by Hegel in Germany during the early part of the 19th century. His basic ideas were simple enough to be fully understood by those secularists who intended to restructure the world according to their meaning.

Hegel's Philosophy

Hegel denied that God is a personality or entity apart from the universe he created—such as Jehovah of the Bible or Jesus Christ who was his divine presence on earth—a God with whom one could form a covenant. To Hegel that was all mythology. His view was that God is everything that exists, all inclusive, and that everything in the universe is a part of God. This concept is known as pantheism.

Hegel said that the Universe is nothing more than God mind, or spirit, or energy, in the process of achieving its own perfection or self-realization. The process, as human beings saw it and lived it, was history, and the dynamic method whereby perfection was being achieved is the dialectic. The dialectic is an evolutionary process whereby the present state of things, with all of its inner contradictions, is known as the "thesis" which is then challenged by an "antithesis" which, after a prolonged struggle between the two, emerges as a "synthesis."

This synthesis then becomes the new thesis, which in turn is challenged by the inevitable antithesis, which, after the necessary struggle, becomes the new synthesis. The process is supposed to go on ad infinitum until perfection or self-realization is reached. Thus, Hegel saw history as an evolutionary process of dialectical idealism leading toward perfection.

To Hegel, man's mind is a microcosm of the divine mind. Nature, or the material world, is the outer form of this divine spirit. Man, as part of nature, is made in the image of God, and his mind is the highest manifestation of the God Spirit in nature, for, as one American educator put it, man "*is* Divinity awakening out of the sleep of infinitely self-expanded being. And as the expansion is infinite, so the concentration of Return is infinite, assuring to the individual soul an infinite destiny, consisting of endless progress in self-realization, one essential phase of which must be an ever-deepening consciousness of its own Godlikeness."

Covenant Religion Versus Hegelianism

This was heady stuff for the Harvard intellectuals whose Puritan ancestors believed in the depraved, fallen nature of man and his need for salvation through Christ. They preferred Hegel's vision of a pantheist universe, in which God was reduced to a state of harmless energy, and Man elevated to the position of God. It was a wonderfully sinless universe in which mankind was free to create heaven on earth. Christ was indeed divine, but only in the sense that all men are divine. If Christianity was to be practiced in harmony with Hegelianism, it would not be a covenant religion with salvation through grace (orthodoxy), but a philosophical religion preaching ethics and good works (liberalism).

But then along came Karl Marx and the materialists who believed that the dialectical conflict was indeed the historical process whereby mankind was evolving but that the divine energy idea was a lot of bunk. Soulless matter in motion was all there was, and Man was just another form of matter. The struggle between capitalism and socialism,

between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, was the dialectical struggle taking place during this phase of human history. Communist revolutionaries were capable of speeding up and controlling the process by taking an active part in intensifying the dialectical conflict between classes. It was Marx's dialectical materialism which gave the atheist revolutionaries the philosophical justification for their brutal behavior.

How did Hegel's philosophy elevate the status of the state? It was quite simple. If in a pantheist universe there was no objectively real God handing down His law to His creatures, then the only law that could exist is man's law. In fact, in a pantheist universe, man's law becomes indistinguishable from God's law, for man's mind is supposedly the highest manifestation of the universal divine spirit. Indeed, in such a universe one can go further and assert that man's law is God's law, and that his State is supreme for there is no other above it. For Hegel, the State was God walking on earth.

The Divine State

This divine concept of statism had profoundly dangerous implications for America. Our form of government had been created by Calvinists and other Christians who believed that God's law was superior to man's law, and that the state, or government, is "instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the Consent of the Governed" for the purpose of securing men's inherent, God-given rights and protecting them from tyrants who would deprive them of these rights. This required a government of limited powers, limited by divine law higher than the government's law.

Hegelianism began to infect American intellectuals in the 1830s. Calvinists were particularly alarmed at its spread among Harvard's Unitarian elite. The deification of man was seen as the most ominous sign of the new philosophy. The *Princeton Review* stated in 1840:

> The most offensive aspect of this whole system is, that in deifying men, it deifies the worst passions of our nature. "This," says a writer in Hengstenberg's Journal, "is the true, positive blasphemy of God,—this veiled blasphemy,—this diabolism of the deceitful angel of light,—this speaking of reckless words, with which the man of sin sets himself in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. The atheist cannot blaspheme with such power as this; his blasphemy is negative; he simply says, There is no God. It is only out of Pantheism that a blasphemy can proceed, so wild, of such inspired mockery, so devoutly godless, so desperate in its love of the world; a blasphemy at once so seductive, and so offensive, that it may well call for the destruction of the world."

In terms of education, however, Hegelianism seemed far less radical and dangerous than its theology. Indeed, it was quite conservative, for the Hegelians placed great emphasis on the development of the mind. Man's mind is what distinguished him from the animals and made him the highest manifestation of the universal divine spirit in nature. Therefore, it was the duty of the Hegelian to create the kind of state-controlled secular educational system that emphasized man's intellectual skills. Thus the Hegelian

classroom was characterized by discipline, silent activity, punctuality, cleanliness, and academic learning.

Ironically, after 1880 some of the sharpest criticism of progressive child-centered education came from Hegelian educators, one of whom wrote:

> Hegel is in full accord with what in one or another form is the world-old doctrine that, as the child of nature, man is evil; that is, that his immediate inclinations pertain to his animal nature, and that only through training and discipline can he be brought into the state of positive moral life. . . .
>
> Hegel should have little patience with the sentimental sympathy for mere childhood as such and which would at all cost please the child—eliminating law by substituting the child's caprice in place of law. . . . The child, instead of being humored and excused in respect to his irregularities, must be brought to prize order and punctuality. . . .This is to be accomplished through the steady pressure of a wise, consistent, albeit kindly, authority. To endeavor always to persuade the child that the thing required of him is somethng that will prove pleasing to him, is to pervert his mind and confirm him in the belief that he ought to do nothing except what will give him pleasure in the doing.

William Torrey Harris: America's Hegelian Educator

The most prominent Hegelian educator in America was William Torrey Harris who became president of the National Education Association in 1875 and was appointed United States Commissioner of Education in 1889 by President Harrison. Born in Connecticut in 1835, Harris was educated at private academies and graduated from Yale in 1857. It was at Yale that A. Bronson Alcott, a Transcendentalist, got Harris interested in philosophy. In 1858 Harris began his career in the public schools of St. Louis, Missouri, first as assistant teacher, then teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and finally superintendent. In the 1860s he became an enthusiastic believer in Hegel's philosophy and founded the Philosophical Society of St. Louis and the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy.* In 1873 he became president of the National Association of School Superintendents. He was a life director of the NEA and spoke at their conventions more often—145 times—than any other educator.

In 1880 he resigned his position in St. Louis and settled in Concord, Massachusetts, as a member of the School of Philosophy. He was U.S. Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906. As commissioner he set the standards of public education according to Hegel's philosophy. Punctuality, discipline, grammar, study of the classics—all the trappings of "traditional" education—were emphasized. Much of this traditional curriculum was agreeable to religionists, but its results were not what they expected. To a fundamental Christian, education that fosters secular intellectual development can lead to intellectual pride and arrogance and the belief that man can be as God—the sin of pride. But within a religious context, intellectual development can lead to a greater understanding of God's sovereignty and a reverence for His creation.

The Statist Agenda

The statist agenda of the public educators was well aired at annual NEA conventions. In 1865, Samuel S. Greene of Rhode Island called for a National System of Education. In 1866, Zalmon Richards reiterated the need for a U.S. Department of Education. In 1869, Charles Brooks, Unitarian minister from Massachusetts and a tireless advocate of the Prussian system, called for a National System of Free Schools. In 1873 and '74 calls for a National University—a sort of intellectual West Point—came from William T. Harris, Harvard president Charles W. Eliot, and Andrew D. White.

Speeches advocating National Aid to Public Education of some kind or another could be heard at virtually every NEA convention from 1869 onward. The statist philosophy was promoted in such speeches as "The Duties of an American State in Respect to Higher Education" (1866), "Education and the Building of the State" (1881), "The State and School; the Foundation Principle of Education by the State" (1882), "Supervision of Private Schools by the State or Municipal Authorities" (1893), "The Duty of the State in Education" (1899), etc. The educators were promoting the Hegelian concept of the state before most Americans had even heard of Hegel.

Meanwhile, the state system continued to grow in two directions—downward to include more younger children and upward to include older children. In 1873, there were 42 public kindergartens in the U.S. By 1902 there were 3,244. In 1860 there were only 60 public high schools in the U.S. By 1900, about 700,000 young Americans were attending public high schools. Many private academies, unable to compete with these free schools, disappeared.

Statist arguments were used to expand the public system to include high schools. At the St. Louis NEA convention in 1871, Newton Bateman, the Illionois state superintendent of public instruction, used these remarkable words to justify the state's interest in public high schools:

> The amount of latent and dormant power; of wealth-discovering and wealth-producing energy; of beauty-loving and beauty-inspiring taste and skill, that lie concealed and slumbering in the brains and hearts and hands of the keen, shrewd, capable, but untutored millions of our youth, is beyond computation. Now over all this unreclaimed but magnificent intellectual and moral territory, over all of these minds and souls and bodies, with their untold possibilities of good, the State has, in my opinion, a sort of right of eminent domain and not only may, but should exercise it in the interest of her own prosperity and dignity.

What Bateman was saying, in effect, is that American youth is a natural resource to be exploited by the state for "her own prosperity and dignity," not for the simple benefit of the individuals who own their talents. Bateman infers that without compulsory

education, the individual would be incapable of developing these talents, and therefore the state has the right of eminent domain to take possession of that individual and educate him to serve the state. He was echoing those German philosophers who believed that "the happiness of the individual should be included in and made subservient to the general good."

Such collectivist philosophy was totally contrary to the principles of individual freedom on which this nation was founded. The American form of government was created to protect individual rights, not abrogate them. Yet, apparently public educators were more than willing to abandon those principles in order to justify the expansion of a system of government education in which they had strong economic and professional interests.

An Eerie Look Into the Future

In 1906, the NEA reached its fiftieth birthday. To celebrate the occasion, it published a volume of anniversary papers. One of the distinguished educators invited to contribute to the volume was Friedrich Paulsen of the University of Berlin, whose paper was entitled "The Past and the Future of German Education." The Prussian system had served as the ideal model for American public educators, and they were interested in how the German system was evolving. Paulsen wrote:

> In looking back over the entire field, we observe that two general principles stand out quite prominently: on the one hand, the constant tendency to secularize institutions of learning and to place them under the management of the state, and on the other hand, the continuous dissemination of systematic school training over ever-widening circles of the community . . . .The cause of this [secularization] movement evidently lies in the general deterioration of the church, and in the advancement of the state as the ruling power in modern life. . . .
>
> The state will not surrender the right to regulate education after having once attained this right. . . .Besides, we cannot deny that education is too intimately associated with the enlarged purposes and tasks of the state for the latter to countenance a return from the new political to the old ecclesiastical order. . . . Every modern civilized nation conceives as its mission the preservation and elevation of its people.
>
> It is safe to say that the recent successes of the German people have done much to convince other nations how important a national system of education and training is for the entire population, for the efficient self-development of the people from the military and economic standpoints as well.

Little did Professor Paulsen know that the whole Hegelian scheme of secular nation-states in Europe, supposedly dedicated to the "preservation and elevation" of their peoples, would in eight short years explode into the bloodiest war in history, resulting in the deaths of millions. And nineteen years later, it would produce the monstrous regime of Adolf Hitler with its pagan symbolism, demented racism, and unprecedented

barbarism. We now know that it was the Hegelian professors and scientists in German universities who prepared the way to paganism. Indeed, the critics of 1840 were chillingly prophetic when they warned that Hegelianism was "so devoutly godless . . . that it may call for the destruction of the world."

Part III

The Progressive Period

We can get an idea of the growth and consolidation of the public school movement by measuring the growth of the National Education Association. In its early years the NEA was little more than a forum for the men who were shaping and running America's growing public school systems. It wasn't until 1893 that the NEA elected its first paid secretary. He was Irwin Shepard, president of the Normal School at Winona, Minnesota. He ran the affairs of the association until 1912 at an annual salary of $4,000.

Membership did not reach over 400 until 1884, when 2,400 people attended the annual convention. In 1918, membership reached 10,000. Four years later, in 1922, it was up to 118,032. In 1945, it was up to 331,905. In 1953, it reached the half-million mark. In 1962, when the NEA became a full-fledged labor union, its membership was 812,497.

In 1879, Thomas W. Bicknell, founder of the *National Journal of Education,* called for the creation of a special body of top educational leaders and experts within the NEA to "discuss questions involving the principles and philosophy of education, and sustaining an advisory relation to state and national systems of education." What emerged in 1880 was the National Council of Education, a sort of exclusive body of top leaders who were in key positions of power and influence within the education establishment.

Some of the better known educators involved as members, speakers or honorary members were W.T. Harris, John Dewey, Nicholas Murray Butler, G. Stanley Hall, Josiah Royce, Charles W. Eliot, and James Earl Russell. It was in the forum of the National Council where the struggle between Hegelian and Progressive views began to take shape. The proceedings of the meetings reveal the ideas that were setting the stage for the profound changes that would take place within American education from the 1890s onward.

Actually, the struggle was between a new faith in science and a waning faith in Christianity and Hegelianism. An absolute faith in science became the driving force behind the progressives. To them the Bible and its pessimistic view of man's nature was folklore, and Hegel's universal mind-spirit was unprovable philosophical speculation. Science, on the other hand, relied on positive, empirical evidence only—what could be seen, touched, and measured. Subject men to scientific investigation, and the laboratory would reveal the secrets of human nature and enable educators to create the kind of schools and curricula which would produce, if not perfect men, at least the kinds of men and women the educators considered desirable.

The Influence of Evolution

The most important idea that influenced the educators was that of evolution—the notion that man, through a process of natural selection, had evolved into his present state from a common animal ancestry. Evolution was as sharp a break with the Biblical view of creation as anyone could make, and it was quickly picked up by those anxious to disprove the validity of orthodox religion. Evolution had shifted interest away from Hegel. Hegel had dealt with moral and social evolution by way of the dialectic which was somehow connected with that evolving universal world spirit. To Hegel, man's mind was directly linked to the great infinite mind and was a microcosm of it. But according to Darwin, a naturalist, man was linked downward to the lower animals and shared his ancestry with the apes. There was no mystical pantheistic spirit involved in the physical process of evolution. It was all "matter in motion" and it fit in very well with the dialectical materialism of the atheist Marxists who were now able to link man's physical evolution with his social evolution. And it was all, according to them, an inevitable historical process.

Darwin's book, *Origin of Species,* was published in 1859. But its influence on American educators was not felt until the 1880s when, through laboratory work in German universities, the field of psychology caught up with those of physiology and biology.

The most prominent American scholar to study in Germany was William James. While still a medical student at Harvard, James visited the University of Berlin in 1867 where he attended lectures by Helmholz on physiology. Helmholz and his assistant, Wilhelm Wundt, were applying scientific methods to the study of the nervous systems of frogs, dogs, and other animals in their laboratory through vivisection. Since it was generally accepted that man and the lower animals had a common ancestry, such study was a prelude to the scientific study of man himself.

The German Influence

The following year another young American traveled to Europe to soak up German science and philosophy. He was G. Stanley Hall who spent 1868-69 at the University of Berlin studying theology and physiology. Hall, a product of an orthodox New England farm family, totally succumbed to German influences.

