

# **How Liberal Utopians Have Turned Public Education into a Criminal Enterprise**

## **Books by Samuel L. Blumenfeld**

*How to Start Your Own Private School and Why You Need One*

*The New Illiterates*

*How to Tutor*

*The Retreat from Motherhood*

*Is Public Education Necessary?*

*Alpha-Phonics: A Primer for Beginning Readers*

*The Whole Language/OBE Fraud*

*Homeschooling: A Parents Guide to Teaching Children*

*The Victims of Dick and Jane*

*Revolution via Education*

*The Marlowe-Shakespeare Connection*

*How Liberal Utopians Have Turned Public Education into a Criminal Enterprise*

# **How Liberal Utopians Have Turned Public Education Into a Criminal Enterprise**

**By**

**Samuel L. Blumenfeld**

**Publisher**

**Copyright 2013 © by Samuel L. Blumenfeld**

**161 Great Road**

**Littleton, MA 01460**

**781-354-2040    slblu123@verizon.net**

## Preface

Progressive utopians are criminals! They are genocidal psychopaths who have killed more human beings in the last 100 years than any other ideologues in history. They don't limit their murder just to individuals, but to entire nations, as in National Socialist Germany's war of extermination against the Jews, the Soviet Union's war against anti-communists, Cambodia's slaughter of the educated middle class, and communist China's cultural war. And all of this was done in the name of creating a new utopian society. In the United States the socialist utopians adopted a new and unique method of destroying a nation: by dumbing it down, by destroying the brain power of millions of its citizens.

The plan to dumb down America was launched in 1898 by socialist fanatic John Dewey in an essay entitled *The Primary Education Fetich*. In it he showed his fellow progressives how to transform America into a collectivist utopia by taking over the public schools and destroying the literacy of millions of Americans. The plan has been so successfully implemented that it is now a fact that half the adult population of America are functionally illiterate. They can't read their nation's Constitution or its Declaration of Independence. They can't read their high school diplomas.

The method of achieving this was by simply changing the way children are taught to read in their schools. The utopians got rid of the traditional intensive phonics method of instruction and imposed a look-say, whole-word method that forces children to read English as if it were Chinese. The method is widely in use in today's public schools, which is why the American public education system now consists of failing schools that cannot teach children the basics. This can only be considered a blatant and sadistic form of child abuse.

And this abuse escapes detection because of the cleverness and deception of the perpetrators. In his essay, Dewey warned his colleagues about being too hasty. "Change must come gradually," he wrote. "To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction." In other words, deception would have to be used in order for their plan to be successfully implemented. They learned quickly how to deceive trusting parents and taxpayers.

They also learned how to manipulate politicians. They also knew that the children would be powerless to resist their abuse. And teachers have been taught to blame academic failure on the children and not themselves. Indeed, many of them revel in the idea that they are transforming America to suit their own social interests.

Of course, most teachers are unaware that they are complicit in this evil conspiracy. They simply do what they were taught to do by their professors of education. Few become aware that their professors deceived them and prepared them to create failure. Most of these teachers are as much victims of the system as the students they are teaching.

The purpose of this book is to expose the kind of crimes that are being committed every day against American children and the nation in the name of education. Most parents trust the public schools because they are supposed to represent the cherished values of our democratic republic. But the unhappy truth is that today's public schools have rejected the values of the Founding Fathers and adopted values from 19<sup>th</sup> century European social utopians that completely contradict our own concepts of individual freedom.

What are the crimes being perpetrated by the educators against America and its children? The first most serious crime is **Treason**. In April 1983, The National Commission on Excellence in Education said in its final report, *A Nation at Risk*:

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.

In other words, our educators are engaged in a deliberate dumbing down of America, of sabotaging the intellectual growth of our children, and depriving Americans of the most productive use of their own lives. This is a criminal act of war against the American people and should be called what it is: Treason.

The deliberate dumbing down of an entire nation is genocidal in its impact on that nation's culture and intellectual future. No group of educators should have been permitted to impose on American schools a program that is the antithesis of true education. But when deception is

practiced on the scale that is beyond public understanding, it becomes a crime as specific as perjury under oath.

A second serious crime is ***child abuse*** by deliberately inflicting physical harm on a child's brain by using teaching methods designed to produce dyslexia and learning disabilities. Brain scans now prove beyond a doubt that the sight, or whole-word, method of teaching reading creates dyslexia and functional illiteracy by forcing children to use their right brains to perform the functions of their left brains. Deliberately impairing a child's brain ought to be a punishable offense.

A third serious crime is *contributing to the delinquency of a minor* by teaching pornographic sex education and "alternative" lifestyles that lead to pre-marital sex, venereal disease, and unwanted pregnancies. More children are now born out of wedlock than ever before, creating one of America's most serious social problems. More American children are living in poverty because of their parents adopting an irresponsible lifestyle based on liberal morality.

A fourth serious crime is ***destroying a child's belief in biblical religion***, a moral crime that leads children into secular humanism, atheism, nihilism, and Satanism which can result in self-destructive, murderous behavior. School shootings, massacres, arson, teen suicide, student depression, self-destructive behavior are the result of a school curriculum that denies the existence of God and His loving protection.

A fifth serious crime is that of ***pushing drugs*** on millions of children by promoting the use of powerful mind altering drugs such as Ritalin or Adderall, which are as potent as cocaine, to alleviate such school-induced disorders as Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD). Some of these drugs have even caused sudden deaths among athletic teens.

A sixth serious crime is ***extortion***, by defrauding taxpayers of billions of dollars in the name of school improvement and reform which never take place. The money is used by the educators to buy more miseducation. The present reform movement is promoting the implementation of

Common Core Standards, which will not improve education but cost the taxpayers billions of dollars. You cannot have high standards without high literacy, and high literacy has no place in the new curriculum.

How do you deal with such criminality? First you have to be aware that it is taking place. Then you must make your political leaders aware of what is going on in the schools. Most political leaders wear blinders when dealing with education. For example, when it comes to reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, our Washington legislators tinker with its many titles in the hope that somehow education can be improved. But what they fail to understand is that what goes on in the schools is based on an agenda that Progressive utopians put in place decades ago and have no intention of deviating from it. Only a massive outcry by an awakened public will force our state and national legislators to recognize the crimes taking place in the name of education and put a stop to them.

There is no doubt that what goes on today in the public schools of America are criminal activities of such a serious nature that millions of American children suffer their consequences for their entire lives. We all recognize obvious child abuse when we see it. But the kind of abuse that goes on in our schools escapes detection because of the cleverness and deception of the perpetrators. Indeed, it is easier to believe a credible lie than an incredible truth.

Our educational leaders have learned how to deceive parents and the taxpaying public and get away with it. They know that the children are powerless to resist their abuse. And they know how to blame academic failure on the children and not themselves. Indeed, they revel in the idea that they are transforming America to suit their own social interests. Only an enlightened public will be able to put a stop to this degradation of American education.

# Chapter One

## The Anatomy of a Failed System

According to Mary Sanchez of *The Kansas City Star*, quoted in *This Week* magazine of March 1, 2013, we are “a wealthy nation of dummies and dropouts,” lagging far behind other countries’ educational performance. But President Obama now has an ambitious plan to close that gap. In his State of the Union address, Obama proposed a program that would give all U.S. 3- and 4-year-olds access to “high quality” pre-school education. The new program would be run at the state level with federal oversight.

Another worthless idea calculated to continue the deception being played on the American people by our political leaders. If our educational professionals cannot teach the 5- and 6-year-olds the basics in their present “high quality” programs, what makes anyone think they will be able to produce better results with a so-called “high quality” curriculum on a pre-school level?

Here is what our well-financed public education system has given us, according to a blog published by the Foundation for Excellence in Education Program:

**Eighty-one percent** of American 18-year-olds are **unprepared** for college coursework.

More than **25 percent** of students **fail to graduate from high school** in four years; for African-American and Hispanic students, this number is approaching **40 percent**.

According to ACT, **three-quarters** of American students who *do* achieve a high school diploma are **not ready** for college coursework and often need remedial classes at both the university and community college levels.



More than a third of all Americans, **43%, read at the lowest 2 literacy levels** according to the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL).

In 2009 nationwide, **67% of 4th grade students, 75% of 8th grade students, and 74% of 12th grade students** were not reading at a proficient level according to the National Center for Educational Statistics.

**70%** of those in prison and **70%** of those on welfare read at the lowest 2 literacy levels according to the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey.

On the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress – known as the Nation’s Report Card, **only 35 percent** of 8<sup>th</sup> graders performed **at grade level** or above in Math, while **just 34 percent** of both 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders scored at grade level or above in English. Which means that **65 percent** of 8<sup>th</sup> graders performed below grade level in Math and **66 percent** of 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders performed below grade level in English.

U.S. students have fallen to **14<sup>th</sup> in the world in reading** and **25<sup>th</sup> in math**.

States and students spend **\$3 billion** annually to reteach high school classes to college kids.

**Thirty percent** of high school graduates **can’t pass the U.S. military entrance exam**, which is focused just on basic reading and math skills.

Parents in the U.S. spend **\$5-7 billion a year on tutoring programs**. Tutoring programs offering additional out-of-school instruction to students are drawing a growing number of clients as parents continue to be concerned about the quality of their children’s schools.

The U.S. has more than **600,000 manufacturing jobs vacant** because there aren’t enough qualified people to fill them.

The Alliance for Excellent Education estimates that if the **1.3 million high school dropouts** from the class of 2010 had earned their diplomas instead of dropping out, the **U.S. economy** would have seen an additional **\$337 billion in wages** over these students' lifetimes. But why would anyone stay in a school that can't teach them to read?

A survey conducted last year by McKinsey & Company found that **87 percent** of educational institutions thought they had prepared their students well for employment, but **only 49 percent of employers agreed** that their new employees had the training they needed.

A Deloitte survey found that **63 percent of life science and aerospace firms report shortages of qualified workers**. In the defense and aerospace industries, many executives fear this problem will accelerate in the coming decade as **60 percent** of the existing workforce reaches retirement age.

In New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, Schools Chancellor Dennis M. Walcott, State Board of Regents Chancellor Merryl H. Tisch and State Education Commissioner John B. King, Jr. revealed the test results from the new Common Core State math and English tests for students third through eighth grades. The new tests, supported by the Obama Administration, for the first time measure whether students are prepared to succeed in college and careers in today's economy, as opposed to measuring whether they are on track to graduate high school. Under the new, more rigorous test, **29.6 percent of students met proficiency standards in math and 26.5 percent of students met the standards in English**.

Across the City, **15.3 percent of black students met the proficiency standards in math. In English, the percentage of proficient black students in New York City was 16.3 percent**.

All of the above is the lamentable story of the failure of our public schools to educate American children. Those failures are not the result of accident. They are the result of programs created by our educators who are the best organized and best paid educators on the planet. All of these programs that create failure were conceived to produce the results we are getting. But why are American educators able to get away with these crimes? It's because Americans

cannot believe that our professional and highly respected educators could be involved in a conspiracy to deliberately dumb down the nation. They recognize that we are indeed being dumbed down, but they don't blame the educators. They blame the children and the culture.

Perhaps no one in America is more qualified to report on the true condition of our government schools than John Taylor Gatto, the now-famous educator who spent 26 years teaching in six different schools in New York City and quit because he could no longer take part in a system that destroys lives by destroying minds.

In 1990 the New York Senate named Mr. Gatto New York City Teacher of the Year. The speech he gave at that occasion, "The Psychopathic School," amounted to a devastating indictment of public education as a failed system. In 1991 Mr. Gatto was named New York State Teacher of the Year, at which occasion he gave a speech, "The Seven-Lesson Schoolteacher," so insightful of the wrong headedness of public education that it will probably become a classic in educational literature. These two remarkable speeches were published in a book entitled *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling*, which perfectly describes the curriculum crafted by John Dewey and his colleagues.

Gatto was born in Monongahela, Pennsylvania, an industrial river town forty miles southeast of Pittsburgh. He writes: "it was a place where independence, toughness, and self-reliance were honored, a place where pride in ethnic and local culture was very intense. It was an altogether wonderful place to grow up, even to grow up poor." Gatto's grandfather was the town printer and, for a time, the publisher of the town newspaper, *The Daily Republican*, a source of independent thinking in a stronghold of the Democratic party.

The move from Monongahela to Manhattan was quite a jolt for Gatto. The difference in society and values turned Gatto into an anthropologist and in the next twenty-six years he used his classes "as a laboratory where I could learn a broader range of what human possibility is . . . and also as a place where I could study what releases and what inhibits human power."

Like so many university students, Gatto was taught by his professors that intelligence and talent were distributed throughout the population in bell curve predictability. But his experience as a teacher taught him differently. He writes:

The trouble was that the unlikeliest kids kept demonstrating to me at random moments so many hallmarks of human excellence—insight, wisdom, justice, resourcefulness, courage, originality—that I became confused. They didn't do this often enough to make my teaching easy, but they did it often enough that I began to wonder, reluctantly, whether it was possible that being in school itself was what was dumbing them down. Was it possible I had been hired not to enlarge children's power, but to diminish it? That seemed crazy on the face of it, but slowly I began to realize that the bells and confinement, the crazy sequences, the age-segregation, the lack of privacy, the constant surveillance, and all the rest of the national curriculum of schooling were designed exactly as if someone had set out to prevent children from learning how to think and act, to coax them into addiction and dependent behavior.

In other words, Gatto had figured out through his own deductive reasoning that the education system was so organized and constructed to deliberately dumb down the kids. This startling insight led Gatto to develop a teaching style completely opposite to the philosophy of education taught in the university. He writes:

Bit by bit I began to devise guerrilla exercises to allow the kids I taught—as many as I was able—the raw material people have always used to educate themselves: privacy, choice, freedom from surveillance, and as broad a range of situations and human associations as my limited power and resources could manage. . . .I dropped the idea that I was an expert, whose job it was to fill the little heads with my expertise, and began to explore how I could remove those obstacles that prevented the inherent genius of children from gathering itself.

Naturally, Gatto's methods put him more and more at odds with the system. He explains:

The sociology of government monopoly schools has evolved in such a way that a premise like mine jeopardizes the total institution if it spreads. . . . But once loose the idea could imperil the central assumptions which allow the institutional school to sustain itself, much as the false assumption that it is difficult to learn to read, or that kids resist learning, and many more.

In his speech, "The Seven-Lesson Schoolteacher," Gatto describes the seven lessons that are taught in all public schools by all teachers in America, whether they know it or not. He writes:

The first lesson I teach is confusion. Everything I teach is out of context. I teach the un-relating of everything. I teach dis-connections. . . . Even in the best of schools close examination of curriculum and its sequences turns up a lack of coherence, full of internal contradictions.

Gatto is right. Confusion is taught by the arbitrary content of the curriculum, beginning with whole language and invented spelling and a confusing mishmash called social studies.

The second lesson I teach is class position. . . . The children are numbered so that if any get away they can be returned to the right class. . . . My job is to make them like being locked together with children who bear numbers like their own. . . . If I do my job well, the kids can't even imagine themselves somewhere else, because I've shown them how to envy and fear the better classes and how to have contempt for the dumb classes. . . . That's the real lesson of any rigged competition like school. You come to know your place.

Class position is enhanced by separating the gifted and talented (the rulers of tomorrow) from the vocational proles and peons whose future place in society will be determined by the psycho-visionary utopians.

The third lesson I teach is indifference. . . . When the bell rings I insist they drop whatever it is we have been doing and proceed quickly to the next work station. They must turn on and off like a light switch. . . . Bells inoculate each undertaking with indifference.

Indifference is instilled by teaching students that they are the products of evolution and have no special purpose in life. Logic and reason give way to emotion as the principle means of knowing.

The fourth lesson I teach is emotional dependency. By stars and red checks, smiles and frowns, prizes, honors, and disgraces, I teach kids to surrender their will to the predestinated chain of command.

The fifth lesson I teach is intellectual dependency. . . . It is the most important lesson, that we must wait for other people better trained than ourselves, to make the meanings of our lives. . . . If I am told that evolution is a fact instead of a theory, I transmit that as ordered, punishing deviants who resist what I have been told to tell them to think. . . . Successful children do the thinking I assign them with a minimum of resistance and a decent show of enthusiasm. . . . Bad kids fight this, of course, even though they lack the concepts to know what they are fighting. . . . Fortunately there are tested procedures to break the will of those who resist.

Gatto points out that rarely do parents come to the aid of their resisting children. They generally believe that their kid's school is not one of the bad ones and they tell their children to obey their teachers. Intellectual dependency creates politically correct thinking.

The sixth lesson I teach is provisional self-esteem. . . . The lesson of report cards, and tests is that children should not trust themselves or their parents but should instead rely on the evaluation of certified officials. People need to be told what they are worth.

The seventh lesson I teach is that one can't hide. I teach students they are always watched, that each is under constant surveillance by myself and my colleagues.

No wonder students celebrate when they are released from their prisonlike school at graduation. But can they cope with the real world after having spent twelve years in the stifling, inhuman system that did not educate them but simply indoctrinated them in the world-view of the liberal utopians? Can the system be reformed? Gatto writes:

The current debate about whether we should have a national curriculum is phony. We already have a national curriculum locked up in the seven lessons I have just outlined. Such a curriculum produces physical, moral, and intellectual paralysis, and no curriculum of content will be sufficient to reverse its hideous effects. . . . Look again at the seven lessons of schoolteaching . . . all of these lessons are prime training for permanent underclasses, people deprived forever of finding the center of their own special genius.

Gatto's testimony has had a great influence on homeschoolers but has not been able to stop the progressive juggernaut which maintains its power through its political connections. The unionized educators are the most skilled lobbyists in Washington and in every state capital. Some of their power has been undermined by the Charter School movement. But Charter Schools are public schools and thus cannot wander too far off the plantation. They are more of a threat to the union than to the progressive utopians who still control curriculum development. The latter are organized under the umbrella of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), the world's most powerful, low-profile cadre of educational progressives. Their yearbooks are all on the Internet. When a thousand doctors of education write on school reform, you know that what they are doing is simply trying to justify their own salaries. They are the best-paid nonproductive "professionals" in America. The damage they have done to American education is beyond calculation.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Treason:**

# **The Deliberate Dumbing-Down of a Nation**

## **The Planning of Cultural Genocide**

Destroying the brain power of a nation is an act of war against that nation. At no time in history has such a treacherous crime been committed against a free and trusting people. In The National Commission on Educational Excellence's report, *A Nation at Risk*, we read:

Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them. . . .

In other words, although we have in every city, town, and hamlet in America a tax-supported public school and compulsory attendance laws, our educators, indeed our entire society, seems to have lost sight of why we have them. Not only do we have schools, we have teachers colleges, we have educational psychologists, we have educational labs, we have lots of educational research. In short our educational establishment is the best financed in the world. Yet, virtually no one in that establishment seems to know why schools exist.

The simple truth is that most parents know why they send their children to school: to learn to read, write, and do arithmetic at the very least. Everybody, except the educators, seems to know what happens next. You teach history, geography, grammar, French or Spanish, and lots more to fill twelve years of schooling.

The Commission issued its Report in April 1983. It said:

Some 23 million American adults are functionally illiterate by the simplest tests of everyday reading writing, and comprehension.

About 13 percent of all 17-year-olds in the United States can be considered functionally illiterate. Functional illiteracy among minority youth may run as high as 40 percent.

Over half the population of gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school.

The College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) demonstrate a virtually unbroken decline from 1963 to 1980. Average verbal scores fell over 50 points and average mathematics scores dropped nearly 40 points.

And the nation kept getting dumber. In 1988, Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, told his fellow newspaper publishers: "Today up to 60 million Americans—one third of the adult population—cannot read their local newspaper. As we edge closer to the 21<sup>st</sup> century, life is becoming more complex and will become more difficult for adults who cannot read."

In October 1993, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) released the results of its study of "Adult Literacy in America." It found that some 40 million American adults had only the most rudimentary reading and writing skills after spending years in our public schools. Education Secretary Richard W. Riley remarked: "This should be a wake up call for all Americans to consider going back to school and getting a tune-up." If the schools were unable to teach these 40 million to read to begin with, why should they go back for a so-called "tune-up." How lame can a Secretary of Education be?

In 2003, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that only 13 percent of American adults are highly literate, 56 percent have intermediate literacy skills, and that 43 percent of American adults were virtually illiterate.

In 2007, the National Endowment for the Arts released its own survey of literacy in the United States. According to its report, *Reading at Risk*, the number of 17-year-olds who never read for



pleasure increased from 9 percent in 1984 to 19 percent in 2004. Almost half of Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 never read books for pleasure.

Endowment chairman, Dana Gioia, commented: "This is a massive social problem. We are losing the majority of the new generation. They will not achieve anything close to their potential because of poor reading."

According to the *Washington Post* of September 14, 2011:

SAT reading scores for graduating high school seniors this year reached the lowest point in nearly four decades, reflecting a steady decline in performance in that subject on the college admissions test, the College Board reported Wednesday.

And according to SAT scores even the smart are getting dumber. In 1972, 2,817 students achieved the highest verbal score of 750 to 800. In 1994, it was down to 1,438. America has been literally losing its brains. As for those at the bottom of the scale, in 1972, the number of students who achieved the lowest verbal score of 200-290 was 71,084. In 1994 that number was up to 136,841. And so, the smart are getting dumber and the dumb are getting dumber. The number of test takers in 1972 was 1,022,820. In 1994, it was 1,050,386.

In 1994, the College Board decided to "recenter" the scoring scale. What had happened since the original 200-800 scale was made in 1941 is that in 1994 the students' average scores were well below the 500 average of previous generations, which simply reflected the steady dumbing down taking place in American education. In 1994, the verbal "average" was 423, some 77 points below the 500 average, and the math "average" of 479 was 21 points below the 500 average.

Which meant that even the 469 average verbal score made by independent school test takers was well below the 1941 average of 500! And yet those same test takers scored 54 points above the 1994 average of 423. In other words, in 1994 the average student was a lot dumber than the average student of 1941, and the smarter students in 1994 were dumber than the average students of 1941. The College Board explained:

Beginning with the high school class of 1996, the College Board will recenter the scales, based on a more contemporary reference group. This means that the average score will once again be at or about the center of the scale — 500 — for a new reference group from the 1990s....

Setting the average verbal and math scores at 500 means that most students' scores will be higher. So if a student scored a verbal score of about 430 and a math score of about 470 before recentering, the score would be about 500 for both verbal and math when the test is recentered.

Now you see it, now you don't. It reminded me of a shell game, using numbers to deceive the public. Everyone's score will suddenly go up. But the average will still remain an average so that colleges would be able to tell who is or is not above or below average for purposes of acceptance. But what they won't know is how much dumber these students are from their counterparts in 1941.

Which brings us fast-forward to 2011. According to the College Board, the SAT reading scores for the high school class of 2011 were the lowest on record and combined reading and math scores fell to their lowest point since 1995. And in context of the 800-point test, the three-point decline from last year's score, which is now 497, is nothing to worry about.

The average verbal score in 2011 was 498. If we wish to see what that score would be in pre-centering terms, we would simply subtract 87 points from 498, which would give us a pre-centered score of 411. In other words, in 1972 the average pre-centered verbal score was 453. Today it is 411, a decline of 42 points in pre-centered calculation — 89 points lower than the average in 1941.

That all of this dumbing down is deliberate and not some sort of huge national accident has been proven by the work of courageous, indomitable whistleblower Charlotte Iserbyt, who served as a Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education, during the first term of President [Ronald Reagan](#). Prior to that position, she was a staff employee of the U.S. State Department and served in South Africa,

Belgium, and South Korea. Born in 1930, Iserbyt attended [Dana Hall preparatory school](#) and [Katharine Gibbs College](#) in New York City, where she studied business. Her father and grandfather were Yale University graduates and members of the [Skull and Bones](#) secret society.

Iserbyt's mammoth tome, *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America*, based on research and documents she retrieved from the Department of Education, proves that the dumbing-down process has been engineered by American Progressives determined to mold American children into members of the [proletariat](#) in preparation for a socialist-collectivist world of the future.

The man who conceived the idea of dumbing down an entire nation, as pointed out in the Preface, was none other than the philosophical leader of the Progressive Education movement, John Dewey. In reality, he was planning to impose on America a form of cultural genocide never before imposed on any nation. The way to do it, he asserted, was to change the way children were taught to read. We have included the full text of his plan, The Primary Education Fetich, in an Appendix to this book.

The progressives were a new breed of educator who came on the scene around the turn of the last century. They were members of the Protestant academic elite who no longer believed in the religion of their fathers even though many of them came from good Christian families. Some of them even had fathers who were ministers and missionaries.

These sons rejected the religion of the Bible and put their new faith in science, evolution and psychology. Indeed, men like G. Stanley Hall, James McKeen Cattell, Charles Judd, James Earl Russell traveled to Germany to study the new psychology under Prof. Wilhelm Wundt at the University of Leipzig. It was these men who later imposed the new psychology on American education and transformed it permanently from its academic function to one dedicated to behavioral and social change.

John Dewey was introduced to the new psychology by G. Stanley Hall at Johns Hopkins University. In 1887, at the tender age of 28, Dewey felt that he knew enough about psychology to write a textbook on the subject, entitled fittingly *Psychology*. In 1894, Dewey was appointed head of the department of philosophy, psychology and education at the University of Chicago

which had been established two years earlier by a gift from John D. Rockefeller. In 1896, Dewey created his famous experimental Laboratory School where he could test the effects of the new progressive curriculum on real children.

Dewey's philosophy had evolved from Hegelian idealism to socialist materialism, and the purpose of the experimental school was to show how education could be changed to produce little socialists and collectivists instead of little capitalists and individualists. It was expected that these little socialists, when they became voting adults, would dutifully change the American economic system into a socialist one.

Dewey did not get his socialism from Karl Marx. He got it from an American by the name of Edward Bellamy, a Unitarian journalist, who wrote a book in 1884 entitled *Looking Backward*, a fantasy of a utopian socialist America in the year 2000. The book described a totally transformed America in which the egalitarian ideal had been achieved and was working with marvelous efficiency. It was this utopian vision of a socialist future that drove the progressives in their messianic crusade to use education as the means of changing America into a socialist society.

In creating his Laboratory School, Dewey had to devise a curriculum that would produce little socialists and collectivists. In order to do so he analyzed the traditional curriculum that sustained the capitalist, individualistic system and found what he believed was the sustaining linchpin—that is, the key element that held the entire system together: high literacy.

To Dewey, the greatest obstacle to socialism was the private mind that seeks knowledge in order to exercise its own private judgment and intellectual authority. High literacy gave the individual the means to seek knowledge independently. It gave individuals the means to stand on their own two feet and think for themselves. This was detrimental to the “social spirit” needed to bring about a collectivist society. Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education*, published in 1916 (p. 297):

[W]hen knowledge is regarded as originating and developing within an individual, the ties which bind the mental life of one to that of his fellows are ignored and denied.

When the social quality of individualized mental operations is denied, it becomes a problem to find connections which will unite an individual with his fellows. Moral individualism is set up by the conscious separation of different centers of life. It has its roots in the notion that the consciousness of each person is wholly private, a self-inclosed continent, intrinsically independent of the ideas, wishes, purposes of everybody else.

And he wrote in *School and Society* in 1899:

[T]he tragic weakness of the present school is that it endeavors to prepare future members of the social order in a medium in which the conditions of the social spirit are eminently wanting. . . .

The mere absorbing of facts and truths is so exclusively individual an affair that it tends very naturally to pass into selfishness. There is no obvious social motive for the acquirement of merely learning, there is no clear social gain in success thereat.

It seems incredible that a man of Dewey's intelligence could believe that the sort of traditional education that produced our Founding Fathers and the wonderful inventors of the 19<sup>th</sup> century lacked "social spirit" when it was these very individuals who created the freest, happiest, and most prosperous nation in all of human history. No small accomplishment of the capitalist individualistic system.

Of course, Dewey was writing before the Russian revolution. But, in reality, it was the progressives' rejection of God which made them yearn for a utopia of their own making. And if high literacy was standing in the way, it had to go. Dewey wrote in 1896, after the Laboratory School had been in operation for nine months:

It is one of the great mistakes of education to make reading and writing constitute the bulk of the school work the first two years. The true way is to teach them incidentally as the outgrowth of the social activities at this time. Thus language is not primarily the expression of thought, but the means of social communication. . . . If language is abstracted from social activity and made an end in itself, it will not give its whole value

as a means of development. . . . It is not claimed that by the method suggested, the child will learn to read as much, nor perhaps as readily in a given period by the usual method. That he will make more rapid progress later when the true language interest develops . . . can be claimed with confidence.

Note that Dewey admitted that the reading program he was proposing would not be as effective as the traditional method. But blinded by his vision of a utopian socialism, Dewey was capable of miseducating the child to suit his social agenda. It is doubtful that he was incapable of seeing what was truly happening in the mind of a child and why the teaching of reading and writing was quite appropriate for children between ages 4 and 7. All children, except the very seriously impaired, develop their innate language faculty very rapidly from ages 2 to 6. In fact, by the time they are six, they have developed speaking vocabularies in the thousands of words, and can speak with clarity and grammatical correctness without having had a single day of formal education.

In other words, children are dynamos of language learning and can easily be taught to read between ages 4 and 7, provided they are taught in the proper phonetic way. Also, Dewey's notion that the primary function of language is social communication is debatable. If we accept the Bible as our source of information, it becomes obvious that the primary purpose of language—which was God's gift to Adam—was to permit Adam to converse with God and know his Creator. The second purpose of language was to permit Adam to know objective reality and develop his practical use of language by naming the animals. God made Adam a scientist and lexicographer even before He created Eve.

The third purpose of language was to permit Adam to know Eve, the social function of language. The fourth purpose of language was to permit Adam to know himself through introspection and inner dialogue. For Dewey and his colleagues, only the social function of language was its most important use, and therefore children would be instructed in reading and language in a manner that emphasized its social function. Today, the whole language method carries out the Dewey dictum most efficiently.

In May 1898, Dewey published his far-reaching plan to dumb-down America, “The Primary-Education Fetich.” It would show progressives how to implement the plan in their long-range crusade to remake American education as an instrument to bring about socialism. He 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. On the contrary, the fact that this mode of education was adapted to past conditions, is in itself a reason which it should no longer hold supreme sway. . . . 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. . . . 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 present curriculum is psychologically impossible. It is simply superstition: it is the remnant of an outgrown period of history.

But then he added a very important bit of advice to his fellow progressives, which left no doubt that this was a conspiracy to deceive the parents and taxpayers of America. He wrote:

Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction.

If what they were advocating was so beneficial, why would parents react violently against it? In other words, Dewey and his colleagues were willing to use as much deception as possible to advance the cause of socialism in education. And that deception is still going on today. That is why the American public school system has become a criminal enterprise based on lies and deception.

The idea that a group of socialist educators would take it upon themselves to embark on a conspiracy to dumb down an entire nation speaks volumes about the evils of socialism. Of course, they embarked on this conspiracy before the Russian revolution, before the true evil of communism would show its true colors. But even after the revolution, Dewey visited Russia and came back extolling its virtues. Years later he defended Leon Trotsky against Stalin, but never gave up his belief in a utopianism that kills.