"Germany almost remade me," he later wrote. "I came home feeling that I had also attained maturity in my religious consciousness, where most suffer such dwarfing arrest. I had felt the charm of pantheism, ... of agnosticism, of even materialism, ... had wrestled with Karl Marx and half accepted of what I understood of him; thought Comte and the Positivists had pretty much made out their case. But the only whole-hearted scheme of things which I had accepted with ardor and abandon was that of an evolution which applied no whit less to the soul than the body of man. This was bedrock. Darwin, Haeckel, and especially Herbert Spencer seemed then to me to represent the most advanced stage of human thought."

Hall returned to the United States in 1871 in full revolt against his Puritan upbringing. But he managed to keep his radical thinking to himself, knowing that he would not be hired for anything if his radicalism were known. In 1872, he took a teaching position at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, a "western outpost of Unitarianism" where Horace Mann spent the last fourteen years of his life. "From Antioch," writes Hall, "I several times made excursions to St. Louis to spend Saturday evening with the Hegelian, William T. Harris, who had won national fame by his educational reconstruction of the St. Louis schools, which was widely copied." A member of that St. Louis group was Thomas Davidson who would in 1883 found the Fabian Society in London. The Fabians would socialize Britain through the slow method of permeation.

Professor Wundt and the New Psychology

Hall was determined to return to Germany for further study in psychology. He had read Wundt's new book on psychology and wanted to study with the master himself. But before doing so he spent the year 1875 teaching English at Harvard. During that period Hall and James became intimate friends, sharing a strong interest in experimental psychology. Hall spent the next two years at the University of Leipzig. He was the first American to work in Wundt's new laboratory devoted to experimental psychology. He also worked in Prof. Ludwig's physiology lab, where experiments were conducted on living tissue, using rats, rabbits, guinea pigs, dogs, pigeons, etc. Hall then spent a year at the University of Berlin working with Prof. Helmholz, the first scientist to accurately measure the rate of the transmission of a stimulus along nerves by using the sciatic nerve in the frog.

Hall then returned to Harvard where he was the first to receive a Ph.D. in psychology, after which he was invited to Johns Hopkins University to lecture for a year and then set up, in 1882, America's first psychology lab. His department became the nation's leader in experimental psychology.

One of Hall's first students was John Dewey who spent three years sopping up Hall's fervor for evolution and German philosophy. Dewey had come from the same sort of rural New England background as did Hall, and both men rebelled against the same religious orthodoxy. Max Eastman writes: "Unless you understand how exciting it is to fall in love with Hegel—and what hard work—there was very little Dewey could tell you about those three years at Johns Hopkins."

Child Study

Hall originated the idea of subjecting psychic processes to the same exact, objective, and experimental methods that muscular and nerve tissue were subjected to in experimental physiology. It was Freudianism which later came closest to fulfilling that function in psychology. Hall was also instrumental in focusing interest and research in a new area of psychological investigation, that of child-study. The work he and others did in this field would provide the "scientific" basis for the progressive education movement.

But Hall's strongest influence was in spreading the gospel of evolution. He writes: "As soon as I first heard it in my youth I think I must have been hypnotized by the word 'evolution,' which was music to my ear and seemed to fit my mouth better than any other." Hall conceived the whole world, material and spiritual, as an organic unity in which supernaturalism played no part. Man had a "soul," but only in a pantheistic sense. Jesus was a great man and teacher, but not God. Thus, to Hall, man's salvation was to be found in science, psychology and education. His vision was truly that of the secular humanist when he wrote:

> Nature and Man—there is nothing else outside, above, or beyond these in the universe. ... Only now is man beginning to realize that he is truly supreme in all the universe we know and that there is nothing above or beyond him. ... Man sees his destiny, which is to rule the world within and without by the power that comes from knowledge. ... Science is both the organ of apprehension and his tool by which he must make his sovereignty complete, come fully into his kingdom, and make his reign supreme. Thus, again, we see that research is his highest function.

Hall's influence among educators can be measured by the fact that he was one of the most frequent and popular speakers at NEA conventions from 1885 to 1900 or so and was instrumental in getting the NEA to create its Child-Study Department. Also, his many students went on to create departments of experimental psychology in many other universities.

In 1889, Hall became president of the newly founded Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. It was established as a graduate school with a heavy emphasis on psychology, and it quickly became the headquarters of the child-study movement. While many of Hall's students went on to positions of influence elsewhere, Clark University, because of financial problems, was unable to attain the influence and power in American education comparable to that of Teachers College at Columbia University, New York.

Teachers College: Citadel of Progressivism

Teachers College was founded in 1889 by Nicholas Murray Butler, then associate professor of philosophy, and Frederick Barnard, president of Columbia University. In 1893, it became the pedagogy department of Columbia. It floundered until 1897 when James Earl Russell, at the age of 33, became dean-elect. Russell had spent the years 1893-95 at Leipzig getting a Ph.D. from Prof. Wundt. His enthusiasm for the New Psychology was unbounded. From then on, it was merely a matter of time before the Wundtian new psychology would become the dominating force in American pedagogy.

It was James Earl Russell's vision and drive that turned Teachers College into the "West Point of progressive education." He made it the largest and most influential school of education in the world by bringing to its faculty other dedicated practitioners of the New Psychology. In this he was helped by the indefatigable James McKeen Cattell who, in 1891, had established Columbia University's department of psychology. Cattell had

studied under G. Stanley Hall at Johns Hopkins in the early 1880s. He later received his Ph.D. from Prof. Wundt in 1886 after spending two years working in the professor's laboratory at Leipzig. It was there that Cattell had performed his reaction-time experiments that would be used two decades later as the scientific basis for changing reading instruction in America from phonics to look-say, thereby creating the reading problem we have today. What went wrong? Educators adopted the notion that half-baked, untried educational "science" could substitute for a thousand years of hard-earned teaching experience.

Enter Edward L. Thorndike

Probably the single most influential psychologist to join the faculty of Teachers College was not G. Stanley Hall's prize pupil, John Dewey, but Edward L. Thorndike, who had gotten his master's degree at Harvard in 1897 working under William James. According to Lawrence Cremin's book, *The Transformation of the School:*

> It was at Harvard that Thorndike undertook his first work with animal learning, a course of experimentation destined profoundly to influence the American school. ... A fellowship from Columbia brought Thorndike to New York to study with James McKeen Cattell. ...
>
> What was the nature of the experiments? Basically, they involved an animal in a problem box, a situation in which a specific behavior, like pressing down a lever, was rewarded with escape from the box and a bit of food. The animal was placed in the box, and after a period of random activity, it pressed the lever and received the reward. ...

Once you understand that today's public school classroom is a version of Thorndike's problem box, you can understand why today's children act the way they do. John Taylor Gatto, in his latest book, explains it very nicely. He writes:

> Much of the weird behavior kids display is a function of aperiodic reinforcement schedule. And the endless confinement and inactivity slowly drives children out of their minds. Trapped children, like trapped rats, need close management. Any rat psychologist will tell you that

Lawrence Cremin continues:

> Thorndike called the process by which the animals tended to repeat ever more efficiently and economically behaviors which were rewarded *learning*, and out of his experiment came a new theory of learning and a new "law" founded on that theory. The theory maintained that learning involves the wedding of a specific response to a specific stimulus through a physiological bond in the neural system, so that the stimulus regularly calls forth the response. In Thorndike's words, the *bond* between S and R is "stamped in" by being continually rewarded. And from this follows what Thorndike called the "law of effect"—namely, that a

> satisfactory outcome of any response tends to "stamp in" its connection with a given situation, and conversely, that an unsatisfactory outcome tends to stamp out the bond or connection. ...
>
> Thorndike's experiment inaugurated the laboratory study of animal learning, assuming that a demonstration of the conditions of animal behavior under laboratory conditions, could help solve the general problems of psychology. The assumption, of course, represents a synthesis of scientific method and evolutionary doctrine, since in the absence of the latter animal learning would hardly have been considered a suitable topic for a psychologist.

And now you can understand why the educators will battle to the end to maintain the supremacy of the theory of evolution in the system, because everything they now do in terms of their psychology and curriculum is founded on the belief that animals and humans essentially learn the same way, and can be "educated" in the same way, through stimulus, response and reward.

Thorndike was thoroughly convinced that his discoveries in animal learning could provide a scientific basis for the teaching profession. He wrote: "The best way with children may often be, in the pompous words of an animal trainer, 'to arrange everything in connection with the trick so that the animal will be compelled by the laws of his own nature to perform it.'"

The profound effects Thorndike's theories had on American education cannot be overestimated. They were, as were Pavlov's experiments in the 1920s, a natural development of Wundtian psychology. Wundt had said: "If we try to answer the general question of the genetic relation of man to the animals on the ground of a comparison of their psychical attributes, it must be admitted ... that it is possible that human consciousness has developed from a lower form of animal consciousness."

Thus, the theory of evolution, applied to the mind, was used by Thorndike and other psychologists as a basis for building a new theory of learning by conditioning. Children were to be considered as animals and the classroom was to be transformed into a laboratory providing the optimum environment in which learning by reflex conditioning could take place, thus eliminating the use of mind. Is that possible? A new philosophy of teaching and learning that virtually eliminates the use of the mind? A new type of classroom, a new type of teacher, and new classroom materials and books would have to be developed to duplicate the conditions of that kind of psych lab.

Thus, the idea that evolution is merely a theory taught in the biology classroom is erroneous. Evolution is at the very basis of modern progressive education where the child is taught that he is an animal linked by evolution to the monkeys. His school materials have been designed to teach him as an animal in a problem box, using Thorndike's stimulus-response and reward techniques which are now universally used thoroughout our public school system. So we ought not to be surprised when students act like animals and call their public school a "zoo." The message has gotten through to

them, and they are behaving in a manner faithful to the concepts of the men at Teachers College who conceived their education.

In contrast, children in a Christian school are taught that they are human beings created in God's image and accountable to their Creator. These children are expected to act like human beings, and they do. Their link is not downward through evolution to the animal world, but upward, through the Bible, to their Creator.

Enter John Dewey

While Thorndike developed and formulated the psychological basis for progressive education, John Dewey formulated its social goals. Dewey joined the faculty at Columbia in 1904 as a professor of philosophy. In 1884 he had gone from Johns Hopkins to the University of Michigan and, in 1894, to the University of Chicago as head of the department of philosophy, psychology, and education. It was there, in 1896, that Dewey created the famous Laboratory School which was to be for his department what a lab is for a biology or chemistry department.

Dewey wanted to test certain philosophical and psychological ideas in practice with real live children, and a laboratory school was the best place in which to do it. As with so many liberal intellectuals who had abandoned Christianity, Dewey's philosophy had evolved from Hegelian idealism to socialist materialism. The purpose of the school was to show experimentally how education could be reformed to create little socialists instead of little capitalists who, in the long run, would change the American economic system.

"The school's ultimate social ideal was the transformation of society through a new, socially minded individualism."

According to Dewey, the traditional school encouraged competitive individualism. "Each child sits in his place in a fixed row of desks and faces, not his companions as an active guided social group, but his teacher as an instructor and disciplinarian. He studies largely by himself and for himself and is, during much of the time, in direct competition with his mates."

The classroom had to be transformed to encourage social contact. "The physical set-up of the classrooms of the Laboratory School with their movable chairs helped to make each period a social occasion. In all classes teacher and children started off the day's work with a face-to-face discussion of cooperative plans for individual and group activity.

Socialism vs. Capitalism

It was clear to Dewey that reform in the classroom had to precede reform in society at large. Thus, the battle was between cooperation and competition, the group and the individual, socialism and capitalism. Dewey hoped to find the means of reconciling the needs of the individual with the needs of the collective. If collectivism had become his

religion, it was because Humanity had replaced God at the focus of his loyalty. He made that clear when he wrote in *A Common Faith*:

> The ideal ends to which we attach our faith are now shadowy and wavering. They assume concrete form in our understanding of our relations to one another and the values contained in these relations. We, who now live, are part of a humanity that extends into the remote past, a humanity that has interacted with nature. The things in civilization we most prize are not ourselves. They exist by grace of the doings and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it. Here are all the elements for a religious faith that shall not be confined to sect, class, or race.

It was thus Dewey who began to fashion a new materialist religion in which humanity was venerated instead of God. This is basically the religion of Secular Humanism, and this is what has become the official religion of the United States, for it is the only religion permitted in its public schools and totally supported by government funds. The Constitution of the United States forbids the establishment of a national religion. But we have one, whether the people know it or not.

None of this could have happened had not the teaching profession gained a new prestige and status. Prior to the progressive revolution, colleges and universities had left teacher training up to the so-called Normal Schools, and prior to that it was the private academies that produced the teachers of America. It was not thought that teachers needed a college or university education. With the advent of compulsory school attendance, the Normal Schools took over teacher training. But the Normal School idea did not last long. At the turn of the century, when teacher training was converted into a science by the Wundtian psychologists, the universities began to build graduate schools of education along with departments of psychology and experimental psychology labs. Behavioral psychology had elevated the teaching profession to a new exalted position, and education had given psychology a whole new field in which to practice its skills. In addition, John Dewey gave education a social mission of exalted revolutionary proportions: the transformation of American society from a capitalist, individualistic nation to a socialist, collectivist society.

The Genesis of the Dumbed Down Curriculum

Dewey was also responsible for setting American education on its dumbing-down course, by advocating new methods of teaching reading which would deliberately shift the emphasis away from academic learning to socialization. In an essay entitled "The Primary-Education Fetich," published in 1898, Dewey wrote:

> There is ... a false educational god whose idolators are legion, and whose cult influences the entire educational system. This is language study—the study not of

> foreign language, but of English; not in higher, but in primary education. It is almost an unquestioned assumption, of educational theory and practice both, that the first three years of a child's school-life shall be mainly taken up with learning to read and write his own language. If we add to this the learning of a certain amount of numerical combinations, we have the pivot about which primary education swings....
>
> It does not follow, however, that because this course was once wise it is so any longer.... My proposition is, that conditions—social, industrial, and intellectual—have undergone such a radical change, that the time has come for a thoroughgoing examination of the emphasis put upon linguistic work in elementary instruction....
>
> The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to me a perversion.

Dewey then argued how important it was for the child to experience life through classroom activities, projects and social interaction before learning to read about them. And the reading materials themselves had to be relevant to the child's needs. He wrote:

> Every respectable authority insists that the period of childhood, lying between the years of four and eight or nine, is the plastic period in sense and emotional life. What are we doing to shape these capacities? What are we doing to feed this hunger? If one compares the powers and needs of the child in these directions with what is actually supplied in the regimen of the three R's, the contrast is pitiful and tragic.... No one can clearly set before himself the vivacity and persistency of the child's motor instincts at this period, and then call to mind the continued grind of reading and writing, without feeling that the justification of our curriculum is psychologically impossible. It is simply superstition; it is a remnant of an outgrown period of history.

Finally, Dewey, the master strategist, set forth what must be done:

> Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction. What is needed in the first place, is that there should be a full and frank statement of conviction with regard to the matter from physiologists and psychologists and from those school administrators who are conscious of the evils of the present regime.... There are already in existence a considerable number of educational "experimental stations," which represent the outposts of educational progress. If these schools can be adequately supported for a number of years they will perform a great vicarious service. After such schools have worked out carefully and definitely the subject-matter of a new curriculum—finding the right place for language-studies and placing them in their right perspective—the problem of the more general educational reform will be immensely simplified and facilitated.