## **Chapter Three**

### **John Dewey:**

### **Father of America's Utopian Madness**

John Dewey is generally lauded as the father of progressive education. But he is father of much more. He was determined to impose on all of America his utopian socialism, which he outlined in his 1898 plan. He preceded tyrants like Vladimir Lenin, Fidel Castro, Mao-Tse-tung, Pol Pot, and other communist leaders who have used brutal force to impose their utopian dreams on their entire nations. Millions were killed in the process. But in Dewey's case, he knew that his socialist dreams could not be imposed on America by force. And so he told his followers:

Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction.

Of course, in all countries where communism has been imposed, there have been violent reactions. But these utopian regimes have learned how to deal with anti-utopianism: kill off the resisters, or put them in re-education work camps, and create mobs to intimidate the rich.

But in America, the greatest, richest, and freest nation on earth, the imposition had to be subtle, slow, patient, and "democratic." The primary vehicle for this gradual change would be the public schools where the dumbing down process could be carried out without parents knowing what was being done to their children, the future of America.

But as Abraham Lincoln is reported to have said: “You can fool some of the people some of the time. You can even fool some of the people all of the time. But you can’t fool all of the people all of the time.”

And so, over the years resistance to Dewey’s plan has grown. Indeed, in the last thirty years so many parents have come to understand what is going on, that they’ve taken their children out of the schools and created a growing, vibrant homeschool movement where reading is taught by phonics and belief in God is upheld.

Dewey did not get his utopian madness from Marx, although he no doubt had read the Communist manifesto. He got his megalomania from an American by the name of Edward Bellamy, a Unitarian journalist, who wrote a book in 1884 entitled *Looking Backward*, a fantasy of a utopian socialist America in the year 2000. The book described a totally transformed America in which the egalitarian ideal had been achieved and was working with marvelous efficiency. It was this utopian vision of a socialist future that drove the progressives in their messianic crusade to use education as the means of changing America into a socialist society.

Egalitarianism is what Lenin gave to the Russians and Castro gave to the Cubans. Equal poverty for all. The Chinese communist leaders rejected the equalitarianism of Mao and adopted a free-market economy in order to become a rich and powerful nation. In other words, the Chinese learned that the road to any semblance of utopia is capitalism, not communism. Unfortunately, that message has not been received by American utopians who constantly cavil about economic inequality and how the rich are not paying their fair share in taxes.

Indeed, capitalism has made the poor in America the richest the poor have ever been. They have cars, TV sets, refrigerators and freezers, subsidized housing, air-conditioners, healthcare, food stamps, free progressive education even though it keeps them poor, and other benefits.

Dewey had no problem recruiting other utopians to the cause. They formed a kind of socialist brotherhood in which they all contributed their resources and ideas to this utopian crusade.

Dewey suggested that what was needed first was a “full and frank statement of conviction . . . from physiologists and psychologists” that could be used to convince teachers and principals of

the need to downgrade literacy in the primary grades. This need was actually supplied by one Edmund Burke Huey, a professor of psychology who had studied under G. Stanley Hall at Clark University and did his Ph.D. dissertation on the psychology and physiology of reading. His book, *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading*, published in 1908, became the bible of look-say, whole-word instruction. Huey wrote:

As child nature is being systematically studied, the feeling grows that these golden years of childhood, like the Golden Age of our race, belong naturally to quite other subjects and performances than reading, and to quite other objects than books;

and that reading is a “Fetich of Primary Education” which only holds its place by the power of tradition and the stifling of questions asked concerning it. . . .

What is this “Golden Age of the race” in which there was no need for books or reading? Before there was literacy there was no civilization. Was that the Golden Age? This is the sort of intellectual quackery that was going to be used to destroy “stifling” tradition in the primary school. Huey continued:

In an article on “The Primary Education Fetch” in *Forum*, Vol. XXV, [Dewey] gives his reasons for such a conclusion. While the fetich of Greek is passing, there remains, he says, the fetich of English, that the first three years of school are to be given largely to reading and a little number work. . . . Reading has maintained this traditional place in the face of changed social, industrial, and intellectual conditions which make the problem wholly different. . . .

Against using the period from six to eight years for learning to read and write, Professor Dewey accepts the opinion of physiologists that the sense-organs and nervous system are not adapted then to such confining work, that such work violates the principle of exercising the fundamental before the accessory, that the cramped positions leave their mark, that writing to ruled line forms is wrong, etc. Besides, he finds that a certain mental enfeeblement comes from too early an appeal to interest in the abstractions of reading. (eit)

Huey then suggested that children be taught to read through the same sort of stages that the human race went through before the alphabet was invented. He writes in the quack's sanctimonious, all-knowing style:

The history of languages in which picture-writing was long the main means of written communication has here a wealth of suggestion for the framers of the new primary course. . . .

It is not indeed necessary that the child should be able to pronounce correctly or pronounce at all, at first, the new words that appear in his reading, any more than that he should spell or write all the new words that he hears spoken. If he grasps, approximately, the total meaning of the sentence in which the new word stands, he has read the sentence.

So here in 1908, we have a justification for teaching children to read without accuracy. It is obvious that Dewey knew exactly the kind of reading that would destroy high literacy, and reduce young readers to word guessers. Huey goes on:

Usually this total meaning will suggest what to call the new word, and the word's current articulation will usually have been learned in conversation, if the proper amount of oral practice shall have preceded reading. And even if the child substitutes words of his own for some that are on the page, provided that these 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 give 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 belongs, on reading as *thought-getting* independently of expression.

Huey's words are an exact definition of the philosophy behind Whole Language, the most recent reading program of the progressives. So, there you have the look-say, whole-language philosophy of reading summed up very neatly in 1908 by Professor Huey, whose book is still considered the authority on reading instruction. It is not known whether Dewey or Huey had ever taught a child to read. They certainly made no references to such experiences in their writings. But their views have dominated reading pedagogy in the teachers colleges of America since then.

In 1991, the authors of *Whole Language: What's the Difference*, defined reading as:

Whole language represents a major shift in thinking about the reading process. Rather than viewing reading as "getting the words," whole language educators view reading as essentially a process of creating meanings. . . . It is a transaction, not an extraction of the meaning *from* print, in the sense that the *reader-created* meanings are a fusion of what the reader brings and what the text offers.

In other words, today's whole-language teachers are completely faithful to the view of reading as given by Dewey in 1898 and Huey in 1908. What all of this shows is the continuum of the Dewey plan and how it is still being faithfully carried out by the education elite to this very day.

Naturally, it took some time before the new philosophy of reading could be translated into textbooks for the schools. The development of these textbooks took place mainly at the University of Chicago and at Teachers College, Columbia University, in New York. In Chicago it was William Scott Gray, protégé of Wundtian Charles H. Judd, dean of the school of education, who produced the Dick and Jane reading program. At Teachers College, it was Arthur I. Gates, protégé of Edward L. Thorndike, father of behaviorist educational psychology, who produced the Macmillan reading program.

By the time the books were published, there were enough progressive superintendents of schools in place to make sure that the new books were adopted. However, this was during the Depression and many school districts could not afford these new expensive, colorful basal

reading programs. But when the economy improved after World War II, virtually every school district in America was teaching children to read by these crippling look-say programs.

In June 1928 Dewey visited the Soviet Union with a group of educators. The Soviet Commissar of Education had invited a group of American educators to visit Soviet schools in Leningrad and Moscow. Upon his return to the U.S. Dewey wrote a series of six articles for *The New Republic* summarizing his impressions of Soviet education. What most attracted Dewey's attention in the Russian schools was that they were made to serve the needs and interests of a Communist society. George Dykhuizen, in his biography of Dewey, writes:

The curriculum, he found, stressed the central role of work in human life, relating it on the one hand to materials and natural resources and on the other to social and political history and institutions. Classroom methods and procedures were designed to develop habits and dispositions that would lead people to "act cooperatively and collectively as readily as now in capitalistic countries they act "individualistically."

Dewey believed that American public schools could be transformed to resemble the Soviet ones. Dykhuizen writes:

Summing up his impressions, Dewey suggested that the most instructive way to view events in Russia was as a great national experiment whose outcome was still in doubt. Like all experiments, the Soviet one involved continuous adjustments, risks, inconveniences, and uncertainties; because of this Dewey was frank to admit that "for selfish reasons I prefer seeing it tried in Russia than in my own country."

Apparently, Dewey was not quite ready for the dictatorship of the proletariat with its slave-labor camps, intense class warfare, secret police, controlled media, and collectivist farming.

John Dewey died on June 1, 1952, three years before Rudolf Flesch had made the public aware of the devastating impact his ideas about literacy and reading were having on America's schoolchildren. To the very end he clung to his idea of imposing on America the utopian evil of egalitarianism as fantasized by Edward Bellamy in his novel, *Looking Backward*.

The extent of the book's influence can be measured by the fact that in 1935, when Columbia University asked philosopher-educator John Dewey, historian Charles Beard, and *Atlantic Monthly* editor Edward Weeks to prepare independently lists of the 25 most influential books since 1885, *Looking Backward* ranked as second on each list after Marx's *Das Kapital*. In other words, *Looking Backward* was considered the most influential American book in that 50-year period.

John Dewey characterized the book as "one of the greatest modern syntheses of humane values." Even after the rise of Hitler's National Socialism in Germany and Marxist-Leninist communism in Russia, Dewey still clung to Bellamy's vision of a socialist America. In his 1934 essay, "The Great American Prophet," Dewey wrote:

I wish that those who conceive that the abolition of private capital and of energy expended for profit signify complete regimenting of life and the abolition of all personal choice and all emulation, would read with an open mind Bellamy's picture of a socialized economy. It is not merely that he exposes with extraordinary vigor and clarity the restriction upon liberty that the present system imposes but that he pictures how socialized industry and finance would release and further all of those personal and private types of occupation and use of leisure that men and women actually most prize today....

It is an American communism that he depicts, and his appeal comes largely from the fact that he sees in it the necessary means of realizing the democratic ideal....

The worth of Bellamy's book in effecting a translation of the ideas of democracy into economic terms is incalculable. What *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was to the anti-slavery movement Bellamy's book may well be to the shaping of popular opinion for a new social order.

Bellamy envisaged America becoming socialist by way of consensus rather than revolution. In turn, Dewey, who spent his professional life trying to transform Bellamy's fantasy into American reality, saw education as the principle means by which this transformation could be achieved.

The result, of course, is the dysfunctional public education we have today — a minimal interest in the development of intellectual, scientific, and literacy skills and a maximal effort to produce socialized, politically correct, individuals who can barely read.

Today, the University of Chicago stands as an island of academic tranquility in Chicago's Southside, surrounded by a sea of social and urban devastation caused by the philosophical emanations from Dewey's laboratory and other departments. Charles Judd, the university's Wundtian professor of educational psychology, labored mightily to organize the radical reform of the public school curriculum to conform with Dewey's socialist plan.

It was Dewey's exhaustive analysis of individualism that led him to believe that the socialized individual could only be produced by first getting rid of the traditional emphasis on language and literacy in the primary grades and turning the children toward socialized activities and behavior. All of that required destroying America's political, social, and moral culture of religious freedom, individual rights, unobtrusive government, and high literacy for all. If Dewey was not advocating a form of cultural genocide, I don't know what else you would call it.



## **Chapter Three**

### **Child Abuse:**

### **Turning Normal Children into Dyslexics**

One of the great unrecognized crimes being committed everyday in our public schools is turning perfectly normal, intelligent children into dyslexics, or lifelong functional illiterates. How is this done? Very simply: by using a sight, or whole-word method of teaching reading.

The sight method of teaching reading was actually invented in the early 1800s by the Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, founder of the Hartford Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb. Gallaudet thought that he could apply to normal children some of the techniques used in teaching deaf-mutes to read.

Since his deaf-mute pupils could not use the spoken language, they could not learn a sound-symbol system of reading, unless they were taught the articulation method. However, Gallaudet had been trained to use the sign method. He taught his pupils to read by a purely sight method consisting of pictures and whole words. For the deaf pupil written language represented ideas and not language sounds. Indeed, he thought that such a method might work even better with normal children.

In 1835 Gallaudet published his *Mother's Primer*, the first whole-word primer to be published in America. Its first line reads: "Frank had a dog; his name was Spot." The dog Spot would later turn up in the Dick and Jane look-say reading program. In 1836 the Boston Primary School Committee decided to try Gallaudet's primer on an experimental basis, and, in the following year officially adopted it for use in Boston's primary schools. Seven years later, the decline in students' reading ability was so horrendous, that a group of Boston schoolmasters published a blistering critique of the new method. The Boston schools got rid of the Gallaudet method and returned to the traditional method as used by Noah Webster in his celebrated *Blue-Backed Speller*.

But the deaf-mute teaching method did not die. It was kept alive in the new state-owned teachers colleges—or Normal Schools as they were then called—until they were refurbished by a new generation of progressive educators.

The socialist professors claimed that their new method of teaching reading was based on a scientific experiment conducted in 1885 by a 25-year-old American psychologist, James McKeen Cattell, who was studying under Prof. Wilhelm Wundt at the University of Leipzig, in Germany. Wundt, founder of experimental psychology, believed that human beings could be studied like dogs or other animals and could be conditioned to behave as society wanted. Man, in other words, was nothing more than a stimulus-response organism. This concept formed the basis of behavioral psychology and its views on behavior modification.

Cattell, a colleague of Dewey's, was anxious to see how these principles could be applied to early education, particularly in the teaching of reading. In his experiment, he "discovered" that adult readers read words as whole units, or total word pictures like Chinese characters. If that's the way adults read, he thought, why not teach children to read total word pictures from the very beginning? It sounded like a wonderful idea, except that he failed to realize that an adult reader recognizes the letters in the word so quickly that it *seems* as if he is reading them as wholes. Indeed, a fluent reader has had to first learn the letters and their sounds before becoming a proficient reader.

The Progressives were in favor of this new approach to primary reading because it fitted in nicely with their philosophy of education. They strongly agreed with Dewey, whose aim it was to change the focus of education from the development of individual intellectual skills to the development of cooperative social skills. The objective of socialism had been from the very beginning to remake man from the competitive individual of capitalist society to a cooperative being in a collectivist state. Education was considered the best way to achieve this transformation. Indeed, President Obama's idea of transforming America is in line with the Progressive aim to create a socialist America.

Dewey's famous Laboratory School at the University of Chicago (1896-1904), in which his ideas were tested on children, led to the writing of his book *School and Society*, which became the bible of Progressive education. His ideas were later implemented at the Lincoln School (1916-1946) at Teachers College, Columbia University, in New York, where Dewey was invited to set up shop and set the direction for teacher education.

There he joined his two colleagues, James McKeen Cattell and Edward L. Thorndike, who became the chief architects of progressive education. Having gotten his PhD in psychology under Wundt in Leipzig, Cattell became head of the Department of Psychology, Anthropology, and Philosophy at Columbia in 1891. Thorndike, who had studied how animals learn at Harvard under William James, completed his PhD at Columbia University in 1898 under the supervision of Cattell. In 1899 he became an instructor in psychology at Teachers College, where he remained for the rest of his career, developing his human-animal training program known as the S-R, Stimulus-Response, learning process.

The Lincoln School, which opened in 1916, with support from the Rockefeller General Education Board, became the experimental school for Teachers College. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who admired John Dewey and his radical education ideas, donated \$3-million to the school.

Among the school's chief architects were Charles W. Eliot, a former president of Harvard University and an influential member of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; his protégé Abraham Flexner, a member of the controversial Rockefeller philanthropy, the General Education Board; Otis W. Caldwell, a professor of science education

at Teachers College and the school's first director; and the dean of Teachers College, James E. Russell.

Rockefeller, Jr., also sent four of his five sons to the school to be educated under the new progressive philosophy. All four boys, subjected to the new method of teaching reading, became dyslexic.

Jules Abel, in his book on the Rockefellers, revealed what the new teaching method did for the boys' literacy:

The influence of the Lincoln School, which as a progressive school, encouraged students to explore their own interests and taught them to live in society has been a dominant one in their lives. . . . Yet Laurence gives startling confirmation as to "Why Johnnie Can't Read." He says that the Lincoln School did not teach him to read and write as he wishes he now could. Nelson, today, admits that reading for him is a "slow and tortuous process" that he does not enjoy doing but compels himself to do it. This is significant evidence in the debate that has raged about modern educational techniques.

David Rockefeller writes of his experience at the Lincoln School in his *Memoirs*, published in 2002:

It was Lincoln's experimental curriculum and method of instruction that distinguished it from all other New York schools of the time. Father was an ardent and generous supporter of John Dewey's educational methods and school reform efforts. . . .

Teacher's College of Columbia University operated Lincoln, with considerable financial assistance in the early years from the General Education Board, as an experimental school designed to put Dewey's philosophy into practice.

Dewey's educational methods were conceived and calculated to dumb down the nation, and he started out by dumbing down the four Rockefeller boys. Nelson, of course, was able to hire Henry Kissinger to do his reading for him.

David Rockefeller writes further:

Lincoln stressed freedom for children to learn and to play an active role in their own education. . . . But there were some drawbacks. In my case, I had trouble with reading and spelling, which my teachers, drawing upon "progressive" educational theory, did not consider significant. They believed I was simply a slow reader and that I would develop at my own pace. In reality I have dyslexia, which was never diagnosed, and I never received remedial attention. As a result my reading ability, as well as my proficiency in spelling, improved only marginally as I grew older. All my siblings, except Babs and John, had dyslexia to a degree.

David went on to become a banker and philanthropist, while Winthrop became a philanthropist and the 37<sup>th</sup> Governor of Arkansas. Their wealth made it possible for them to deal with their reading handicaps by having great secretaries.

The experience of the Rockefeller boys is indicative of how progressive education can cripple an individual who must live with his disability for the rest of his life. Nelson Rockefeller was especially victimized by the education he got at the Lincoln School. When he was Governor of the State of New York, he wrote a rather startling confession that appeared in *The Reading Teacher* of March 1972:

I appreciate the opportunity to make some observations on the importance of reading—for I am a prime example of one who has had to struggle with the handicap of being a poor reader while serving in public office.

On many occasions, upon confronting an audience, I have elected to announce that I have thrown away my speech in favor of giving the audience the benefit of my spontaneous thoughts.

And, usually, I have added: "Besides, I went to a progressive school and don't read very well anyhow." This, of course, is a trial to my very able speech writer as well as a libel upon all the devoted teachers and professors who saw me through the years of my formal education. It is also usually a rather popular device, since it implies a desire to communicate with the audience on a much more intimate basis—but the truth is that it

serves primarily to cover the fact that I really wish I could do a better job of reading a speech or other public statement.

Why didn't the progressive educators admit that their teaching methods were creating dyslexia and go back to the traditional phonics method? Because what they had done to the Rockefeller boys in a private school, they intended to do to the rest of American children in the public schools.

The tragedy is that there are millions of Americans like the Rockefeller boys who must endure the crippling consequences of educational malpractice.

The fact that the progressives refused to stop what they were doing indicates that their intent was criminal. Indeed, they were politely but emphatically warned in February 1929 by Dr. Samuel T. Orton, a neuropathologist, in an article in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* entitled, *The "Sight Reading" Method of Teaching Reading as a Source of Reading Disability*. Dr. Orton couldn't have been more critical of the new teaching method. He wrote:

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 adapted but often proves an actual obstacle to reading progress, and moreover I believe that this group is one of considerable educational importance both because of its 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.

Orton had discovered all of this in the 1920s while investigating cases of reading disability in Iowa, where the new teaching method was being widely used. But since the professors of education had no intention of changing their dumbing-down agenda, they simply argued that Orton didn't know much about education. And so they continued their plans to develop and publish their new basal reading programs for the public schools. Later they made use of Orton's own medical diagnoses and terminology to identify what was wrong with the kids

having trouble learning to read. But they never admitted that it was the teaching method that was causing these problems to begin with.

And so, as early as 1929, the educators had had explicit warning from a prominent physician that the new whole-word method could cause serious reading disability. And they certainly must have known about the Gallaudet experiment in Boston in the 1830s and '40s. Despite this, the new basal reading programs, with their delightful illustrations, turned out to be huge commercial successes for the publishers as virtually overnight whole school districts switched to Dick and Jane, Alice and Jerry, Janet and Mark, Jimmy and Sue, Tom and Betty and other whole-word basal series that were making their professor-authors rich. By the way, no one seems to know why, in the midst of the Great Depression, American schools suddenly decided to spend millions of dollars on a new experimental teaching method that had yet to prove its efficacy.

By the 1940s, however, the new method's harmful effects were quite evident. Schools everywhere were setting up remedial reading departments and reading clinics to handle the thousands of children with reading problems. In fact, remedial teaching had blossomed into a whole new educational specialty with its own professional status.

Researchers, seeking the causes of this epidemic of reading disability, began to develop a whole new lexicon of exotic terms to deal with this previously unknown educational phenomenon: congenital word blindness, word deafness, developmental alexia, congenital alexia, congenital aphasia, dyslexia, strephosymbolia, binocular imbalance, ocular blocks, dyslexaphoria, ocular-manual laterality, minimal brain damage, and anything else a gullible public would accept.

What were the cures recommended for these horrible conditions? Life magazine, in a major article on dyslexia in 1944 (April 10), described the cure recommended by the Dyslexia Institute at Northwestern University for one little girl with an IQ of 118: thyroid treatments, removal of tonsils and adenoids, exercises to strengthen her eye muscles. It would have been a lot easier and cheaper to simply teach the little girl the letters and sounds of the alphabet in an intensive phonics program.

With the boom in remedial teaching also came the creation of professional organizations to deal with reading disability. In 1946 the National Association for Remedial Teaching was formed, and two years later, the International Council for the Improvement of Reading Instruction. The professors must have laughed all the way to the bank, having enormous fun deceiving an entire nation.

At this point, one might ask, how could these progressive educators get away with this blatant educational malpractice in a free country where parents and elected representatives are supposed to have ultimate control over the public schools? In 1955 Rudolf Flesch gave the answer in *Why Johnny Can't Read*:

It's a foolproof system all right. Every grade-school teacher in the country has to go to a teachers' college or school of education; every teachers' college gives at least one course on how to teach reading; every course on how to teach reading is based on a textbook; every one of those textbooks is written by one of the high priests of the word method. In the old days it was impossible to keep a good teacher from following her own common sense and practical knowledge; today the phonetic system of teaching reading is kept out of our schools as effectively as if we had a dictatorship with an all-powerful Ministry of Education.

Apparently, government-monopoly education, even without a dictatorship, is quite capable of stifling dissent. In the matter of reading instruction, what we have had to contend with is a private monopoly of professors of education within a state-controlled and -regulated system. These professors have had a strong economic and professional interest in pushing and keeping their textbooks and methodology in the schools, and the state system made it easy for them to create a monopoly and maintain it indefinitely.

Teacher certification laws require young teachers to be trained by these professors, who not only prepare the curriculum for teacher training but also hold sway over the professional journals the teachers read and the organizations they join. In addition, the professors of education are organized professionally along national lines and therefore can assert a nationwide influence over the teaching profession as a whole. They also had the help of the



National Education Association which published numerous articles in its Journal in favor of the new teaching method.

Nevertheless, Flesch's book was an eye-opener. Now, for the first time, parents knew why so many of their children were having such a difficult time learning to read. Flesch wrote:

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

What was the reaction of the professors of education in 1955 to *Why Johnny Can't Read*?

Unlike the parents who praised the book, the professors denounced Dr. Flesch in no uncertain terms, accusing him of misrepresentation, oversimplification, and superficiality. At the same time they decided to consolidate the two previously mentioned reading organizations into one major professional organization: the International Reading Association. In a few short years it would become the impregnable citadel of the whole-word method, protecting the professors' vested interests not only from Dr. Flesch but from all other critics who would dare question the professors' wisdom.

So if you've wondered why reading instruction in America has not gotten better since the publication of *Why Johnny Can't Read*, there's the reason. The profession is simply too well insulated from public or parental pressures. Today the International Reading Association has about 60,000 members, publishes three professional journals, and holds an annual convention that draws as many as 13,000 attendees. It will be holding its 58<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention in 2013 in San Antonio. If you peruse the *Reading Teacher*, the IRA's journal for classroom teachers, you will see how complex the teaching of reading has become. Complexity has become the reading establishment's defense against a return to anything as simple and effective as intensive, systematic phonics.

Another reason why there has been no improvement in reading instruction is because the academic elite don't believe that everyone should be taught to read. That's the opinion of Harvard Professor Anthony Oettinger, chairman of the Harvard Program on Information Resources Policy and a member of the prestigious Council on Foreign Relations. He told an audience of Telecom executives in 1982:

Our idea of literacy, I am afraid, is obsolete because it rests on a frozen and classical definition...The present "traditional" concept of literacy has to do with the ability to read and write. But the real question that confronts us today is: How do we help citizens function well in their 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 in our technology to achieve a new flowering of oral communication? What is speech recognition and speech synthesis all about if it does not lead to ways of reducing the burden on the individual of the imposed notions of literacy that were a product of nineteenth century economics and technology?

Professor Oettinger doesn't want to impose on American children notions of literacy that were a product of nineteenth-century economics and technology. What he chooses to forget is that literacy was high in early America because of the need to be able to read the Bible and know the Word of God. To our forefathers the purpose of education was to pass on to the next generation the knowledge, wisdom, and values of the previous generation. To our forefathers, man was made in God's image and therefore children had to be educated with that concept in mind.

I don't know of any parent who sends a child to school not to learn to read, write, and do arithmetic. Yet, a member of the Harvard elite is telling us that these are things not all children have to learn, and that the dumbing-down curriculum is just fine.

## Chapter Four

### Readingate

### Spinning Wheels

In 1965, Congress decided to do something about the reading problem in the only way it knows how: by throwing money at it. It passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with its now-famous Title One compensatory education program. The new Title One bureaucracy began showering the schools of America with billions of dollars in the hope that students who were failing in reading would be saved from future lives as functional illiterates. But what actually happened is that the 17,000 school districts that got the money indulged in an orgy of spending and hiring that caused untold joy among the suppliers and new levels of prosperity for the educators.

But did the program do any good for the children? Ten years later the results could be read in newspapers from New York to California reporting the disastrous decline in reading scores. As for SAT scores, they were in an alarming nosedive. The *Boston Globe* described it as “a prolonged and broad-scale decline unequalled in US history.” The verbal SAT mean score had gone from 467 in 1966-67 to 424 in 1980—a drop of 43 points!

The failure of Title One to improve reading skills did not go entirely unnoticed. In 1969 the National Academy of Education appointed a blue-ribbon Committee on Reading to study the

nation's illiteracy problem and recommend ways of solving it. In its report issued in 1975, which seems to have been read by no one, the committee had this to say about Title One:

It is not cynical to suggest that the chief beneficiaries of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) have been members of the school systems—both professional and paraprofessional—for whom new jobs were created. Seven years and as many billions of dollars later, the children of the poor have not been “compensated” as clearly as the employees of the school systems through this investment.

The committee recommended a rather radical idea, a sort of reading stamps program—the use of vouchers with which students could purchase reading instruction from competent public or nonpublic sources. The committee further stated:

We believe that an effective national reading effort should bypass the existing education macrostructure. At a minimum, it should provide alternatives to that structure. That is, the planning, implementing, and discretionary powers of budgeting should not rest with those most likely to have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, especially given their unpromising “track record.”

It was the first time in American educational history that a committee of educators had actually alluded to vested interests standing in the way of educational improvement. What the committee was telling us, in effect, is that the greatest obstacle to literacy in America is our own educational establishment and that if we want to achieve real education in our country, we shall have to circumvent that establishment.

What a staggering indictment! The system had been created to ensure literacy for all. Now we were being told that it was an obstacle. How could you circumvent \$100-billion worth of institutionalized malpractice?

Actually, the federal government had tried to do something like that in the 1970s with a program during the Nixon administration called Right-to-Read. Does anyone remember it? It was supposed to mobilize a nationwide effort to abolish illiteracy. It, too, failed because it

could not overcome the establishment's monopoly over reading instruction. It quietly folded in 1980.

In 1981, Dr. Rudolf Flesch once more put the educators on trial with a new book, *Why Johnny Still Can't Read*, an updated report on the reading fiasco. But this time the professors barely took notice of their long-time critic. They couldn't have cared less what he had to say. After all, they were virtually untouchable. Tenure alone secured their progressive power.

And if the nation wasn't all that worked up over what Flesch had to say, it was probably because it had already begun to accept declining literacy as part of the way things are. Back in 1955, expectations for excellence were still high. But by 1981—a generation later—the public was willing to settle for minimal competency. Besides, it was now possible to blame television, the nuclear arms race, and the breakdown of the family for the decline. Indeed, the reading problem had defied solution for so long that it now seemed wiser to adjust to illiteracy than to try to achieve what now seemed impossible: universal literacy.

Meanwhile, in 1980 the Texas state textbook selection committee adopted five whole-word basal reading programs to be used throughout the state's public schools for the next five years, thus ensuring the perpetuation of the reading problem for many years to come. This was after Flesch had published in the November 1979 *Family Circle* magazine his list of the “dismal dozen” whole-word programs which he advised parents to beware of if they didn't want their children to become reading disabled. All of the Texas adoptions were among Flesch's “dismal dozen.”

And in California, in 1982, the Board of Education, not to be outdone by Texas, adopted nine basal reading programs, only one of which was phonics oriented. Thus, the public education systems of the two largest states in America would engage in educational malpractice on an unheard of scale and produce functional illiterates by the millions. What is so horrendous is that both these states have large Hispanic populations who needed to be taught to read English in the most effective way possible—through intensive, systematic phonics—but were denied access to the method that would have made them fluent, proficient readers in English.

In 1982, President Ronald Reagan's Secretary of Education, Terrel H. Bell, ordered another survey of America's failing education system. An 18-member National Commission on Excellence in Education was created. In April 1983 it issued its highly critical report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform*. Its most damning statement was widely quoted by the media:

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 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.

What were the results of the report? Some states made small improvements in graduation rates and SAT scores. But there were no spectacular improvements for one simple reason. The schools continued to dumb-down the students with their reading programs. In *Why Johnny Still Can't Read*, Flesch had written: "Twenty-five years ago I studied American methods of teaching reading and warned against educational catastrophe. Now it has happened."

Of course, the response of the educators was quite expected: "If you want improvement in education, give us more money." And they got it.

If Flesch had proven anything, it was that the progressive educational establishment is virtually immovable—not only unwilling to change anything but even unwilling to admit that anything needs changing. For parents, this means that they cannot depend on the public schools to teach their children to read in the proper phonetic manner.

The only member of Congress who took an interest in the reading methods controversy was the late Senator Edward Zorinsky of Nebraska. In July 1983, he introduced a bill (S.J. Res. 138) to establish a National Commission on Teacher Education. He explained:

The colleges of education and departments of education are not subject to scrutiny as are our public schools. Therefore, a national Commission would be the most effective way to look into this matter. I also believe that we should not put this investigation into the hands of the education community alone. Representatives of business and industry

as well as parents should be included in any study because they are also directly affected and can provide a fresh perspective.

Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the United States Senate on June 7, 1984. This writer was one of the witnesses who testified before the subcommittee. Other witnesses, including celebrated black educator Marva Collins, shared the same story of educational malpractice in the teaching of reading in the public schools.

The hearings were published and a digitized version is available today through Google. But, as expected, nothing came of the testimonies. The education establishment had too many friends in Congress who could stop any attempt by parents or critics to change anything. Thus, Zorinsky's bill to form the commission failed.

As already state, In November 2007, the prestigious National Endowment for the Arts released its own alarming report on the state of literacy in the United States, *Reading at Risk*. The Report stated:

*Reading at Risk* is not a report that the National Endowment for the Arts is happy to issue. This comprehensive survey of American literary reading presents a detailed but bleak assessment of the decline of reading's role in the nation's culture. For the first time in modern history, less than half of the adult population now reads literature, and these trends reflect a larger decline in other sorts of reading. Anyone who loves literature or values the cultural, intellectual, and political importance of active and engaged literacy in American society will respond to this report with grave concern.

In other words, we are becoming an increasingly illiterate nation, which does not bode well for our future. And, as Flesch recommended in 1955, the solution is astonishingly simple: start teaching every child in primary school to read with intensive systematic phonics. That's all it will take to restore high literacy to America because once young Americans learn to read they will read whatever interests them, thus expanding their intellectual horizons. But in 2013,

there is no sign that a return to Intensive, systematic phonics is in the offing. What we will get is a new Common Core Standard for literacy, which does not guarantee that children will be taught to read in the proper phonetic way. A standard is no substitute for intensive, systematic phonics.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Creating ADD & ADHD:**

### **The Crime of**

### **Pushing Powerful Drugs on Millions of Schoolchildren**

Dr. Peter Breggin in his book, *Talking Back to Ritalin*, writes:

A large segment of America's children are being subjected to drugs to control their minds and behavior. Nothing like this has ever happened in the history of any society or nation. Never before have so many parents been told that their children need psychiatric drug treatment for difficulties at school and in the home. Ritalin has become so ingrained in society that some parents have been forced by courts to give the drug to their children.

According to the Wall Street Journal of June 17, 2013: "Walk into any American high school and nearly one in five boys in the hallways will have a diagnosis of attention deficit hyperactive disorder. According to the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, 11% of all American



children ages 4 to 17—over six million—have ADHD, a 16% increase since 2007.” *The Washington Post* of 3/30/12 reports: “The number of doctor’s visits by children being given a diagnosis of ADHD jumped to 10.4 million in 2010, a 66% increase over 2000.”

Why is there now such a horrendous epidemic of ADHD, a learning disorder that did not exist when this writer was attending public school in the 1930s and ‘40s? Younger parents and writers don’t know why. But anyone who has studied the radical changes that have taken place in the schools since then, knows that the schools themselves with their gross educational malpractice are the cause of the epidemic.

What are the symptoms of ADHD? A July 1994 *Time* cover story reported:

ADHD has three main hallmarks: extreme distractibility, and almost reckless impulsiveness and, in some but not all cases, a knee-jiggling, toe-tapping hyperactivity that makes sitting still all but impossible.

And who decides that a child has ADHD? *Time* writes:

Diagnosing ADHD is a rather inexact proposition. In most cases, it is a teacher who initiates the process by informing parents that their child is daydreaming in class, failing to complete assignments or driving everyone crazy with thoughtless behavior. . . .

Diagnosing those with ADD without hyperactivity can be trickier. Such kids are often described as daydreamers, space cases. They are not disruptive or antsy.

Is that teacher aware that her faulty teaching methods are causing increasing frustration among her students? Probably not. She was told by her professors that teaching children to read English as if it were Chinese is perfectly okay. And so she forces her students to look at each printed word as a picture which the student has to remember. She is forcing her students to use their right brains to perform a left-brain function, something she knows nothing about. She was also told in her college of education that 30% of the children would not be able to learn to read. So her job is to identify that 30% and give them the “help” they need. Incidentally,

according to the *Washington Post*, the typical appointment for diagnosing ADHD takes all of 15 minutes. Everyone in the system works together: the teacher, the administrators, the school nurse, the pediatricians, the psychiatrists, and the drug companies. It's a diabolical machine designed to create a real mental disorder and enrich the pharmaceutical companies, all of which is a highly sophisticated form of child abuse.

And much of this is being taught the public by many well-meaning physicians who are ignorant of what goes on in the classroom, because it's none of their business. In one of the most popular books on ADHD, *Driven to Distraction* by Drs. Edward M. Hallowell and John J. Ratey, the authors write:

ADD lives in the biology of the brain and the central nervous system. The exact mechanism underlying ADD remains unknown. There is no single lesion of the brain, no single neurotransmitter system, no single gene we have identified that triggers ADD. The precise workings of the brain that underlie ADD have so far escaped us, in part due to the extraordinary complexity of the attentional system. (p. 269)

Actually, now that we have brain scans, it is not all that difficult to figure out what happens in the brain when a child is forced to use his right brain to perform the functions of the left brain. It creates brain impairment. Deliberately damaging a child's brain with a known faulty method of teaching reading is a crime.

The authors do admit that the cause of ADD may have something to do with the way schools teach reading, but they shy away from such controversy. They write (p.33):

Although a full discussion of learning and language problems, including dyslexia, is well beyond the scope of this book, we cannot discuss ADD without some mention of language problems—and learning disabilities in general—since they so often coexist with ADD, each usually making the other worse.

In fact, virtually every ADD case history discussed by the authors involves some traumatic experience in early education. They write (p. 16):

Due to repeated failures, misunderstandings, mislabelings, and all manner of other emotional mishaps, children with ADD usually develop problems with their self-image and self-esteem. Throughout childhood, at home and at school they are told they are defective. They are called dumb, stupid, lazy, stubborn, willful, or obnoxious. . . . They are reprimanded for classroom disturbances of all sorts and are easily scapegoated at school. They are the subject of numerous parent-teacher conferences.

In other words, to the primary symptoms of distractibility, impulsivity, and restlessness are added the secondary symptoms of cognitive confusion, academic failure, low self-esteem, depression, boredom and frustration with school, impaired peer relations, sometimes drug or alcohol abuse, stealing or even violent behavior due to mounting frustration, forgetfulness, disorganization, indifference, and unpredictability.

We wonder how many of today's adult ADD patients attended the once-controversial open classrooms in their primary school years in which they were subjected to wall-to-wall bedlam? Why should it have been expected that children under such conditions would be able to calmly concentrate on learning the abstractions of alphabetic writing and arithmetic being taught in a faulty, fragmentary, disorganized manner by an equally distracted, befuddled teacher with noises of all sorts coming from all directions? How could any normal child fail to be distracted and annoyed by the din of activities around him and by the constant interruptions inherent in such a learning-hostile environment?

Yet, apparently, none of the experts on ADD has bothered to investigate the possible school causes of attention deficit disorder. They might surmise that since many students have emerged from that classroom turmoil without ADD, that those who were affected by the environment were biologically predisposed. And they might well have been. But the point is that schools are supposed to be healthy environments for all children, not just for those with nerves of steel.

It is common knowledge that no two children are alike. Parents of more than one child recognize this phenomenon quite readily. Some children can tolerate loud noises, others can't.

Some children require silence in order to concentrate, others can listen to rock-and-roll music while reading. A proper school provides an environment that makes it possible for all students to thrive, and you would think that our educators would be aware of this. But American public schools have become increasingly chaotic not only in curriculum and methodology but also in classroom configuration.

Those of us who went to the traditional public schools of the 1930s and '40s remember the order and silence that prevailed. Our attention was focused on the teacher who sat at the front of the room. There was no distractibility, no impulsive behavior, no abnormal restlessness. And as a result, there was no ADD or ADHD.

But we are well into the twenty-first century, and the instance of ADD and ADHD has increased significantly. Why? Because the Dewey-inspired plan to dumb-down America is still in place, reinforced by progressive professors of education who train all the new teachers, and are well-funded by politicians who need the support of the teachers unions.

Meanwhile, the drugging millions of schoolchildren so that they will be able to sit zombie-like in their classrooms, has made the pharmaceutical industry very rich. The authors of *Driven to Distraction* write: "Many people with ADD point to school as the first place they realized that anything was different about them." And so they don't recommend changing anything in the classroom. They recommend drugging the child. They write (p. 237):

There are two main classes of medication for ADD: the stimulants and the antidepressants. . . . Finding the right medication and the right dosage can take several months of trial and error, as we do not as yet have a way of predicting what medication in which dosage will help a given individual. . . . Often an increase in dosage or a change in medication will make a dramatic difference. . . .

[The stimulants are Ritalin, Dexedrine and Cylert.] [They] act on neurotransmitters to activate or stimulate the central nervous system. . . . They do not "drug up" or cloud the

sensorium of the individual taking them. They are not addictive in doses prescribed for ADD.

However, a new book by Dr. Peter Breggin, *Medication Madness*, warns us that medicating millions of children with psychiatric drugs not only harms the brains of these children, but also is having an enormously negative impact on our society. He writes:

I was testifying before a committee of the Colorado State Legislature concerning why I thought the legislators should oppose the widespread drugging of schoolchildren. . . . The legislature had a close-to-home example of both in Eric Harris, who was on Luvox at the time he slaughtered his classmates at Columbine and then committed suicide.

Psychoactive drugs cause madness. . . . [They] reduce or cloud the highest human functions, including love, creativity and spirituality.

Put simply, psychiatric drugs are proven to cause bizarre, unwanted and dangerous mental states. . . . Stimulants given to children often reduce all spontaneous behavior, and the antipsychotic drugs given to children and adults can utterly crush free will. . . . Free will and rational-choice making require an intact brain, and psychiatric drugs, one and all, always cause brain dysfunction. That's how they work.

Dr. Breggin's book is full of horrendous human tragedies caused by psychiatric drugs. Yet, our schools continue to produce ADD and ADHD which then require drugging the students. The schools have no intention of changing the way they teach anything. In fact they have become factories for creating learning disorders. Dr. Breggin, in his earlier book, *Talking Back to Ritalin*, writes:

The term "LD Child" is probably as commonplace as "ADHD Child." According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, IV* (1994), learning disorders are divided into three main categories: "Reading Disorder" (previously called dyslexia), "Mathematics Disorder," and "Disorder of Written Expression." The disorders are diagnosed "when the individual's achievement on individually administered,

standardized tests in reading, mathematics, or written expression is substantially below that expected for age, schooling, and level of intelligence.” In other words, the child isn’t performing up to expectations. The everyday concept of the “underachiever” has been turned into a disorder.

The concept of LD, like ADHD, puts the blame for the disorders on the child’s brain. This discourages parents from looking at the true source of the problem, such as the way the child was taught to read in the primary grades. That, indeed, is the cause of the frustration, anger, acting-out, and disruptive behavior that is then coined ADD or ADHD. Parents are informed of their child’s unacceptable behavior and told that he or she will have to be medicated in order to be able to sit quietly in the classroom.

It would be so easy to prove the truth of the above statement by taking two groups of students, one being taught to read by intensive phonics, the other by the sight method and see how the children behave. But the educators won’t accept the challenge. They prefer deceiving parents, destroying the lives of children, and enriching drug companies. Many teachers may not know that this is what they are doing. But that is no reason for Americans to place the education of the greatest nation in history in the hands of the most ignorant, deceptive, and treasonous people on the planet.

## **Chapter Six**

### **The Victims of Educational Malpractice**

The great tragedy in America is that the vast majority of Americans who acquire school-induced dyslexia are unable to develop their full potential as productive human beings. They are denied of the rich cultural heritage to be found in books. Many remain stuck in the underclass for the rest of their lives. Others struggle to get and keep good jobs.

But in America, where free enterprise offers the ambitious unlimited opportunities to build businesses and thrive, high achievers have found ingenious ways to get around their school acquired reading handicap. But many of them keep their illiteracy a secret. This was the case with self-made millionaire, Jay Thiessens, owner of a successful manufacturing company, B&J Machine and Tool. Lewis Schiff writes in his book, *Business Brilliant*:

For most of his life, though, Thiessens harbored what he called “a little secret.” The secret was that Thiessens was illiterate. Thanks to a few lenient teachers and a lot of vocational classes, he was handed a high school diploma in 1962 that he could not read.

Over the ensuing years, he developed a kind of mental block about reading and, by the age of fifty-six, he still could not make his way through a children's book.

How can an obviously intelligent, ambitious young man spend twelve years in school and not learn to read? Apparently, progressive educators have found a way to make that happen on a scale that boggles the mind. Thiessens never knew that he was a victim of school-induced dyslexia. Schiff writes further:

Thiessen's story is an extreme example of a very commonly observed fact. A lot of entrepreneurs were poor students when they were young and had particular difficulties with reading and writing. A 2007 study concluded that about 35 percent of U.S. small-business owners suffer from some form of dyslexia, compared with about 10 percent of the general population and just 1 percent of corporate managers. . . .

The reason for that is quite interesting. Since it is difficult for an illiterate to climb the corporate ladder if he can't read or write, these ambitious individuals are forced to create their own companies where they can hire others to do the tasks that require literacy. Schiff continues:

The most successful dyslexic entrepreneur in the United States is probably self-made billionaire Charles R. Schwab, founder of the brokerage that bears his name. When Schwab was applying to colleges as a young man, he had miserable verbal SAT scores and was accepted at Stanford only because he was recruited for the golf team . . . but he almost flunked out because he failed the same introductory English course twice. "It was a very debilitating, depressing thing for me to do that," Schwab recalls, "because I was thought of as pretty bright and I didn't realize how incompetent I was at the skill of writing."

Schwab was forced to endure the pain of a needless handicap foisted on him by his progressive educators who were more interested in advancing their agenda than teaching kids to read in the proper phonetic manner. As a reporter, I encountered a similar individual many years ago when doing a story on Boston's famous Quincy Market. He was the owner of the market's most popular restaurant, and during the interview he told me that he couldn't read even



though he was a university graduate. I offered to tutor him with my Alpha-Phonics program, and he accepted the offer. I would go to his office after hours and teach him the sounds of our alphabet letters. When I taught him the “short a,” he asked if anybody else knew this? His ignorance of our alphabetic system was total. He then told me something that I will never forget. He said that he would rather be beaten than have to read.

That is the kind of pain inflicted on millions of American children by the progressive sadists who control our public schools. And, as we know, socialist utopians have been responsible for inflicting more pain on the human race than any other political philosophy. And they continue to do that today in America.

Other successful dyslexics include the brilliant entrepreneur Richard Branson, creator of Virgin Airlines, Tom Cruise, the actor, Cher, the singer, Rich Little, the impersonator, Stephen Spielberg, the film producer, Jay Leno, the comedian, the actor, Whoopi Goldberg, the actress, and Nolan Ryan, who said, *“When I had dyslexia, they didn’t diagnose it as that. It was frustrating and embarrassing. I could tell you a lot of horror stories about what you feel like on the inside.”*

Henry Winkler, another victim of school-induced dyslexia, was able to achieve great success as an actor despite his dyslexia. He says about his schooling (Instructor, Feb. 2007):

It was extraordinarily difficult. It was like climbing Mount Everest with no clothes on. I didn’t get math. Reading is still difficult. Spelling was out of the question. I had teachers who literally had no time or patience.

However, he didn’t realize he was dyslexic until he was an adult. He says:

I was 31. My stepson was in third grade and was diagnosed. It was then that I realized: “Oh, my goodness, that was me.” Then I saw I had been saying to him all the things that were said to me—“you’re so smart, so verbal, you’re just lazy.” I learned just to be quiet and support him. . . .

Be the most supportive that we can possibly be [with kids with learning disabilities].

Children's feelings about themselves when they meet with frustration again and again can become so damaged and so brutalized.

In other words, Winkler has accepted the notion that there is nothing wrong with the teachers or the schools. The problem is that many children, like his stepson, are born with learning problems which the schools can't properly deal with. The idea that these problems are deliberately caused by the whole-word reading programs in the schools never even crossed his mind. Why? It's too incredible. As we have said, it is easier to believe a credible lie than an incredible truth.

David Mamet, the playwright, writes of his school experience in a way that probably echoes the experiences of millions of children:

I loathed school. I never opened a schoolbook. I failed every test given to me. (I was sent back from second to first grade, and was enrolled in remedial reading classes.) It never occurred to me to point out the books that occupied all my leisure time, and suggest that perhaps they left one little time for Dick and Jane ("oh Dick, see Spot run. Run, Spot, run. Jane see Spot run," et cetera).

The habit, inculcated at school and at home, of thinking myself a failure persisted through my school career.

It makes perfect sense that a literary genius would find his public school curriculum loathsome. But its brutality forced to think of himself as a failure during all of his time in school. That is what the dumbing down process does to intelligent kids. What it does to the average child is unspeakable.

Despite all attempts to expose the criminal educators who have deliberately turned perfectly normal intelligent American children into dyslexics, their crimes are still being committed everyday in American public schools. What is needed is for the parents these dyslexics to organize into a group and sue the education system by means of a class action suit. So far, the courts have rejected law suits by individual dyslexics against the education system. But a class action suit may fare better in our courts of law.

## **Chapter Seven**

### **How Dumbed-Down Are We?**

Most Americans have no idea that our reading problem is the result of faulty teaching methods. It is assumed that our schools are run by professional educators who know what they are doing. The idea that our schools are deliberately engaged in a conspiracy to dumb-down the country is simply beyond belief. How could an entire respected profession be engaged in something so evil? But what they all recognize is that our graduates are coming out of our high schools with very poor literacy skills and little cultural or historical knowledge.

Indeed, E.D. Hirsch writes in *The Decline in Literate Knowledge*:

In the mid 1980s, American business leaders became alarmed by the lack of communication skills in their young employees. They met to discuss the fact that their younger middle-level executives could no longer communicate their ideas effectively in

speech or writing. They wanted to know why, despite the great advances in the technology of communication, the effectiveness of business communication had been slipping, to the detriment of our competitiveness in the world. The figures from NAEP surveys and the scores on the verbal SAT were solid evidence that literacy has been declining in this country just when our need for effective literacy has been sharply rising.

To find answers to the corporate leaders' questions, a major grant was made to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The academy spent 20 years trying to come up with the answers, but only came up with more questions. Here's the Academy's description of what had to be done:

The project is assembling teams of scholars and practitioners from a wide variety of fields to begin the preliminary study of the rationale, means, and consequences of providing universal education. Participants will offer informed but fresh perspectives on the magnitude of the challenge, the opportunity costs, and the potential benefits of such an ambitious undertaking.

"Teams of scholars" means jobs for members of the academic establishment.

Economists, developmental psychologists, demographers, statisticians, historians, cultural anthropologists, public health workers, business leaders, and others, working with representatives from the World Bank and the United Nations, will join with educators to study the environmental, demographic, economic, and cultural impact of universal education. They will develop a set of thoroughly researched, multidisciplinary, and well-integrated reports that will be published, along with critical commentary, by the Academy.

The project included everything and everyone except those who actually knew what the problem was all about. All they had to do was read Flesch's book *Why Johnny Can't Read*, or my own study *The New Illiterates*, and they would have known what had to be done. But that would have been too easy. The Academy's project became known as the Universal Basic and Secondary Education (UBASE) study and was finally completed in May, 2005. It had been

expanded to include education worldwide and never did answer the question posed by the business leaders in the 1980s of why their younger middle-level executives couldn't communicate their ideas effectively. The final report stated:

Five changes are essential to achieve universal primary and secondary education by mid-century: (1) Open discussions, nationally, regionally and internationally, on what people want primary and secondary education to achieve — that is, the goals of education; [Believe it or not they still hadn't decided what the goals of education are!] (2) A commitment to improving the effectiveness and economic efficiency of education; (3) A commitment to extending high-quality secondary education to all children; (4) Recognition of the diverse character of educational systems in different countries, and adaptation of aid policies and educational assessment requirements to local contexts; (5) More funding from rich countries for education in poor countries. [Pleas for more funding are always the first and last resort of establishment researchers.]

In other words, the research team delivered no answers but simply asked new questions, totally irrelevant to the reading problem. That's how the establishment manages to make everything more complex than it has to be. By burying their musings under a mountain of irrelevant data, they made sure that lucrative foundation grants will continue to support the academic researchers in their pursuit of the unknowable. And that is why there is such widespread, self-inflicted ignorance among the top leaders of this country. Those of us who have the answers are simply relegated to a form of social and professional exile that never before existed in American history.

But independent scholar E.D. Hirsch apparently knows the source of the problem. He writes of his son John's experience as a teacher of Latin in high school and eighth grade:

In one of his classes he mentioned to his students that Latin, the language they were studying, is a dead language that is no longer spoken. ... One girl raised her hand to challenge my son's claim. "What do they speak in Latin America?" she demanded.

At least she had heard of Latin America. Another day my son asked his Latin class if they knew the name of an epic poem by Homer. One pupil shot up his hand and eagerly said, "The Alamo!" Was it just a slip for *The Iliad*? No, he didn't know what the Alamo was, either.

Hirsch then quotes Ben Stein, who has his own stories to tell about ignorant youth:

I spend a lot of time with teen-agers. Besides employing three of them part-time, I frequently conduct focus groups at Los Angeles area high schools to learn about teen-agers' attitudes towards movies or television shows or nuclear arms or politicians....

I have not yet found one single student in Los Angeles, in either college or high school, who could tell me the years when World War II was fought. Nor have I found one who could tell me the years when World War I was fought. Nor have I found one who knew when the American Civil War was fought....

Only two could tell me where Chicago is, even in the vaguest terms. (My particular favorite geography lesson was the junior at the University of California at Los Angeles who thought that Toronto must be in Italy. My second-favorite geography lesson is the junior at USC, a pre-law student, who thought that Washington, D.C. was in Washington State.) ...

Only two could even approximately identify Thomas Jefferson. Only one could place the date of the Declaration of Independence. None could name even one of the first ten amendments to the Constitution or connect them with the Bill of Rights...

It's all very funny to point out the appalling ignorance of our youth. But it is more a tragedy than a comedy. For these ignoramuses are the leaders of tomorrow, and America never became the freest and richest nation on earth out of ignorance.

## **Chapter Eight**

### **Contributing to the Delinquency of Minors: A Serious Crime**

The public schools contribute to the delinquency of minors in four different ways. 1. They promote semi-pornographic sex education that leads to premarital sex and all of the social and emotional problems associated with that kind of behavior. 2. They promote teenage drug abuse by plying them with stimulants like Ritalin and Adderall that lead many teenagers to addiction to hard drugs that ruin their lives. 3. They use blatant educational malpractice on the children so that they never learn to read and become frustrated and angry at the society that

turned them into illiterates. 4. They destroy the child's belief in religious morality by teaching moral relativism and values clarification which lead many children into immoral behavior.

As we all know, parents who ply schoolchildren with liquor at parties can be hauled into jail for contributing to the delinquency of minors. In other words, it's a serious crime to contribute to the delinquency of a minor. But that's what the public schools do every day. Some schools provide kids with condoms so that they can engage in premarital sex, supposedly to guard them from getting a disease or impregnating another minor teenager. But apparently, the condoms are not being used or they fail because teenage girls are still getting pregnant, having abortions or having a child out of wedlock.

The schools teach everything wrong. Instead of teaching that love and marriage should precede sex, they teach that sex comes first without love or marriage. Indeed, probably the single most pressing moral issue facing youth today is that of premarital sex, which leads to widespread abortion, unwed motherhood, a life on welfare, fatherless families, venereal diseases that may lead to sterility and death, unhappy emotional entanglements, the awakening of a sexual appetite that may lead to promiscuity, prostitution, and perversion, loss of self-esteem, abusive sexual partners, and nervous breakdowns.

But students have become so corrupted by our sex-obsessed culture that some of them clamor for more sex education, not less. They want more than just condoms. They want to know more about sexually-transmitted diseases. According to the *Boston Globe* of February 16, 2013, the Boston Public Health Commission reported that 54 percent of city high school students have had sex, and half of them have had sex with more than three partners. Thus, the likelihood of these students getting a sexually transmitted disease is high.

In 2007, 1,383 students between the ages 15 and 19 in Boston were diagnosed with chlamydia — a disease that can cause infertility in women — a 70 percent increase since 1999. Apparently there hasn't been enough discussion about the dangers of promiscuous, recreational sex. Many students are only dimly aware of the health risks that such sexual dalliance can lead to.

Abstinence is not considered a realistic option by these students, although it's obvious that many students do practice abstinence out of good common sense and religious beliefs.



One high-school senior told the *Globe* reporter, “I feel like they are focusing on ‘Don’t have sex or don’t get pregnant.’ There’s more to it than that. It was like ‘This is a condom. This is what males use to prevent pregnancy.’ We didn’t really talk about sexually transmitted diseases.”

So what do the students want? A female high-school sophomore opined: “Sex education is important to me because sexual identity is part of our lives. And when we don’t talk about it, people learn the wrong things about it or nothing at all.” She said that sex education among teens is like a “fairy tale” shared from one teen to another with little or no factual information. Many of her peers have sex in order to fit in and don’t fully understand the consequences of their actions. “What they need to learn about sex,” she said, “is that it’s something you don’t want to rush into. It seems a shame that we aren’t learning what we need to.”

And what was the response of the school authorities? Barbara Huscher-Cohen, health education program director for the school system, said the district is creating new health education frameworks that will include sex education. It will include an inventory of the district’s health education efforts, create a task force to review condom access, establish comprehensive health education benchmarks, and train staffs to implement them.

Anyone familiar with public-education bureaucratese will see exactly what the program director wants: a bigger budget for the task force to review condom access and to train staffs on how to implement all of the new programs. Apparently, the school authorities as well as the liberal city councilors believe that taxpayers should be forced to pay for students’ access to free condoms.

Why does anyone expect schools that can’t teach reading properly to be able to teach sex education properly? Is there a proper way to teach about sex? Hasn’t SEICUS provided all of the sex educators of America with their guidelines? SEICUS is the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States. Its 2009 report provided the following information on student sexual activity: 46.0 percent of students reported ever having had sexual intercourse (47.8 percent in 2007); 5.9 percent of students reported having had sexual intercourse before age 13 (7.1 percent in 2007); 13.8 percent of students reported having had sex sexual intercourse with four or more sexual partners in their lifetime (14.9 percent in 2007); 34.2 percent of students reported being currently sexually active, defined as having had sexual

intercourse in the three months prior to the survey (35.0 percent in 2007); 61.1 percent of sexually active students reported that either they or their partner had used a condom during their last sex (62.5 percent in 2007); and 87.0 percent of students reported having been taught about AIDS or HIV in school (89.5 percent in 2007).

In other words, in 2009, students were slightly less promiscuous than in 2007. But fewer students reported knowing about AIDS and HIV in 2009 than in 2007. It is obvious that sex education has nothing to do with education but a lot to do with sex.

In the days before sex ed people managed to fall in love, get married, and have families. Many lived happily ever after, some did not. But how did the human race manage to deal with sex before it became a classroom subject? Through the kinds of cultural institutions that generally dealt with such matters. Yes, there has always been titillating secrecy about the subject, but if you adhered to biblical religion you knew that premarital sex was a sin. It wasn't a perfect world, but neither is our sex-saturated world where students complain that their schools are not doing enough to protect them from the consequences of their degrading behavior.

In Chicago, the public schools have decided to introduce a full sex education curriculum aligned with National Sexuality Education Standards. The groups involved in designing the standards include the radical Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), the equally radical Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), the abortion giant Planned Parenthood, and the National Education Association. For the early grades, the curriculum includes lessons about anatomy and physiology, reproduction, healthy relationships and personal safety. In fifth through 12th grades they learn about abstinence, medically recommended contraceptives, how to prevent sexually transmitted diseases including HIV, and healthy relationships, which includes informed decision making, sexual orientation and personal safety. The six lessons taught four- and five-year-olds in kindergarten are:

- My Body: accurate names and locations of external body parts.
- Good Touch/Bad Touch: the difference between appropriate and inappropriate touching by others and how to stay safe.

- Reproduction. The birds and the bees. How different species have sex.
- The Family: Traditional families and Gay families.
- Feelings: how to identify uncomfortable feelings and use “I” messages to express them.
- Bullying: how to identify bullying, why it’s wrong and how to report it.

Many psychologists believe that children at that age are too young to be given elementary sex education. Peter Sprigg of the Family Research Council told the *Christian Post* that the notion of early-childhood sex education “is part of the legacy of Alfred Kinsey, and the belief that 'children are sexual from birth.' This is a false and pernicious idea that introduces words, thoughts, and concepts to children long before it is developmentally appropriate for them. This premature exposure may contribute to early sexual activity, when we should be working to prevent it.”

To sum it up, sex education as presently taught in the schools contributes to the delinquency of minors. That is a crime!

We also know that plying schoolchildren with highly potent psychiatric drugs can lead to drug abuse with other substances. How many lives are ruined by this kind of drug abuse? Here are some statistics from a drug rehab organization called Inspiration:

In 2008, among persons with substance dependence or abuse, the proportion with dependence on or abuse of illicit drugs also was associated with age: 60.6 percent of youths aged 12 to 17 were dependent on or abused drugs compared with 37.4 percent of young adults aged 18 to 25 and 24.3 percent of adults aged 26 or older.

Among youths aged 12 to 17, the types of drugs used in the past month varied by age group. Among 12 or 13 year olds, 1.5 percent used prescription-type drugs (xanax, Percocet, oxycontin, etc) nonmedically, 1.2 percent used inhalants (huffing aerosols),

and 1.0 percent used marijuana.

Among 14 or 15 year olds, marijuana was the most commonly used drug (5.7 percent), followed by prescription-type drugs used nonmedically (3.0 percent), inhalants (1.3 percent), and hallucinogens (1.0 percent).

Marijuana also was the most commonly used drug among 16 or 17 year olds (12.7 percent); it was followed by prescription-type drugs used nonmedically (4.0 percent), hallucinogens (1.6 percent), cocaine (0.7 percent), and inhalants (0.7 percent).

In other words, drug abuse among teenagers is a huge problem. To what extent do schools contribute to this problem is not known. But it can be assumed that when millions of schoolchildren are required to take highly potent mind-altering psychiatric drugs like Ritalin, Adderall and others, that it can lead to the delinquency of minors who then experiment with more highly addictive drugs. The schools also teach drug ed, which acquaints the child with all of the drugs available and what they do to the body. These drugs include marijuana, pain relievers, cocaine, tranquilizers, hallucinogens, stimulants, heroin, inhalants and sedatives.

Of course, there is also the drinking problem, which can't be blamed on the schools. Indeed, underage drinking has become an enormous public health issue. Alcohol is the drug of choice among children and adolescents. Annually about 5,000 youths under age 21 die from car crashes, homicides, and suicides that involve underage drinking. In 2006, 1.4 million teenagers needed treatment for alcohol abuse.

In short, pushing drugs in the schools does contribute to the delinquency of minors. That is a crime.

Depriving children of the ability to read through deliberate educational malpractice also contributes to the delinquency of minors. Michael S. Brunner, author of *Retarding America*:

*The Imprisonment of Potentia*, believes that there is a definite link between reading failure and delinquent, anti-social behavior. In 1991, he wrote:

Low reading levels tend to predict the likelihood of the onset of serious delinquency. Longitudinally, poor reading achievement and delinquency appear to mutually influence each other. Prior reading level predicted later subsequent delinquency . . . [moreover] poor reading achievement increased the chances of serious delinquency persisting over time.

Another researcher writes in the *Journal of Correctional Education* (Sept. 1990):

There is a disproportionate involvement in delinquency by those youth failing in school. Schools are apparently contributing to the delinquency problem by continuing to provide traditional programming, though it has failed repeatedly.

E. E. Gagne writes in the *Journal of Special Education* (1977):

[the] compulsory school attendance law . . . facilitates delinquency by forcing youth to remain in what is sometimes a frustrating situation in which they are stigmatized as failures . . . . The longer learning-disabled students stay in school, the more likely they are to become involved with the police.

In a Report to the Congress issued in 1977 by the Comptroller General of the United States we read:

In our society, school is the only major legitimate activity for children between the ages of 6 and 18. If a child fails in school, generally there is little else in which he can be successful. . . . Delinquency and misbehavior become a way for the failing child to express his frustration at those who disapprove of his academic underachievement. This

disapproval comes not only from parents and teachers, but also from other children who are keenly aware of the school status based on performance.

Michael Brunner writes in his study, *Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency; Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse*, issued in 1991 by the U.S. Dept. of Justice:

Continued failure in the most significant educational task challenging the child (reading) is a deeply frustrating experience when permitted to continue for several years . . . . Continued frustration over prolonged periods of time will result in aggressive behavior directed toward society (delinquency) or inward toward the self (neurosis).

In investigating two groups of incarcerated delinquents, 48 in each group, in two different states, a significant correlation between reading underachievement and aggression for both groups was found. . . . Only reading failure was found to correlate with aggression in both populations of delinquent boys.

It is quite conceivable that when functional illiterates in the form of gangs turn against society and burn down the community, as they did in South Central Los Angeles in 1992, they are directing their hatred at the very system that destroyed their minds. The government school represents the establishment as a whole, and these youths know that the schools did a job on them, for they remember the intelligence they had before they went to school and they remember the humiliating and frustrating experience of failure after they were in school.

In reality, the reading instructive methods were devised to do just that: produce disability in the learner by way of a subtle, non-surgical prefrontal lobotomy called the sight-word method. What they saw in the Rodney King beating by the police was what had been done to them mentally and psychologically in the schools. The oppressive dumbing down turned them into walking time-bombs waiting for the right moment to go off. And when several thousand

walking time-bombs organize into gangs, they can cause a social explosion of incredibly destructive force.

Destroying a child's belief in biblical religious is another school contribution to the delinquency of minors. Through values clarification and the philosophy of Secular Humanism, the schools convince the child that the morality of the Ten Commandments is old fashioned and based on superstition and mythology. All those "Thou shalt nots" are based on out-dated religious dogma, and have no place in modern society. The result is that children, no longer restrained by the absolute morals of the Bible, are free to construct their own moral codes based on their own concepts of right and wrong. Inevitably, they will justify their delinquent behavior on any grounds that will suit their egos. There is no heaven or hell. There is no sin. There is only the reality of one's emotions and desires. A dangerous way to live, but one encouraged by a morally dysfunctional education system.

## **Chapter Nine**

### **Destroying a Child's Religious Beliefs: A Moral Crime**

*"That God rules in the affairs of men is as certain as any truth of physical science. . . . Nothing is by chance, though men, in their ignorance of causes may think so."*

*George Bancroft, Historian, Memorial Oration on Lincoln, 12 Feb. 1866.*

Contrast George Bancroft's beliefs with those of the second federal district court which, in 1988, ruled against students at Westside High School in Omaha, Nebraska, from forming a Bible Club under the Equal Access Law. The Principal denied the students' request, which was upheld

by the school board. They argued that a Bible Club was a non-curriculum related activity unlike such organizations as Interact, Chess, and Subserfers were. Interact was related to psychology; Chess was related to logical thinking; and Subserfers were related to physical education.

But what about Bible study? The Bible is related to early American history (the Puritans), ancient history, philosophy, history of religion, comparative religion, Bible as literature, archeology, geography, mathematics (B.C., A.D., etc.). psychology (man's nature), history of moral development, development of Western law, ancient chronology, history of Western Civilization, Greek, Latin, Elizabethan English, history of the Jews, history of the early church, biography, genealogy, American colonial history, early American education, history of parochial education, and more.

The King James Version of the Bible is considered the greatest work of literature of the Elizabethan era. In fact, without knowledge of the Bible one could hardly be considered educated. Biblical references are found throughout English and world literature, even in crossword puzzles. Not to know the Bible is to be ignorant of the single most important influence in Western civilization. That so-called educators and a school board can claim that Bible study is not curriculum-related is glaring proof that American public education is morally and academically bankrupt.

They also ignore the fact that virtually all children are born believers whether they or their parents know it or not. According to Dr. Justin L. Barrett, author of *Born Believers, The Science of Children's Religious Belief*, published in 2012, children are born with an innate belief in the supernatural. Dr. Barrett writes:

I have conducted numerous additional studies on religious belief, and colleagues in my field, the cognitive science of religion, have discovered more evidence that children have a natural affinity for thinking about and believing in gods. . . . People may practically be born believers. . . .

Regardless of culture and without need for coercive indoctrination, children develop



with a propensity to seek meaning and understanding of their environments. Given the way their minds naturally develop, this search leads to beliefs in a purposeful and designed world, an intelligent designer behind the design, an assumption that the intentional designer is super-powerful, super knowing, super perceiving, and immortal.

In other words, children come to school with a set of beliefs in the supernatural, which provides them with a knowledge of God and their own sense of purpose. Life has meaning is the message that has been conveyed to them by this innate supernatural force. But when they enter an atheist public school, they are told that their beliefs are nonsensical superstitions, that there is no God, and that life has no spiritual dimension, and that their lives have no transcendent meaning. In essence, they are no better than their pet cats and dogs.

A godly school need not be a religious school. But it must be a school that deeply respects the God of creation and the child's inborn belief in the supernatural. At the New York City public school I attended in the 1930s, the principal read the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm at our assemblies. It was a great moment of spiritual uplifting. We were Catholics, Protestant, and Jews, yet we all responded to this eloquent and poetic description of our relationship with the loving God of the Bible.

One can imagine the negative effects a school's rejection of God and the supernatural has on the child. The most egregious effect is childhood depression, a condition that did not exist when schools were godly. In an 818-page tome, *Treating and Preventing Adolescent Mental Health Disorders*, published in 2005, we read in the Introduction:

Although for many years depression was considered a problem that afflicted only adults, in the last 30 years there has been an increasing recognition that this disorder can and does occur in children, particularly in adolescents. Fifty years ago its mean age was near 30, but now it is close to 15.

Why would American adolescents, with all of the goodies supplied by our high-tech economy, become depressed? What is it that they don't have that actually leads some of them to commit

suicide? They are generally loved by their parents and friends, and have been given many of the high-tech toys to enjoy. America is the land of the free that permits each individual to develop his or her talents and gifts and pursue happiness as a God-given right. Yet, none of this is enough to make them enjoy their good fortune to be born Americans. Why?

In my opinion it is the lack of God's love in their lives. They've been told by their atheist schools that God is a myth and that life has no meaning apart from the pursuit of physical pleasure, and that is why these young students become depressed. Obviously, the need to know God and a sense of purpose in life is so powerful, that when the adolescent fights against it in order to please his atheist or humanist teachers by being politically correct, he condemns himself to depression or suicide.

On the phenomenon of atheism, Barrett writes (p.199):

Atheism is rarer than you might think. If you are one of those people who never recalls having believed in any kind of god . . . then the first thing you must understand is that you are very unusual.

Atheists who only hear their colleagues affirm atheism are even more likely to think that everyone around them is an atheist. . . .[B]elief in gods is the norm and nonbelief has been very unusual indeed.

What is even more interesting is that while children become depressed by being forced to give up their innate belief in God, "Committed theists," writes Dr. Barrett, "are psychologically healthier and more equipped to cope with emotional and health problems than nonbelievers."

In other words, if we want to improve the mental health of American children, the easiest and fastest way to do it is to convert our atheist schools into godly schools. Barrett explains why:

[R]esearch does indicate that commitment to a religious belief system and participation in a religious community is associated with many positive outcomes. Actively religious people have been shown to enjoy more mental and emotional health, recover from

trauma more quickly, have longer and happier lives, are more generous, volunteer more, and actively contribute to communities more than nominally religious or nonreligious people do.

I would add that the author's comments apply mainly to believers in Biblical religion. Obviously, Islamists driven to violence by their interpretation of the Koran are not committed to a happy life but to a love of death. Also, the Kool-Aid drinkers led by a religious fraud to commit mass suicide is hardly based on Biblical religion in which love of life and love of God go hand in hand. In other words, if we want to improve the mental health of American children, the easiest and fastest way to do it is to convert our atheist schools into godly schools.

While today's public schools have no choice but to live with school shootings and student suicides, one thing they will not tolerate is the Holy Bible in their classrooms, for one simple reason. The entire progressive curriculum is based on the theory of evolution. Without evolution the students cannot be considered to be animals subject to the teaching methods the Skinnerian behaviorists use in training students. Also, belief in God teaches us that every human being has a soul destined to a life after death in eternity. With humanism—the anti-God philosophy that governs public education—there is only the here and now.

The schools and even the courts have gone so far as to forbid a fourth-grade student from conducting a Bible study class during recess. The principal of the school in Knox County, Tennessee, stated:

I indicated to the students and the parents that I did not feel that an organized activity of this type was appropriate during the school day. . . . While we do not discourage students from reading at recess, I think that a daily planned activity that is stationary or physically static in nature defeats the real purpose of recess. The purpose is to give students an opportunity to have some physical activity during the school day.

In other words, the school authorities will find any excuse to prevent students from Bible study inside a school building during school hours. But according to a local minister who had

previously met with the principal about this issue, her concern was really about the so-called separation of church and state.

But if believers can't get the Bible back in the schools, there is another way of countering Darwinism—by getting the schools to include Intelligent Design, or scientific creationism, in the science curriculum. Indeed, during the past four years, two states have passed laws that protect teachers if they present the theory of scientific creationism in a course of learning.

Behind these two laws is the Discovery Institute, which is described by evolutionists as “a non-science propaganda organization whose purpose is to attack Darwinism, and wedge intelligent design into the science curriculum.” According to Jack Hassard, writing in *Education Week* (4/24/12):

The academic freedom bills that have been passed in Louisiana (2008), and Tennessee (2012) disguise their intent of teaching creationism and intelligent design using clever and slick language that they are coming to the rescue of science teachers by passing a law that protects teachers' academic freedom to present lessons questioning and critiquing scientific theories being studied including but not limited to evolution, the origins of life, global warming, and human cloning. Kind of a poor "Trojan horse" scenario, don't you think? Where is the theory of gravity, plate tectonics, and atomic theory on their to-do list?

While evolutionists insist that Intelligent Design or Creation Science is not science, the people at the Discovery Institute say that it is.

And it is the scientists, notably the physicists, who are proving that man is a spiritual being. For the deeper they probe into the nature of matter, the more they find less and less matter and more and more “spirit.” That’s what the quantum theory is all about. It was Max Planck (1858-1947), the German physicist, who formulated the quantum theory, which has permitted man to go from exploration of visible matter to the exploration of invisible matter, which is really non-matter.

Max Planck wrote: “However much discussed and however promising this atomic theory might appear, it was, until recently, regarded merely as a brilliant hypothesis, since it appeared to many far-sighted workers too risky to take the enormous step from the visible and directly controllable to the invisible sphere, from the macrocosm to the microcosm.”

In his book, *Microcosm*, George Gilder writes: “The central event of the twentieth century is the overthrow of matter. In technology, economics, and the politics of nations, wealth in the form of physical resources is steadily declining in value and significance. The powers of mind are everywhere ascendant over the brute force of things. This change marks a great historic divide.”

Everything you ever wanted to know about teen depression is now on the Internet. Just type in the words “teen depression,” and it’s all there. In a website entitled Teen Depression, I found the following:

Depression is the most common mental health disorder in the United States among teens and adults, and can have a serious impact on the lives of the many teens who suffer from depression.

Teen depression can affect a teen regardless of gender, social background, income level, race, or school or other achievements, though teenage girls report suffering from depression more often than teenage boys. Teenage boys are less likely to seek help or recognize that they suffer from depression, probably due to different social expectations for boys and girls - girls are encouraged to express their feelings while boys are not. Teenage girls’ somewhat stronger dependence on social ties, however, can increase the chances of teen depression being triggered by social factors, such as loss of friends.

Note that the depression suffered by these teens is serious enough to require medical intervention, which generally includes psychiatric therapy and taking drugs to alleviate the mental pain caused by depression. Apparently there are also many depressed teens who manage to cope and don’t seek medical treatment. Some of them commit suicide to alleviate the pain of being alive.

Here is a list of symptoms of teen depression as given on a website for the drug Abilify:

- Sadness most of the day
- Low energy or fatigue
- Loss of interest in favorite activities
- Feelings of hopelessness and/or pessimism
- Difficulty concentrating
- Irritability, restlessness, or being slowed down
- Feeling worthless or guilty
- Trouble sleeping or sleeping too much
- Significant weight change
- Thoughts about suicide or dying

Thoughts about suicide or dying. But that's what the schools teach. They teach about death and dying. Children write their own obituaries in school. They are told there is no God and that life is purposeless. If a child is taught that his or her life is of no more significance than that of a cat or dog, that will make one feel pretty worthless.

Atheist schools even destroy the joy of Christmas by banning any mention of Christmas in the holiday season. The students are supposed to celebrate the "Winter Solstice" which is probably what the worshippers at the Stonehenge celebrated.

The fact that neither parents, therapists, nor educators will even admit that removing God from education can produce depression is a sign of how spiritually perverse our society has become. Teachers of death education admit that teaching about death and dying, and the writing of obituaries can cause student depression. But that doesn't seem to bother them. Indeed, over 50,000 American teenagers have committed suicide since the introduction of death education in America's public schools.

According to *Education Week* (10/31/84), there were 18 teenage suicides a day in the United States, about 6,570 per year. A more recent statement about teen suicide was given by The American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry:

Suicides among young people continue to be a serious problem. Each year in the U.S., thousands of teenagers commit suicide. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for 15-to-24-year-olds, and the sixth leading cause of death for 5-to-14-year-olds.

Teenagers experience strong feelings of stress, confusion, self-doubt, pressure to succeed, financial uncertainty, and other fears while growing up. For some teenagers, divorce, the formation of a new family with step-parents and step-siblings, or moving to a new community can be very unsettling and can intensify self-doubts. For some teens, suicide may appear to be a solution to their problems and stress.

Depression and suicidal feelings are treatable mental disorders. The child or adolescent needs to have his or her illness recognized and diagnosed, and appropriate treatment plans developed. When parents are in doubt whether their child has a serious problem, a psychiatric examination can be very helpful.

Note that suicide is the sixth leading cause of death for 5-to-14 year olds. The idea of child suicide was unheard of before the schools became atheistic. It is true that family dysfunctions can depress a child especially if that child has no recourse to God, because the school told him that there is no God, just as there is no Santa Claus.

Everybody wonders why there have been so many shootings and massacres in schools and elsewhere, so many teen suicides, so much self-destructive behavior among teens. But the obvious is too unbelievable to atheist-humanist America. Simply put, Godless education leads to depression, suicide, and anti-social behavior.

Death educator, Nina Ribak Rosenthal, in an article entitled "Death Education: Help or Hurt?" which appeared in *The Clearing House* of January 1980, wrote:

Death arouses emotions. Some students may get depressed; others may get angry; many will ask questions or make statements that can cause concern for the instructor. . . . Students may discuss the fact that they are having nightmares or that the course is making them depressed or feeling morbid. . . . Others may have no reactions or feel a great sense of relief that someone finally is talking about the things they often felt they could not say. Others may become frightened. In fact, Bailis and Kennedy report that secondary students increased their fear of death and dying as a result of participating in a death education program.

Depression, fear, anger, nightmares, morbidity. These are the negative emotions and reactions stirred up in students by death education. Is this what parents want their children to experience? Is this why they send their children to school so that they can learn about death rather than life? However, according to the misguided Ms. Rosenthal, simply because death education can cause such emotional turmoil and anxiety is no reason not to teach it. "Since death has been such a taboo topic, open and honest communication is essential. Such communication," she writes, "helps to desensitize students to anxiety-arousing items."

Thus, the purpose of death education is to "desensitize" children to death—to remove or reduce that reasonable, rational, and useful antipathy toward death that helps us preserve our lives. It is when children begin to see death as "friendly" and unthreatening that they begin to be drawn into death's orbit and lured to self-destruction. It's a phenomenon that might be called "death seduction," in which an individual is drawn irresistibly into a fascination and then obsession with death. The individual begins to disdain life and love death.

Atheist schools play with fire. They play with the emotional lives of their students and are nonplussed when the students act up. According to an article in *Education Week* (12/14/88):

A nationwide poll of 22,000 public-school teachers sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has revealed a disturbing picture of the problems teachers encounter in their classrooms.



Nearly 90 percent reported disruptive behavior and student apathy to be serious problems in their classrooms. Almost 70 percent identified theft and vandalism as problems in their schools, and 50 percent said that alcohol and drugs were problems. Ninety percent complained about lack of parental support; 44 percent were concerned about violence against students; and 24 percent they considered violence against teachers a problem.

That's a perfect picture of what happens in a school without God. Violence, vandalism, theft, apathy, drugs—and add to that suicides, shootings and massacres, plus low test scores and children who can't read and you get an idea of how serious the problem of Godless education has become for this nation. None of the reform programs offered by the establishment address any of these problems because the establishment refuses to acknowledge the need for biblical religion in education.

When I was attending public school in the 1930s and '40s, the principal read the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm at every assembly. That was enough to inform the student body that there was a God and that He protected us from evil. The curriculum was a solid one based on traditional teaching methods. We learned to read with phonics, write in cursive script, learned the arithmetic facts by rote, and learned about our history in chronological order.

All of that is gone today, and the educators refuse to go back to the methods that worked and the Bible-based morality that governed the schools. Thus parents have no recourse but to refuse to put their children in atheist schools and either teach them at home or enroll them in decent private schools where religion can be taught.

Computer technology has made homeschooling the most effective form of education in America today. But 85 percent of American children still attend public schools, sent by parents who have no idea what goes on in those classrooms. The very decent parents of the two Columbine killers had no idea what the school was doing to their sons.

And when children come home from school depressed, parents have no idea why. The school is never blamed, so there must be something wrong with the children. If a child can't learn to read, it's not the fault of the school's teaching methods, it's the fault of the child who was born with a learning handicap. If schools hand out condoms to teenagers, they are not contributing to the delinquency of minors, they are protecting them from a sexually transmitted disease and unwanted pregnancy.

It's time for American parents to wake up. Atheist schools are a danger to the health, safety, and emotional lives of their children. These schools should either be abolished or reconstituted as genuine institutions of learning in which God is acknowledged as the Creator of the universe and all of life in it.

## **Chapter Ten**

### **Teen Suicide: Is Death Ed a Cause?**

Is death education still in the school curriculum? *Omega*, the journal of death and dying, is now forty years old and has become a highly respected peer reviewed publication. Its website says:

This *Journal* brings insight into terminal illness; the process of dying, bereavement, mourning, funeral customs, suicide. Fresh, lucid, responsible contributions from knowledgeable professionals in universities, hospitals, clinics, old age homes, suicide prevention centers, funeral directors and others, concerned with thanatology and the impact of death on individuals and the human community. *OMEGA* is a rigorously peer-refereed journal.

Meanwhile, ADEC, the Association of Death Education and Counseling, is holding its 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference in Hollywood in 2013. Its theme: "Reframing Images of Grief: Identity Transformation Through Loss."

The issue of death education seems to have faded into the background. But we have found an interesting story from the past involving Columbine High School, the site of the massacre in April, 1999. It seems that back in 1985, Tara Becker, a student from Columbine High, went to a pro-family conference in Colorado to tell the attendees about death education at the school and the effect it had on her. Jayne Schindler, who heard Tara's testimony, reported:

Tara brought with her a booklet she had helped to compile for one of her school classes. This booklet was called "Masquerade" and was full of subliminal pictures and prose. Tara explained how she had been taught to use the hidden, double meaning, subliminals and how she had focused so much of her time and attention on death that she, herself, had tried to commit suicide.

A video was made of Tara's testimony and distributed nationwide by Eagle Forum. The video was aired on British television, and *The Atlantic Monthly* did a feature story based on it. The producers at 20/20 saw the video and decided to do a segment on death education which was aired in 1990.

Schindler writes, "Tara explained that the subject of death was integrated into many of the courses at her high school. She said that death was made to look glamorous, that living was hard, and that reincarnation would solve their problems. Students were told that they would always return to a much better life form. They would return to the 'Oversoul' and become like God.

"After one of the students at her school committed suicide, a 'suicide talking day' was held and every class was to talk about death. Class assignments were for students to write their own obituaries and suicide notes. They were told to trust their own judgment in choosing whether to live or die."

So Tara began to think of suicide as a means of solving some of her problems. She thought of liberating her spirit from enslavement to her body. She says she also wanted to die to help relieve the planet of overpopulation. These were a few of the crazy thoughts put into her head by her "educators." God knows what kind of equally crazy thoughts were put into the heads of the two killers at Columbine. But if you read the diaries of the two killers, you will conclude that the idea of the "Oversoul" would have definitely appealed to them.

Fortunately, Tara survived death education at Columbine High and lived to talk about it. But thousands of students have committed suicide all across America and no one in Washington has even bothered to hold a hearing on the subject. It is now assumed that teenage suicide is as natural as burgers and fries. It's just one of those things that teenagers now do in America.

But what seems to be happening as death education becomes more and more sophisticated is that many of these teenagers with the suicidal urge now want to take some of their teachers and classmates with them. After all, reincarnation is an equal opportunity concept. It's for everybody.

Incidentally, the National Education Association played an active role in promoting death education. One death educator wrote in the March 1973 issue of the *NEA Journal*: "Death by its very nature involves science and medicine, social studies and sociology, psychology, history, art, literature, music, insurance, and law."

Thus, death education can easily be integrated into any subject and permits classroom discussion concerning "the moral and ethical issues of abortion and euthanasia, and the spiritual and religious aspects of death and afterlife." The article ends with this justification for teaching about death:

(bit) Subject matter for today's education must have universality, must be intrinsically interesting, must be intellectually challenging, must have both personal and social relevance, and must prepare students for life. We believe that teaching about death meets these criteria. (eit)

In short, teaching about death is supposed to prepare students for life. And so, the decision to introduce death education into the public school curriculum was made without consultation with parents who have become quite irrelevant in these matters.

In another article in the *NEA Journal* of September 1976, the author, an English teacher at a high school in Wyoming, wrote: "The highlight of the course was our visit to a mortuary and cemetery. . . . Afterwards . . . a boy stated, 'The visit to the graveyard and funeral home really blew my head, and I had to talk and think about death.'" And another student commented: "After discussing it with others, death didn't seem like such a terrible happening." That's the mind-change that can lead to death seduction.

Not unexpectedly, the National Education Association played an important and active role in promoting death education. It pioneered in the development of sensitivity training and values clarification by sponsoring the National Training Laboratory, founded in 1948 at Bethel, Maine. It has promoted death education by sponsoring the writing and publication of *Death and Dying Education* by Prof. Richard O. Ulin of the University of Massachusetts. The book includes an 18-week syllabus for the death educator.

In addition, death education is promoted in a book on Health Education published by the NEA as part of a series of books entitled *Education in the 80's*. There is a chapter in that volume entitled "Death Education Comes of Age" by Kathleen Hoyt Middleton. Ms. Middleton writes:

(bit) In the 1980's the subject of death and dying will become an accepted and essential aspect of the health education curriculum. . . . Journals such as *Death Education* and *Omega* can be helpful in keeping up-to-date on the issues. . . . Funeral directors in many communities are also becoming more concerned with their role as educator. (eit)

Ms. Middleton is the author of *A Conceptual Approach to Death and Dying Education*, a complete curriculum for junior high. She was also Director of Curriculum, School Health Education Project, part of the National Center for Health Education.

Death educators have long been aware that fear of the subject among teachers had to be overcome. An article in *Phi Delta Kappan* of March 1974 explained:

(bit) It is considerably easier to know something about sex education as an adult than it is to have experience with one's own death. But at least we do possess value-clarification precedents in approaching the subject of death. We have the rich experience now of sensitizing adults to racial and economic discrimination, sex stereotyping, and other human relations problems. It should be possible to apply some of the strategies used in those earlier inservice efforts to the topic of death and dying. No administrator should be surprised to find that his staff is afraid of handling this topic. When he considers that research studies reveal similar fears among medical practitioners and even prospective funeral directors. . . . Surely the topic is too important to be kept in the morgue any longer. (eit)

And so, out of the morgue and into the classroom! By now we've had about forty years of death education in the schools, and the subject has metastasized throughout the entire curriculum.

Thanatology, the study of death and dying, has become a subject of growing professional interest. You can earn a degree in Thanatology at the National Center for Death Education. ADEC also provides certification for teachers of death and dying. Their annual conferences have turned into extravaganzas of death and dying fellowship. This is their vision statement:

(bit) The Association for Death Education and Counseling® envisions a world in which dying, death and bereavement are recognized as fundamental and significant aspects of the human experience. Therefore, the Association, ever committed to being on the forefront of thanatology (the study of death and dying), will provide a home for professionals from diverse backgrounds to advance the body of knowledge and to promote practical applications of research and theory. (eit)

Their 34<sup>th</sup> annual conference, which was held in Atlanta in March 2012, featured many speakers who had much to say about the subject. Here are a few of the topics: “Guided Imagery: Promoting Continuing Bonds with Children.” “Teaching Death and Dying: Combatting the Challenges of Two Pedagogies.” “Soul Soothers: Psalms of Lament in a Hurting World.” “Understanding the Needs of Grieving College Students.” “Healing Presence: A Rural Child Bereavement Program.” “Using Guided Imagery to Heal Traumatic Grief Reactions.” “African-Centered Approach to Death Education.” “When Youth of Color Loses a Peer.” “Children and Grief: Theories, Skill and Interventions for the Grief Counselor.” You can read the titles of all their conference sessions on their website.

Now that death education has become a permanent part of the public school curriculum, it has taken a back seat to APEC’s overall promotion of thanatology, which has become a respected subject of academic interest. Whenever there is a school shooting or a teen suicide there is always a certified grief counselor ready and able to do his or her job. What can parents do? They’ve never been able to get rid of sex education, no matter how much they’ve tried, and they will never be able to get rid of death ed. That’s the simple, unvarnished truth.

## **Chapter Eleven**

### **How Suicide Ed Killed a Child**

Had eight-year-old Stephen Nalepa not been shown a film about suicide in his second-grade class on March 23, 1990, he would now be a young adult and probably enjoying life. But, apparently, the educators at his elementary school decided to show this highly emotional film to their second-graders just to see what would happen.

After all, the school had adopted Professor Benjamin Bloom's humanist educational objectives as outlined in his curriculum bible, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, 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.

What an intriguing idea: Just one hour of the right humanist lesson might completely change a child's behavior forever. Maybe that's what the educators were thinking when they embarked on their experiment to see what would happen to these eight-year-olds if they were shown this film on suicide. The *Detroit News* of 3/27/90 described exactly what happened:

An 8-year-old boy hanged himself on 3/24/90 in Canton, Michigan, one day after seeing a film on suicides shown to his class. Stephen Nalepa was found by his brother Jason about 9:30 p.m., Saturday, dangling by a belt from his bunk bed, his feet barely an inch off the floor.

Stephen's shocked parents, Larry and Debby Nalepa, said their son's hanging may have been an accident inspired by a movie on suicides shown to his class Friday at Gallimore Elementary School in Canton....

Three officials at Plymouth-Canton Community Schools said they had never heard of the movie and refused to comment.

What was Stephen like? Was he neurotic or depressed? He had an IQ of 130 (100 is the norm), was an outgoing child, played soccer and basketball, collected baseball cards, and took art and music lessons. In other words, he was a perfectly normal American boy who did not expect the school to perform experiments on him that would lead to his death.

On November 8, 1990, the Nalepas filed a wrongful death cause of action in Wayne County Circuit Court against the parties involved in the production, distribution, and showing of the film, entitled *Nobody's Useless: Encyclopedia Britannica* (distributor), Osmond Productions (producer), the Wayne Oakland Library Federation (which obtained the film from defendant Wayne County Intermediate School District, and which distributed the film to the Plymouth-Canton Community Schools), the Plymouth-Canton School Board, Dr. Jacqueline Hisey (school psychologist), Shirley Spaniel (executive director of elementary education), Jane Armstrong (Stephen's teacher), Norma Foster and Alice Brown (second-grade teachers who showed the film to the three second-grade classes). The Nalepas' attorneys requested a trial by jury but were denied it by the court.

Curiously enough, the Plymouth-Canton schools had adopted Professor Bloom's Outcome Based Education and Mastery Learning in 1982. Did the educators read *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* so that they could implement Bloom's ideas? The Nalepas' attorneys had obtained an affidavit from another parent whose son saw the same film. The parent testified:

Shortly thereafter, my daughter Janie telephoned me at work and said that Jimmy had just tried to kill himself by climbing on top of the freezer in the basement, tying a noose around his neck and pretending to jump. When I came home and asked why Jimmy had done this, he said because the boy did it in the movie Jimmy had seen at school.

An affidavit from Encyclopedia Britannica stated that the film was released for distribution in 1980 and that by 1990 it had been shown to at least 1,800,000 children without a claim ever having been made by anyone against the distributor. Just because nobody filed a claim doesn't mean that many of those children who saw the film didn't suffer traumas of one sort or another.

How did the educators defend themselves? After the judge dismissed the case against Encyclopedia Britannica, the teachers' attorneys argued:

Allowing the civil action to continue and/or the imposition of civil damages against these Defendants would violate the right of free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of

the United States Constitution.... The complaint filed by Plaintiffs herein alleges duties that resemble teacher malpractice and not those dealing with personal injury proximately caused by a teacher.... However ... Michigan law does not recognize teacher malpractice as a theory of recovery.

On November 9, 1992, Judge Turner dismissed all of the complaints against all of the defendants. He wrote in a semi-literate opinion:

Although defendants herein owed plaintiffs' decedent a duty of reasonable care, as a matter of law that duty did not include an obligation to view and thereafter decline to exhibit the subject film based on the contingency that a student might resultingly commit suicide.