Here was, indeed, a master plan, involving the entire progressive education community, to create a new socialist, dumbed-down curriculum for the schools of America, a plan, based on the new psychology, that was indeed carried out and implemented. It was a plan that denigrated the intellect of the child in favor of his motor development.

Yet, what is the most obvious and breathtaking development in every child? It is his ability to learn to speak his own language and sometimes a second language if one is spoken at home, a process that begins almost at birth and reaches an incredible height of language development at about the time a child is ready for some sort of formal learning. The traditional curriculum took advantage of this language-learning energy in favor of literacy. But psychologists like Edward L. Thorndike, who thought that they could learn more about how children learned by studying animals rather than children, ignored the language-learning phenomenon in children and agreed with Dewey to emphasize motor instincts.

Getting Rid of Phonics

Perhaps the most bizarre turn in American education was the decision by the progressives to implement John Dewey's plan to dumb down the school curriculum by shifting the emphasis away from academics and high literacy to socialization and activities. The way to achieve this goal was to change the way reading was taught in the primary grades: to get rid of alphabetic phonics and replace it with whole-word methodology.

Undoubtedly some of the educators were familiar with the dispute that Horace Mann had had with the Boston Schoolmasters over Gallaudet's whole-word teaching method, which had caused reading failure among many Boston students. And so, they could not argue in favor of adopting the Gallaudet method, which was based on a way of teaching the deaf to read. Indeed, the Boston schools had returned to the traditional phonics method, and the rest of the country had never stopped using traditional phonics. Noah Webster and William Holmes McGuffey were the best known advocates of the phonics approach, and their books sold in the millions.

And so the progressives decided to use science as the basis for their radical change in reading instruction. They would use James McKeen Cattell's reaction-time experiments at Leipzig as the scientific justification for their pedagogical decisions. In order to convince teachers and parents that such a change was scientifically called for, Dewey said that what was needed was a "statement of conviction" from psychologists and physiologists on the matter to give authoritative weight to the change. And such an authoritative statement was produced by a 38-year-old psychologist who had been trained by G. Stanley Hall at Clark University. He was Edmund Burke Huey and his book was *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading,* published in 1908. In it he argued in favor of the whole-word method. He wrote:

> Even if the child substitutes words of his own for some that are on the page, provided that those express the meaning, it is an encouraging sign that the reading

> has been real, and recognition of details will come as it is needed. The shock that such a statement will have to many a practical teacher of reading is but an accurate measure of the hold that a false ideal has taken of us, viz., that to read is to say just what is upon the page, instead of to *think*, each in his own way, the meaning that the page suggests. ... Until the insidious thought of reading as word-pronouncing is well worked out of our heads, it is well to place the emphasis strongly where it really belongs, on reading as *thought-getting*, independently of expression.

In other words, accuracy is not important, and word substitutions are okay, as long as they convey meaning. Huey thought that such a view might shock teachers of reading. But today not only are teachers not shocked, but Huey's views are now totally accepted by whole-language teachers as the norm. In a book entitled *Evaluation: Whole Language, Whole Child*, published in 1988, we read:

> The way you interpret what the child does will reflect what you understand reading to be. For instance, if she reads the word *feather* for *father*, a phonics-oriented teacher might be pleased because she's come close to sounding the word out. However, if you believe reading is a meaning-seeking process, you may be concerned that she's overly dependent on phonics at the expense of meaning. You'd be happier with a miscue such as *daddy*, even though it doesn't look or sound anything like the word in the text. At least the meaning would be intact.

What this whole-language teacher seemingly doesn't know is that when a phonetic reader makes a mistake he usually can correct himself quickly, especially when what he's read doesn't make sense. The whole-word reader, on the other hand, doesn't even know when he's made a mistake and continues to misread until he comes to a word he can't even associate with.

Huey also wrote that "recognition of details will come as it is needed." But what we have learned over the years is that for many children taught by the whole-word method, the impairment is so severe that they can't even deal with the letter details, for they have acquired a holistic reflex, by way of which they look at all words automatically as whole configurations, like Chinese characters, and they cannot see the phonetic structure of the words. In order to be able to automatically see the phonetic structure of alphabetic words, the reader must develop a phonetic reflex. That reflex can only be acquired by learning the letter sounds at the very beginning of reading instruction so that the new reader can sound out all of the words he reads and break up big words into their syllabic units.

It should be noted that while phonics was the most prevalent method in use in the schools of America prior to the 1930's, after the Boston dispute of the 1840s the whole-word method was kept alive in the state Normal Schools and given validation by such progressive educators as Francis W. Parker at the University of Chicago where Dewey was also performing his educational experiments at the Laboratory School, which went

on from 1896 to 1904. Indeed, it was while conducting the school that Dewey wrote his essay, "The Primary School Fetich."

The Progressive Cabal

That Huey was part of a progressive cabal to deceive the public, is proven by his lengthy quotations of Dewey's essay and the fact that he knew Prof. Cattell quite well. Indeed, the latter had helped him financially. In his chapter on Cattell's reaction-time experiments, Huey gave the impression that here was positive scientific proof that children could learn to read better by way of a whole-word approach.

The Cattell experiments had been performed in Wundt's laboratory at the University of Leipzig. The results were published in German in 1885, when Cattell was a mere 25-year-old graduate student. It was republished in condensed form in English in *Mind*, under the title, "The Time it Takes to See and Name Objects." The participants in the experiment were nine individuals, including university teachers and students. Using rather primitive home-made equipment, Cattell was able to determine the length of time it took them to read words and letters. It turned out that the participants were able to read words slightly faster than a series of letters. Since these students were highly literate individuals, naturally it was easier for them to read known words than a series of letters which required closer attention to detail.

What did any of this have to do with teaching children to read? Nothing. But it was used as if it did. It was assumed that since words were read (by adults) a tiny bit faster than letters, that therefore children ought to be taught to read by a whole-word method. And that's what Huey tried to convey in his book, which was hailed unanimously by the progressives as the authority on reading pedagogy. Ironically, neither Dewey, nor Cattell, nor Huey had ever professionally taught a child to read, yet they were the authorities determining the future of reading instruction for all of the children in all of American schools.

The aim of all of this, of course, was to lower the literacy level of the American people. Thus, when Huey's book was published, G. Stanley Hall commented:

> The best pedagogues are now drifting surely, if slowly, toward the conclusion that instead of taking half the time of the first year or two of school to teach reading, little attention should be paid to it before the beginning of the third year, that nature study, language work, and other things should take the great time and energy now given to this subject. ... We can agree with Huey that the home is the natural place for a child's learning to read, and intelligent children of intelligent parents, will almost do so of themselves sooner or later. Primary reading should no longer be made a fetich. This should always be secondary and should have a purpose—that is, there should be no reading for the sake of reading, for this is never an end, but should always be a means of gratifying an interest.

At the turn of the century, it was only the middle class that could or would teach their children to read at home. The rest, particularly immigrant parents, relied on the public schools to do the job, which they did quite well in those days. In another article, Hall went so far as to extol the virtues of illiteracy. He wrote:

> Very many men have lived and died and been great, even leaders of their age, without any acquaintance with letters. The knowledge which illiterates acquire is probably on the whole more personal, direct, environmental and probably a much larger proportion if it practical. Moreover, they escape much eyestrain and mental excitement, and, other things being equal, are probably more active and less sedentary. It is possible, despite the stigma our bepedagogued age puts upon this disability, for those who are under it not only to lead a useful, happy, virtuous life, but to be really well educated in may other ways. Illiterates escape certain temptations, such as vacuous and vicious reading. Perhaps we are prone to put too high a value both upon the ability required to attain this art and the discipline involved in doing so, as well as the culture value that comes to the citizen with his average of only six grades of schooling by the acquisition of this art.

Although there was much discussion about teaching children to read by a whole-word method, no one knew in advance how children would actually learn by such an approach, and it was vital to find out. Thus, there were three studies undertaken by teachers in Chicago to determine how one could learn to read if phonics was eliminated. The first study was conducted in 1912 by a teacher at the Elementary School at the University of Chicago. Prof. Walter F. Dearborn, who had been a pupil of Cattell's, evaluated the results of the experiment:

> Misreadings or the mistaking of one word for another occurred most frequently in these early stages, first when the words were of the same length; secondly, when words had common letters, the "g" and "o" of "igloo" caused it to be read as "dogs"; thirdly, when the initial letters of words were the same; and fourthly, when the final letters were the same. Words were recognized upside down nearly as easily as right side up, but two children noticing any difference.

The teacher who had conducted the study, Josephine Bowden, wrote a report that was published in Elementary School Teacher. She wrote:

> The comments and the questions, as well as the misreadings seem to show that children learn to read words by the trial and error method. It may be the length of the word, the initial letter, the final letter, a characteristic letter, the position of the word in the sentence, or even the blackness of the type that serves as the cue. ... There is no evidence in any of the cases studied that the child works out a system by which he learns to recognize the words. That he does not work out phonics for himself comes out quite clearly in the transposition test.

Miss Bowden recommended that some phonics be added to the whole-word program because the latter by itself would never teach a child to read. Another study was

conducted by a teacher in Chicago, Myrtle Sholty, and published in the Elementary School Teacher, February 1912. It revealed that the two methods of teaching reading produced two different kinds of readers: objective and subjective. The alphabetic-phonics method produced fluent, accurate, objective readers while the sight or whole-word method produced impaired subjective readers who guessed at words, omitted words, inserted words, substituted words, and mutilated words. The sight readers' lack of phonetic knowledge put them at a distinct disadvantage. They were unable to accurately decode the words since they looked at them as whole configurations, like Chinese characters, with no connection to the sounds of the language.

Another significant study, published in the November 1914 issue of Elementary School Teacher, was conducted by Clara Schmitt, an assistant in the child-study department of the Chicago Board of Education. She analyzed the errors made in oral reading by two groups of children: one mentally defective, the other normal. The normal children were average good readers, aged 7 to 11. The defective children were between ages 10 and 16. Both groups had been taught to read phonetically. The defective children were sometimes capable of acquiring a large visual—or sight—vocabulary, but showed themselves to be very deficient in perceiving phonetic relationships. Miss Schmitt wrote:

> The phonetics which underlie the reading process is the great stumbling block of the defective child. Seldom is one found who has this accomplishment. He may be able to learn a very few of the simplest combinations, such as consist of one or two consonants and a vowel. The normal child progresses in his knowledge of phonetic values to such an extent that he becomes independent of the teacher in so far as the illogical complexities of our English spelling permit. At the fourth grade the normal child is able to work out new and unfamiliar words with approximate phonetic correctness.

What this study proved is that when normal children are taught to read by a whole-word method, they make the same kinds of errors that defective children make. In other words, the whole-word method turns a normal child into a defective child.

But none of this changed the determination of the educator-psychologists to advance their agenda as quickly and effectively as possible. That agenda, and the radical reforms that went with it, can be tracked very easily in the yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education, which was formed in 1902 by the top educational leaders as a forum in which discussion over curriculum decisions could be made among themselves. Each yearbook concentrated on a specific subject in the process of reform. By now, 98 yearbooks have been produced, making it fairly easy for the educational researcher to trace the entire enterprise of curriculum reform from 1902 to the present.

Bellamy's Vision and John Dewey

In 1899, Dewey wrote *The School and Society,* his blueprint for socialism via education. It clearly established him as the leader of progressive education. It should be noted that Dewey did not get his socialism from Karl Marx. He got it from an American, Edward

Bellamy, a Unitarian journalist, who wrote a book entitled *Looking Backward,* a futuristic fantasy about a socialist America in the year 2000. Bellamy's book was published in 1888 and is considered one of the most socially influential books in American history.

Also, the marriage between behavioral psychology and education, a union made in Leipzig and consummated at Teachers College, permanently changed the character of American education by changing education into therapy. No true reform of the system is possible without getting behavioral psychology out of it. But that is now impossible. The symbiotic bond between teacher education and behavioral psychology that has existed for almost a full century has transformed American education into a unique institution of social control. And because so many careers, and so much federal funding are involved, any change in the system at best will only be cosmetic.

Foundation Money and the Progressives

It was also during the first decade of the Twentieth Century that wealthy industrialists such as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller set up their tax-exempt foundations which then became important sources of financing for the educational experiments of the progressives. It was Frederick T. Gates, chairman of Rockefeller's General Education Board, who expressed the benign objectives of the foundation in an article on rural education published in The World's Work of August 1912. He wrote:

> In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand. The present education conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or of science. We are not to raise up from among them authors, orators, poets, or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians. Nor will we cherish even the humbler ambition to raise up from among them lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we now have ample supply. ... For the task that we set before ourselves is a very simple as well as a very beautiful one: to train these people as we find them for a perfectly ideal life just where they are.

The philosophy of the "molding hand" is the one that governs not only the foundations but also the public educators. Instead of simply providing academic skills so that the individual can mold himself into whatever he or she wants to be, the establishment wants to mold children into what they want them to be. This philosophy of education, the core of which is social control, is hardly compatible with the principles of a free society.

In 1917, the trustees of the General Education Board granted $3 million for the creation of a new progressive school in which a new curriculum and new teaching methods were to be developed and used. It was called the Lincoln School and was to be run by Teachers College at Columbia University. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had such confidence in the school that he sent four of his five sons—Nelson, Lawrence, Winthrop and David—to be educated there. This was one of the "outposts of educational progress" that

John Dewey said was needed in order to develop the future progressive curriculum for the public schools.

How did the Rockefeller boys fare? Nelson became dyslexic. Laurence had trouble with his three R's and almost flunked out of Princeton. Winthrop floundered so badly that he was transferred to a more formal prep school where he earned two E's and three F's. He had to take extra tutoring at night and on weekends in order to stay in the school. Only David did well, probably because he was the youngest and was spared some of the worst of the experiments his older brothers were subject to. Of course, these dismal results did not dissuade the progressives from abandoning their experiment. Indeed, they proceeded to put these new educational programs in all the public schools of America.

Concerning the Lincoln School, which closed in 1948, Prof. Lawrence Cremin wrote: "The Lincoln School was the most influential private school in the progressive movement; in fact it may well have been the most influential single school in the United States between 1900 and 1940." We can thank the Rockefeller Foundation for that.

The Education Mafia

When Dewey came to Columbia in 1904, at the invitation of James McKeen Cattell, the university and its Teachers College became the undisputed training center for the new scientifically based progressive education. Its graduates fanned out across American to become deans and professors at other teachers colleges and superintendents of entire public school systems. Their loyalty to their mentors was demonstrated by how well they implemented their teachings in the schools of America. Among the alumni were Elwood P. Cubberly, who became dean at the School of Education at Stanford; George D. Strayer, who became professor at Teachers College and president of the NEA in 1918-19; George H. Betts, professor of education at Northwestern; Edward C. Elliott, who became president of Purdue; Walter A. Jessup, who became president of the University of Iowa and president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; William H. Kilpatrick, who became a professor at Teachers College and a founder of Bennington College; Bruce R. Payne, who became president of George Peabody College in Nashville; David S. Snedden, who became Massachusetts State Commissioner of Education; Lotus D. Coffman, who became dean of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota and later the university's president.

These were just a few of the men who created a network of control and influence that was to change the face of public education in America by implementing Dewey's agenda. As David Tyack described the power of this network in his book *Managers of Virtue:*

> They controlled important resources: money, the creation of reputations, the placement of students and friends, the training of subordinates and future leaders, and influences over professional association and public legislative and administrative bodies.