The judge also agreed with the defendants that they were protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution. Of course, the Nalepas were devastated by the judge's opinion and took the case to the Court of Appeals. But they had a problem obtaining documents from the educators, such as the teachers' lesson plans. The reason? The teachers destroyed them. Indeed, Stephen's own teacher, Jane Armstrong, testified at her deposition that she had destroyed her lesson plan book for the 1989-1990 school year. She had no recollection of what was in her lesson plan for the day the film was shown, March 23, 1990. If she was so innocent of wrongdoing, why did she destroy her lesson plan book, the day-by-day record of her entire year's work, and why couldn't she remember anything about the day the film was shown?

Finally, on November 23, 1994, four years after Stephen's death, the Court of Appeals announced its decision. It dismissed the Nalepas' case against all of the defendants. The court had decided that the school district and the superintendent were "entitled to absolute governmental immunity from tort liability when acting within the scope of their authority.... The film dealt with mental health issues, about which our state has evinced a concern." The court's opinion further stated:

The rationale for declining to recognize claims of teacher malpractice stems from the collaborative nature of the teaching process.... Even where the chain of causation is

complete and direct, recovery may sometimes be denied on grounds of public policy because ... allowance of recovery would enter a field that has no sensible or just stopping point.

Further, we conclude that recognizing the cause of action could lead to a flood of litigation which would be detrimental to our already overburdened educational system.... Finally we do not wish to embroil our courts into overseeing the day-to-day operations of our schools.

In other words, “parents beware,” because the educators can do just about anything they want with your children and you will have no recourse in the court system. Indeed, the Nalepa case provides homeschoolers with a very strong argument against any government regulation or oversight of their children’s home education. If educators have absolute governmental immunity from tort liability, it would be risky for homeschoolers to have anything to do with such educators.

On Saturday morning, March 24, 1990, the last day of his life, Stephen Nalepa was tested to see if he qualified for the talented and gifted program. Terri Michaelis, the program coordinator, provided an account of how Stephen behaved. She wrote:

Mrs. Nalepa also asked me to comment on my recollection of Stephen during the testing on March 24th. I picked up the students at the front of the school. Stephen first came to my attention when I called the roll from my list to see if I had everyone I should. Stephen corrected my mispronunciation of his last name self-confidently. He sat directly in front of my desk. He was active during testing with a lot of moving in his seat during the test. There were three short breaks while testing, during which he moved about with others and chatted at my desk. He tried hard and seemed to want to do well. He finished the test. The whole group left chatting and my memory is that Stephen was glad the test was over and as eager as the rest of the group to go home and play on a sunny Saturday. My memory of Stephen is that of a bright energetic second grader.

Despite all that the courts did to clear the teachers of any wrongdoing, the Nalepas know that if Stephen had not been shown that film by his teacher on March 23, 1990, he'd be alive today.

## **Chapter Twelve**

### **The Making of the Black Underclass**

Why Is there a Black Underclass in America? Why, after over 140 years of freedom from slavery and the benefits of compulsory, universal education, do we find in every large American city thousands of blacks who live in poverty, are functionally illiterate and engaged in drug trafficking, gang violence, and crime?

Why is there such a phenomenon as an “underclass” in today’s technologically advanced America with so many people living without hope in this land of opportunity? Wasn’t universal

education supposed to lift up the African-American to the same standard of economic prosperity as the white? Theoretically, that is what should have happened. But it didn't. Why?

Census statistics on illiteracy provide some clues. In 1890, illiteracy among African-Americans over the age of 10 was 57.1 percent. In 1900, it was 44.5 percent. In 1910 it was 30.4 percent. And by 1920 it was down to 22.9 percent. Among white Americans only 2.0 percent were illiterate.

In other words, great strides in literacy were being made among African-Americans from 1890 to 1920. According to the 1920 Census, the percentage of illiterates among African-Americans ranged from 38.5 percent in Louisiana to 2.9 percent in New York. The Census of 1930 showed an even greater improvement in literacy among African-Americans.

In 1930, illiteracy among African-Americans in the urban population was 9.2 percent; in the rural population 23.2 percent; in the rural non-farm population, 20.5 percent. That same 1930 Census revealed that 4,283,753 of a total population of 122,774,046 Americans, or less than 4 percent, were considered illiterate.

But if we move fast-forward 63 years to 1993 we find a U.S. Government report revealing that 90 million American adults can barely read or write! Indeed, it is estimated that 50 percent of African-Americans today are functionally illiterate! What happened in the interim to produce this literacy catastrophe? Two things: (1) The progressives adopted the racial policies of the Eugenics movement, which declared African-Americans racially inferior and relegated them to a non-academic, manual education. And (2) the progressives denigrated high individualistic literacy created by intensive phonics in favor of collectivist social goals.

The great tragedy is that African-Americans had made great educational advances in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. But from 1950 onward began the great slide into academic failure for many African-Americans.

The acclaimed film, *The Great Debaters*, dramatically tells the story of black academic achievement in the racially segregated South of the 1930s. It reveals how education was stressed as the way out of poverty and ignorance. Indeed, the increase in African-American

literacy and intellectual development during that period produced a vibrant culture of great writers and readers. But the film doesn't provide a clue as to why that process of educational advance was stopped and reversed.

As we now know, it all started in 1898 when John Dewey, leader of the Progressive Education movement, advocated moving education away from individualistic high literacy in favor of social collectivism. He was able to get his fellow educators to accept a completely new educational philosophy based on collectivism and socialism. And it was understood among them that a decline in individual-centered literacy was essential in carrying out their plan for a new collectivist society in America.

Indeed, it was Professor G. Stanley Hall, a leading progressive educator and mentor to John Dewey, who wrote in defense of illiteracy in 1911:

Very many men have lived and died and been great, even the 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 of it practical. Moreover, they escape much eye-strain and mental excitement, and, other things being equal, are probably more active and less sedentary. . . . 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.

And 70 years later, in 1981, we find Harvard Professor Anthony Oettinger telling an audience of communications executives:

The present "traditional" concept of literacy has to do with the ability to read and write. . . . 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?

Ironically, young blacks have developed a new oral expression to compensate for their lack of literacy. It's called Rap!

Of all Americans affected by this change in educational philosophy, African-Americans have suffered the most. They have had a much more difficult time adjusting to the new curriculum and teaching methods than any other group. As a result, a great negative gap has grown between the academic achievements of African-Americans and their white compatriots.

Frustrated and discouraged by their inability to learn to read, many African-American high-schoolers drop out and wind up on the streets. They form gangs and angrily take their revenge on society by anti-social, criminal behavior which lands them in jail.

The simple truth is that American public education deliberately prevents many black students from succeeding academically. In an article on Black Education Failure, Professor Walter Williams writes:

SAT scores confirm the poor education received by blacks. In 2009, average SAT reading test scores were: whites (528), Asians (516) and blacks (429). In math it was whites (536), Asians (587) and blacks (426). Twelve years of fraudulent primary and secondary education received by most blacks are not erased by four or five years of college.

This is evidenced by examination scores taken for admission to graduate schools. In 2007, Graduate Record Examination verbal scores were: whites (493), Asians (485) and blacks (395). The math portion scores were: whites (562), Asians (617) and blacks (419). Scores on the LSAT in 2006, for admission to law school, were: whites (152), Asians (152) and blacks (142). In 2010, MCAT scores for admission to medical schools were: whites (26), Asians (26) and blacks (21).

Liberal black politicians, who generally do whatever the liberal-progressive utopians want, have not addressed the problem of declining black literacy. The few conservative blacks who know what is going on have little influence on the politically correct black leadership. Yet, films like



Waiting for Superman, which movingly depict the agony black parents go through in trying to get their children into Charter Schools, seems to have had little impact on the educational establishment. Williams writes:

The education establishment's solution is always more money; however, according to a *Washington Post* article (4/6/2008), "The Real Cost of Public Schools," written by Andrew J. Coulson, if we include its total operating budget, teacher retirement, capital budget and federal funding, the D.C. public schools spend \$24,600 per student.

Washington's fraudulent black education is by no means unique; it's duplicated in one degree or another in most of our major cities. However, there is a glimmer of hope in the increasing demand for charter schools and educational vouchers. This movement is being fought tooth and nail by an education establishment that fears the competition and subsequent threats to their employment. . . .

The fact that black youngsters trail their white counterparts by three or four years becomes even more grim when we recognize that the education white youngsters receive is nothing to write home about.

What is needed in the black community is for some leader to realize that the only way out of the underclass is through high literacy. And that can be achieved by teaching all black children to read by intensive, systematic phonics. It can be done if the will is there to do it.

Concerning the cultural causes of the underclass, British former prison doctor and psychiatrist Theodore Dalrymple writes in his book, *Life at the Bottom*:

I have little hesitation in saying that the mental, cultural, emotional, and spiritual impoverishment of the Western underclass is the greatest of any large group of people I have ever encountered anywhere. . . . [P]atterns of behavior emerge—in the case of the underclass, almost entirely self-destructive ones. Day after day I hear of the same

violence, the same neglect and abuse of children, the same broken relationships, the same victimization by crime, the same nihilism, the same dumb despair.

It will come as no surprise to American readers, perhaps, to learn that the majority of the British underclass is white, and that it demonstrates all the same social pathology as the black underclass in America—for very similar reasons of course.

Dalrymple places the blame for the moral depravity of the underclass on the intellectual elite, the intelligentsia, who promoted among themselves the tantalizing idea of free love and moral relativism. These ideas have filtered down to average Americans mainly through their secularized culture and education. He writes:

But intellectuals in the twentieth century sought to free our sexual relations of all social, contractual, or moral obligation and meaning whatsoever, so that henceforth only raw sexual desire itself would count in our decision making.

That's why the kids need condoms! He comments:

Where fashion in clothes, bodily adornment, and music are concerned, it is the underclass that increasingly sets the pace. Never before has there been so much downward cultural aspiration. . . . Each day my faith in the ability of human beings comprehensively to ruin their lives is renewed. . . . Truly, the ways of human misery are infinite.

Words of wisdom from a close observer of the underclass. Their nihilism comes from the schools they attended. Without religious belief from their educators to imbue their existence with transcendent meaning, their lives have become void of any spiritual meaning. If anyone believes that there are no evil consequences to removing God and biblical morality from the schools, there is more than enough misery in the underclass to prove otherwise.

## **Chapter Thirteen**

### **Eugenics and the Making of the Black Underclass**

#### ***Eugenics: the Skeleton in the Progressive Closet***

One of the evil fruits of the tree of evolution is the idea of eugenics, the notion that human beings can be bred to perfection by the same methods used to breed perfect cattle. Since evolution itself reduces men to the level of animal, it is not surprising that eugenics was adopted by many in the educational elite as the means of solving man's social problems. But eugenics in itself poses a problem: what do we mean by human perfection, and whose definition of perfection shall be adopted?

The founder of the eugenics movement, Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911), cousin of Charles Darwin, found his model of 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 created an anthropometric laboratory in 1884 for the measurement of man, with the hope that by means of tests he could single out those individuals who should survive. However, Galton realized 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 in Germany. It was there that Cattell conducted his reaction-time experiments which became the "scientific" basis for teaching children to read by the whole-word method. Cattell spent the next two years working in Galton's lab at Cambridge University where he used experimental techniques to investigate the mental differences among normal individuals. He coined the term "mental test." Cattell used Galton's framework of physical and physiological anthropometry in which to conduct his experiments on individual differences.

Born in 1860, Cattell graduated in 1880 from Lafayette College (Easton, Penn.) 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 was the first American to study at Leipzig under Prof. Wundt, and he encouraged Cattell to get his doctorate under Wundt at Leipzig.

After completing his studies in Germany and his experiments at 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. He trained many young psychologists who then fanned out across American academia to teach the new gospel of psychology. In 1904, Cattell arranged for his friend John Dewey to come to Columbia as professor of philosophy.

At Teachers College, Cattell's star pupil was Edward L. Thorndike, who espoused the principles of eugenics and became America's leading educational psychologist. He devised 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. Socialist Dewey wrote 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.

Inherent in Dewey's creed is the notion that individual human worth is determined by social usefulness, a concept taught today in lifeboat survival exercises.

This was clearly the educational philosophy of a collectivist state, not a Constitutional republic in which the purpose of government is to secure the God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of the individual. The purpose of education in a free society is to provide the individual with the skills needed to make his way in the adult world, not to determine where he can be "of most service."

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.

Eugenics conferences were held in the United States to spread the new spirit of scientific racism within academia. G. Stanley Hall, who had become president of Clark University (Worcester, Mass.) in 1889, encouraged his students 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 this 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 determined 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 rare inferior to that of the white can be proved 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 a sure sign of mental inferiority!

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 Margaret Sanger, Gifford Pinchot, David Starr-Jordan, Charles M. Eliot, Emma Goldman, and such conservatives as Herbert Hoover and Charles Davenport. Sanger was motivated by her belief in eugenics to start the birth-control movement.

The eugenics movement persuaded Congress to pass new immigration laws to curtail the influx of "inferior" peoples from Eastern and Southern Europe. 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.

It was this philosophy of government which enabled Congress to pass Prohibition, which made it illegal to drink alcoholic beverages. And we all know what a social disaster Prohibition turned out to be. Likewise, Mayor Bloomberg of New York believes that it is government’s highest duty to determine what people should be allowed to eat. Sounds benign and sensible to a statist. But nothing in our Constitution gives government such powers to interfere with an individual’s eating habits.

Among the members of the Eugenics General Committee were Herbert Hoover, Gifford Pinchot, Robert M. Yerkes, and Edward L. Thorndike, who was then chairman of the psychology department at Teachers College, Columbia.

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 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 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 advertisement for "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro" by Marion J. Mayo. And at the National Education Association convention 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 differences in the gains made by very intellectual pupils . . . and average pupils taking identical programs, and is less than the difference in 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 education 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 and 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, Edward L. 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 by 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.” These are the monstrous ideas that those who reject the benign influence of God in the lives of human beings substitute for so-called educational purposes.

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 chose 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 leadefrs 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 the twentieth-century educational theory and together established the frame of referenced in which their contemporaries and successors were to work.

In other words, the two most important influences in modern American education were a eugenicist and a socialist, two radical utopians, and today’s public schools reflect their influences. They were the educators who deliberately engineered the decline of literacy in America. Their colleagues in crime included James McKeen Cattell, G. Stanley Hall, Arthur I. Gates, Charles Judd, William Scott Gray, and Edmund Burke Huey—a combination of eugenicists and progressive socialists.

John Dewey provided the educational philosophy and the dumbing-down plan that justified the shift from intellectual training to socialization. Cattell’s reaction-time experiments in Wundt’s Leipzig laboratories provided the supposedly scientific basis for the change from phonics to look-say. He was also Francis Galton’s prize disciple. Edmund Burke Huey, a pupil of G. Stanley

Hall's, wrote the "authoritative" book advocating the change in reading instruction (*The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading*, 1908). Thorndike provided the new stimulus-response technique of conditioning as the new classroom methodology. His protégé, Arthur Gates, actually edited the new readers for the Macmillan Company. Charles 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.

These are the men whose utopian ideas have ruined American public education. They have led to the creation of millions of functional illiterates and a nation of dummies. Unfortunately, the system cannot be returned to what it was before the progressives took control of it. Neither the public nor the politicians have the knowledge or the will needed to reform the system. Thus it is up to the parents to either homeschool their children or provide them with the kind of education they want in a private school. Charter schools are public schools, and to what degree they are free to create an academic curriculum that produces high literacy is still questionable. Those who issue the charters have the power to determine curriculum.

But there is no doubt that liberal utopians have done a job on the black community. They adhere to the Democratic Party which keeps the whole criminal enterprise in place. Ignorance of political reality will keep blacks in the underclass for the foreseeable future.

## **Chapter Fourteen**

### **The Sight Vocabulary And How It Damages the Brain**

In writing my book, *The New Illiterates*, in which I did a painstaking, line-by-line analysis of the Dick and Jane reading program, I came to the conclusion that anyone taught to read exclusively by that sight-word method was at risk of becoming dyslexic. Requiring a child to memorize a sight vocabulary, in my estimation, was putting that child on the high road to dyslexia, especially because it forced the child to use the right brain to perform a left-brain function.

The fact that the human brain is divided into two hemispheres, with specialized functions in

each hemisphere, has become the subject of intense study among brain scientists, particularly those concerned with the issue of dyslexia. Stanislas Dehaene writes (p. 209):

Literacy drastically changes the brain--literally!...The literate brain obviously engages many more left-hemispheric resources than the illiterate brain--even when we only *listen* to speech. Most strikingly, literacy did not only alter brain activity during language listening tasks, but also affected the anatomy of the brain. The rear part of the corpus callosum, which links the parietal regions of both hemispheres had thickened in the literate subjects. This macroscopic finding implies a massive increase in the exchange of information across the two hemispheres--perhaps explaining the remarkable increase in verbal memory span in literates.

So we know that literacy has a positive affect on brain development. But what does dyslexia do to the non-reader's brain? Dehaene writes:

The comparison of the dyslexic with their respective control groups reveal a clear anomaly. A whole chunk of their left temporal lobe was insufficiently active. Furthermore, this reduced brain activity was observed at the same location and to the same degree for all three nationalities....[T]he left temporal lobe seems to be systematically disorganized....This decrease in temporal lobe activity was found in adults who had suffered from lifelong reading deficits. But reduced activity can also be seen in young dyslexic children aged from eight to 12 years old.

Using the right brain to perform a left-brain function causes cognitive confusion, which is viewed in the left brain as being disorganized. And it is the learning of the sight vocabulary which causes this symbolic and cognitive confusion and left-brain disorganization. Learning an alphabetic system is the function of the left temporal lobe, and memorizing a sight vocabulary thwarts that function. That is why, in *The New Illiterates*, I called a sight vocabulary "the Thalidomide of primary education." It does to the brain what the drug did to the fetus that emerged from the womb without arms.

Several years ago, I had a demonstration of how easy it is to turn a perfectly normal child into a budding dyslexic. A father, in his early forties, brought his 5-year-old kindergartner to me for an evaluation. The boy had had ear infections which the parents thought might interfere with his learning to read. He had some difficulty distinguishing m's and n's, and his teacher said that the boy "wasn't catching on." Previously, the parents had signed a statement that they would make sure that the child did the homework assigned by the teacher.

The boy's pediatrician recommended that the child be core evaluated. At a core evaluation, teachers, counselors, and psychologists discuss what's wrong with the child with the parents. They then recommend an individualized learning program. The father had heard about me and wanted my advice about the need or desirability of a core evaluation. Having served as a teacher in a private school for children with learning and behavioral problems, I had participated in several core evaluations and was familiar with the process. But I wanted to meet the child and judge for myself whether or not he needed any kind of core evaluation.

The 5-year-old turned out to be very friendly and from all appearances perfectly normal. First, I wanted to see if he could learn to read by intensive phonics. He was able to recite the alphabet but he had not yet learned the letter sounds, and his ability to identify all of the letters correctly required more work on his part. This was quite normal for a 5-year-old.

But I wanted to demonstrate to his father that the boy was quite capable of learning to read by phonics. So I turned to Lesson One in my Alpha-Phonics book and I explained to the youngster that the letter *a* stood for a short *a*, which I then articulated quite distinctly. I asked the boy to repeat the sound, which he did. Then I pointed to the letter *m* and told the boy that the letter *m* stood for the "mmm" sound. And the boy was able to repeat the "mmm" with no problem. I then demonstrated that when we put the short *a* together with the "mmm" we get the word "am."

I then introduced the letter *n* and its sound, "nnn." The boy repeated the sound quite nicely. I then joined the short *a* with the "nnn" to create the word "an." The boy repeated the word. I

told him that *an* was a word and asked him if he had ever used it. He said no. So I told him to listen to me, and I said, “I have *an* apple.” He got the message.

Meanwhile, through all of this he sat on his dad’s lap and was smiling happily. I went through the rest of the consonants in the lesson: s, t, and x, showed how the words as, at, and ax were composed of two sounds, articulated the sounds, had him repeat them and demonstrated their use in short sentences. I asked him if he knew what an ax was. He did.

The purpose of the lesson was to show this anxious father that his son was quite capable of learning to read by phonics, emphasizing that it required patience and repetition. Repetition, the use of flashcards, were needed to produce automaticity--the development of a phonetic reflex. I did not think that the boy’s hearing problem was even a problem. I was sure that his pronunciations would improve as he learned to read phonetically and that his very minor problem with *m* and *n* would clear up as he became a reader.

The father then showed me the papers his son had brought home from school. The math papers were simple counting exercises. There was also an exercise in categorizing. One exercise, which was supposed to test the youngster’s ability to follow instructions, was somewhat confusing and got the child a failing grade in the exercise. That upset the father.

But what really perked my interest was the Dolch list of basic sight words which the child was required to memorize. The teacher had given the child this list of 90 words which were to be memorized with the help of the parent--five words per week, from January to June. The first week’s words were: *a, the, yellow, black, zero*. Second week’s words: *and, away, big, blue, can*. Third week: *come, down, find, for, funny*. Fourth week: *go, help, here, I, in*. And so on. Now, the child had hardly learned the alphabet and was not aware that letters stood for sounds. So why was he being given this arbitrary list of words to memorize by sight? Most of the words were perfectly regular in spelling and could have easily been learned in the context of a phonics reading program. Did the teacher realize that she was in the process of turning this child into a dyslexic? Once this child left her kindergarten class, she would probably never see him again.

E. W. Dolch was a professor of education in the early 1920s who composed a list of the most frequently used words in English. It was thought that if children learned several hundred of these words by sight, that is, by whole-word recognition, before they even knew the alphabet or the letter sounds, they would have a jumping head start in learning to read.

But what Dolch didn't realize is that once the child began to automatically look at English printed words as whole configurations, like Chinese characters, or little pictures, the child would develop a whole-word or holistic reflex or habit, which would then become a block against seeing our alphabetic words in their phonetic structure. And that blockage would cause the symptoms of what is known as dyslexia.

You might ask, what is a reflex? A reflex is a quick, automatic, habitual response to stimuli. There are two sorts of reflexes: unlearned (unconditioned) and learned (conditioned). An unlearned reflex is innately physical, such as the automatic reaction of our eyes when we go from daylight into a dark tunnel. The response is automatic and thus unlearned. A learned reflex is the kind we develop through habitual use, for example, in learning to drive. When we see a red light ahead, we automatically apply our foot to the brake pedal. We do this without thinking, in the middle of a conversation, or on a cell-phone, or listening to the radio. That's a learned reflex.

A learned reflex is not easy to unlearn. For example, an American who rents a car in England, where they drive on the left side of the road, must suppress his right-drive reflex if he is to avoid a head-on collision. In that case, the American driver can no longer rely on his normal reflexes, and must think about every move he makes while driving. Likewise, when an American pedestrian in London wants to cross a road with heavy traffic, he habitually looks to the left, but in London he must look to the right to avoid being hit by one of those huge double-decker buses.

That learning to read involved the development of conditioned reflexes was well known by the professors of reading, especially when teaching a child to read by the sight method. Professor



Walter Dearborn of Harvard University, wrote in 1940:

The principle which we have used to explain the acquisition of a sight vocabulary is, of course, the one suggested by Pavlov's well-known experiments on the conditioned response. This is as it should be. The basic process involved in conditioning and in learning to read is the same....

In order to obtain the best results from the use of the conditioning technique, the substitute stimulus must either immediately precede, or occur simultaneously with, the adequate stimulus. As we have explained before, the substitute stimulus in the case of learning to read is the word seen and the adequate stimulus is the word heard. (School and Society, 10/19/40, p. 368)

And so, it was well understood by the professors of reading that in learning to read, it was necessary to develop automaticity, a reflex. But the correct reflex to develop in learning to read an alphabetic writing system is a phonetic reflex, which comes about by learning the letter sounds and being drilled sufficiently in the consonant-vowel combinations so that the learner can see the phonetic structure of a word and can automatically sound out a multi-syllabic word by articulating each syllabic unit. In other words, the child automatically associates the letters with sounds. When that phonetic reflex is acquired, reading becomes easy, fluent, enjoyable, and accurate.

## **Chapter Fifteen**

### **How Do Children Learn a Sight Vocabulary?**

#### **Any Way They Can!**

While we know how children learn to read phonetically, no one seems to know how children learn a sight vocabulary. Indeed, teaching children to read in the 20th and 31st centuries by a method preceding the invention of the alphabet does not make sense. After all, alphabetic writing has tremendous advantages over the older forms of writing. For the first time man had an accurate, precise means of transcribing the spoken word directly into written form. It was the most revolutionary invention in all of history. It did away with hieroglyphic and ideographic

writing and accelerated the speed of intellectual development and the expansion of vocabulary, thus expanding knowledge and brain power. It also made learning to read simple and available to the population as a whole.

In light of these advantages, it seems strange that professors of education in the early twentieth century would decide to teach American children to read English as if it were an ideographic writing system. How could you possibly teach children to read that way? To a logical mind the whole idea seems not only absurd but insane. Yet, that is what the professors did, and what most primary school teachers continue to do today.

Essentially, the sight method works as follows: the child is given a sight vocabulary to memorize. He or she is taught to look and say the words without knowing that the letters stand for sounds. As far as the learner is concerned, the letters are a bunch of arbitrary squiggles arranged in some arbitrary, haphazard order. The learner's task is to see a picture in the configuration of the whole word--to make the word *horse* look like a horse.

Of course, the word *horse* does not look like a horse. So how does a child remember that the word is horse? Anyway he can. There isn't a professor of education anywhere in the world who can tell you how a child learns a sight vocabulary. The only research we know of that addressed that question was done by Josephine H. Bowden at the elementary school of the University of Chicago around 1912. A description of the studies was given by Prof. Walter F. Dearborn in 1914 as follows:

In the first study the pupils, who had had no instruction in reading, were taught by a word method without the use of phonics and the problem was to determine by what means the children actually recognized and differentiated words when left to their own devices. The following quotation indicates the methods employed by the experimenter: "First, incidents; for example, one day when the child was given the cards to read from, it was observed that she read with equal ease whether the card was right side up or upside down. This incident suggested a test which was later given. Second, comments of the child; for example, when she was asked to find in the context the word 'shoes,'

she said that 'dress' looked so much like 'shoes' that she was afraid she would make a mistake. Third, questioning; for example, she had trouble to distinguish between 'sing' and 'song.' When she had mastered the words she was asked how she knew which was which. Her reply was, 'by the looks.' When questioned further she put her finger on the 'i' and the 'o.' These three types of evidence correspond to introspection with the adult. The fourth type of evidence is a comparison of the words learned as to the parts of speech, geometric form, internal form, and length. Fifth, misreading; for example, 'dogs' was read 'twigs,' and 'feathers,' 'fur.' Sixth, mutilations; for example, 'dogs' was printed 'digs,' 'lilac' was written 'lalci.'"

Some of the conclusions may be cited, first as regards the kind of words most easily learned on the basis of word forms. Four out of six children learned more "linear" words, *i.e.*, words like "acorns," "saw," in which there are no high letters, than of any other group. In but one case were the "superlinear" words more easily recognized....

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 (which again controverts Messmer's findings); 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 [only] two children noticing any difference. The word seems to be recognized as a whole, and as the author notes, recognized upside down just as the child would recognize a toy upside down.

The general conclusions of the study may be quoted:

"The comments and the questions, as well as the misreading, 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 words. That he does not work out phonics for himself comes out quite clearly in the transposition test. Furthermore, only once did a child divide a word even into its syllables. There is some evidence that the child is conscious of the letter, except in the of "E," who so analyzed the word "six." Sometimes, when the child seemed to have made a letter analysis, he failed to recognize the word a second time, and in some cases did not learn it at all."

And so, it was obvious to the professors as far back as 1914 that the sight method was a totally horrendous, inaccurate, inefficient and illogical way of teaching a child to read. And despite Dr. Orton's warning in 1929 that the sight method would harm many children, they proceeded to put their new reading programs in all the schools of America.

The writers of the new look-say reading programs realized that they had to beef up their sight-vocabulary primers with a battery of "word recognition strategies." They provided configuration clues: putting sight words in frames; picture clues: loading the page with illustrations depicting the words; context clues: inane stories in which the word could be easily guessed on the basis of context; and phonetic clues: teaching initial and final consonant sounds to reduce the ridiculousness of some of the guesses.

It is important to note that teaching phonetic clues is not the same as teaching intensive, systematic phonics. The latter helps the child acquire an automatic association of letters and sounds and teaches blending. The former provides phonetic information that is stored in the brain and requires effort to retrieve. Learning an isolated consonant sound without knowing the other sounds in the word makes no sense at all.

That this sight method of teaching reading can cause the symptoms of dyslexia is not difficult to surmise. What are the symptoms? Dr. Harold N. Levinson, founder of the Medical Dyslexic Treatment Center in Lake Success, New York, and author of *Smart But Feeling Dumb*, which he dedicated to the "40 million dyslexic Americans," lists the symptoms as follows: (1) memory instability for letters, words, or numbers; (2) a tendency to skip over or scramble letters, words, and sentences; (3) a poor, slow, fatiguing reading ability prone to compensatory head tilting,

near-far focusing, and finger pointing; (4) reversal of letters such as *b* and *d*, words such as *saw* and *was*, and numbers such as 6 and 9 or 16 and 61.

These symptoms sound just like the very mistakes made by those children back in 1912 who were trying to learn a sight vocabulary. Some of those children even read the words upside down!

It is obvious that if you are told to look at a word as a picture, you may look at it from right to left as easily as from left to right. You will reverse letters because they look alike and you have not been drilled to know them by sound as well as by sight. In alphabetic writing, the sounds in the word follow the same sequence in which the letters are written, which makes reversing letters virtually impossible. A sight reader will be a poor speller because the sequence of letters seems completely arbitrary, with no rhyme or reason. But to a phonetic reader the sequence of letters is most important because it follows the same sequence in which the sounds are uttered.

Other symptoms include transposing letters in a word, for example, *abroad* for *aboard*, *left* for *felt*, *how* for *who*; confusing words with others of similar configuration, such as, *through*, *though*, *thought* or *quit*, *quite*, *quiet* or *realty* and *reality*; guessing at unknown words.

Dr. Kenneth L. Goodman, America's top professor of reading and chief advocate of the sight method, calls reading a "psycholinguistic guessing game." And that's exactly what it is for most American children in today's primary schools. The result is an explosion in Special Education, which has become the growth industry for educators so worried about the dropout problem. The primary schools create the learning disabilities, and the federal government is funding a new industry to deal with them. In the 1976-77 school year there were 796,000 learning disabled students in Special Education. In 1983-84 there were 1,806,000. Dyslexia is booming!

Obviously, the prevalent methods of teaching reading cause dyslexia. I have visited many American cities on my lecture tours and have seen for myself the sight-word basal reading

programs being used in today's primary classrooms all across the country. Yes, they now teach more phonics, but not in the intensive systematic way that would produce the needed phonetic reflex. They teach letter sounds as information that the student may or may not use while looking at the words as little pictures. The educators call that a "balanced approach." But the scale is tipped in favor of the sight-method.