The education mafia became known as the "Educational Trust" and they held annual meetings under an umbrella called the Cleveland Conference, named thus because the first conference had been held in Cleveland in 1915. This exclusive club began with 19 members, including those graduates of Columbia and Teachers College named earlier. Among the others were James R. Angell, a colleague of Dewey's at the University of Chicago who became its president and later president of Yale. Angell had gotten his M.A. under William James at Harvard, his Ph.D. at Leipzig and was the first president of the American Psychological Association and later a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation; Leonard Ayres, director of the Russell Sage Foundation; Abraham Flexner, director of the Rockefeller Institute; Paul Hanus, who set up Harvard's Graduate School of Education with the help of Rockefeller's General Education Board; Frank E. Spaulding, another Leipzig Ph.D. who organized Yale's Department of Education, was its chairman and later also a member of the General Education Board; Paul Monroe, director of Columbia's school of education and later founder and president of the World Federation of Education Associations; and Edward L. Thorndike.

Charles Judd: Guiding Spirit

The guiding spirit of the education mafia was Charles Judd who got his Ph.D. in 1896 from Prof. Wundt at Leipzig and became head of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago in 1909. He represented, *par excellence*, the Wundtian psychologist determined to reform American education according to scientific, evolutionary principles. David Tyack writes:

> He had a vision that both the structure of the schools and the curriculum needed radical revision, but that change would take place "in the haphazard fashion that has characterized our school history unless some group gets together and undertakes, in a cooperative way, to coordinate reforms."

Judd urged the members of the Cleveland Conference to jump into the breach and undertake "the positive and aggressive task of ... a detailed reorganization of the materials of instruction in schools of all grades.... It is intended that we make the undertaking as broad and democratic as possible by furnishing the energy for organizing a general movement at the same time we stimulate each other to make direct contributions wherever possible."

Tyack comments: "There was, of course, some incongruity in the notion of a small, self-appointed group of experts proposing a 'democratic' revision of studies from the top down." Of course, the experts didn't bother to consult with the parents of the children they were educating. This radical revision was to be effected after the professionals had gotten rid of local lay control of the public schools through a process of centralization.

Was the Cleveland Conference a conspiracy? It had no constitution, no minutes, no officers, no bylaws, and no "public life" whereby its deliberations could be scrutinized. It was, in short, very much a private, if not secret, organization, determining the future of *public*, tax-funded education. And we can assume that there were many confidential

meetings and conversations among the small inner circle to determine, among other things, who to place where.

The education mafia was efficiently run by godfathers stationed in key universities: Cubberly at Stanford, Judd at Chicago, and Strayer at Teachers College. They became known as "placement barons," who placed their loyal graduates in positions of influence throughout the education system.

But a placement baron could only be a power broker if the school board recognized his authority. And that is why the education mafia promoted "reform" of local school governance that wrested control of the public schools from elected local politicians and put it in the hands of appointed professional educators. The reform movement had actually started in New York in 1896 under the leadership of Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, and financed by the socially prominent. The movement spread across America. The results gave the godfathers enormous leverage and power in local communities.

Strayer's Law

In Detroit, for example, local reformers who had fought for a new city charter and abolished the old ward-elected board of education turned for their superintendent to "the new school of professionally trained educators" and elected Charles Chadsey, trained at Teachers College and a protégé of George Strayer.

And what happened if you disobeyed your godfather? According to Tyack:

> One principal recalled "Strayer's Law" for dealing with disloyal subordinates: "Give 'em the ax."

The radical revision of the public school curriculum could only be implemented if the superintendents, principals and professors, who were placed in strategic positions of power by their mentors, pushed for the reforms the godfathers wanted, regardless of what parents or traditional teachers desired. That, for example, is how the progressives were able to replace phonics with look-say instruction in virtually all of the primary schools in America in a few short years. The two most prominent creators of look-say instruction materials were graduates of Teachers College: William Scott Gray, father of Dick and Jane who worked under Judd at the University of Chicago, and Arthur I. Gates, protégé of Thorndike at Teachers College. Getting the new books into the schools was easy, for according to Tyack: "The network of obligations linked local superintendents more to their sponsors than to their local patrons and clients."

So if you were a parent and wondered why your little Johnny wasn't learning to read and found your local school superintendent unresponsive to parental concerns, the answer is that his career depended not on pleasing parents but on pleasing his sponsor. If that's the way the godfathers wanted reading to be taught in the schools, what superintendent would be so foolhardy as to want to go against their wishes?

The Godfathers Take Over the NEA

It was only natural that the progressives would eventually take control of the National Education Association. If they wanted their new curriculum to be efficiently implemented in the schools, they would need the cooperation of the teachers. And so teachers had to be educated to accept the radical changes that would take place.

By 1900 the NEA had only 2,332 members. It was, in reality, a forum for the educational elite. But the elite was divided philosophically. William T. Harris, the Hegelian, wanted the schools to emphasize intellectual development and the maintenance of Western civilization through study of the classics in Greek and Latin. Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard, reflected William James' pragmatism and preferred to replace the classical languages of antiquity with modern languages and science. Nicholas Murray Butler represented the new professionalism of the educator-psychologist being honed at Teachers College.

The most important act of the old guard was the formation in 1892 of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, with Charles W. Eliot as its chairman. The committee had been formed to establish uniform curriculum guidelines and standards for the nation's secondary schools. Until then, the role of secondary education was seen as college preparatory. But with the growth of public high schools and the increasing number of secondary students not going on to college, there was a need to decide what subjects to teach, the order of teaching them, and the amount of time to devote to teach one of them.

So they came up with four basic programs: (1) Classical, including Latin, Greek, English, German and French, Mathematics, Science, Geography. (2) Latin Scientific, eliminating Greek and emphasizing Science. (3) Modern languages, replacing Latin and Greek with two modern languages. (4) English, offering only one foreign language and stressing English and the other subjects. The major shift was from the classical curriculum to a more modern program of studies. Clearly a compromise had been reached between Harris and Eliot. But the emphasis was still on mental training. As Harris put it: "The school gives youth the tools of thought.... He studies the structure of language in grammar, and this reveals the structure of intellect."

The Committee of Ten not only set the course of American education for the next twenty-five years or so, but it also represented an important milestone in NEA history. It marked the end of the NEA's limited function as a discussion club and the beginning of its expanded role as a formulator of national education policy. America did not have, nor wanted, a European-style "ministry of education" that could reform the nation's schools by decree. And so it was decided by the educators that the NEA would have to perform that function. Nicholas Murray Butler described the problem when he wrote in 1894:

> In this country...where no central educational administration exists, and where bureaucracy is not popular, educational reform can be brought about only by

> persuasion and cooperation, for no official and no institution is empowered to dictate to us. The press, the platform, the teachers' meeting, must be availed of to put forward new ideas, and women in large numbers must be reasoned with and convinced in order to secure their acceptance.

In other words, the educators would have to learn to manipulate the press, con the public, and influence the teachers. The NEA would eventually learn to do all of these and much more.

The Committee of Ten's views on education reflected those of an older generation of educators who had not been bitten by the Leipzig bug. But by 1915, most of the members of the committee were either dead or in retirement. Harris had died in 1909 and Eliot had retired from the presidency of Harvard in the same year. A younger generation—imbued with Wundtian psychology and Deweyism—had taken over, and the first major project of the new progressive outlook was the report of the NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education issued in 1918.

Eugenics: The Skeleton in the Progressives' Closet

But before we get into the work of that Commission, it is important to look at one of the chapters of public education which the educators wish we would forget, the skeleton in the progressives' closet: the influence of eugenics on educational policy and practice.

One of the evil fruits of the tree of evolution is scientific racism, otherwise known as eugenics, which advances the notion that racial stock is the determining factor in human development and that human beings can be bred to perfection by the same methods used to breed perfect cattle. Since evolution reduces man to the level of animal, it is not surprising that eugenics was adopted by many in the education elite as an important guide in determining educational policy.

The founder of the eugenics movement, Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911), cousin of Charles Darwin's, found his model of human perfection in the British elite. But he was painfully aware that the birthrate of the elite was far lower than that of the inferior classes. In this he saw a great danger to civilization. He concluded that ways had to be found to encourage the fertility of the superior stock and to discourage the fertility of the inferior stock.

In order to determine which individuals had superior traits, Galton devised a series of tests. According to Prof. J. McVicker Hunt, Galton "saw that if [eugenical] decisions were to be made as to which human beings were to survive and reproduce it would be necessary to have some criteria for survival. So he formed his anthropometric laboratory [in 1884] for the measurement of man, with the hope that by means of tests he could determine those individuals who should survive. Note that he was not deciding who should be selected for jobs in a given industry, but who should survive to reproduce."

James McKeen Cattell and Eugenics

Galton realized, however, that physical measurements alone were not enough to determine the criteria he needed. He began searching for ways to investigate psychological differences. In 1886 he was introduced to James McKeen Cattell, a young American who had just completed two years of study in the laboratories of Prof. Wilhelm Wundt, the world's leading experimental psychologist, at Leipzig University. Cattell had conducted various forms of reaction-time experiments, which Galton believed could be adapted to his purposes.

Cattell spent the next two years studying at Cambridge University where he set up a psychology lab. During this time he was greatly influenced by Galton's ideas. In fact, he would later refer to Galton as "the greatest man I have ever known."

Cattell is best known in psychology as the first person to use experimental techniques to investigate the mental differences among normal individuals. He coined the term "mental test." What Galton did was give Cattell the framework of physical and physiological anthropometry in which to develop his interest in individual differences.

Cattell was born in 1860 and graduated in 1880 from Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania, where his father, a Presbyterian minister, was president. While at college, Cattell studied the ideas of Auguste Comte, the French philosopher, who stressed the authority of scientific knowledge over religious or metaphysical forms of thought. This philosophy, known as Positivism, led Cattell to adopt a new "religion" of science.

In 1882-83 Cattell studied at Johns Hopkins University where his classmate was John Dewey and their professor was psychologist G. Stanley Hall. Hall, of course, was the first American to study in the laboratories of Wilhelm Wundt in 1878.

After completing his work at Leipzig and Cambridge, Cattell returned to the United States where he became professor of psychology at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1891, Cattell moved to Teachers College, Columbia University, where as professor of experimental psychology he built the nation's leading department of psychology. In 1904 Cattell arranged for his friend John Dewey to come to Columbia as professor of philosophy.

At Columbia, Cattell's star pupil was Edward L. Thorndike who espoused the principles of eugenics with enthusiasm and became America's leading educational psychologist, devising a new theory of learning based on conditioning techniques used in animal training. His book, *Animal Intelligence* (1898) laid the groundwork for the school of behaviorism.

Both Cattell and Thorndike were active in applying the principles of eugenics to education. Like Dewey, they held an organic view of society. Dewey elaborated on that view in his famous, *My Pedagogic Creed*:

> I believe that the individual who is to be educated is a social individual and that society is an organic union of individuals. ... Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child's fitness for social life and reveal the place in which he can be of most service and where he can receive the most help.

The whole purpose of developing mental tests was to permit the educator-psychologist to determine how individuals should be educated. Thorndike, in a monograph on Cattell's work, wrote:

> How much we need just such an investigation as Professor Cattell is now making may be brought home to us by our present ignorance concerning these matters which so closely touch our profession, our country, and the advancement of science. If we had perfect power to breed the next generation from one tenth of the present, we would not know which men and women to select as that tenth. If we had perfect power to choose from the fifteen-year-olds now alive ten thousand to be apprenticed to the study of science, we should not know which ten thousand to select. If we had perfect freedom to regulate their careers, we should not know what studies to prescribe or which institutions to enroll them in.

That's why the tests were needed, for the rating and selection of human beings by those who would direct and control them. Only Hitler and the communist states achieved that "perfect power" whereby they could control everybody in their countries. The idea that such a power is needed by the educators in a free society indicates that something is terribly wrong with the thinking of these educators.

Scientific Racism

Inherent in Dewey's creed is the notion that individual human worth is determined by social usefulness, a concept taught today in the lifeboat survival exercises in values clarification. In any case, it was inevitable that those who believed in eugenics would see society in racial terms and impose racist ideas on American education. The veneer of science made racism respectable among the social-radical progressives who were supposedly only interested in the future good of mankind.

Books were written and conferences were held to spread the new gospel of scientific racism within academe. For psychologists, the challenge was to develop the means to determine individual genetic superiority or inferiority. G. Stanley Hall encouraged his students at Clark University to develop tests to assess mental capacity. One of his students, Lewis Terman, devised a mental test that was to become the most famous of them all, one that measured the I.Q., or Intelligence Quotient. The I.Q. expressed the ratio of a child's mental age to his chronological age, multiplied by one hundred. Terman believed that intelligence was a matter of genetic inheritance and that genetic superiority could therefore be determined by his test.

One of the earliest tests to determine racial differences was conducted by R. Meade Bache and published in *The Psychological Review* in 1895. It was a reaction-time test, using three groups of males: 12 Caucasians, 11 American Indians, and 11 American Negroes. They were tested for the speed with which they reacted to the sight of a pendulum, a particular sound, and a slight electric shock.

The Indians reacted fastest, the Caucasians slowest, and the blacks fell in the middle. On the basis of these flimsy results, Bache concluded that the smarter and more intellectually developed the individual, the slower his reaction time to ordinary physiological stimuli. From this he concluded:

> Pride of race obscures the view of the white with reference to the relative automatic quickness of the negro. That the negro is, in the truest sense, a race inferior to that of the white can be proven by many facts, and among these by the quickness of his automatic movements as compared with those of the white.

In other words, a superior physical trait was now considered a sure sign of mental inferiority!

Eugenics Movement Grows

The Anglo-American eugenics movement grew in influence on both sides of the Atlantic. In England it was embraced by Fabian socialists because they believed that an ideal society could be produced only by "superior" people. In America, it drew such progressives as birth-control crusader Margaret Sanger, future governor of Pennsaylvania Gifford Pinchot, Stanford president David Star-Jordan, Harvard president Charles W. Eliot, anarchist Emma Goldman, and such conservatives as Herbert Hoover and Charles Davenport. What both conservatives and radicals had in common was their rejection of biblical religion and their acceptance of the new religion of science with its central belief in evolution.

Eugenicists Henry Goddard, a student of G. Stanley Hall's, and Charles Davenport, a Harvard alumnus, were particularly influential in effecting changes in immigration policy in the United States. The Immigration Act of 1924 severely curtailed the influx of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, supposedly of "inferior" stock. What greatly disturbed the eugenicists was the low fertility rate of America's elite stock. They were alarmed, for example, that late 19th century Harvard graduating classes had, twenty to twenty-five years later, accounted for male progeny equal only to half to two-thirds their original number.

In 1921, the Second International Congress of Eugenics was held at New York's Museum of Natural History. Its president was Henry Fairfield Osborn, who wrote in the program:

> The right of the state to safeguard the character and integrity of the race or races on which its future depends is, to my mind, as incontestable as the right of the state to safeguard the health and morals of its people. As science has enlightened

> government in the prevention and spread of disease, it must also enlighten government in the prevention of the spread and multiplication of worthless members of society, the spread of feeble-mindedness, of idiocy, and of all moral and intellectual as well as physical diseases.

Osborn, an 1877 graduate of Princeton, had been professor of zoology at Columbia before becoming curator of the museum. He was known as one of America's foremost exponents of evolution. Among members of the Congress's General Committee were Herbert Hoover, Gifford Pinchot, Robert M. Yerkes, and Edward L. Thorndike.

Thorndike taught the principles of eugenics in his books on teacher training which were widely read in the profession. In *Elementary Principles of Education,* which he authored with his protégé Arthur I. Gates and which was published in 1929, he wrote:

> Education, then, cannot improve the racial stock by the direct means of biological heredity, but it may do so, indirectly, by means of social inheritance. It may improve the race by teaching prospective parents to breed men, as they do plants and animals, by discovering the nature of the best stocks and by seeking to increase their fertility while decreasing the productivity of the poorest strains. To achieve this end, ideas and mores different from those now prevailing must be established since most persons still feel superstitious dread of tampering with the question of who shall be born, though no other question so deeply affects the welfare of man.

To Thorndike, blacks were inferior and had to be treated differently in education. Thorndike's colleagues were in agreement on this issue, for the eugenics-inspired tests and experiments always seemed to provide "scientific proof" that blacks were inferior to whites. Cattell's weekly publication, *School and Society,* often reported the results of these tests. For example, the March 6, 1915, issue published an account of tests conducted by W.H. Pyle of the University of Missouri entitled "The Mind of the Negro Child." When some of the Negroes turned out to be more intelligent than expected, Pyle commented, "It may be that the negroes living under better social conditions are of better stock. They may have more white blood in them." The issue of March 20, 1915, carried an ad for "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro" by Marion J. Mayo. And at the National Education Association in August 1915, Lewis Terman spoke on "Education and Race Improvement."

The practical results of all of this was the relegation of blacks to an education in keeping with their inferior status. In a speech Thorndike gave to his colleagues in 1928, he said:

> I am commissioned to describe and discuss scientific researches concerning the curriculum. ... Teachers in the course of their work observe certain facts about the results which certain courses of study have upon certain pupils and make up their minds that this, that and the other features of the course of study have such and such advantages or weaknesses. They then proceed to change the curriculum in so far as they have the zeal and power to do so. Many improvements have had

> such an origin, for example, the change in certain schools for Negroes from a predominantly literary to a predominantly realistic and industrial curriculum. ...
>
> Researches concerning individual differences have also exposed the fallacies of judging curricula by their products without allowances for the selection of the human material upon which the curriculum worked. ... The differences in gain due to taking English, history, mathematics and Latin rather than English, history, typewriting and cooking is less than the difference in the gains made by very intellectual pupils . . . and average pupils taking identical programs, and is less than the difference in the gains made by white pupils and colored pupils taking identical programs.

In other words, as a result of "scientific research," pupils were now no longer being judged as individuals, but as members of different racial groups. Scientific racism had become an integral part of progressive educational policy.

The rise of Nazism in Germany with its evil racial policies brought the whole eugenics movement into disrepute. Many scientists had rejected it as pseudo-science, in the same category as phrenology. But Nazi racism indicated dramatically how eugenics would work in practice. In 1933, the Nazi government passed a Eugenic Sterilization Law that resulted in the compulsory sterilization, within three years, of 275,000 people judged "unfit" by Hereditary Health Courts. In 1939, the Nazi regime inaugurated a policy of euthanasia for the mentally diseased or disabled. Some 70,000 patients were shot or gassed to death. All of this was prelude to the mass extermination of Jews that would take place during the war years.

Despite the growing revulsion to eugenics after 1933, Thorndike continued to believe in it right up to his death in 1949. In his last book, *Human Nature and the Social Order,* published in 1940, he wrote, in a section on "Eugenics and the Good Life": "Improvement of the human genes . . . is the surest means of fostering the good life; it operates at the source of producing better people." In other words, there was no hope of improvement for people who started out with bad genes, like blacks. Therefore they should be trained with a "realistic and industrial curriculum."

While Thorndike is barely remembered today, his impact while he lived was enormous. Lawrence Cremin, in his history of Teachers College, writes:

> Coming to Teachers College in 1899 at the age of 25, [Thorndike] rose within five years from instructor to full professor and head of the Department of Educational Psychology. For 40 years he served Teachers College and his chosen field, becoming in every sense the outstanding educational psychologist of his era. ... The schoolroom was for Thorndike a "great laboratory" in which the modification of instincts and capacities into habits and powers was the central and unending subject of educational research. ...

> Like all pioneers, Thorndike inspired innumerable disciples and leaders to carry on his revolutionary work in education. ... Indeed, it may well be stated that two thinkers, Thorndike and Dewey, supplied the two great formative influences of twentieth-century educational theory and together established the frame of reference in which their contemporaries and successors were to work.

In other words, the two most important influences in modern American education were a eugenicist who thought that children should be taught like animals, and a socialist whose goal it was to use the public schools as the means of changing America from a capitalistic, individualistic society to a collectivist one. These two men, along with James McKeen Cattell, G. Stanley Hall, Arthur I. Gates, Charles Judd, William Scott Gray, and Edmund Burke Huey, were responsible for changing the way American children would be taught to read, which has led to the dumbing down of America.

Thorndike's behavioral psychology provided the new classroom teaching methods based on conditioning. His protégé, Gates, actually edited the new readers for the Macmillan Company. Judd, of the University of Chicago, another Wundtian Ph.D., organized the wholesale reform of the public school curriculum, and his protégé, William Scott Gray, supervised the writing, editing and publication of the Dick and Jane reading program.

The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education

In 1918 the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education was created by the NEA to redefine the functions of the American high school, the student population of which had grown from 202,963 in 1890 to 1,645,171 in 1918. The reforms recommended by the Commission were called *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, and they reflected the full influence of the new psychology as well as Dewey's educational agenda for a socialist society. The shift in emphasis from intellectual development to social development was revolutionary.

Dewey strongly opposed the traditional system, which encouraged the development of the independent mind ready to compete in capitalist society. "The mere absorbing of facts and truths," he wrote in *School and Society*, "is so exclusively individual an affair that it tends very naturally to pass into selfishness." And to Dewey selfishness was synonymous with capitalism. If education was to lead the next generation to socialism, it would have to be much less intellectual and much more social. Dewey wrote in *My Pedagogic Creed*:

> I believe that the social life of the child is the basis of concentration, or correlation, in all his training and growth.... I believe, therefore, that the true center of correlation on the school subjects is not science, nor literature, nor history, nor geography, but the child's social activities. I believe, therefore, in the so-called expressive or constructive activities as the center of correlation. I believe that this gives the standard for the place of cooking, sewing, manual training, etc., in the school.

It is obvious that the Commission was very much in accord with Dewey's ideas when they came up with their Cardinal Principles as the main objectives of education. The Cardinal Principles were: (1) Health, (2) Command of Fundamental Processes, (3) Worthy home-membership, (4) Vocation, (5) Citizenship, (6) Worthy use of leisure time, and (7) Ethical Character. The report stated:

> No curriculum in the secondary school can be regarded as satisfactory unless it gives due attention to each of the objectives of education outlined herein.
>
> Health, as an objective, makes imperative an adequate time assignment for physical training and requires science courses properly focused upon personal and community hygiene, the principles of sanitation, and their applications. Command of fundamental processes necessitates thorough course in the English language as a means of taking in and giving forth ideas. Worthy home-membership calls for the redirection of much of the work in literature, art, and the social studies. For girls it necessitates adequate courses in household arts. Citizenship demands that the social studies be given a prominent place. Vocation as an objective requires that many pupils devote much of their time to specific preparation for a definite trade or occupation, and that some pursue studies that serve as a basis for advanced work in higher institutions. The worthy use of leisure calls for courses in literature, art, music, and science so taught as to develop appreciation. It necessitates also a margin of free electives to be chosen on the basis of personal avocational interests.

The Cardinal Principles also put forth its own collectivist view of democracy with this curious definition:

> The purpose of democracy is so to organize society that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well-being of his fellow members and of society as a whole.

In the first place, our country is a constitutional republic, not a democracy. The purpose of our government is to secure the unalienable rights of the people, not organize society so that a specific kind of personality is formed. Nowhere in the U.S. Constitution is there a government mandate to organize society. But what the wording of the Cardinal Principles demonstrates is how far into socialist statism our educational leaders had gone.

Who were the educators who put the Cardinal Principles together? The driving force behind the commission was its chairman, Clarence Darwin Kingsley, State Superintendent of High Schools in Massachusetts, who had gotten his Master's degree at Teachers College in 1904 and his job in 1912 through David Snedden, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, a 1907 Ph.D. from Teachers College. Snedden became a member of the semi-secret Cleveland Conference in 1915 and in 1916 became a professor of education at Teachers College. The radical reform and reorganization advocated by the Cardinal Principles was exactly what the Cleveland Conference mafia wanted.

NEA Moves to Washington

In 1917, the NEA decided to set up its permanent headquarters in Washington, D.C. The decision was logical in view of the NEA's expanding role as formulator of national education policy. If the NEA was to become America's equivalent of a ministry of education, the place to be was in the nation's capital. Besides, the NEA had gotten a new charter from Congress in 1906, signed by President Theodore Roosevelt.

The publication of the Cardinal Principles in 1918 by the U.S. Office of Education gave it the look of a government document, the aura of government approval, and wide distribution throughout the nation, even though it was a private agenda concocted by a private commission. In reality, the progressives had staged the most successful political coup in American history by capturing tax-funded public education and using it to steer America in a socialist direction, and enlisting the help of the federal government to do it. As John Dewey put it, "The schools, like a nation, are in need of a central purpose which will create new enthusiasm and devotion, and which will unify and guide all intellectual plans."

With the godfathers pulling the strings, the NEA became an indispensable tool for controlling national policy. The easiest way to do this was to form a "commission" to develop educational policies. By putting the right people on the commission, the string pullers could get the results they wanted.

With America's entry into World War I in 1917, the NEA formed a Commission on the Emergency in Education with George G. Strayer of Teachers College at its head. The commission's report, read at the NEA convention in 1918, was called "a complete national plan for education." In 1920, the plan was fashioned into a bill and put before Congress. It proposed creating a Department of Education with cabinet status; appropriating money to reduce illiteracy; Americanize immigrants; and promote physical education and teacher training. It also advocated partial payment of teachers' salaries by the federal government.

The response of Congress fell dismally short of what the educators wanted. But it marked the beginning of the NEA's permanent role as lobbyist in Congress, promoting its legislative agenda each year, finding the ways and means to influence Congressmen. Meanwhile, the NEA itself was undergoing change. It was becoming a large teacher organization overshadowing the college and university professors who had virtually owned the organization in previous years. The creation of a Representative Assembly posed problems of control for the string pullers, but as long as they could get their men into leadership positions, they could control the teachers very nicely.

The Psychological Corporation

Meanwhile, in 1923, James McKeen Cattell organized The Psychological Corporation, a private company to do psychological consulting, testing and research for education,

industry and government. The stock of the corporation had been sold exclusively to Wundtian and behavioral psychologists. In describing the purpose of the corporation, Cattell wrote:

> If everybody were trained and selected for work there might result a revolution in industry as great as that brought about through the introduction of machinery. ... The scientific control of conduct may become of greater economic importance than the uses of electricity or of steel. ... It is not unreasonable to assume that the production of national wealth would be doubled if everyone, from the feeble-minded child to the President of the Nation, were allowed to do the work he can do best and were trained to do it in the best way.

There you see the beginnings of Outcome-Based Education based on the idea of using the "scientific control of conduct" to increase productivity. Naturally, such an idea appealed to many large corporations that wanted pliant employees who could be trained to work at a high level of efficiency, like a machine. The idea of a free country, in which each individual had the right to be a human being and not a scientifically controlled machine had no appeal to the progressive educators. Controlling people was the major goal of the entire progressive enterprise. John B. Watson had written in his book, *Behaviorism:*

> The interest of the behaviorist in man's doings is more than the interest of the spectator—he wants to control man's reactions as physical scientists want to control and minipulate other natural phenomena. It is the business of behavioristic psychology to be able to predict and to control human activity.

Meanwhile, there was much discussion among professors about the need to reform the public school curriculum. Professor Dallas Johnson of the University of Washington wrote in 1915: "Scholastic traditions and academic prejudices must give way to the ideal of increasing the social solidarity of our people." Professor Walter R. Smith of State Normal School, Emporia, Kansas, wrote in 1918: "The process of socialization will require greater emphasis upon the social studies in our schools. The linguistic and mathematical core of the old classical curriculum must give way to a social core."

Socialism on the March

The 1920s and '30s were devoted to bringing all of these curriculum changes into place. Charles Judd told a meeting of the American Political Science Association in 1931 that the entire organized profession was now engaged in the process of promoting "a movement to bring to full realization the project of socializing the whole body of instructional material in schools and colleges."

The work, in fact, was being done so vigorously that a reporter, attending the 1932 meeting of the NEA's school superintendents department, held in Washington, D.C., and attended by John Dewey, Charles Judd and other progressives, could write:

> Here in the very citadel of capitalism ... this group of outstanding spokesmen of American education talked a remarkably strong brand of socialism.

Some of these "outstanding spokesmen of American education" had toured Soviet Russia in 1928 and come back with glowing reports about the communist experiment. Even the American Historical Association got into the act of preparing America for socialism. In 1934 its Commission on the Social Studies reported:

> The report makes it clear that two social philosophies are now struggling for supremacy: individualism, with its attending capitalism and classism, and collectivism, with planned economy and mass rights. Believing that present trends indicate the victory of the latter the Commission on the Social Studies offers a comprehensive blueprint by which education may prepare to meet the demands of a collectivist social order without submerging the individual as a helpless victim of bureaucratic control.

Enter Kurt Lewin

During the 1930s many refugees from Hitler's Germany came to America. One of them was social psychologist Kurt Lewin, whose work was to have a profound effect on American education. In Germany, Lewin had worked on many psychological experiments in tandem with his colleagues in Moscow. From 1923 to 1930, Soviet psychologists Pavlov, Luria, and Vygotsky had been working on experiments to see if they could artificially induce behavioral disorganization. The technique they used was to force the subject to deal with two conflicting reflexes, thus causing a nervous breakdown. A book on the subject was written by A.R. Luria entitled *The Nature of Human Conflicts.* It was translated into English by W. Horsley Gantt and published in the United States in 1932. Gantt had gone to the Soviet Union and worked with Pavlov in his laboratory from 1924 to 1929. On his return to America he joined the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic at Johns Hopkins University.

The book is described on its title page as "An objective study of disorganization and control of human behavior." In his Introduction, Luria wrote:

> 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 lying at the basis of the disintegration of behaviour.

Luria describes how Pavlov achieved success in his experiments with animals. He 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.

Is it possible that American behaviorists knew that pitting a holistic reflex against a phonetic reflex in reading would cause behavioral disorganization in the student? Luria revealed to what great extent psychologists in the Soviet Union were aware of the works of behavioral psychologists on affect—the emotions—in the United States and Germany. He wrote:

> Many psychologists have attempted, so it seems to us, to introduce affect into the system of active human behaviour; but in the study of affect as a part of the system of pure psychology John Dewey [in Theory of Emotion, 1894] was perhaps the first to show the close connection between emotion and human activity, advancing the hypothesis that emotion appears when human activity is obstructed. Watson [in Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, 1919], Kantor [in Psychology of Feeling and Affective Reactions, 1923], Marston [in Emotions of Normal People, 1928], MacCurdy [in Psychology of Emotions, 1925], came to the same conclusions from their investigations, showing that emotional behaviour actually depends upon how freely the tension which is produced in the nervous apparatus as a result of one or another condition is discharged. Finally, K. Lewin [in Wille, Vorsatz und Bedurfniss, 1925] attempted to show, in a series of carefully executed experiments, a more sharply marked relation between the processes of tension, discharge, and affection.