There is an educator in Odessa, Texas, by the name Donald Potter, who specializes in tutoring reading disabled children with phonics. He wrote in an email to me: "One of the cardinal signs of whole-language instruction is the confusion of 'a' and 'the.' I know they look totally different, but the kids continually confuse them. I take it that the 'determiner slot' in the sentences can be filled with either 'a' or 'the' and still make good sense. The kids have been taught to read with syntactic clues (along with graphemic and semantic). This training CAUSES them to make these substitutions. The parents (and researchers) are fooled into thinking that the kids have dyslexia when they are really just performing as they have been instructed in their 'How to Guess Reading Classes.' The a/the confusion is only one of many examples of syntactic substitutions. The sentence will always make sense, even though they have read the wrong word."

Which means that the minds of millions of American children are being crippled, their futures handicapped, their self-esteem destroyed by educators who should know better. This criminal malpractice is going on in virtually every community in the nation. And yet, there is little one can do about it. The professors of education won't listen--after all, they write the textbooks. The book publishers publish what the educators want and what the textbook committees will adopt. The classroom teachers know no other way to teach; the professional organizations promote these faulty methods; and principals, administrators, and superintendents leave the teaching of reading to the "experts."

Also, holistic readers are encouraged by their teachers to substitute words, as explained by a whole-language advocate quoted in the *Washington Post* of Nov. 29, 1986. The headline reads, "Reading Method Lets Pupils Guess; Whole-Language Approach Riles Advocates of Phonics."

The article states:

The most controversial aspect of whole language is the de-emphasis on accuracy. American Reading Council President Julia Palmer, an advocate of the approach, said it is acceptable if a young child reads the word house for home, or substitutes the word pony for horse. 'It's not very serious because she understands the meaning,' said Palmer. 'Accuracy is not the name of the game.'

When does accuracy become the name of the game in Ms. Palmer's system of education? Probably, never, for if you teach children in primary school, through invented spelling and word substitutions, that accuracy is not at all important, they may never acquire a sense of accuracy, unless forced to do so by the demands of the workplace.

What we do know is that when you impose an inaccurate, subjective ideographic teaching technique on a phonetic-alphabetic writing system which demands accurate decoding, you create symbolic confusion, cognitive conflict, frustration and a learning breakdown. In addition, I strongly suspect that Attention Deficit Disorder, otherwise known as ADD, is a form of behavioral disorganization created by a teaching disorganization. It is the symbolic confusion, cognitive conflict, learning blocks and frustration caused by holistic teaching methods that literally force children to react physically to what they instinctively know is harming them. They started school feeling very intelligent. Now they feel stupid. They may not know exactly what the teacher is doing that is harming them. But they certainly know that they are being harmed. And that is why they react.

But there is some hope. The enormous growth of the homeschool movement has spurred the development of many new phonics programs which are being used at home. Also, there are more and more private and church schools that teach children to read with intensive phonics. And here and there one finds a teacher in a public school who teaches phonics. But phonics in a public school is usually taught as "bootleg phonics," that is, surreptitiously, if at all.



However, for the nation as a whole, there is little hope that the vast majority of schools will change their teaching methods in the foreseeable future. The fact that more and more children are being labeled Learning Disabled, Dyslexic, or ADD, and are being given drugs each day in order to attend school, is a sad indication that the schools are committed to programs that damage children.

One would expect American business leaders, who need literate workers, to be in the forefront of those urging education reform. But the problem is that business professionals go to educational professionals for information and ideas and are given the usual song and dance in which the professional educators have become expert practitioners.

Professionals in other fields cannot believe that educational professionals are deliberately miseducating American children and causing dyslexia. And so, considering how poorly informed our business leaders are and how difficult it is to reach them, let alone brief them on this rather complex subject, there is little likelihood that they will act effectively on behalf of the children entrapped in the government schools.

## **Chapter Sixteen**

### **How Edward Miller Was Able to Prove That the Sight Method Causes Dyslexia**

Back in 1973, after completing my book *The New Illiterates*, I became convinced that the sight method of teaching reading could cause dyslexia--that is, the inability to see the phonetic structure of our alphabetically written words. Without having been taught the alphabetic principle and drilled in the letter sounds, it was impossible for a child to see something he did not know existed.

In that book I also uncovered the fact that the sight method had been invented back in the 1830s by the Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, the director of the American Asylum at Hartford for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb. The good Reverend was able to teach the deaf to read by a

sight method, juxtaposing a picture of a cat with the word cat. In that way the deaf were able to acquire a limited sight vocabulary and read primary texts.

He then thought that this method might work with normal children, sparing them the drudgery of learning the alphabet and the letter sounds before acquiring a considerable reading vocabulary. He produced a small primer based on this method in 1836, *The Mother's Primer*, and it was adopted by the Boston Primary Schools in 1837. Horace Mann was Secretary of the Board of Education, and he favored the new method.

But by 1844, the defects of this new teaching method were so apparent that the Boston schoolmasters issued a blistering attack against it, and urged a return to the traditional alphabetic-phonics method of teaching reading. I reprinted that critique in my book in order to demonstrate how early the defects of the sight method were recognized by responsible educators who were not seduced by the siren songs of the reformers.

But in my lectures, I encountered parents who told me that their child was already dyslexic before entering school. How could that be? Were they born that way? I could not honestly answer that question until the fall of 1988, when a man by the name of Edward Miller called me from his home in North Carolina. Ed had seen me on a television interview in 1984 and was so astounded by what I had said about dyslexia that he decided to get my book on the National Education Association, *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education*.

Miller was particularly interested in this subject because he himself was dyslexic and had been so since the first grade. He had been taught to read in a rural school in North Carolina by a young teacher fresh out of college who used the sight method. At first Miller thought that it was stupidity that was causing his reading problem. But in the fourth grade he proved that he was not stupid by memorizing the multiplication table and winning a prize in class.

From then on Miller saw his reading problem merely as a handicap that had to be compensated for by all sorts of tricks. For example, he found that he could pass many essay tests by writing

short, simple sentences in which all the words were correctly spelled. He might get a C for his efforts, but C's were better than F's.

Miller even made it through North Carolina State College. In fact, despite his reading disability, he was able to become a math teacher and finally an assistant administrator in a high school in Hollywood, Florida.

It was by reading an excerpt from Rudolf Flesch's book, *Why Johnny Can't Read*, in a newspaper in 1956 that Miller became aware that there were two ways of teaching reading: the phonetic way or the look-say, or sight way. He realized that he had been taught by the sight method and had adjusted to his reading handicap in as successful a way as possible.

But it wasn't until 1986 that Miller decided to investigate the matter of dyslexia further. His young grandson, Kevin, then in the first grade, had developed a reading problem. In the pain and suffering of his grandson, he saw a repeat of himself. He knew that Kevin had learned to read by the sight method because the boy could read his little sight vocabulary books rapidly. But when it came to the little phonetic books that Miller had given him, Kevin had extreme difficulty. Miller could see that his grandson was trying to guess the words. The process of sounding out the words was too painful.

In observing this phenomenon, Miller recalled what he had read in my NEA book about the Russian psychologists, Luria and Pavlov, and of how they had devised a way of artificially inducing behavioral disorganization by introducing two conflicting stimuli to the organism. Miller believed that he was seeing the same process at work in Kevin. He was sure that Kevin had learned a way of reading at an early age that was interfering with his attempt to decode the little phonetic books.

Kevin had apparently learned a way of reading that conflicted with the phonetic method, and it was causing "dyslexia." But Miller wondered how the boy could have developed such a strong automatic sight way of looking at words without any formal reading instruction. The answer came when Miller examined the little preschool books that Kevin had been reading, including

the popular Dr. Seuss books, the contents of which Kevin had memorized by sight. Indeed, if Kevin had become a sight reader by having memorized the words in these books, he would indeed have had a problem by entering a first-grade class in which the teacher was using a phonetic reading program. That explained how a child could enter school already “dyslexic.”

To my mind, that was a very significant discovery by Miller. It answered the question I had previously been unable to answer. It also brought my attention to the entire field of preschool readers which millions of children are memorizing, thus causing reading problems that would affect their ability to learn at school, problems that parents would assume were caused by something wrong with their children.

Indeed, most parents are unaware that the Dr. Seuss books were created to supplement the whole-word reading programs in the schools. Most people assume that Dr. Seuss made up his stories using his own words. The truth is that a textbook publisher supplied Dr. Seuss with a sight vocabulary of 223 words which he was to use in writing the book, a sight vocabulary in harmony with the sight reading programs the schools were using. Thus, the children would enter first grade having already mastered a sight vocabulary of several hundred words, thereby making first-grade reading a breeze.

Because the Dr. Seuss books are so simple and delightful, many people assume that they were easy to write. But Dr. Seuss debunked that idea in an interview he gave *Arizona* magazine in June 1981. He said:

They think I did it in twenty minutes. That damned *Cat in the Hat* took nine months until I was satisfied. I did it for a textbook house and they sent me a word list. That was due to the Dewey revolt in the Twenties, in which they threw out phonic reading and went to word recognition, as if you're reading a Chinese pictograph instead of blending sounds of different letters. I think killing phonics was one of the greatest causes of illiteracy in the country. Anyway, they had it all worked out that a healthy child at the age of four can learn so many words in a week and that's all. So there were two hundred and twenty-three words to use in this book. I read the list three times and I almost went out of my head. I said, I'll read it once more and if I can find two words

that rhyme that'll be the title of my book. (That's genius at work.) I found "cat" and "hat" and I said, "The Title will be *The Cat in the Hat*."

So Dr. Seuss was quite aware what the educators were up to. He was correct in citing John Dewey, the progressive educator, as the culprit in this insidious changeover from phonics to the sight method, which Seuss believed was one of the greatest causes of illiteracy in America. But somehow that insight, made by America's most famous writer of children's books, has escaped our educators.

Meanwhile, bookstores are now awash with colorful preschool books that turn children into sight readers without parents knowing what is being done to them. Knowledgeable parents will teach their children phonics while also reading these beautifully illustrated books. But most parents will be completely unaware of the harm they are causing by allowing their children to memorize these books. They may even be pleased when their kids are able to "read" these books easily and happily. Nowadays, publishers are selling books for preschoolers with audio tapes so that children can learn to read by the sight method without the help of their parents. There ought to be a warning on these books informing parents that their children can become dyslexic if they memorize these books by sight.

Meanwhile, Miller went to great lengths to bring his ideas about "educational dyslexia" to the powers that be in government and the universities, but found little enthusiasm or interest in his work. Some of these experts on dyslexia, doing research on large government grants, were not interested in any theories that might undercut their own well-financed projects.

And so, Miller decided to do something that would force the experts to recognize that the sight method of teaching reading could cause dyslexia. He began experimenting on a test which would demonstrate beyond any doubt that there was such a phenomenon as "educational dyslexia." It took about ten months of work before he finally devised an ingenious test that anyone could duplicate, which would indicate clearly whether a child, or adult, was a sight reader or a phonetic reader and at what point the child's reading mode became permanent. The test would also provide the means of scientifically measuring the severity of an individual's dyslexia.

The test consists of two sets of words: the first set consists of 260 sight words taken from two of Dr. Seuss's books, *The Cat in the Hat* and *Green Eggs and Ham*. The second set consists of 260 equally simple words drawn from Rudolf Flesch's phonetic word lists in *Why Johnny Can't Read*. The sight words are arranged in alphabetic order across the page. They include such multi-syllabic words as *about, another, mother, playthings, something, yellow*, while the words from Flesch's book, also arranged alphabetically across the page, are all at first-grade level, single syllable and phonetically regular. In other words, for a child who knows his or her phonics neither set of words would pose any problem.

By now hundreds of children have been given the Miller Test and what it shows is that children who are taught by the sight method read the sight words rather quickly with few errors, but when they are then required to read the one-syllable, phonetically regular words, they slow down considerably and make many more errors. For example, on tests conducted by Miller, an eleven-year-old child was able to read the sight words at 51 words per minute with no errors, but read the phonetic words at 17 words per minute with 91 errors. That child was clearly dyslexic. A second child, aged 7, read the sight words at a speed of 44 words per minute with no errors, but read the phonetic words at 24 words per minute with 47 errors.

Both youngsters had become dyslexic. The fact that they could read the sight words at over 30 words per minute meant that their word-identification mode was automatic and, therefore, permanently fixed. Their cognitive block against phonics had been established by the way they had learned to read. Unless the blockage was removed through intensive remedial intervention, it would remain a major lifelong handicap, preventing them from pursuing careers that required accurate reading skills.

In January 1990 Miller obtained permission to administer his test to 68 students at the Ronda-Clingman Elementary School, a rural school with an enrollment of about 600 near the town of Ronda in Wilkes County, North Carolina. Of the 68 students, 25 were fourth-graders, 26 were second-graders, and 17 students were from different grades in Title 1. The results were alarming.

Of the 26 second-graders, 5 were phonetic readers, 11 were permanently holistic readers (with a sight-reading speed of over 30 words per minute) and therefore educationally dyslexic, and 10 were in a state of reading limbo, that is, they hadn't yet developed automaticity in either word-identification mode and could either become fluent phonetic readers or educationally dyslexic readers. The outcome would depend on how they were taught to read in the next few months.

Of the 25 fourth-graders, 14 were phonetic readers and 11 were holistic, that is, educationally dyslexic. None were in an indeterminate state. In other words, they had all developed the degree of automaticity in their word-identification mode which made their reading mode permanent. If this fourth-grade class was typical of fourth-grade classes throughout North Carolina, this meant the 44% of all students in the public schools of that state would emerge at the end of their school careers educationally dyslexic, that is, functionally dyslexic.

Of the 17 students in Title 1, 6 were phonetic readers, 6 were holistic (educationally dyslexic), and 5 were in limbo. Of the latter, 4 were in first grade, indicating that their reading instruction was leading them into educational dyslexia.

What was happening at the Ronda-Clingman school was going on in every elementary school in North Carolina. Were the authorities concerned? Miller had actually gone to the state education authorities in September of 1989 and demonstrated to them his theory on the artificial induction of dyslexia. Two months later he received a letter from Betty Jean Foust, the state's Consultant for Reading Communication Skills. She wrote:

This letter is in response to your request that I review your materials and comment upon your theory of dyslexia. Members of the Department of Public Instruction believe in a multiple approach to teaching reading. We believe that phonics may help the beginning reader if it is done early and kept simple. We do not feel phonics are useful with older students. In my teaching experience, I have encountered several students who could not hear sounds; therefore, we used other methods for learning to read. In my opinion, all students do not need a phonics assessment. We have never promoted



reading words out of context as your assessment does. Time is precious in our schools, and we need activities which promote achievement. Secondly, I believe all students can be taught to read. Some can read better than others, but all students can learn something. We need to guard against the use of dyslexia as a term for “catch all reading problems.”

Thus spake the State Reading Authority.

In January 1991, Miller gained permission to test 62 students at Dade Christian School, a private school in Miami, Florida. The school, with an enrollment of about 1,000 students, is racially mixed, with many children from Spanish-speaking families. Of the 62 students tested, 26 were in fourth grade, 19 in second grade and 17 in a special group selected from second and third grades because of the difficulties they were having in reading. Of the 19 second-graders, 14 were established phonetic readers, 4 were holistic, and 1 was indeterminate, that is, in the limbo state. All of the 16 children in the special group were educationally dyslexic. Of the 26 fourth-graders, 24 were phonetic readers, and only 2 were educationally dyslexic.

In other words, while in the public schools of North Carolina 44 out of 100 students were becoming educationally dyslexic because of their reading-instruction methods, only 8 out of 100 were becoming educationally dyslexic at the private school in Florida. But even that rate was too high. In any case, Miller had not ascertained how those 2 dyslexic students in the fourth grade had become that way, nor was he given the academic histories of the 17 children in the special group.

The implications to be drawn from Edward Miller’s theory on the artificial induction of dyslexia are most significant. In the first place, they infer that dyslexia is being caused by the reading-instruction methods presently being used in most American public schools, and that educational dyslexia can be prevented by the teaching of intensive, systematic phonics so that the children will become phonetic readers. As Miller has pointed out, a phonetic reader cannot become dyslexic.

If what Miller has discovered is true, then the millions of dollars the federal government is spending on finding the genetic causes of dyslexia is a total waste. In addition, the billions ofChapter One dollars the U. S. Dept. of Education has spent in support of reading programs that are causing educational dyslexia are more than a waste. They are being used to commit a horrible crime against the children of this country.

For years, now, we have been telling the public that the dyslexia that afflicts millions of perfectly normal, healthy children is being caused by the reading-instruction methods used in our schools. Whole language, which is presently sweeping through the primary schools of America like a plague, is the latest manifestation of this insane addiction to defective teaching methods. It is sad to know that millions of innocent children will be permanently damaged by these methods, used by teachers who believe they are doing the right thing.

In April, 1992, Miller obtained permission to retest the same students at Ronda-Clingman he had tested in 1990 using the same first-grade test. Fifty-one of the original 68 students were available for retesting.

The results showed that none of the students who were holistic readers in 1990 had become phonetic readers in the interim. Most of them were able to read these first-grade words faster, and their accuracy had improved in the phonetic part of the test. But more than half of the dyslexic students miscalled some of the very sight words they had read correctly in 1990. One student, who as a fourth-grader, had made a total of 12 errors in 1990 made 29 errors in 1992 as a sixth-grader on the identical test. In other words, this student read better in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade than in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade! In fact, 17 out of the 27 sixth graders did better in 1990 as fourth graders than they did two years later on the same first-grade test!

And nowhere was the dumbing down process more obvious than among the good phonetic readers of the second and third grades of 1990 who were now in the fourth and sixth grades. Of the 13 students who had achieved the best scores in 1990, nine made more errors on the very same test in 1992. One student who had made on 2 errors as a fourth grader in 1990 made 18 two years later as a sixth grader. Whereas he ahd missed no sight words in 1990, he missed 8 in 1992. And whereas he had missed only 2 of the phonetic words in 1990, he missed 10 in

1992. Obviously, whatever was being taught at Ronda-Clingman was not advancing the academic skills of the students. On the contrary, many of the students had regressed.

The data also showed that 28 of the 51 students tested missed more of the sight words in 1992 than in 1990, indicating that there is a limit on how many sight words an individual could retain in memory. Apparently, the dyslexic will retain only those sight words that are frequently seen. In other words, low frequency words learned by sight are often forgotten.

Another important phenomenon Miller observed through his testing is that even the worst of the educationally dyslexic readers has a good deal of phonetic knowledge which he or she can only tap through conscious effort.

Miller obtained this vital data by having the children go back and spell the words they missed. Almost always they were able to reread the words correctly after spelling them. Obviously, there was enough phonetic information in the spelling alone that enabled the student to experience the word as a phonetic entity. The problem for the sight reader was that the holistic reflex overrode and thereby suppressed whatever phonetic knowledge the reader may have acquired through oral spelling. In fact, it was the holistic reflex that was creating the block against the phonetic experience.

One of the features of the whole-language reading program is a writing exercise called invented spelling, in which the student is encouraged to write a word without regard to its correct spelling. If he orally spells the word as he has written it, he will not see that the sequence of letters makes phonetic sense. The whole concept of invented spelling simply reinforces a view, encouraged by his teacher, that letters in words are just arbitrary nonsensical conglomerations which depict a word. To the severely dyslexic, letters have no meaning, and that is why they become lifelong nonreaders. To inflict this kind of diabolical pedagogy on a normal child who wants to learn to read is a horrendous crime.

Through his tests, Miller also developed a means of measuring an individual's phonetic knowledge and a scale that measures the severity of the dyslexic's handicap. Just as a physician can measure a fever with a thermometer on a scale of 98.7 to 108, Miller devised a wazy of

measuring the severity of the dyslexic condition on a scale of 1 to 100, based on the number of words miscalled on the phonetic portion of the word identification assessment.

The scale is applied only to students who have developed a holistic reflex. A score of 1 would indicate a very mild reading handicap while a score of 100 would indicate an extremely severe case of educational dyslexia. A score of 8 or 10 may indicate a slight reading problem for a second grader, but for a sixth grader it would represent a more serious handicap since the measuring instrument is a first-grade test. Of the 51 students tested at Ronda-Clingman in 1992, 13 had no handicap, 17 showed handicaps from 8 to 13, and 20 students had handicaps from 21 to 100.

Although Miller went to great lengths to bring his findings to the attention of the powers that be in government, the foundations, and the private sector, he found no interest. It is hoped that this book will bring Miller's extraordinary work to the public at large so that it can be used productively by Americans who want to solve our reading problem.

Miller's test dramatically illustrated the startling difference between a holistic, sight reader and a phonetic one. And of those he tested were perfectly normal children. Are there children born with neurological problems which make learning to read a problem? Yes, but even many of these children can be taught to read by intensive phonics if instructed with great patience and understanding.

The best way for parents to prevent educational dyslexia is to teach their children to read phonetically before giving them the Dr. Seuss books or any other preschool books to read. They should avoid having their children memorize words by their configurations alone, because once that mode of viewing words becomes an automatic reflex, it will create a blockage against seeing the phonetic structure of the words.

A preschool child who has memorized a sight vocabulary will do well in kindergarten and first grade, and even in second grade. But as the child moves into the third grade where reading demands are much greater, involving many new words which the child's overburdened memory cannot handle, the child will experience a learning breakdown.

But the problem can also show up in the first grade where the teaching method is phonics-based. This is often the case in many private and religious schools where reading is taught phonetically. If a child enters the first grade in such a school after having already memorized several hundred sight words from preschool readers, that child will most likely have already developed a blockage against looking at words phonetically. That's why we see "dyslexia" among some first graders.

When they entered school at the age of 5 or 6, these children felt very confident, very intelligent. After all, they had all taught themselves to speak their own language very nicely without the aid of certified teachers or school. And when they enter school, they expect to be able to learn to read with the same competence. And, normally, this is what happens when they are taught to read phonetically and begin to master our alphabetic system.

If they are taught to read holistically, mastering our alphabetically written words becomes a superhuman task. And because the teaching method seems to defy all logic and common sense, their minds react against such teaching just as their stomachs would if some sort of poison were eaten. The stomach throws up, rejecting the poison, and I suspect that ADD is a form of mental rejection of pedagogical poisoning.

What other defense does the child have against pedagogical poisoning? What Ritalin does is lower the defense against such poisoning. The child becomes a docile, defenseless victim of whatever nonsense the teacher is inflicting on the child. And the child is usually dumped into Special Education for the rest of his or her academic life.

Fortunately, homeschoolers are in the best position to guard their children against the kind of pedagogy that is turning millions of normal children into LDs. They can begin teaching their children to read phonetically as early as the child wishes. Above all, they must avoid having their preschoolers memorize words holistically without any knowledge of the letter sounds. If you tell children that letters stand for sounds, they will begin to understand what our alphabetic system is all about.

Ed Miller died in July, 2010. He enters the Pantheon of those unsung heroes who have provided humanity with the means to improve their lives, and in particular the lives of school children. That is not what can be said of those who, as professional educators, continue to inflict pain and suffering on the most vulnerable of our citizens. This deliberate dumbing down of American children must stop!

## **Chapter Seventeen**

### **The New Barbarians Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong**

Back in the 1930's and '40's, when this writer was attending public school in New York City, shootings in schools, let alone massacres, were unheard of. Yes, there was an occasional tragedy in a school in some far off place, but, in general, we all loved our schools because they were not doing us any harm. In fact, they were really educating us: teaching us to read with traditional phonics, teaching us how to hold a pen or pencil in the correct manner, teaching us to write in a neat cursive script, teaching us basic arithmetic, and grammar, and history and geography and how to be a good patriotic American. We respected our teachers and obeyed them. And at assemblies, the Principal read from the Bible. But all of that is gone. All of that has vanished. What we have now can hardly be understood.

The horrendous massacre at the Sandy Hook primary school in Newtown, Connecticut, in which 20 children and seven adults were brutally murdered, indicates that an evil force has been let loose that no one knows what to do about. This is the same evil force that turned two normal

teenagers at Columbine High School in Colorado into nihilist murderers. What the two Columbine killers and Adam Lanza, the 20-year-old Sandy Hook killer, had in common was unusually high intelligence combined with hatred of God. The *Telegraph*, a British newspaper, reported online:

Lanza was said by classmates to be fiercely intelligent.

"You could tell he was, I would say, a genius," said Miss Israel. "There was something that was above the rest of us."

He'd correct people's Latin homework, when they were aged around 14, and at 16 was among the list of top students in his English class, studying "Of Mice and Men" and "Catcher In The Rye" — the classic tale of troubled youth.

"It was almost painful to have a conversation with him, because he felt so uncomfortable," said Olivia DeVivo, who sat behind him in English. "I spent so much time in my English class wondering what he was thinking."

"He didn't have any friends, but he was a nice kid if you got to know him," said Kyle Kromberg, now studying business administration at Endicott College in Massachusetts. He studied Latin with Lanza.

"He didn't fit in with the other kids," he said. "He was very, very shy. He wouldn't look you in the eyes when he talked. He didn't really want to lock eyes with you for very long."

He was also a technical whizz kid, keen on computers and video games, and part of a group who would meet up for computer programming get-togethers.

Obviously, Lanza was also exposed to the entire secular-humanist curriculum of our atheist public schools: evolution, values clarification, sex education, and other programs that served to wrest children away from traditional Biblical religion. What was the religion of his parents? Were they church goers? His parents were divorced in 2009 when Adam was 17. He was born in

1992. The Columbine shooting took place on April 20, 1999, when Lanza was seven years old. Had Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris, the Columbine killers, become his heroes?

"My brother has always been a nerd," Ryan Lanza said, according to Gloria Milas, whose son was a club member along with Adam Lanza.

Catherine Urso, who was attending a vigil on Friday evening in Newtown, said her college-age son knew the killer and remembered him for his alternative style.

"He just said he was very thin, very remote and was one of the goths," she said.

According to Wikipedia, the goth subculture began in England during the early 1980s in the gothic rock scene, an offshoot of the post-punk genre. "Its imagery and cultural proclivities indicate influences from the 19th-century Gothic literature along with horror films." It also includes an obsession with death, which may be influenced by the death education taught in our public schools. It is also associated with nihilism.

What were Adam's parents like? Peter Lanza, his father, was a highly qualified academic who was vice president at an energy investment firm in Stamford. In 2011, Lanza remarried a University of Connecticut librarian. According to the Telegraph:

Mr Lanza agreed to pay \$240,000 (£148,400) annually to his ex-wife, and Mrs Lanza appeared to live in comfort with Adam. There was also suggestions that she was unable to work.

"She needed to be home with Adam," one family insider said.

In other words, this was an upper middle-class family, living very comfortably in a lovely Connecticut town. Both brother Ryan and father were well educated and well employed in finance and earning good money. As for Nancy Lanza, Adam's mother, the *Telegraph* writes:

Marsha Lanza, aunt to the boys, described Mrs Lanza as a good mother and kind-hearted. Mrs Lanza would host games of dice, or else venture out to visit her neighbours for a glass of wine. The home was immaculate; the swimming pool behind the house well maintained.



But Mrs Lanza was also, according to friends, an avid gun collector.

Dan Holmes, owner of a Connecticut landscaping firm, said Mrs Lanza once showed him a "high-end rifle" that she had purchased, adding, "She said she would often go target shooting with her kids".

The gun used to shoot Mrs Lanza was her own.

And the guns used to murder the children and adults at the Sandy Hook school also belonged to Mrs. Lanza. Indeed, Adam killed his own mother before committing the school massacre. But we know nothing of the family's spiritual life.

The public schools, as we know, have eliminated every trace of Biblical religion from their curriculum. They have adopted a secular-humanist philosophy that leads many children to reject their family's religion. The steep decline of Christianity in America can be attributed to the public schools that have become the parochial schools of atheism.

Here is a list of the school shootings and killings, taken mainly from Denver Westword Blogs, Wikipedia, and other Internet sites, that have occurred since Columbine:

The killing of three students by a fellow student at Chardon High School in Chardon, Ohio, on February 27, 2012, indicates that whatever evil forces led to the massacre at Columbine on April 20, 1999, have not gone away. Indeed, only a week after Columbine, on April 28, 1999, in Taber, Alberta, Canada, one student was killed and one wounded at W. R. Myers High School. The gunman, 14-year-old Todd Cameron Smith, walked into his school and began firing at three students in a hallway, killing one student and wounding another. Because this shooting took place only eight days after the Columbine High School Massacre in Littleton, Colorado, it was widely believed to have been a copycat crime. It was the first fatal high-school shooting in Canada in more than two decades.

A month after Columbine, on May 20, 1999, at Heritage High School in Conyers, Georgia, six students were injured by a 15-year-old shooter, Thomas Solomon, who was reportedly depressed after breaking up with his girlfriend. The shots were fired about 20 minutes before

school started. The gunman, a sophomore, was quickly taken into custody. The shots were fired in a common area around 8 a.m., near a cafeteria where some students were eating breakfast.

On November 19, 1999, in Deming, New Mexico, Victor Cordova, Jr., 12, shot and killed 13-year-old Araceli Tena in the lobby of the Deming Middle School. And on December 6, 1999, at Fort Gibson, Oklahoma, four students were wounded when Seth Trickey, 13, opened fire with a 9mm semiautomatic handgun at the Fort Gibson Middle School.

Thus ended 1999, with no end to school shootings. As expected, the educators hadn't a clue as to why all of this mayhem was taking place. Of course, no one believed that it had anything to do with what the kids were being taught in their classes. One thing was obvious, the killers were getting younger. Dr. Benjamin Bloom, the educational psychologist, had stressed the importance of reorganizing, (i.e., de-Christianizing), the minds of these kids as early as possible.

On February 29, 2000, at the Mount Morris Township, Michigan, near Flint, six-year-old Kayla Rolland was shot dead at Buell Elementary School by six-year-old Dedric Owens with a .32-caliber handgun, which he had found in his uncle's home. Owens shot Kayla during a change of classes in the presence of a teacher and 22 students while moving up a floor on the stairs, saying to her "I don't like you" before pulling the trigger. The bullets entered her right arm and traveled through her vital artery. Rolland was pronounced dead at Hurley Medical Center while in cardiac arrest.

According to Wikipedia, at six years of age, Kayla Rolland is believed to be the youngest school shooting victim in U.S. history. Dedric Owens is the youngest school shooter. Due to his age (born on May 5, 1993) and the legal claim that at that age he would have the lack of ability to form intent, Owens was not charged with murder. In most U.S. states, six-year-olds are not liable for crimes they commit. In an 1893 ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that "children under the age of 7 years could not be guilty of felony, or punished for any capital offense, for within that age the child is conclusively presumed incapable of committing a crime." However, back in colonial days, five and six year olds were taught: "In Adam's fall we sinned all." That was the first line of the New England Primer. You were never too young not to know the difference between right and wrong.

The next horror took place on March 10, 2000, in Savannah, Georgia, where two teenagers were killed by a 19-year-old, while leaving a dance sponsored by Beach High School. The dance was in celebration of the school's basketball championship. Stacy Smalls, 19, died from gunshot wounds at Savannah hospital, and Ramone Kimble, a 16-year-old student at Savannah High School was shot in the head and died shortly after. Darrell Ingram, 19, was arrested for the shootings and charged with murder.