Luria had high praise for Lewin's work in particular. He wrote:

> K. Lewin, in our opinion, has been one of the most prominent psychologists to elucidate this question of the artificial production of affect and of the experimental disorganisation of behavior. The method of his procedure—the introduction of an emotional setting into the experience of a human, the interest of the subject of the experiment—helped him to obtain an artificial disruption of the affect of considerable strength.

Group Dynamics

What does all of this experimentation mean in connection with education? Lewin founded the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (it later moved to the University of Michigan). Lewin showed that it was easier to produce change in human beings with weak or ambivalent values when they were in groups where group solidarity could operate. It was much harder to change the mind of an individual committed to a strong set of values. Lewin wrote:

> Acceptance of the new set of values and beliefs cannot usually be brought about item by item.

> The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to a group.
>
> The chances for re-education seem to be increased whenever a strong we-feeling is created.

Alfred Marrow, Lewin's biographer, writes:

> Belonging is signified by adherence to the group code. Those who belong "obey." Thus group pressures regulate the conduct of the would-be deviant member. He stays among those he feels he "belongs" even if their conduct seems unfair and their pressure unfriendly. To change his conduct or point of view independently of the group would get him into trouble with his fellow group members.

Lewin is credited with inventing sensitivity training, which became the inspiration for the encounter movement. Shortly before his death in 1947, Lewin established the National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine, under the sponsorship of the National Education Association. The latter described the purpose of the NTL: "To carry on research in . . . group decision making and action planning, and induction of change, resistance to change, the ethics of leadership in inducing change."

Lewin's work in group dynamics spurred the development of Third Force psychology by humanists Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Sidney Simon, and others who attempted to interject an emotional and spiritual component in behavioral psychology. Since the goal of education was redefined as "self-actualization," the emphasis was now on the development of the affective domain through such programs as values clarification, sensitivity training, situational ethics, multiculturalism, pluralism, and human sexuality.

NEA Promotes World Government

Another theme promoted in public education since the end of World War II has been that of world government. In December 1942, NEA *Journal* editor Joy Elmer Morgan wrote an editorial entitled "The United Peoples of the World," announcing the NEA's support for world government:

> World organization may well have four branches which in practice has proved indispensable: The legislature, the judicial, the executive, and the educational. In addition to the framework of government the world needs certain tools of cooperation: A world system of money and credit; a uniform system of weights and measures; a revised calendar; and a basic language.

Morgan also called for a world police force and a world board of education (which came in 1945 as UNESCO). For the NEA, the United Nations became the hope of the world. In January 1946, Morgan wrote in the NEA *Journal:*

> 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 cooperation. ... 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.

America Develops a Reading Problem

Although the decision to get rid of phonics and replace it with a whole-word approach in reading instruction was made by the progressives early in the century, it wasn't until the 1920s that the method was used widely enough in private and public schools so that the educators began to become aware of the reading problems the new teaching method was causing—problems that were forewarned in the studies done by Josephine Bowden, Myrtle Sholty, and Clara Schmitt in 1912 and 1914.

The first serious attempt to study the problem was made in Iowa in 1926 and '27 by neurologist Dr. Samuel T. Orton under a Rockefeller grant. At the time, educators were labeling the reading problem that children were having under the new teaching method as "congenital word blindness." Dr. Orton did his own investigation. What he found was quite different, and he wrote an article about it, which was published in the February 1929 issue of the Journal of Educational Psychology. Its title, "The 'Sight Reading' Method of Teaching Reading as a Source of Reading Disability," put the problem in an entirely different light. Orton, trying to be as cautious, diplomatic and non-confrontational as possible, wrote:

> I feel some trepidation in offering criticism in a field somewhat outside of that of my own endeavor but a very considerable part of my attention for the past four years has been given to the study of reading disability from the standpoint of cerebral physiology. This work has now extended over a comparatively large series of cases from many different schools and both the theory which has directed this work and the observations garnered therefrom seem to bear with sufficient directness on certain teaching methods in reading to warrant critical suggestions which otherwise might be considered overbold.
>
> I wish to emphasize at the beginning that the strictures which I have to offer here do not apply to the use of the sight method of teaching reading as a whole but only to its effects on a restricted group of children for whom, as I think we can show, this technique is not only not adopted but often proves an actual obstacle to reading progress, and moreover I believe that this group is one of considerable size and because here faulty teaching methods may not only prevent the acquisition of academic education by children of average capacity but may also give rise to far reaching damage to their emotional life.

Collier's magazine of Nov. 26, 1954, interviewed Dr. Orton about his research. It wrote:

> Dr. Orton barnstormed Iowa from school to school with a mobile mental-hygiene unit. One of his first observations was: "In my original group of reading disability cases I was surprised at the large proportion of these children encountered." He later compared two towns, one of which had twice as many retarded readers as the other. "In the community with the lesser number of cases," he said, "sight reading methods were employed but when children did not progress by this method they were also given help by the phonetic method. In the town with the larger number, no child was given any other type of reading training until he or she had learned 90 words by sight. ... this strongly suggests that the sight method not only will not eradicate a reading disability of this type but may actually produce a number of cases."

Since the Journal of Educational Psychology was edited by the very progressives responsible for the decision to replace phonics with a whole-word, sight method, one wonders why they published Dr. Orton's article. The article, unfortunately, gave the impression that there was nothing intrinsically wrong with the sight method, but that there was something wrong with a large number of children who couldn't learn to read with it. And so, the educators concentrated on what was wrong with the children, not the teaching method.

In 1930, the Dick and Jane books, edited by William Scott Gray, Judd's protégé at the University of Chicago, and the Macmillan readers, edited by Arthur I. Gates, Thorndike's protégé at Teachers College, both reading programs based on the whole-word method. were published and sold to schools throughout the nation.

Both the Dick and Jane and the Gates "Program of Reading Primers" were based on the teaching methods developed by Thorndike: the use of a small number of sight words serving as stimuli, and repetition of the same words as the conditioning response. The social content of the books followed John Dewey's prescription in *School and Society*. Dewey opposed using myths and fairy tales in primers. They stimulated the private imagination rather than the social spirit. He wrote:

> Some writers appear to have the impression that the child's imagination has outlet only in myth and fairy tale. ... The John and Jane that most of us know let their imaginations play about the current and familiar contacts and events of life—about father and mother and friend, about steamboats and locomotives. and sheep and cows.

Thus. the focus in the new look-say, whole-word primers was on family and neighborly relationships in which the child's social development was stressed. The result was such literary gems composed by Dr. Gray as:

> Dick
> Look. Jane.
> Look. look.

See Dick.
See, see.
Oh, see.
See Dick.
Oh, see Dick.
Oh, oh, oh.
Funny, funny Dick.

Also, the books had lots of pictures, for Dewey had said in *My Pedagogic Creed*: "I believe that the image is the great instrument of instruction."

Of course, that contradicted all of human history in which it had been proven since the beginning of time that language, not image, is the chief instrument of both learning and instruction. Only the deaf rely on image more than language, and even they must master language to achieve any high degree of learning.

Both "Dick and Jane" and Gates's primers, the "Nick and Dick" books, appeared during the Depression when schools were strapped for money and couldn't afford the new whole-word primers. Thus, the Depression probably saved millions of children from becoming functional illiterates. But eventually the phonics books wore out, and the schools had no choice but to buy the new look-say primers. The education mafia made sure of that.

It didn't take very long for American school children to develop reading problems. In October 1936, the NEA *Journal* began publishing a series of articles on reading problems by Arthur I. Gates and Guy L. Bond, a fellow primer author, in which it was pointed out "that there are probably nearly a half-million children in the first four grades of American schools whose educational career is blocked by serious disabilities in reading." And what was causing all of this trouble? According to Gates the new look-say primers introduced too many sight words too soon and repeated them too few times. Gates wrote:

> The typical reader introduces a new word in about every 15 running words. Experiments have shown that this vocabulary burden is very heavy for even the brightest pupils and that it is overwhelmingly difficult for the slow readers.

So what did Gates recommend? Did he recommend that the whole-word reading experiment be abandoned and that the schools return to phonics? Not at all. He recommended teaching the children fewer sight words but repeating them more often. Thus, when the Dick and Jane books were revised in 1951, this is what they did:

> In 1930 the Dick and Jane pre-primer taught 68 sight words in 39 pages of story text, with an illustration per page, a total of 565 words and a *Teacher's Guidebook* of 87 pages. In 1951, that same pre-primer was expanded to 172 pages, divided into three separate pre-primers, with 184 illustrations, a total of 2,613 words, and a *Teacher's Guidebook* of 182 pages to teach a sight vocabulary of only 58 words.

In 1930 the word *look* was repeated eight times in the pre-primer. In 1951, it was repeated 110 times. In 1930, the word *oh* was repeated 12 times, in 1951, 138 times. In 1930, the word *see* was repeated 27 times, in 1951, 176 times.

Did the revisions do any good? Apparently not, for the problems of reading disability continued to grow in scope and complexity. As early as 1944, Life magazine ran a major article on "dyslexia," a new medical term most Americans had never heard of. It said:

> Millions of children in the U.S. suffer from dyslexia which is the medical term for reading difficulties. It is responsible for about 70% of the school failures in 6- to 12-year-age group, and handicaps about 15% of all grade-school children. Dyslexia may stem from a variety of physical ailments or combination of them—glandular imbalance, heart disease, eye or ear trouble—or from a deep-seated psychological disturbance that "blocks" a child's ability to learn. It has little or nothing to do with intelligence and is usually curable.

It is also obvious that the article itself had nothing to do with intelligence and was written by a fool who no doubt believed anything the educators told him. The article then went on to describe the case of a little girl with an I.Q. of 118 who was examined by the Dyslexia Institute of Northwestern University. After her tests, the doctors concluded that the little girl needed "thyroid treatments, removal of tonsils and adenoids, exercises to strengthen her eye muscles." The article concluded:

> Other patients may need dental work, nose, throat or ear treatment, or a thorough airing out of troublesome home situations that throw a sensitive child off the track of normality. In the experience of the institute these range from alcoholic fathers to ambitious mothers who try to force their children too fast in school.

Gray and Gates must have laughed all the way to the bank as they collected their royalties from their prosperous publishers. And so the public was getting a very confusing message about their children's learning problems and the growing plague of reading disability.

Enter Rudolf Flesch

Finally, in 1955, one man with one book woke up the nation and told parents exactly what was wrong. The man was Rudolf Flesch and the book was *Why Johnny Can't Read.* Flesch wrote:

> The teaching of reading—all over the United States, in all the schools, and in all the textbooks—is totally wrong and flies in the face of all logic and common sense.

And then he explained how the professors of education had changed the way reading is taught in American schools. They had thrown out phonics, the proper way to teach children to read an alphabetic writing system, and put in this new look-say method that

taught children to read English as if it were Chinese. That was surprising news to a lot of American parents. Now, for the first time they understood what was wrong with their little Johnnies and Susies.

While the general public received Flesch's book with positive appreciation, the education establishment did everything in their power to discredit the man and his book. Gray, Gates and their fellow whole-word educators circled the wagons and organized the International Reading Association, which became the impregnable citadel of whole-word teaching practice.

Thus, while there was considerable pressure on the part of parents to get the schools to return to phonics, their success was very limited. The reading establishment managed to weather the storm so well, that the teaching of a sight vocabulary is now considered the accepted way to introduce first graders to reading.

Bloom's Taxonomy

While parents and educators were battling over reading instruction at the elementary school level, behavioral psychologists in 1956 were in the process of redefining the purpose of education in behavioral terms. Its purpose was no longer to impart academic skills so that a child could develop independent intelligence and make a life for himself. The new purpose was clearly stated by Prof. Benjamin Bloom in his book, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain,* in which he wrote:

> By educational objectives, we mean explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process. That is, the ways in which they will change in their thinking, their feelings, and their actions. ... The evidence points out convincingly to the fact that age is a factor operating against attempts to effect a complete or thorough-going reorganization of attitudes and values. ... The evidence collected thus far suggests that a single hour of classroom activity under certain conditions may bring about a major reorganization in cognitive as well as affective behaviors.

Note that education is now comprised of cognitive and affective domains. The cognitive is supposed to deal with subject matter or knowledge, while the affective deals with emotions, beliefs, feelings, and values. But what the educators proceeded to do is meld the cognitive with the affective, so that now it is impossible to separate the two.

Prof. Bloom, a behavioral scientist at the University of Chicago, wrote the book with a group of behavioral scientists. But the book became known as Bloom's Taxonomy. Bloom is also considered the father of Outcome-Based Education and Mastery Learning. The latter uses animal training techniques of stimulus-and-response with reinforcement rewards for correct responses. This teaching technique, inspired by the work of B.F. Skinner in the training of rats, bypasses the mind or intellect and uses operant conditioning to produce the desired result. That's why, wherever it's been tried, it

produces failure and student misery. Children are not animals, and if you don't engage their minds in the learning process, they do not learn.

Bloom's Taxonomy went on to become one of the most influential educational monographs of the century. In 1994, the 93rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education devoted its pages to a symposium on the Taxonomy and its influence. Dr. Bloom wrote:

> The original plans called for a complete taxonomy in three parts—the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. ... The cognitive domain was the domain most central to much of the test development work at that time. It was also the domain in which most of the work in curriculum development had taken place and where the clearest definitions of objectives as *descriptions of student behavior* were to be found.
>
> To overcome the problem of classifying objectives which could not be observed or manipulated as directly as those in the physical and biological sciences, the group decided that virtually all educational objectives when stated in behavioral form have their counterparts in student behavior.
>
> Since its publication in 1956, the *Handbook* has been translated, either totally or partially, into at least eighteen languages. ... In 1970 I went to South America for the purpose of selecting teams of educators to participate in the historic seminar on curriculum development which was to be held in Granna, Sweden, in 1971. I was surprised to discover that in every country I visited, the Taxonomy was well known, thanks to the Spanish translation. ... The Granna seminar resulted in the establishment of Curriculum Research Centers—all based on the Taxonomy—in many of the participating countries.
>
> In 1986, I was invited by Lin Fu Nian, Honorary President of East China Normal University in Shanghai, to be an exchange scholar. One of my primary responsibilities was to conduct a series of seminars. During these seminars, the Taxonomy was described and discussed. Lin Fu Nian was so impressed with the *Handbook* that he had it translated into Chinese and distributed a million copies to educators throughout China. The magnitude of this effort is truly mind-boggling.

What is also mind-boggling is the extent to which behavioral scientists and psychologists now control the content of American public education, in which an educational objective is viewed as a change in behavior. Under such a regime, there is no place for intellectual development.

It should be noted that the behaviorists were working in accordance with behavioral psychology, which had been formulated by John B. Watson in his book, *Behaviorism*, published in 1924. In that book he wrote:

> [We believe] that man is an animal different from other animals only in the types of behavior he displays. ... The raw fact that you, as a psychologist, if you are to remain scientific, must describe the behavior of man in no other terms than those you would use in describing the behavior of the ox you slaughter, drove and still drives many timid souls away from behaviorism. ...
>
> The interest of the behaviorist in man's doings is more than the interest of the spectator—he wants to control man's reactions as physical scientists want to control and manipulate other natural phenomena. It is the business of behavioristic psychology to be able to predict and to control human activity. ...
>
> This discussion of stimulus and response shows what material we have to work with in behavioristic psychology and why behavioristic psychology has as its goal *to be able, given the stimulus, to predict the response—or, seeing the reaction take place to state what the stimulus is that has called out the reaction.*

In the heading to his chapter on Talking and Thinking, Watson added: "Which, when rightly understood, go far in breaking down the fiction that there is any such thing as 'Mental' life."

These are the scientists in whose hands American parents place their children to be educated and then wonder why their children can't read, write, spell, do arithmetic, or know anything. The simple fact is that behaviorists don't believe in education. They believe in operant conditioning. Margaret Hyde, in her book, *Brainwashing,* writes:

> Operant conditioning, on which much of behavior modification is based, makes use of consequences to strengthen or weaken behavior. Rewards are given for desired responses and punishments are used to discourage repetition of undesired behavior.

So, the question becomes who decides what is desired and undesired behavior? Is desired behavior a euphemism for politically correct behavior? That is why behavioral psychology can so easily undermine true education, because true education is based on truth, not behavior. But by equating learning with behavior, psychologists can simply use the techniques of behavior modification to get the "learning" results they want.

Desegregation

On May 17, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal" which had been in effect for nearly 70 years. While public schools in the North had racially integrated schools, Southern states had created dual school systems, one for whites and one for blacks, separate but equal. The Supreme Court deemed this arrangement unconstitutional. Black children were now able to attend local schools which became racially integrated. But in practice, most black children preferred to remain in the predominantly black schools and white children remained in their schools.

However, on October 30, 1969, the U.S. Supreme Court, dissatisfied with the slow pace of racial integration, issued an unsigned order stating: "The obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools." Racial balance became the new standard of integration. But in order to implement the new standard, forced busing was required. The result is that many white parents, to avoid forced integration, created private academies throughout the South. Equally important was the integration of teaching and administrative staffs and of national educational associations.

The Sputnik Surprise

In 1957, the Soviet Union demonstrated its technological prowess by sending the satellite Sputnik into orbit in outer space. It so alarmed the American people, that the Congress then enacted its first federal aid-to-education program. The purpose of the program was to help train scientists and engineers for our own space exploration program. While America was able in time to outdo the Soviets in outer space, it is doubtful that the aid-to-education program did much good in the elementary schools, where Dick and Jane was still being used to teach children to read.

The NEA Becomes a Major Political Force

Meanwhile, the National Education Association was busy working overtime to get teachers interested in politics. In an article entitled "Education is a Political Enterprise," published in the NEA *Journal* of November 1964, Professor Stephen K. Bailey of Syracuse University told readers:

> If Education is to receive the moral and financial support of citizens, political forces must be mobilized in its behalf. ...
>
> Education is one of the most thoroughly political enterprises in American life. More money is spent for education than for any other single function of state and local government.
>
> It seems to me ... that we ... should face squarely the politics of mobilizing support for public education and that we should understand how the process works. ... In every case where a major breakthrough in increasing state aid to education, the state teachers associations ... have either been at the forefront or in the middle of the political campaign for increasing such state aid. ... It is evident that effective political leadership is the keystone to the arch of educational finance.

In 1967, Sam Lambert, executive secretary of the NEA, predicted, "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."

The NEA had the organizational means to impose its will on the American people: 4,000 to 6,000 NEA members in each of the nation's 435 Congressional districts, 12,000 local NEA units permitting control of every school district in the country, and 50 powerful state associations riding herd on the 50 state legislatures.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act

In 1965, the educators, working with Pres. Lyndon Johnson, achieved their greatest political victory to date with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which began a new era for both educators and taxpayers. For the educators it meant hitting the federal jackpot with untold prosperity for themselves and their suppliers. For taxpayers it meant a new, never-ending, ever-increasing tax burden with little or no academic improvement to show for it. With behavioral scientists in control of curriculum development, academic improvement would be impossible. In fact, 1965 marks the year when the SAT scores began their toboggan slide downward. In 1965, the SAT Verbal Score was 473, in 1994 it was down to 423.

The best known component of the ESEA was Title One, compensatory education for economically and culturally deprived youngsters. The program was inaugurated with an appropriation of $1 billion. By 1995, more than $123-billion had been spent on Title One with no improvement at all. In fact, reading scores had declined.

The BSTEP

The year 1965 also saw the launching of the *Behavioral Science Teacher Education Program* (BSTEP), funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The program was initiated at Michigan State University, and its purpose was to change the teacher from a transmitter of knowledge to a social change agent, a facilitator and a clinician. The program outlined three major goals:

1. Development of a new kind of elementary school teacher who is basically well educated, engages in teaching as clinical practice, is an effective student of the capacities and environmental characteristics of human learning, and functions as a responsible change agent.

2. Systematic use of research and clinical experience in decision-making processes at all levels.

3. A new laboratory and clinical base, from the behavioral sciences, on which to found undergraduate and in-service teacher education programs, and recycle evaluations of teaching tools and performance.

   The program is designed to focus the skills and knowledge of Behavioral Scientists on education problems, translating research into viable programs for preservice and in-service teachers. The traditional concept of research as theory is not discarded, but

the emphasis is shifted to a form of practical action research in classrooms and laboratory.

In a section entitled "Futurism as a Social Tool and Decision Making by an Elite," we read:

> Long-range planning and implementation of plans will be made by a technological-scientific elite. ... The Protestant ethic will atrophy as more and more enjoy varied leisure and guaranteed sustenance. Work as the means and end of living will diminish. ... Most people will tend to be hedonistic, and a dominant elite will supply "bread and circuses" to keep social dissension and disruption to a minimum. ... The controlling elite will engage in power plays largely without the involvement of most of the people. ... The society will be a leisurely one. People will study, play, and travel; some will be in various stages of drug-induced experiences. ... Each individual will receive at birth a multipurpose identification which will have, among other things, extensive communications uses. None will be out of touch with those authorized to reach him. ...

One wonders what this team of behavioral researchers at Michigan State University were smoking when they dreamed up this 1984 version of the American future. Apparently, there are a lot of behavioral scientists in America who believe in this anti-democratic future and are working night and day to bring it about. As long as taxpayers are willing to pay for these blueprints of the future, the researchers will vent their drug-induced fantasies ad nauseam. What all of this means, of course, is that there is no end to the nonsense that federal money can buy.

The Downward Slide

For years, the NEA had argued and pleaded that federal money was needed to improve public education in quantity and quality. Now that they had the money, what were the results? In 1966, the SAT mean score was 467. In 1977, it was down to 429. The *Boston Globe* (8/29/76) described the situation as "a prolonged and broad-scale decline unequalled in U.S. history. The downward spiral ... began abruptly in the mid-1960s and shows no signs of bottoming out."

In other words, flooding the schools with billions of federal dollars obviously contributed to the decline in academic skills, for the simple reason that it gave the educators the funds needed to carry out their nonacademic educational experiments. The ESEA also called for the setting up of eight Regional Education Laboratories across the country for the express purpose of conducting research and experimentation in education. These labs are supported by contracts with the U.S. Education Department and Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Whatever these labs have been doing over the years, we know of no single program of theirs that has had a positive effect on student academic achievement.

Thus, the decline in academic achievement took place when educators now had more money than they ever dreamed of. The floodgates of the U.S. treasury had been thrown open for them to use to improve education. But clearly the money was going to be spent on fulfilling the dreams of the progressives. Professor John Goodlad told the readers of the NEA *Journal* in March 1966 that the curriculum of the future "will be what one might call the *humanistic curriculum* and that it may become significantly evident by 1990 or 2000. ... Only within a humanistic conception of education and a humanistic conception and conduct of the whole of schooling can a humanistic curriculum center upon human interests and values."

Americans Flunk Geography

According to a study released in July 1988 by the National Geographic Society, Americans aged 18 to 24 ranked last in an international comparison of geographic knowledge, and American adults of all ages scored among the bottom third. The nine-nation study found that 75 percent of Americans surveyed were unable to locate the Persian Gulf on a map, and fewer than half could identify the United Kingdom, France, South Africa or Japan.

The survey also found that one out of seven—a figure that would project to 24 million American adults—could not identify the United States on a world map and half could not identify Nicaragua as the country in which the Sandinistas and contras were fighting.

Why this lack of geographic knowledge? American public schools have de-emphasized the teaching of factual knowledge in favor of teaching processing skills. Educators want their students to be able to process information rather than store their brains with factual knowledge. Thus, the public schools are turning out empty-headed young adults who have been told that they have been taught how to apply critical thinking to whatever information they encounter.

School Prayer Banned

As humanism was slowly becoming the religion of public education, Christianity was being phased out mainly through court decisions. In June,1963, the U.S. Supreme Court, in an 8-to-1 decision, ruled that Bible reading and prayers in public schools were unconstitutional.

Subsequently, the courts have become the battleground between Christians and secularists in the war between the two cultural forces. For example, in 1987 a superior court judge in Snohomish, Washington, ruled that a Christmas display at a junior high school in Mulilteo School district was unconstitutional because it violated the separation of church and state.

In Iowa in 1987, the Iowa Civil Liberties Union won a suit against the Adel-De Soto Community School District to stop the free distribution of Gideon Bibles to students who

wanted them. The suit was initiated by a father and daughter who found the practice a violation of the separation of church and state.

On February 3, 1987 U.S. District Judge Ernest Tidwell ruled that public prayers before high school football games in Douglasville, Georgia, violated the First Amendment ban on the state establishment of religion. The judge opined that allowing Protestant ministers to offer invocations before sporting events served no secular purpose.

Federal Court Bans High School Bible Club

In 1988, a second federal district court ruled against students trying to form a Bible club under the Equal Access Act. Students at Westside High School in Omaha, Nebraska, were forbidden to form the Bible club, the Court ruled, because the public school had a "closed" forum which permits only curriculum-related clubs to meet before and after school hours.

The Equal Access Act reads: "It shall be unlawful for any public secondary school which receives Federal financial assistance and which has a limited open forum to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or discriminate against, any students who wish to conduct a meeting within that limited open forum on the basis of religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings." The Act was passed by Congress in August 1984.

The dispute at Westside began in January 1985 when a student asked permission to form a religious club that would meet on campus during non-school hours. The Principal denied the request. Two months later, the school board upheld the Principal's decision, arguing that since Westside did not allow non-curricula organizations to form on campus, they were not under the requirements of the EAA.

However, it was pointed out that the school permitted such organizations as Interact, Chess, and Subserfers to hold meetings on campus. But the school board argued that these clubs were curricula related. Interact, they claimed, was related to psychology and sociology; Chess provided an arena for logical thinking; and Subserfers were related to the goals of the physical education department.

For some reason, nobody pointed out that Bible study was related to ancient history, philosophy, history of religion, comparative religion, archeology, geography, psychology (study of human nature), history of the Jews, biography, Puritan history, American colonial history. The King James Version of the Bible provided students with the single greatest work of literature of the Elizabethan era and help students learn to read Shakespeare and other Elizabethan authors. Biblical references are found throughout English and world literature, and even in crossword puzzles. In fact, it would be hard to find another work more relevant to education than the Bible.

The Decline in Intelligence

Meanwhile, the nation was experiencing a severe decline in student intelligence. The most telling indicator of that decline were the SAT figures for those at the very top. In 1972, the number of students who scored at the top between 750 and 800 on the verbal test was 2,817. In 1994, that number was down to 1,438! At the bottom of the scale, the number of students who scored between 200 and 290 in 1972 on the verbal test was 71,084. In 1994, it was up to 136,841. Americans were indeed getting dumber.

In 1970, Karl Shapiro, the eminent poet-professor who had taught creative writing for years at the University of California Davis, told an audience of librarians:

> What is distressing is that this generation cannot and does not read. I am speaking of university students in what are supposed to be our best universities. Their illiteracy is staggering. ... We are experiencing a literacy breakdown which is unlike anything I know of in the history of letters.

In the same year as Prof. Shapiro's speech, President Nixon launched the Right-to-Read program, a ten-year effort to wipe out illiteracy in the United States. Millions of dollars were spent, but the program was a failure. The entire effort is now little more than a footnote in the history of American education in the 1970s.

Enter the Change Agent

In 1970, a new educational actor entered the stage of education reform with a good deal of fanfare. He or she was referred to as a "change agent." The September 1970 issue of *Today's Education* defined the term:

> 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.

Note that the change agent is not only interested in changing education but society as well. The idea of the "change agent" seems to have originated with Prof. Bloom who wrote in his Taxonomy: "By educational objectives, we mean explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process. That is, the ways in which they will change in their thinking, their feelings, and their actions."

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided funding for change-agent development. Thus, Ronald G. Havelock wrote his book, *The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education,* published in 1973, under a contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the title "Diffusion of Utilization Research to Knowledge Linkers in Education."

According to the book, the change-agent is involved in: (1) the planning of educational change, (2) the training of laboratory T-groups to effect organizational change, (3) conflict resolution, (4) attitude and opinion change, (5) sensitivity training groups, (6) mental health consultation, (7) creating models for social change, (8) developing strategies for change agents, (9) utopian-analysis, (10) the manipulation of human behavior, (11) group dynamics, (12) role playing, (13) force field analysis applied to school situations, (14) reconciling community conflict, (15) understanding the dynamics of the influence process, (16) humanistic education, (17) identifying the characteristics of innovators, (18) reorganizing the school and classroom, (19) developing a pupil-assessment system, (20) creating social systems of knowledge transfer, (21) orientation of planned change, (22) Title III as it relates to educational change, (23) student behavioral objectives, (24) resistance and barriers to change.

With educators so preoccupied with change, what chance do children have of learning the basic academic skills that require little if any change at all? Also, American society has been subject to enormous cultural and industrial changes in the last one hundred years without the help of a cadre of organized change agents. The invention of the automobile, electric light, telephone, movie camera, phonograph, and thousands of other inventions have changed America dramatically through a natural process of the more efficient new replacing the less efficient old. That's what is known as progress—without the dialectic.

The Third Force

The cultural upheavals of the 1960s also saw the rise of the so-called Third Force in American education. The leading figures of the Third Force were humanist psychologists Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow. Maslow had worked on sexological research under the auspices of Edward L. Thorndike from 1935 to 1937. According to feminist Betty Friedan, Maslow's findings helped advance the feminist approach to psychology. Maslow, trained in behavioral psychology, began to moderate it with his own theory of self-actualization.

Maslow, born in New York of a Jewish immigrant family in 1908, rejected religion early in life because he associated it with a mother he detested. He wrote in later years:

"I always wondered where my utopianism, ethical stress, humanism, stress on kindness, love, friendship, and all the rest came from. I knew certainly of the direct consequences of having no mother-love. But the whole thrust of my life-philosophy and all my research and theorizing also has its roots in a hatred for and revulsion against everything she stood for."

By the time Maslow was a teenager he regarded all religion as nonsensical. To him religious observance attracted only the naïve and hypocritical. Later, in high school, a teacher introduced him to the novels of Upton Sinclair, which turned him into a socialist. Eugene Debs, Norman Thomas, and other prominent American socialists became his heroes.

In 1928 Maslow chose psychology as his career after reading several essays by John B. Watson, the father of American behaviorism. "I suddenly saw unrolling before me into the future," he wrote, "the possibility of a science of psychology, a program of work which promised real progress, real advance, real solutions of real problems. All that was necessary was devotion and hard work."

Watson's anti-religious outlook strongly appealed to Maslow, who shared Watson's faith in rationality as the means to a better society. He was particularly taken in by Watson's optimistic belief in the malleability of human nature. Change the environment and you can change human nature, argued Watson.

However, it was through his fieldwork with the Blackfoot Indians in Montana in the 1930s that Maslow began to revise his behaviorist views. He wrote: "It would seem that every human being comes at birth into society not as a lump of clay to be molded by society, but rather as a structure which society may warp or suppress or build upon. I am now struggling with a notion of a 'fundamental' or 'natural' personality structure."