On May 26, 2000, English teacher Barry Grunow was shot and killed at Lake Worth Middle School by Nathaniel Brazill, 13, with a .25-caliber semiautomatic pistol on the last day of classes. Brazill had been suspended earlier that day for throwing water balloons in the school cafeteria. He returned later and asked Grunow if he could enter the classroom and speak with two students. When Grunow said no, Nathaniel pointed the gun at him and it went off, killing the teacher with one bullet to the head.

Brazill was convicted of second degree murder and aggravated assault, and sentenced to 28 years in state prison followed by seven years of felony probation. His release date is May 18, 2028.

On January 17, 2001, a student was shot and killed in front of Lake Clifton Eastern High School in Baltimore, Maryland. On March 5, 2001, two students were killed and 13 wounded by Charles Andrew Williams, 15, firing from a bathroom at Santana High School in Santee, California. Two days later, on March 7, 2001, 14-year-old Elizabeth Catherine Bush wounded student Kimberly Marchese in the cafeteria of Bishop Neumann High School in Williamsport, Pa. Cause of the shooting? Envy.

On March 22, 2001, Jason Hoffman, 18, wounded a teacher and three students at Granite Hills High School, Granite Hills, California. A policeman shot and wounded Hoffman. On March 30, 2001, a student at Lew Wallace High School in Gary, Indiana, was killed by Donald R. Burt, Jr., a 17-year-old student who had been expelled from the school. On November 12, 2001, Chris Buschbacher, 17, took two hostages at the Caro Learning Center in Caro, Michigan, before killing himself.

What is causing so many young Americans in so many different places to kill so many of their fellow students or their teachers? No one in authority seems to know why. The next

noteworthy shooting took place on April 24, 2003, when James Sheets, 14, killed Principal Eugene Segro of Red Lion Junior High School, Red Lion, Pa., before killing himself. And on September 24, 2003, at Rocori High School in Cold Spring, Minnesota, two students were killed by John Jason McLaughlin, 15. The killer was diagnosed as schizophrenic.

Although there were no school shootings reported in 2004, there were probably many assaults and disruptions in public schools that were not serious enough to be reported nationally. On March 21, 2005, the Red Lake reservation in Red Lake, Minnesota, was the scene of a gruesome murder that then turned into a school massacre. It began at noon when 16-year-old Jeffrey Weise killed his police sergeant grandfather and his grandfather's girlfriend, then later drove his grandfather's police vehicle to Red Lake Senior High School where, at 2:45 p.m. he began shooting, killed seven people on the school campus, including five students, one teacher, and an unarmed security guard, and wounded five others. The shooting ended when Weise committed suicide.

Witnesses say Weise smiled as he was shooting at people. One witness said that he asked a student if he believed in God, a link obviously connected to the events that took place during the Columbine High School massacre.

Then, on November 8, 2005, in Jacksboro, Tennessee, a 15-year-old shot and killed an assistant principal at Campbell County High School, and seriously wounded two other administrators. On August 24, 2006, Christopher Williams, 27, looking for his ex-girlfriend at Essex Elementary School, in Essex, Vermont, shot two teachers and wounded another. Before going to the school, he had killed his ex-girlfriend's mother.

On September 27, 2006, an adult male held six students hostage at Platte Canyon High School, Bailey, Colorado, then shot and killed Emily Keyes, 16, and himself. Two days later, on September 29, in Cazenovia, Wisconsin, a 15-year-old student shot and killed Weston School principal, John Klang.

On October 3, 2006, a truly bizarre massacre took place in Nickel Mines, Pa., when a 32-year-old milk-truck driver, Carl Charles Roberts, entered the one-room West Nickel Mines Amish

School and shot 10 schoolgirls, ranging in age from six to 13 years old, and then himself. Five of the girls and Roberts died. Roberts, who was not Amish, left his wife and children suicide notes. A movie has already been made of this chilling tragedy.

On January 3, 2007, Douglas Chanthabouly, 18, shot fellow student Samnang Kok, 17, in the hallway of Henry Foss High School in Tacoma, Washington. On April 16, 2007, in Blacksburg, Virginia, a 23-year-old Virginia Tech Student, Cho Seung-Hui, killed two in a dorm, then killed 30 more two hours later in a classroom building. His suicide brought the death toll to 33, making that shooting rampage the most deadly in U.S. history. Fifteen others were wounded.

On September 21, 2007, at Delaware State University, Dover, freshman Loyer D. Brandon shot and wounded two other freshmen students on the university campus. He was charged with attempted murder and assault. On October 10, 2007, 14-year-old Asa H. Coon shot and injured two students and two teachers before killing himself at Cleveland High School, Cleveland, Ohio. The victims survived the shooting.

The United States is not the only country afflicted with school shootings. On November 7, 2007, an 18-year-old student in Tuusula, Finland, shot and killed five boys, two girls, and the female principal at Jokela High School. At least 10 others were injured. The gunman shot himself and died of his wounds in the hospital.

On February 8, 2008, a nursing student at Louisiana Technical College, in Baton Rouge, shot and killed two women and then herself in a classroom. Three days later, in Memphis, Tennessee, a 17-year-old student at Mitchell High School shot and wounded a classmate in gym class. A day later, on February 12, 2008, in Oxnard, California, a 14-year-old boy shot a student at E. O. Green Junior High School causing the 15-year-old victim to become brain dead. Two days later, on February 14, a gunman killed five students, wounded 17 others, and then killed himself when he opened fire on a classroom at Northern Illinois University. The gunman, Stephen P. Kazmierczak, was identified as a former graduate student at the university in 2007.

On September 23, 2008, there was another massacre at a school in Finland. A 20-year-old male student shot and killed nine students and himself at a vocational college in Kauhajok, Finland, located two hundred miles north of Helsinki, the capital.

On November 12, 2008, a 15-year-old female student was shot and killed by a classmate at Dillard High School in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

On February 5, 2010, at the Discovery Middle School in Madison, Alabama, a ninth grader was shot by another student during a class change. The boy pulled out a gun and shot Todd Brown in the head while walking in the hallway. Brown later died at the hospital. A week later, February 12, at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, during a meeting on campus, Amy Bishop, a biology professor, shot her colleagues, killing three and wounding three others. A year earlier, she had been denied tenure.

On January 5, 2011, in Omaha, Nebraska, two people were killed and two more injured in a shooting at Millard South High School. Shortly after being suspended from school, the shooter returned and shot the assistant principal, principal, and the school nurse. The shooter then left campus and took his own life. On that same day, in Houston, Texas, two gunmen opened fire during a Worthing High School powder-puff football game. One former student died, and five others were wounded.

On May 10, 2011, in San Jose, California, three people were killed in a parking garage at San Jose State University. Two former students were found dead on the fifth floor of the garage. A third, the suspected shooter, died later at the hospital. On December 8, 2011, at Blacksburg, Virginia, a Virginia Tech police officer was shot and killed by a 22-year-old student from Radford University. The shooting took place in a parking lot on Virginia Tech's campus.

On February 10, 2012, in Walpole, New Hampshire, a 14-year-old student shot himself in front of seventy fellow students. Seven days later, at Chardon High School, in Chardon, Ohio, a former student opened fire, killing three students. The shooter entered the school cafeteria at 7:45 a.m., shot into a group of students, killing one and wounding four. Several days later two of the wounded also died, bringing the total dead to three.

The shooter, identified as 17-year-old T. J. Lane, was described by classmates as an outcast who had been bullied. He also came from a divorced family with a history of domestic violence. In late December he posted a poem on his Facebook page that read: "He longed for only one thing, the world to bow at his feet," and ended ominously: "Die, all of you." Apparently he had learned to hate life and love death.

A fellow student described Lane as "a quiet kid. Freshman year he got into a 'goth' phase and didn't talk to that many people anymore. He never egged anybody on. He just went about his business."

Finally, on March 6, 2012, in Jacksonville, Florida, Shane Schumerth, a 28-year-old teacher at Episcopal High School, returned to the campus after being fired and shot and killed the headmistress, Dale Regan, with an assault rifle.

What can we conclude from this gruesome record of school horrors? One thing I know. When I was going to public school in the days when belief in God was still permissible and school principals could quote the Bible at assemblies, there were no school massacres. Take God out of the schools, and you get mayhem. As Rev. R. J. Rushdoony has written: "Humanistic education is the institutionalized love of death."

## **Chapter Eighteen**

### **How Using the Right Brain to Perform a Left Brain Function Causes Dyslexia**

The human brain is divided into two hemispheres, each with different functions. The left brain is the center of language development. The right brain deals with spatial functions: art, distance, depth, perspective, etc. The human being is quite distinct from every other species, in that we have the faculty of speech, the ability to use voice sounds to represent meaning. Thus, we develop spoken language.

Other species can make voice sounds, but these sounds are the functions of their vocal chords. Only the human being has this unique brain faculty that permits him to develop spoken language: the ability to use speech sounds to represent objects, feelings, emotions, and ideas.

It is language that has permitted man to create civilization, write history, communicate with each other in the most intimate manner. In other words, language permits us to have knowledge of the power that created us, knowledge of the objective world, knowledge of others, and knowledge of ourselves. We think in terms of language. We formulate scientific knowledge by the use of language. We argue with our tongues. We pray with language. We develop complex philosophical ideas with language. We speak to ourselves in language. And that is why the distance between the highest jungle primate and the human being is eons apart.



Modern scientists have become quite interested in the functions of the brain and of its development from infancy to adulthood. Investigations of brain damage and how they affect behavioral functions have become the focus of intense scientific interest. Soldiers whose left-brain hemispheres have been injured will have speech difficulties. Victims of stroke will also suffer loss of normal speech. Anyone who has been around an individual who has suffered a stroke will be keenly aware of the stroke's affect on speech. However, with the invention of brain-scanning machines, we can now actually see how the brain functions under different normal and abnormal circumstances.

Of late there has been considerable interest in the subject of dyslexia and how this disease affects brain functions. It is thought by some investigators that we can see the origin of dyslexia in some actual brain damage or distortion. They assume that this brain anomaly is the cause of dyslexia instead of being the result of the child being forced by educators to use the right brain to perform a left-brain function. This is done by forcing children to look at our alphabetic words as little pictures when in reality our alphabetic words are symbolic representations of language sounds.

Back in the early 1800's, the Reverend Thomas H. Gallaudet was able to have his deaf pupils use their right brains to learn a sight vocabulary because they could not hear language. That permitted the deaf to associate the printed words with pictures and thereby learn a sight vocabulary. But when that same method is applied to normal children with normal hearing, it creates reading problems. Why? Because a sound-symbol system cannot be learned as a picture meaning system. Yet, today, in American schools, and in schools in Canada, England, Australia, and New Zealand, children are being taught to read as if our printed words are pictures instead of the representations of language sounds.

Recent brain research has shown how faulty teaching methods can actually alter the physical form of the brain. Two recent books provide the results of extensive research on dyslexia: *The Brain that Changes Itself* by Norman Doidge (Penguin Books, 2007) and *Reading in the Brain* by Stanislas Dehaene, a French neuroscientist.

Dr. Doidge deals with the adaptability of the brain, or its plasticity. The leading researcher in the field of neuroplasticity is Michael Merzenich. He has proven that dyslexia, even in adults, can be cured. Since I've tutored numerous dyslexics and cured them of their condition, I've known that the brain is plastic enough to change a sight reader into a phonetic reader. It means creating a phonetic reflex to replace the holistic one. This is not always easy to do. It depends on the individual. But first I teach the student the entire alphabetic system with Alpha-Phonics. Then, I show the student how to apply his new knowledge to the printed page. That may require weeks or months of getting rid of sight-reading habits and learning how to look at the phonetic structure of words.

I tutored one 8-year-old who found it painful to make the transition from sight reader to phonetic reader. He could not look at the page directly. He had to sit sideways. And sometimes he burst into tears. But eventually we succeeded. But from that experience I learned why so many dyslexics do not want to undergo an intensive course in phonics. It would be too painful.

In 1996, Merzenich and his colleagues formed a company, Scientific Learning, devoted to using neuroplastic research to help people "rewire their brains." They developed a computerized training program for language-impaired and learning-disabled children called *Fast ForWord*. Doidge writes (p.70): "The program exercises every basic brain function involved in language from decoding sounds up to comprehension--a kind of cerebral cross-training."

Doidge writes further (p.72): "A Stanford group did brain scans of twenty dyslexic children, before and after *Fast ForWord*. The opening scans showed that the children used different parts of their brains for reading than normal children do. After *FastForWord* new scans showed that their brains had begun to normalize. (For instance, they developed increased activity, on average, in the left temporal-parietal cortex, and their scans began to show patterns that were similar to those of children who have no reading problems.)"

What does all of this mean? First, it means that stimulating the brain makes it grow. It also means that neuroscience has finally caught up to those of us who have been curing dyslexia by the old-fashioned way: teaching the English alphabetic system by intensive phonics. But the one thing the neuroscientists have not investigated is how the schools induce dyslexia by the use of faulty teaching methods in the classrooms.

But Doidge emphasizes the importance of exercising the brain (p.41). “The irony of this new discovery,” he writes, “is that for hundreds of years educators did seem to sense that children’s brains had to be built up through exercises of increasing difficulty that strengthened brain functions. Up to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a classical education often included rote memorization of long poems in foreign languages, which strengthened the auditory memory (hence thinking in language) and an almost fanatical attention to handwriting, which helped strengthen motor capacities and thus not only helped handwriting but added speed and fluency to reading and speaking.... But the loss of these skills has been costly; they may have been the only opportunity that many students had to systematically exercise the brain function that gives us fluency and grace with symbols.”

What an extraordinary endorsement of classical education by a leading modern neuroscientist! You would think that those professors who teach in our colleges of education would learn something from our brain scientists. Unfortunately, they are wedded to their agenda which calls for impairing the brains of the children in their charge.

Dr. Stanislas Dehaene’s view on the way reading is taught conforms with our own. He writes (p.326): “We now know that the whole-language approach is inefficient: all children regardless of socioeconomic backgrounds benefit from explicit and early teaching of the correspondence between letters and speech sounds. This is a well-established fact, corroborated by a great many classroom experiments. Furthermore, it is coherent with our present understanding of how the reader’s brain works.”

He is well acquainted with the research conducted in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries that was used to justify using the look-say method in our schools. He writes (p.3): “Recent research on the brain’s reading networks proves it was wrong.” But how long will it take for today’s educators to acknowledge what the brain scientists are telling us?

## Chapter Eighteen

### What We Now Know About the Reading Brain

Dr. Stanislas Dehaene is the Director of the Cognitive Neuro-Imaging Unit at Saclay, France. He is not a member of the American psychological establishment, and therefore quite capable of being objective in his pioneering study of the reading brain.

The fact that American teacher’s colleges, professors of reading, and behavioral psychologists have not bothered to take a critical look at the teaching methods in our schools that are creating reading disability, indicates that a true neuroscientist detached from our corrupt establishments was needed to provide a fresh look at the problem of dyslexia. His book, *Reading in the Brain*, represents a significant break through the educational iron-curtain that protects the establishment against scrutiny.

That is not to say that Professor Dehaene believes that American educators are deliberately creating reading disability. He and others in the establishment have all heard of Dr. Samuel T. Orton and the Russian neuroscientist Alexander Luria, but none of them seem to have read what Orton wrote in the Journal of Educational Psychology in February 1929. His article was entitled *The Sight Method of Teaching Reading as a Source of Reading Disability*. Nor do they seem to have read Luria’s book on how to deliberately create behavioral disorganization.

Thus we find in the *Gale Encyclopedia of Mental Disorders* a long article on Reading Disorders, or dyslexia, that ends with this startling bald-faced lie: “There is no known way to prevent reading disorder.” Since most reading disorders are caused by teaching children sight vocabularies, the only prevention is to teach phonics first along with cursive writing.

Were the editors of the Gale Encyclopedia lying or just ignorant? My view is that the editors were incapable of believing that today’s professional educators would deliberately and knowingly create dyslexia. And I assume that Dr. Dehaene would find the idea incredulous for the simple reason that scientists are supposed to be honest and objective and expect professionals in other fields to be as honest and objective. But we know that Soviet science was enlisted by the Soviet government to advance the cause of communism, and in this country “educational psychology” has been used to advance the agenda of the Progressives.

Simply put, the best way to prevent dyslexia, or reading disability, in normal children is a good phonics-first program in the schools, such as Sue Dickson’s remarkably effective Sing, Spell, Read and Write program, which she wrote for her first-grade class.

But let us quote from Dr. Dehaene’s book to see how much progress has been made in understanding how the brain deals with the reading process:

“Modern brain imaging methods now reveal, in just a matter of minutes, the brain areas that activate when we decipher written words....The insight into how literacy changes the brain is profoundly transforming our vision of education and learning disabilities.... Early research on reading erroneously supported the whole-word approach. Recent research on the brain’s reading networks proves it wrong.”

In other words, Dr. Dehaene repudiates the experiments that James McKeen Cattell conducted in Prof. Wundt’s laboratory in Leipzig in 1885 that became the scientific basis for abandoning traditional phonics in favor of the whole-word method, which spawned the Dick and Jane reading program, and created the greatest reading problem this nation has ever known. This

method was also adopted throughout the English-speaking world, thus lowering the literacy levels in virtually all of these nations. And it is still being used today in American public schools

Is it not ironic that several primitive reaction-time experiments conducted by a 21-year-old student became the “scientific” basis for changing the way reading is taught in virtually all the schools of the English-speaking world? Had Cattell ever taught a child to read before those experiments? Not that we know of. But it is likely that he taught his own children to read in the traditional manner. Dr. Dehaene continues:

We have discovered that the literate brain contains specialized cortical mechanisms that are exquisitely attuned to the recognition of written words....These experiments demonstrate that global word shape does not play any role in reading. Our visual system pays no attention to the contours of words or to the pattern of ascending or descending letters: it is only interested in the letters they contain.

Yet, American primary teachers still teach children to look at our printed words as whole pictures which, according to Dr. Dehaene, have no relation to the reading process. He writes, “Modern brain imaging confirms that this region [the left hemisphere] plays such an essential part in reading that it can aptly be called the ‘brain’s letterbox.’”

For decades now we’ve known that the left hemisphere deals with language and reading and the right hemisphere deals with spatial phenomena. Dehaene writes:

Words and faces also have different preferred hemispheres. When we recognize a word the left hemisphere plays the dominant role. For faces, the right hemisphere is essential. Although both hemispheres are initially equally stimulated, words quickly get funneled to the left and faces to the right....This lateralization is another invariant and essential feature of reading.

Dehaene also provides information on why children learn to speak so early in life. “Many researchers see that anatomical asymmetry as one of the major probable causes of the lateralization of language to the left hemisphere. Not only is the left plenum temporale already bigger than the right prior to birth, but the brains of infants are already powerfully and asymmetrically activated then they listen to speech in the first few months of life.”

In other words, children are born with the left hemisphere larger than the right, for the simple reason what we are all programmed before birth to speak language. And that is why children can learn to read phonetically quite early because of this left hemisphere dominance. But what sight-reading does is impair the growth and development of the left hemisphere, thus actually changing the brain’s physical contours. Indeed, we can surmise that it was the left brain’s dominance that led to the invention of the alphabet, which took full advantage of the left brain’s language power.

Dehaene writes: “We now understand why the whole-language method deluded so many psychologists and teachers even though it does not fit with the architecture of our visual brain....Children learn to read only because their brains already contain the required architecture....These brain regions are genetically predisposed to form a network that allows for language acquisition....At the age of five or six...they possess a vocabulary of several thousand words and have mastered basic grammatical structures of their languages....The discovery of phonemes is not automatic. It requires explicit teaching of an alphabetic code....The deep effects of phonemic awareness prove how profoundly the acquisition of the alphabetic code changes our brains.”

As for dyslexia, Dehaene writes: “In dyslexics the left temporal lobe seems to be systematically disorganized.”

Wasn’t it Luria who, with his colleagues in Pavlov’s laboratory, experimented on ways to artificially create behavioral disorganization? For what purpose? That question has never been

asked or answered. It is a question this writer would like to ask of Dr. Dehaene. The good professor explains:

“All brain imaging studies of dyslexia find a reduction of brain activity in this area [left hemisphere] when it is compared to that of normal readers....Their brain activity, moreover, is much greater than normal in the right temporo-parietal region. This anomaly reflects the lack of rapid access to word phonology, together with a compensatory reliance on right hemisphere pathways that are not typically seen in normal readers. The basic layout of the cortex and its connections appears disorganized in dyslexics.”

In other words, when the right brain is required to perform a left-brain function, you get brain disorganization. Dehaene adds: “In dyslexics the left-temporal region is partially disconnected from the rest of the brain.”

This finding alone should shock our educators into understanding how damaging their teaching of sight vocabularies is on the children they are teaching. Finally, Dehaene writes:

“All children have similar brains. Their cerebral circuits are well tuned to systematic grapheme-phoneme correspondences and have everything to gain from phonics--the only method that will give them freedom to read any text.”

Of course, Dr. Dehaene is telling us something we’ve known since 1929 when Dr. Orton warned the educators that the sight-method of teaching reading could cause reading disability. And we were further alerted by Dr. Flesch who, in 1955, told us why Johnny couldn’t read. And we were even informed by the Boston schoolmasters in 1844 why the whole-word method produced reading problems.

But Dr. Dehaene’s significant contribution to all of this is his use of brain imaging to show the real damage done to a child’s brain when the child is taught to read with a sight vocabulary. Dr. Dehaene’s repeated insistence that children should be taught to read by way of intensive



phonics will no doubt fall on deaf ears in our teacher's colleges where our professors of reading still adhere to the religion of whole-language.

But at least we now have cognitive neuroscientists to back our stand on the need for primary schools to start teaching phonics-first in kindergarten and first grade. That, indeed, is great progress

## Chapter Nineteen

### Big Brother in Public Education

### Government Data Collection

Does the federal government have the right to collect private information about every student and teacher in the public schools and house that data in perpetuity in a Washington data bank? Is that not a violation of the privacy rights of every American citizen? Why would the federal government want that information?

Indeed, one of the more disturbing aspects of the U.S. Department of Education is its obsession with data collection. But it all makes perfect sense if you see it from the point of view of the educational totalitarians whose aim it is to use behavioral psychology for the purpose of modifying and controlling the behavior of American citizens. Thus, the National Center of Education Statistics has been designated by the psycho-educators to be the recipient of the full computer dossiers on every school child and teacher in America.

According to Beverly Eckman's *Educating for the New World Order*, the super computer already exists. It is called the Elementary and Secondary Integrated Data System, and it is linked with all of the other federal computer networks collecting data on American citizens. It was former Vice President Al Gore, as a Senator, who introduced the Supercomputer Network Study Act of 1985 which Congress enacted into law.

That this data collection program has been in the works for some time is indicated by the existence of a Handbook issued in 1974 by the National Center for Education Statistics on State Educational Records and Reports. In their section on Student/Pupil Accounting, they list the

major categories of student information. A three-digit system is used to categorize the data. For example, Personal Identification falls under 1 00: Name 1 01, Student Number 1 02, Sex 1 03, Racial/Ethnic Group 1 04, etc. Note the use of an identification number which will probably be the individual's Social Security Number, which has become the American citizen's all-purpose ID number.

Family and Residence data fall under 2 00, Family Economic Information 2 40, and Family Social/Cultural Information 2 50.

Physical Health, Sensory, and Related Conditions fall under 3 00, starting with the Student Medical Record Number 3 01, and then covering every aspect of the student's physical health and medical life.

Mental, Psychological and Proficiency Test Results and Related Student Characteristics fall under 4 00. All data collected through psychological testing will be placed under that category, with Specific Mental and Psychological Characteristics under 4 30.

Enrollment information falls under 5 00, with Type of Program entered 5 23, and Type of Class for Instructional Grouping 5 24. Performance falls under 6 00, Transportation under 7 00, and Special Assistance under 8 00.

The most recent version of the Student Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education that we've had a chance to study in depth was released in June of 1994 (NCES 94-303) and the Staff Data Handbook: Elementary, Secondary and Early Childhood Education (NCES 95-327) was released in January 1995. But who will have access to all of this intimate private information, and for what reason? Will potential employers, recruiters, and police departments be given this data? Is the U.S. government now to become involved in dispensing private information about its citizens as a new information service? Suppose that some of the information may lead to emotional harm of the individual? Who will be responsible for that harm?

Indeed, who will own all of this information? If the government is not going to make this private information available to others for whatever reasons, why then are the bureaucrats, at great cost to the taxpayer, collecting it?

The government of a free people does not collect dossiers of personal private information on all of its citizens. A police state does. Have we become a police state? According to the Declaration of Independence, the purpose of government is to secure the unalienable rights of its citizens, which include “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Is not privacy one of the most important rights of a free people?

The 2001 edition of the Data Handbook states its purpose:

To make appropriate, cost-effective and timely decisions about students, educators must have accurate and complete information. Recognizing this need, most education systems have moved from paper documents in filing cabinets to automated student information systems. These systems provide teachers and others concerned with effective program design with day-to-day access to information about the students’ background, learning experiences, and performance. They also provide the flexibility necessary to supply aggregate data to school boards, state and federal governments, and other interested parties; and to conduct program evaluations. To be effective, however, these systems must record data accurately and comparably for all students, in all places, and at all times.

The Student Data Handbook for Elementary, Secondary, and Early Childhood Education was developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to provide guidance concerning the consistent maintenance of student information. This handbook is useful to public and private education agencies, schools, early childhood centers, and other educational institutions, as well as to researchers involved in the collection of student data. In addition, the Handbook may be useful to elected officials and members of the public interested in student information. This handbook is not, however, a data collection instrument; nor does it reflect any type of federal data maintenance requirements. It is presented as a tool to help the public and

the American school system make information about students more useful and effective in meeting student needs.

The writers of the Handbook seem to contradict their own words. The Data Handbook is indeed a data collection instrument. What else could it possibly be, especially since every individual in the system is identified with his or her own number? Of course, it may also be used for general information gathering purposes. For example, since the religion of a child is part of the data collected, the government can release general information about how many Catholics, or Baptists, or Mormons are in the public schools. But they can also identify the religion of any individual in the system.

The federal government's original rationale for collecting all of this data was that it was needed to see if the nation was reaching the national education goals set by Goals 2000. Well, Goals 2000 have come and gone. The program was a failure. But the government nevertheless keeps collecting more and more data on students and teachers.

To understand how all of this works, you have to get down into the bowels of Washington's educational bureaucracies. For example, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the grand overseer of all of this data collection. In 1991, it awarded a three-year contract to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) "to facilitate the implementation of a national education data system." The project was called the Education Data System Implementation Project (EDSIP). Two years prior to EDSIP, the NCES began constructing "an interstate student records transfer system currently called ExPRESS," an acronym for Exchange of Permanent Records Electronically for Students and Schools. The function of ExPRESS is as follows:

The activity has included the development of standard data elements for inclusion in an electronic student transcript and a pilot exchange of student records across school districts and from districts to institutions of higher education. The system is now ready for further development, including the appointment of a Governing Board, making formal arrangements with a communications network for exchanging the records, and expansion to more sites.

EDSIP also included implementing a Personnel Exchange System for sharing state expertise in solving education data problems, the development of an Information Referral System for sharing information to improve data systems across states, and the development of student and staff data handbooks.

The CCSSO has carried out two other projects for the NCES. The first, the Education Data Improvement Project (1985-88), “analyzed each state’s capacity to provide standard, comparable and timely data to NCES on public elementary and secondary school and school district, staff, students, revenues and expenditures.” The second project was the New Education Data Improvement Project (1988-91) to provide technical assistance plans for each state, which addressed the state’s problems in responding to Common Core Data requirements.

It is obvious that the long-range goal of this linking of all of the states’ education data to a central computer in Washington is to further the nationalization of American public education. Public schools have always depended on local real estate taxes for their financial support because the local people technically controlled their local schools and were concerned about their performance. But this quiet building of a national data collection network is just a prelude to the kind of total control the totalitarians in Washington hope to achieve over all the schools in the country. Add to that the implementation of the Common Core Standards program, and you see American totalitarianism staring you in the face. And he looks like Big Brother on steroids.

That is one good reason to get rid of the U.S. Department of Education and return the public schools to local control, where they belong. There is no need for bureaucrats in Washington to control every local public school. Neither Goals 2000 nor No Child Left Behind improved American education. For example, Goal 5 of Goals 2000 stated: “By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.”

Yet, in 2007, the National Endowment for the Arts released its grim survey on the decline of literacy in America. The survey, entitled *Reading at Risk*, reported that more and more young Americans are reading less and less. The Endowment’s Chairman, Dana Gioia, stated:

This report documents a national crisis. Reading develops a capacity for focused attention and imaginative growth that enriches both private and public life. The decline in reading among every segment of the adult population reflects a general collapse in advanced literacy. To lose this human capacity — and all the diverse benefits it fosters — impoverishes both cultural and civic life.

As we now know, the decline of literacy in America is the result of a carefully thought-out plan by the progressives to dumb-down America. And what we also now know is that the ultimate aim of all of this centralized activity is a nationalized public education system in which schools are no longer controlled by local communities. But there is no one in the federal government education bureaucracy who will acknowledge this. In other words, the only way to address our ongoing education crisis is for the American people to get the federal government out of the education business. As soon as this is done, local communities can begin to address the problems of their local schools in a manner that makes sense.

## **Chapter Twenty**

### **Extortion:**

#### **How Educators Cheat the Taxpayer**

Gov. Jeb Bush, president of the Foundation for Excellence in Education, speaking at the annual meeting of the American Legislative Exchange Council in Chicago (8/9/13), drew attention to the skyrocketing costs of public education and the lousy product it delivers.

“Look at Detroit,” he said. “As the city descended into bankruptcy, its public school system was mired in corruption and mismanagement, prompting Education Secretary Arne Duncan to call it a ‘national disgrace.’ The city spends more than \$19,000 a year per pupil, and for that investment it produces some of the worst academic outcomes in the nation.”

Multiply \$19,000 by twelve, the number of years a child spends in public school, and we get a mind-boggling cost of \$228,000 to create a functional illiterate. In other words, the taxpayer is being taken to the cleaners by educators who know how to featherbed their pensions but haven’t the faintest idea how to create a literate human being. Gov. Bush further states:

Since 1950, the number of adults in public education has increased at four times the



rate of students. The increase in administrators and other non-teaching personnel has been sevenfold.

Big Government turned the one-room schoolhouse into a massive jobs program. Kids were FTEs -- full time equivalents, good for a guaranteed payment regardless of outcome. FTEs also are the lynchpins for funding outsized pensions at the expense of current spending in the classroom.

If schools don't do a good job, we are told it is because they aren't getting enough money. If spending increases and they still aren't performing, it is because it isn't enough money.

In other words, the more the taxpayer pays for education the worse it gets. This is as bad as any scam concocted by an extortionist. The simple truth is that the educators are highly skilled professional extortionists with the ability to get taxpayers to cough up billions of dollars for less than worthless "education." Extortion is a crime.