Malsow Rejects Behaviorism for Self-Actualization

But it was the birth of his daughter in 1938 that made Maslow reject behaviorism altogether. As he watched his little daughter assert her wants and dislikes, the idea that a child could be molded into anything the psychologist wanted through behavioral conditioning became untenable. He wrote: "Becoming a father changed my whole life. ... It made the behaviorism I had been so enthusiastic about look so foolish that I couldn't stomach it anymore."

In 1943, Maslow formulated his own theory of human motivation. He centered his theory on what he called the hierarchy of human needs. He contended that every person is born with a set of basic needs, such as food, safety, love, self-esteem. But when these basic needs are satisfied, there is a higher need that cries for satisfaction: self-actualization.

He wrote: "A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write, if he is to be ultimately at peace with himself. What a man can be, he must be. This need we may call self-actualization."

Maslow had rejected Freud's pessimistic view of human nature and the behaviorists' animalistic view of man. He had come up with a third view of his own. He was much more interested in human success than in human failure. Maslow's biographer, Edward Hoffman, writes:

"The issue was no longer 'What makes for a genius like Beethoven?' but 'Why aren't we all Beethovens?' Slowly and unexpectedly, Maslow's self-actualization research had become the basis for an entirely new vision of psychology with the premise that each of us harbors an innate human nature of vast potential that usually becomes blocked or

thwarted through the deprivation of lower needs. This inner potential, Maslow believed, had not been taken into account by any existing school of psychology. ...

"He emphasized that the true fulfillment in life comes from satisfying our higher needs, especially the need for self-actualization. The more we pursue and realize our loftier needs, Maslow contended, the happier and even physically healthier we will be."

Maslow himself wrote: "I think of the self-actualizing man not as an ordinary man with something added, but rather as an ordinary man with nothing taken away. The average man is a human being with dampened and inhibited powers."

In short, Maslow had come up with another secular recipe for human perfectibility, in complete contradiction to the Biblical view of man's fallen nature. It is said that Maslow had a Messiah complex with a great personal mission to change the human condition. He said in 1955:

"I am also very definitely interested and concerned with man's fate, with his ends and goals and with his future. I would like to help improve him and to better his prospects. I hope to help teach him how to be brotherly, cooperative, peaceful, courageous, and just. I think science is the best hope for achieving this, and of all the sciences, I consider psychology most important to this end. Indeed, I sometimes think that the world will either be saved by psychologists—in the broadest sense—or else it will not be saved at all."

But toward the end of his life, Maslow became quite disillusioned with his theory of self-actualization. The disrespectful, affluent students in his Brandeis University classroom, whose basic needs were more than adequately satisfied by their parents, showed no great desire for self-actualization. They were more interested in self-indulgence and self-satisfaction.

The Encounter Movement

Humanistic psychology offered mankind a new, atheistic road to salvation, and one of the mechanisms or techniques which the psychologists would use to bring salvation to the individual is the encounter group—the intensive group experience.

The encounter experience was first developed at the National Training Laboratory (NTL) in Bethel, Maine, sponsored by the National Education Association. It was founded in 1947 by Kurt Lewin, father of sensitivity training and group dynamics. The man most responsible for joining the encounter experience with humanistic psychology was Carl Rogers, the founder of nondirective psychological counseling. In nondirective counseling, or teaching, the therapist, or teacher, is merely a facilitator who helps the client or pupil get in touch with his own feeelings so that he can direct his own decision-making in accordance with his own values. In teaching, this encourages moral subjectivism and pupil rejection of all outside authority. Values clarification is the technique used to arrive at moral independence.

Rogers became the guru of the encounter movement because of his extensive experimentation with the technique at the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute (WBSI) at La Jolla, California. In a lecture to an audience of educators in 1968, Rogers described the function of the encounter group:

"One of the most effective means yet discovered for facilitating constructive learning, and growth, and change in individuals and in the organization they represent is the intensive group experience. It goes by many names: encounter group, T-group, sensitivity training. ... The intensive group or encounter group usually consists of 10 to 15 persons and a facilitator or leader. Personally, I like the term facilitator better because I think he really helps to facilitate the group in its own direction. It's a relatively unstructured group providing a climate of maximum freedom for personal expression, exploration of feelings and interpersonal communication."

The first sensitivity training program for educational leaders was conducted by the National Training Laboratory in 1959. It was cosponsored by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. The program was designed for the principal as an agent and manager of change. Rogers wrote:

"Changingness, a reliance on process rather than upon static knowledge, is the only thing that makes sense as a goal for education in the modern world."

Why all the emphasis on change? Because the humanists realized that there was something terribly wrong with public education and that it had to be changed. Rogers wrote in 1971:

"I have days when I think educational institutions at all levels are doomed. I also have moments when it seems that if we could only do away with state-required curricula, compulsory attendance, tenured professors, hours of lectures, grades, degrees, and all that, perhaps everybody could move outside the stifling hallowed walls and learning could flourish on its own."

But Rogers' dream was only a dream. Schools were here to stay and the humanists were determined to remake them in their own image. Humanist educator Arthur Combs wrote:

"There are hundreds of ways we dehumanize people in our schools, and we need to make a systematic attempt to get rid of them.... If we want to humanize the processes of learning, we must make a systematic search for the things that destroy effective learning and remove them from the scene. If we're going to humanize the processes of learning, we must take the student in as a partner. Education wouldn't be irrelevant if students had a voice in decision making."

One must acknowledge that the humanist critique had merit. Public education was every bit as bad as they said it was. But would sensitivity training, values clarification, and

encounter groups make it better or worse? In 1971, John R. Silber, who later became president of Boston University, wrote:

"Encounter groups invade privacy with reckless abandon. You cannot make public what is private without changing it. We have derived our sense of dignity largely from the Judeo-Christian tradition and, to some extent, from the Hellenic tradition. In rejecting those traditions, we forfeit the basis for the respect of the individual person and his dignity. I question the claim that encounter sessions have therapeutic value. ... Some group sessions have caused great harm, bring people over the brink, exacerbating mental difficulties and problems that were relatively under control before the students participated in encounter sessions."

But how does all of this work in the classroom? Since it's difficult to hold encounter sessions in the classroom, educators have had to resort to written forms of self-revelation: student journals, tests that ask very personal psychological questions about one's likes and dislikes and about one's family life. One wonders what is going to be done with all of this information. Back when this writer was attending public school in New York City, all they wanted to know about your family was their address. And all they wanted to know about you were the names of your parents, their address, and your birth date.

U.S. Department of Education

In 1979, the U.S. Department of Education was formed under President Carter. Because of the enormous help he had obtained from the organized educators during his election campaign, he obligingly gave them what they had wanted for over a hundred years: a cabinet level department of their own, thus permanently tying the federal government to public education.

In April 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its devastating report on American education, *A Nation at Risk*. The Report stated: "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people. ... If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves."

That was quite an indictment, and all it really did was encourage state legislatures to simply throw more money at education and increase the budget of the Department of Education. The Reagan administration had made a feeble attempt to close down the Department, but was sabotaged by Terrel Bell, Secretary of Education, working in collusion with some people in the White House. By now it became quite apparent that an ongoing battle between conservatives and liberals over developments in public education would become a permanent part of American political and cultural life.

The 1980s also saw the early growth of a home-school movement. Many parents, no longer willing to accept the failures of public education, and convinced that no

meaningful improvements would be made in the foreseeable future, decided to take matters into their own hands and educate their children at home. At first, they encountered some harassment from the education establishment, which refused to acknowledge their legitimacy. But with the founding of the Home School Legal Defense Association in 1983 by a group of home-schooling lawyers, home schoolers were able to fight back effectively in the courts and win affirmation of the right of parents to educate their children in accordance with their own values and beliefs.

Professor Oettinger of Harvard on Literacy

That the dumbing down process going on in the public schools had the approval of the Harvard elite was confirmed by a speech given by Prof. Anthony D. Oettinger to an audience of business executives at a Northern Telecom senior management conference in February 1982. Oettinger was chairman of the Harvard Program on Information Resources Policy and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. In a speech entitled "Regulated Competition in the United States," Oettinger said:

> Our idea of literacy, I am afraid, is obsolete because it rests on a frozen and classical definition. Literacy, as we know it today, is the product of the conditions of the industrial revolution, of urbanization, of the need for a work force that could, in effect, "write with a fine round hand." It has to do with the Bob Cratchits of the world....

Apparently, Professor Oettinger is not too familiar with our early history. The Puritan colonists taught their children to read because they wanted them to know God by being able to read His word, the Bible. The secondary benefits of literacy were intellectual as well as economic. The industrial revolution was caused by a literate people who had the freedom to invent new machines, new processes, set up new industries and new businesses and create an ever improving standard of living. The Professor goes on:

> The present "traditional" concept of literacy has to do with the abililty to read and write. But the real question that confronts us today is: How do we help citizens function well in our society? How can they acquire the skills necessary to solve their problems? Do we, for example, really want to teach people to do a lot of sums or write in "a fine round hand" when they have a five-dollar hand-held calculator or a word processor to work with? Or, do we really have to have everybody literate—writing and reading in the traditional sense—when we have the means through our technology to achieve a new flowering of oral communication?...
>
> It is the traditional idea that says certain forms of communication, such as comic books, are "bad." But in the modern context of functionalism they may not be all that bad.

I doubt that there are many parents who send their children to school to learn to read comic books. And it is because the schools have abandoned the "traditional" concept of

literacy that an increasing number of parents have taken their children out of the public schools and put them in private schools or gone into home education.

Professor Oettinger also poses a very interesting problem. If it is decided that not everyone has to be literate, who decides which children are to become literate and which children are not? Obviously, it is the elite that decides. They send their own children to private schools where they become literate. Everybody else is relegated to the public school where a high percentage of children, particularly minorities, become functional illiterates.

Outcome Based Education

Bloom's Taxonomy clearly called for the creation of a new curriculum embodying the humanistic purposes of education outlined in the Taxonomy. There would have been no point to the Taxonomy if it did not lead to a new curriculum. Outcome-Based Education (OBE) is the new curriculum based on those ideas. William G. Spady, chief promoter of OBE, tells us that the idea for the implementation of this new concept of schooling started in 1968 with an essay written by Prof. Benjamin Bloom entitled "Learning for Mastery." According to education researcher Charlotte Iserbyt, who formerly worked for the U.S. Department of Education, mastery learning is based on B.F. Skinner's concept of Operant Conditioning, wherein children are trained to respond correctly to stimuli by being rewarded for the correct response and getting negative feedback for an incorrect response. The whole process eliminates the use of the mind, for intellect has no place in the process. It is pure animal training applied to human children.

In an article on mastery learning in the Nov. 1979 issue of *Educational Leadership*, Carl D. Glickman wrote:

> Mastery learning is built on the assumption that the majority of children can become equal in their ability to learn standard school tasks. As Bloom has written, "To put it more strongly, each student may be helped to learn a particular subject to the same degree, level of competence, and even in approximately the same amount of time." ...
>
> What mastery learning does is replace "page 55" with "criterion-referenced materials" or "learning modules." As Bloom describes it, the more advanced students who finish the work quickly are busy with enrichment materials; the middle third use the full 40 minutes to do the work; and the other third need extra time for reinforcing work, peer tutoring, and individual teacher consultations. Ideally, mastery learning works so that the previously faster, average, and slower students eventually reach the same levels of proficiency, and from that point on students can be taught together as a group, mastering the same materials at the same time.

The Chicago Experiment in Mastery Learning

How does mastery learning actually work? A mastery-learning experiment involving reading instruction was conducted in the public schools of Chicago beginning in the mid 1970s. Concerning the new program, the *Chicago Tribune* reported: "It has been ten years in the making, but Chicago school officials now believe they have in place a complete, sweeping program to teach children to read—a program that may be a pacesetter for the nation."

An article in *Learning* magazine of November 1982 explained how the program, dubbed Continuous Progress-Mastery Learning (CP-ML), worked:

> The program worked like this: Each elementary school student was accompanied by a "skill card" listing various reading skills at different levels from kindergarten through eighth grade. The traditional K-8 school organization had been abolished; instead, students progressed from level A through level N during their nine years in elementary school. Teachers were required to teach each skill to individual children [or reading groups]; then the children were tested on each skill. Those who scored 80 percent or better on a skill test moved on to the next skill; those who mastered 80 percent of the skills at any given level moved on to the next level; and those who mastered 80 percent of all the skills moved on to high school, theoretically able to read.

How well did this method work? The article explains:

> Pupils, for their part, were becoming very astute at taking and passing subskill tests, but not at reading. A growing number of students, many teachers said, were entering high school having successfully completed the CP-ML program without ever having read a book and without being able to read one.

It didn't take long for parents to discover that their children weren't learning to read under the program, and they filed a lawsuit demanding the removal of the program from the Chicago public schools because, in their view, the program constituted "educational malpractice."

In 1981, Ruth Love, the Superintendent of the Chicago public schools, asked the school board to replace the Continuous Progress-Mastery Learning program with a new one called Chicago Mastery Learning Reading (CMLR). As for the CP-ML program, Professor Bloom told a reporter: "The original Continuous Progress-Mastery Learning curriculum had little of continuous progress in it and no mastery learning. I was never consulted."

Apparently, no one was willing to take responsibility for the fiasco. But was the new program any better than the old one? The same article in *Learning* states:

> But as the school year progressed, school officials made fewer and fewer claims that CMLR was completely different from Continuous Progress. The behavioral objectives were the same, although in some instances two objectives had been subsumed under one criterion-referenced test. The skills sequence was the same. The criteria for "mastery" were the same. In fact, CMLR culminated the streamlining of Continuous Progress-Mastery Learning. First the school system established objectives; then it wrote tests for each objective; and finally, it produced materials to teach the answers to the tests that tested the objectives.

Eventually parents began to realize that the new program was, indeed, no better than the old one. The children weren't reading books. The curriculum simply consisted of 5,000 pages of materials that taught behavioral objectives. But even the content of the lessons troubled parents. *Learning* states:

> A fourth grade comprehension lesson, for example, featured a story called "Whiskey and Sweets," which depicted a drunken father tricking his son into buying him whiskey and sweets by feigning a heart attack.
>
> A third grade spoof on Cinderella ended with the hero fitting the slipper on the foot of "an ugly forty year old lady who weighed three hundred pounds" and living "unhappily ever after." Junk food was mentioned frequently ("A Big Mac is heaven on a bun"); lessons of urban life were reduced to the basest levels.

What were the final results of this five-year experiment with mastery learning? The article spelled it out in stark, unequivocal terms:

> On April 21, 1982, Chicago's superintendent of schools, Ruth Love, released the results of the city's first high school reading test in seven years. The scores were abysmally poor. ... On the Tests of Academic Progress (TAP) administered in the fall of 1981, Chicago's eleventh graders in 64 high schools scored at the 25th percentile—a drop of 5 percentile points from the last time the test was given, in 1975.

The details were appalling. Only 4 of 64 high schools scored above the 50th percentile, 34 scored below the 20th percentile, and 5 schools, with a total enrollment of more than 7,500 scored at the 10th percentile (a score students could have achieved by simply answering the questions at random). In other words, learning by "behavioral objectives" doesn't produce true learning because it bypasses the mind, thereby not engaging the intellect. Behavioral objectives are based on the theory that children can be taught like animals through stimulus and response, reward and punishment.

Will Outcome-Based Education do any better? To find the answer we must get to know more about William Spady who not only coined the term Outcome-Based Education but has worked since the 1970s to promote its use throughout North America.