Take for example the latest scheme to bilk the long-suffering taxpayer: the adoption and implementation of so-called Common Core State Standards.

Like so many education reform initiatives that seem to arise out of nowhere, the Common Core State Standards is another of these sweeping phantom movements that have gotten their impetus from a cadre of invisible human beings endowed with inordinate power to impose their ideas on everybody.

For example, the idea of collecting intimate personal data on public school students and teachers seems to have arisen spontaneously in the bowels of the National Center for Education Statistics in Washington. It required a small army of education psychologists to put together the data handbooks, which are periodically expanded to include more personal information.

Nobody knows who exactly authorized the creation of such a dossier on every student and teacher in American public schools, but the program exists and is being paid for by the taxpayer. And strange as it may seem, it arose seemingly out of nowhere, like a vampire, to suck the freedom out of the American people. Unlike Santa's elves who work behind the scenes to bring happiness to children, these subterranean phantoms work overtime to find ways of making American children miserable.

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) is another such vampire calculated not only to suck the freedom out of the American people, but also to suck out the brains of their children. And all of this is planned in the dark, away from the prying eyes of parents and writers like me. Ask any educator: "Who is the author of the Common Core Standards?" and they will not be able to tell you.

So I decided to look into the origin of the CCSS. It is said that it originated with the National Governors Association (NGA). When and where? At what meeting? At whose behest? The NGA's Mission Statement says on its website:

The Common Core State Standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them. The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. With American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy.

Sounds wonderful. But why do we need it? Why are we re-inventing the wheel? Didn't our public schools provide a decent education for the "greatest generation" when they were in school? That generation not only learned enough to win World War II but also enough to create the scientific foundation of our high-tech society. What happened to those standards? The only reason why we need the CCSS is because all of these doctors of education need something to justify their degrees and the salaries that go with them. And of course the new curriculum will cost billions of dollars which will enable these vampires to live in the style to which they've

become accustomed. By the way, if you object to my referring to these people as vampires, feel free to use your own designations.

The CCSS adds nothing to what we know about how to teach reading and writing. It adds nothing to how we teach arithmetic and mathematics. It adds nothing to how we teach history, geography, and the “social studies.” In short, it is a fraud to get the American taxpayer to shell out big bucks for something that we already know how to do. Yes, science has greatly expanded, but it also expanded from 1850 to 1950 and didn’t require a different methodology from the scientific method developed by the great scientists of the past. We may have better equipment which students of science must learn to operate, but the scientific method has not changed.

And of course, the CCSS were made to be as complicated as possible so that no parent or normal human being could understand them. For example, there is something called “Common Core State Standards Official Identifiers and XML Representation.” It states:

As states, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity move from widespread adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to implementation, there is a need to appropriately identify and link assets using a shared system of identifiers and a common XML representation. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center), working closely with the standards authors, have released an official, viable approach for publishing identifiers and XML designation to represent the standards, consistent with their adopted format, as outlined below.

So now we know that there is such a body as “the standards authors,” who work closely with such bureaucratic organizations as the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. Who are these “standards authors” and how do we know they know anything about how to teach children? And to make sure that the Standards are being correctly implemented, we read the following in typical vampire educational jargon:

De-referenceable Uniform Resource Identifier (URIs) at the [corestandards.org](http://corestandards.org) domain, e.g. <http://corestandards.org/2010/math/content/6/EE/1> or <http://corestandards.org/2010/math/practice/MP7>. Matching the published identifiers, these dereferenceable URIs allow individuals and technology systems to validate the content of a standard by viewing the web page at the identifier's uniform resource locator (URL). The NGA Center and CCSSO strongly recommend that [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org) remain the address of record for referring to standards.

What kind of human beings not only write such gobbledegook but also know what it means? And these educationists are among the well-paid elite who know how to make everything so complicated that only they are capable of understanding their own complexity. Here's more:

Globally unique identifiers (GUIDs), e.g. A7D3275BC52147618D6CFEE43FB1A47E. These allow, when needed, to refer to standards in both disciplines in a common format without removing the differences in the published identifiers. GUIDs are unwieldy for human use, but they are necessarily complex to guarantee uniqueness, an important characteristic for databases, and are intended for use by computer systems. There is no need for educators to decode GUIDs.

Did you read that line, "GUIDS are unwieldy for human use, but they are necessarily complex to guarantee uniqueness"? These people are masters at creating complexity for its own sake. The more complex, the more difficult it is for normal human beings to know what in blazes they are talking about. But the cost of all of that is in the millions.

What is the National Governors Association for Best Practices? Here is what their website says:

The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) develops innovative solutions to today's most pressing public policy challenges and is the only research and development firm that directly serves the nation's governors....

The mission of NGA Office of Federal Relations is to ensure governors' views are represented in the shaping of federal policy. Policy positions, reflecting governors'

principles on priority issues, guide the association's work to influence federal laws and regulations.

The initiative for the Common Core State Standards seems to have arisen from a speech NGA Chairman Governor Paul Patton, Democrat, of Kentucky gave at the NGA meeting on June 12, 2002, in which he said:

Governors are constantly searching for solutions that will help all schools succeed, but some schools require more help than others. The long-term goal for states is to improve overall system performance while closing persistent gaps in achievement between minority and non-minority students. Fortunately, there are places to look for guidance. Although some schools continue to struggle, some have responded successfully to state reform efforts and others have gone far in improving student performance and closing the achievement gap. Current research also suggests there are ways state policies can effectively stimulate and support school improvement.

How that was translated into the need for Common Core State Standards, is not very clear. The Executive Director of the NGA is Dan Crippen, a Washington policy bureaucrat who was director of the Congressional Budget Office from 1999 to 2002. The Director of the NGA Center for Best Practices is David Moore, formerly of the Congressional Budget Office. The Director of the Education Division is Richard Laine, who directs research, policy analysis, technical assistance and resource development for the Education Division in the areas of early childhood, K-12, and postsecondary education.

We are told that the "Education Division is working on a number of key policy issues relevant to governors' efforts to develop and support the implementation of policy, including: birth to 3rd grade access, readiness and quality; the Common Core State Standards, STEM and related assessments; teacher and leader effectiveness; turning around low-performing schools; high school redesign; competency-based learning; charter schools; and postsecondary (higher education & workforce training) access, success & affordability. The Division is also working on policy issues related to bridging the system divides between the early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary systems." We wonder what the budget for that is.

Among Mr. Laine's staff is Albert Wat, whose expertise is Early Childhood Education. He provides state policymakers "with analyses and information on promising practices and the latest research in early childhood education policy, from birth through third grade. His work focuses on preschool education systems and alignment of early childhood and early elementary practices and policies, including standards, assessments and data systems."

Note the interest of these gentlemen in "birth to 3rd grade" education, an area traditionally left up to parents and primary school teachers.

In other words, the Common Core State Standards have no more legitimacy than the plans of your local village idiot to reform education. They are the thought emanations of those who have nothing better to do. Yet, they will cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars and make American public education even more confusing than ever.

In short, the CCSS movement is a "boondoggle," which is defined as: "work or activity that is wasteful or pointless but gives the appearance of having value." It will cost billions of dollars, which everyone involved — educators, administrators, career counselors, assorted federal bureaucrats, textbook writers, and textbook publishers — will be more than happy to rake in.

Why do we need new Common Core Standards, which will require expensive new textbooks and costly teacher retraining? Because education "reform" is the name of this game of deception that has been going on since 1965 when the Johnson administration enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The National Education Association (NEA) had worked for years to pry open the U.S. Treasury for federal "aid" to education, and they've succeeded beyond their wildest dreams.

And why does anyone think that this reform is any more likely to succeed than any of the previous reforms enacted by Congress? Will this expensive reform make the public schools any better? Will more kids be able to learn to read than at present? Experience has shown that education "reform" is simply the educators' way of getting the taxpayer to pay more for our public schools. We are told that the reform is needed to solve an educational crisis. But when the present crisis is "solved," a new crisis regularly emerges a few years later requiring more

money from the taxpayer. And because most American taxpayers are addicted to public education, they will pay whatever is needed to make sure that all of our little Johnnies and Sallies get the promised quality education they so well deserve but will never get.

Already 45 states have adopted the Common Core Standards, which are expected to be in place in 2014. The enormous bill for all of this is going to hit local taxpayers in the face like a wet rag. Phyllis Schlafly's *Education Reporter* (Jan. 2012) states:

The California Department of Education estimates that Common Core will cost the state about \$760 million. Outside estimates place California's fiscal commitment at up to \$1.6 billion. California already expects a \$3 billion deficit at the end of fiscal year 2011, and a \$10 billion deficit in 2012-13. In addition, General Fund revenues for 2011-12 are lower than expected, triggering a \$2 billion cut to state programs beginning in January. "Adding up to a billion-and-a-half-dollar expenditure to implement national standards under these circumstances is fiscal madness," said Lance Izumi, senior director of education studies at the Pacific Research Institute.

But educational madness is not new to California. This is the same state that implemented Whole Language as the way to teach its precious children to read, with disastrous results, from which most functionally illiterate California children will never recover. Will the Common Core Standards improve literacy? According to Sandra Stotsky of the University of Arkansas' Department of Education, who sat in on a Common Core review panel, the Core's Language Arts standards "will lead to a lower level of literacy for all high school students."

According to Liv Finne, director of the Washington Policy Center's education center, the total nationwide costs of implementing Common Core will be \$30 billion. She also stated quite bluntly, "Experts on standards are warning that the quality of these standards is mediocre and not internationally benchmarked, as advertised."

Already, some states are seeking an exit strategy from Common Core, which they hastily agreed to adopt before it was fully analyzed by its critics. In December, the Education Task Force of the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) drafted model legislation that will provide states

with a lawful way of getting out of Common Core. That should spell doom for the entire program, unless some states are stupid and corrupt enough to stick with it.

The subject of standards will be with us as long as public education exists and educational bureaucrats need more boondoggles. As long as the U.S. Treasury is available to support the educators, they will always come up with new ways to milk the federal cow. Yet there are thousands of private schools in America that don't have access to the federal gravy train and manage to educate their students a lot better than the public schools. What is the secret of their success? The freedom to use teaching methods and a curriculum that work. They don't need national standards or a Common Core because they have a philosophy of education generally based on traditional common sense.

Why can't the public schools learn from the private schools? In the year 2000, there were 27,223 private schools in America with over five million students and over 400,000 teachers. In contrast, there were 84,735 public schools with a student population of 45,366,000 and 2,905,000 teachers. There must be among those 27,000 private schools excellent curricula that could be used by the public schools at very low cost. But I have never heard of a public school ever adopting a successful private school curriculum.

And we haven't even considered the homeschool movement and the plethora of educational materials available at homeschool conventions and on the Internet. Think of it. Parents are able to educate their children at home without a principal, administrator, or state bureaucrat looking over their shoulders. They choose the best educational materials they can find at much lower cost than the state pays to indoctrinate a child in the public school. Homeschooling usually costs parents about \$1000 a year, at no expense to the taxpayer. However, the cost of educating a child, for example, in a New Jersey public school is \$13,800; in the District of Columbia, \$12,979; and in Vermont, \$11,835. And none of these public schools can provide the kind of quality education that homeschooling parents provide for their own children. Indeed, New York State spent \$14,119 per student in 2005 — more than any other state in the nation — and its students are hardly well educated.



And despite all this money spent by states on their public schools, they are still turning out thousands of poorly educated young adults who can barely read their diplomas.

But, according to Liv Finne of the Washington Policy Center, the Common Core will not improve literacy. So why are the educators so gung-ho on spending billions of dollars on implementing this educational fraud? It's because our government educators have become the cleverest extortionists on the planet. As long as politicians are willing to help them perform legal larceny, they are game for this mammoth heist. Billion-dollar robberies have become a great American phenomenon unlike any other anywhere else on the globe.

But what about standards? All they have to do is just collect the catalogs of private schools and copy what will work in the public schools. And most school catalogs are free! Everyone knows that in the primary grades you have to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic using traditional methods that have proved successful for hundreds of years. For example, back in the 1860s, the Packer Collegiate Institute in Brooklyn Heights, New York, listed its curriculum as including: modern languages, Latin, various branches of Literature, History, Mathematics, Chemistry, Natural, Moral, and Intellectual Philosophy, Music, Drawing, Painting, and more. So they knew how to educate back then. But today, the educators can't quite figure out what education should be without imposing a half-baked Common Core curriculum.

But it's not education that really concerns them. It's money. It's jobs. For, it isn't all that difficult to figure out what to teach in a school. What requires real ingenuity is figuring out a way of extorting billions from a long-suffering public which is becoming more and more disenchanted with the public schools but not disenchanted enough to abandon them.

## Chapter Twenty

### What Is Whole Language?

### Does It Have a Political Agenda?

It's refreshing and encouraging to know that neuroscientists like Dr. Dehaene have denounced Whole Language as a faulty way to teach reading. He advocates teaching phonics first, which insures that the child will become a fluent, efficient reader. But most parents haven't the faintest idea what Whole Language is. If they did know they would oppose it strenuously.

The best way to define Whole Language is to simply quote its proponents, who've written books on the subject. They are not at all reticent about describing their idea reading progress. In a book entitled "Whole Language, What's the Difference?" written by three whole-language professors in 1991, we read on page 32:

Whole language represents a major shift in thinking about the reading process. Rather than viewing reading as "getting the words," whole language educators view reading as essentially a process of creating meanings ... Meaning is created through a *transaction* with whole, meaningful texts (i.e., texts of any length that were written with the intent to communicate meaning).

It is a transaction, not an extraction of the meaning *from* the print, in the sense that the *reader-created* meanings are a fusion of what the reader brings and what the text offers ... Although students who learn to read in whole language classrooms are, like all proficient readers, eventually able to "read" (or identify) a large inventory of words, learning words is certainly not the goal of whole language.

Another passage from page 19 of the same book may be even more illuminating:

From a whole-language perspective, reading (and language use in general) is a process of generating hypotheses in a meaning-making transaction in a sociohistorical context. As a transactional process ... reading is not a matter of "getting the meaning" from text, as if that meaning were *in* the text waiting to be decoded by the reader.

Rather, reading is a matter of readers using the cues print provides and the knowledge they bring with them (of language subsystems, of the world) to construct a unique interpretation.

Moreover, that interpretation is situated: readers' *creations* (not retrievals) of meaning with text vary, depending on their purposes of reading and the expectations of others in the reading event. This view of reading implies that there is no single "correct" meaning for a given text, only plausible meanings.

Now you might think that all of this pedagogical insanity is taking place in some kind of political vacuum. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Whole language practice is very politically oriented. We read on page 23:

Learning is a social process ... Although whole language educators accept the importance of learning through individual interactions with the environment (Piaget 1967), they lean more heavily on Vygotsky's ideas about the social nature of learning (Vygotsky 1978).

Whole language takes seriously Vygotsky's notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (Engstrom 1986) which entails stressing the importance of collaborations (between students and teachers and between peers) through which students can transcend their own individual limitations.

You might ask: Who is Vygotsky? Vygotsky (1896-1934) was a Soviet psychologist who worked

with Pavlov's colleagues at the State Institute of Experimental Psychology in Moscow in the 1920s and '30s. James Wertsch, Vygotsky's biographer, writes:

[It] is important to note that Vygotsky was a staunch advocate of dialectical and historical materialism. He was one of the creators of Marxist psychology ... People such as Vygotsky and his followers devoted every hour of their lives to making certain that the new socialist state, the first grand experiment based on Marxist-Leninist principles, would survive.

Vygotsky's colleague, Alexander Luria, wrote: "Vygotsky was ... the leading Marxist theoretician among us ... in [his] hands, Marx's methods of analysis did serve a vital role in shaping our course."

Apparently, these same methods of analysis are also serving to shape the course of the whole-language agenda. The three professors, cited earlier, state on page 67:

The whole language theoretical premise underlying which topics are pursued and how they are treated is: "*All knowledge is socially constructed.*"

Therefore all knowing is political. In an effort to promote critical literacy and thus to help children learn to read the world, not only the word (Shor & [Marxist revolutionary] Freire 1987), teachers who work with theme cycles try – no matter whether the topic is overtly "political" or not – to show how the topic is related to other more general questions.

They try to demystify social institutions by helping children investigate connections between surface facts and underlying social structures, between lived experience and structural features of class, gender and race. They know that not making connections is as political as making connections.

No further explanation needed. But what about phonics, you might ask? Here's a view of phonics given in another book on whole language, "*Evaluation: Whole Language, Whole Child*." We read on page 19:

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.

The response of any sane educator to that kind of imbecilic pedagogy is that any child who looks at the word "father" and says "daddy" can't read. It's as simple as that. But tell that to a Whole-Language teacher. It is therefore to be rejoiced that Dr. Dehaene and other neuroscientists have not been fooled by Whole Language and are warning parents and educators, as Dr. Orton did in 1929, that this ludicrous form of teaching should be thrown out of the schools.

Most parents haven't the faintest idea that there is a political agenda behind their child's classroom reading instruction. They are also unaware that there is a war going on between conservatives and liberals over how reading should be taught. For example, in an article by whole-language advocates in *Education Week* (2/27/85) we read:

The accumulating evidence clearly indicates that a New Right philosophy of education has emerged in this country.... By limiting reading instruction to systematic phonics instruction, sound-symbol decoding, and literal comprehension, and by aiming its criticism at reading books' story lines in an effort to influence content, the New Right's

philosophy runs counter to the research findings and theoretical perspectives of most noted reading authorities.

If this limited view of reading (and, implicitly, of thinking) continues to gain influence ... the New Right will have successfully impeded the progress of democratic governance founded on the ideal of an educated — and critically thinking — electorate.

First, what is the so-called New Right's philosophy of education that threatens to impede "the progress of democratic governance"? It's the same philosophy espoused by our Founding Fathers who gave us our limited form of government as outlined in the U.S. Constitution. In those days, education was considered primarily a private, religious, and parental concern. In fact, homeschooling was the rule and children were taught to read and write at home or at a Dame's School before they went on to any kind of formal education. And since there was a strong religious component in education, it was implicitly assumed that the purpose of education was to pass on to the future generation the knowledge, wisdom, and values of the previous generation.

That, of course, is no longer the case. When the progressives took over American education at the turn of the last century, their goal was to use the schools as the means of changing America from a capitalist, individualistic, believing nation into a socialist, collectivist, atheist or humanist nation. Their vision of a socialist America is to be found in the futuristic novel of Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, published in 1888. In that novel Bellamy, a Unitarian journalist, projected the fantasy of a utopian socialist America in the year 2000. It was that vision of economic equality that motivated John Dewey and his colleagues to educate Americans in a manner which would lead them to turn America into a socialist society.

And so, when educators write of "democratic governance," what form of government are they talking about? John Dewey often used the word "democracy" as a euphemism for socialism, and as we know, communist countries often referred to themselves as democracies, like the late, unlamented German Democratic Republic. An article in *The Reading Teacher* of November 1987 describes the socialist purpose behind Whole Language:

Whole Language views the learner as profoundly social. Thus practice congruent with Whole Language includes participating in a community of readers during small group literature study, peer writing workshops, group social studies projects with built in plans for collaborative learning.

The purpose of Whole Language is to get rid of individualism. Reading is not, as Whole Language people claim, a social activity. It's an individual activity in which the reader is engaged with the author on a one-on-one basis. Indeed, reading is the one activity in which an individual can retreat into his or her own world of thought and pleasure by absorbing the words and experiences of authors living and dead. Yes, a group of readers can read a Shakespeare play aloud and then discuss it. But they come to the activity as individuals and may reread the play in the privacy of their own homes as a personal enhancement of their own understanding of human nature.

Whole Language teachers are attempting to make reading a collectivist experience as if reading can only take place in a classroom with other students. In reality a "community of readers" is really a community of believers all believing in the same thing. The same article speaks of a "political vision woven through Whole Language beliefs.... Its goal is empowerment of learners and teachers."

What does learning to read have to do with political power? Why should a child in primary school, struggling to master the three R's, be concerned with "empowerment"? An article by Whole Language guru Frank Smith in *Phi Delta Kappan* of January 1989 makes it quite clear that Whole Language is a political movement:

Literacy is power. Literacy can do more than transform thought; it can transform the world. Literacy can raise social consciousness and provide a means for the expression and fulfillment of this consciousness. . . . Paulo Freire's pedagogic technique raises social consciousness not as a way of using literacy but as a means of acquiring it.

Smith's reference to Paulo Freire is quite revealing, for Freire was a leading Marxist theoretician who used adult literacy campaigns in the Third World to foment Marxist revolution. He had worked with socialist and revolutionary governments in Tanzania, Guinea-Bissau, and Angola.

Freire was considered a "master dialectician" by his progressive American admirers and colleagues who revered him as a sort of Brazilian incarnation of John Dewey, whose socialist spirit still hovers over the education establishment. In the introduction to *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*, written with radical professor Donaldo Macedo of the University of Massachusetts, Freire wrote:

In order to overcome at least partly, this "crisis of democracy," a critical literacy campaign must be instituted. It must be a literacy campaign that transcends the current debate over the literacy crisis which tends to recycle old assumptions and values concerning the meaning and usefulness of literacy, that is a notion that literacy is simply a mechanical process which overemphasizes the technical acquisition of reading and writing skills . . .

We call for a view of literacy as a form of cultural politics.

That's about as good and clear a description of Whole-Language theory and practice as one is likely to find anywhere. And in order for Whole Language to dominate the education process, teachers have to be empowered. Frank Smith writes:

Of course, there is no way that students will be empowered until teachers themselves are empowered. And this will not happen until teachers are autonomous in their classrooms.... The basic question is, Who is to be in charge of classrooms — teachers or outsiders? ... I see but one solution for all these problems. Teachers must become more professional; they must regain control of classrooms, assert themselves politically, and demand that all outside interference in educational practice be halted.

Outsiders, of course, are parents who might object to their children being taught to read by a method that will turn them into functional illiterates. Implicit in the Whole Language philosophy is that phonics is outmoded and must be rejected. Kenneth Goodman, Whole-Language Guru-in-Chief, wrote in *What's Whole in Whole Language*:



Phonics methods of teaching reading and writing reduce both to matching letters with sounds. It is a flat-earth view of the world, since it rejects modern science about reading and writing and how they develop.

It is Whole Language that is comparable to a flat-earth view of the world, since that methodology preceded the development of the alphabet, an invention that made reading easy and accessible to everyone. It did for the ancient world what the computer has done for the modern world. But as we know, there has always been a political agenda behind the whole-word method of teaching reading. John Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education* in 1916:

The notion that the “essentials” of elementary education are the three R’s mechanically treated, is based upon ignorance of the essentials needed for realization of democratic ideals.

Yet, it was the three R’s, “mechanically treated,” that produced our highly literate Founding Fathers who could write a Declaration of Independence and create the freest society in history where literacy became virtually universal. Sadly, that high literacy is a thing of the past and won’t be revived as long as the public schools are in the hands of the socialists.

That classroom indoctrination should include political content was made clear in an article in *Young Children* (Jan. 1989) entitled “Children’s Political Knowledge and Attitudes,” coauthored by three professors. They wrote:

There is a clear rationale for early childhood educators to explore and promote political socialization in young children, and to play an important role in it. Children have and express political knowledge and attitudes. . . . Early childhood educators have an important role in helping children understand their social and political environment. Teachers can choose to model positive citizenship, practice a consensus decision-making process, and foster feelings of altruism and benevolence, all the while providing language opportunities to help children learn politically oriented vocabulary.

In other words, early childhood education should include political indoctrination by way of vocabulary development, which is very much in line with Freire’s methodology. In the old days,

children sang “My Country ‘Tis of Thee,” which promoted love of country and its founders. They also sang “America the Beautiful.” But that’s now old fashioned, like religion. What’s important now is “empowerment.” William T. Fagan writes in an article entitled “Empowered students; empowered teachers” (*The Reading Teacher*, April 1989):

Teachers have power over how reading and writing are taught, over how children experience reading and writing within the school text. . . . Teachers who impose a narrow view of reading or writing (word sounding, precision in spelling) may confuse children so that they begin to feel powerless in the school context.

The idea that teaching phonics will make a child feel powerless is both ludicrous and imbecilic. When children gain mastery over our alphabetic system, they acquire tremendous intellectual power. But that’s not what the utopians want. John Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education* in 1916:

The notion that the “essentials” of elementary education are the three R’s mechanically treated, is based upon ignorance of the essentials needed for realization of democratic ideals.

Of course, he wrote that before the full impact of his dumbing-down plan could take full effect on a nation very different from the one he was writing about in 1916. However, his socialism was so extreme that he even denied the individual ownership of his own mind. He wrote:

When knowledge is regarded as originating and developing within an individual, the ties which bind the mental life of one to that of his fellows are ignored and denied. When the social quality of individualized mental operations is denied, it becomes a problem to find connections which will united an individual with his fellows.

That notion became the moral justification for cooperative learning, the prevalent form of education that promotes group think. That is why so many individualists hate public education, because it denies them the right to be themselves and own the products of their own brains.

Obviously, cooperative learning or group think does not produce a Steve Jobs or a Mark Zuckerberg. Even those made dyslexic by their schools manage to maintain ownership of their

minds and become successful entrepreneurs. But millions of students never permitted to gain the mastery they need in order to expand their minds. They are the victims of the self-styled utopians who think nothing of destroying a nation's intellectual power. To them cultural genocide is a sacred mission.

## **Chapter Twenty-Two**

### **California's Literacy Disaster**

#### **When the Utopians Rule, the Children Suffer**

Some years ago a lady in Southern California faxed me an article about California's literacy disaster describing what happened when Whole Language was introduced in California schools in 1987. The article, "The Blackboard Bungle" by Jill Stewart, appeared in the March 1-7, 1996, issue of *LA Weekly*. Ms. Stewart writes:

Since 1987, whole-language theory has swept California. . . . The theory's basic principles have been institutionalized in the form of a widely acclaimed reading "framework" adopted by the state Board of Public Education that downplays the teaching of traditional reading skills. . . . "The core idea of whole language," says one of its most vocal proponents, Mel Grubb of the California Literature Project at Cal State Dominguez Hills, "is that children no longer are forced to learn skills that are disembodied from the experience of reading a story. The enjoyment and the wonder of the story are absorbed just as the skills are absorbed.

Apparently, Mr. Grubb doesn't seem to know the difference between reading a story and learning how to read. Ms. Stewart continues:

But whole language, which sounds so promising when described by its proponents, has proved to be a near disaster when applied to—and by—real people. In the eight years since whole language first appeared in the state's grade schools, California's fourth-grade reading scores have plummeted to near the bottom nationally, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Indeed, California's fourth-graders

are now such poor readers that only the children in Louisiana and Guam—both hampered by pitifully backward education systems—get worse reading scores.

And who is to blame for this “near disaster”—which is not near but actual? According to the article “the problems stem from a tragic misinterpretation of the state’s 1989 reading framework.” Was it a “tragic” misinterpretation or a deliberate misinterpretation? In 1987, California already had a horrendous reading problem. An article from the *San Francisco Examiner*, reprinted in the *Patriot Ledger* (Quincy, MA) of Nov. 18, 1987, reported:

Almost one in six adults in California is “functionally illiterate,” and most of those who can’t read are native English speakers who went to school in the United States, according to a new study by the state Department of Education. The report says 3.1 million Californians can’t read well enough to understand advertising in newspapers, simple recipes or job applications. . . .

So California had a serious reading problem in 1987. That’s when the brilliant people who ran education in California decided to improve reading with whole language. Bill Honig, who was then Superintendent of Public Instruction oversaw the creation of the “reading framework.” Years later, in face of a reading disaster brought on by his own administration, Honig distanced himself from whole language and advocated a phonics approach.

Back in Sept. 1988, we wrote in *The Blumenfeld Education Letter*:

Functional illiteracy will be booming in California in the years ahead if the state adopts the look-say basal reading programs it has already approved. . . . Because of textbook selection decisions based on ignorance, millions of California children will be condemned to lives as functional illiterates. Such state sanctioned education malpractice will be doing more damage to more lives than one can possibly calculate.

How is it that we were able to predict the disaster that lay ahead? And why is it that we who have this superior predictive ability are never called upon by the professional educators to help them make the right decisions? The reason is very simple. Dumbed-down people rarely rely on

people who know more than they do for fear that the smarter people will supplant them. Ms. Stewart writes:

Says Honig today: "Things got out of hand. School administrators and principals thought they were following the framework when they latched on to whole language, and our greatest mistake was failing to say, 'Look out for the crazy stuff, look out for the overreaction and the religiously anti-skills fanatics.' We totally misjudged which voices would take charge of the schools. We never dreamed it would be driven to this bizarre edge. When I tell people that we never even say the phrase 'whole language' anywhere in the 73-page document, they look at me like I'm mad."

But if you are Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of California and you decide to create a "reading framework" for the entire state system, you'd better know something about how it is going to be implemented. The war between advocates of systematic phonics and the whole-word method had been going on at least since 1955 when *Why Johnny Can't Read* was published. Obviously, Honig was ignorant of this educational fact of life and was therefore clearly unqualified for the job of Superintendent.

But how did whole language manage to take over California? According to the article, it began in 1986 when Honig invited a select group of educators "to brainstorm about ways to set California on a new course in reading." Honig says, "I told them to dream, and to forget about any old rules that weren't working." And dream they did. Cal State Chico professor Jesus Cortez relates: "Somebody stood up and said that we were there to create a new generation of superior thinkers and readers and writers who would run the businesses and set the policies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Creating that new generation was the dominant theme from day one."

Not only were these people incompetent, but they were wacky visionaries as well! Stewart writes:

The secondary-school representatives emerged as natural leaders because they, more than anyone, were driven by tremendous frustration over skyrocketing drop-out rates,

the hatred many teenagers expressed for reading, and the shocking levels of remedial reading required by California's college freshmen. . . . "They also knew that something had to be done about beginning grade school reading, but they weren't sure what."

These were well-paid professional educators who had no idea how to teach a child to read. And obviously, none of these dummies had read Rudolf Flesch's book, or Prof. Jeanne Chall's *The Great Debate: Learning to Read*, or this author's *The New Illiterates*. Nor did anyone suggest looking into the many good private schools where children were being taught to read successfully with phonics programs. They were acting like a bunch of kids willing to try any wacky experiment that sounded good. Ms. Stewart writes:

"The group was charting new ground, and we wanted an inspirational document," recalls Jerry Treadway, a textbook author and a professor at San Diego State. "I remember specific meetings at which Mel Grubb and other whole-language proponents convinced everyone that there was no distinction between learning how to read as a first-grader and the way a mature reader would handle the printed word. We decided that until we got kids to deal with language the way it is used by adults, as a whole thought, our reading programs wouldn't work. . . . We underwent a real interesting perceptual shift in the meetings, and what we finally stated, almost derisively, is that the traditional reading approach, the emphasis is on mere accuracy. We said, 'How absurd it is to care about individual words and accuracy.' Under whole language the rule was efficiency of the mind: Get the meaning using the least perception possible. Skip words. Absorb ideas instead. At the time, it sounded great."

These are the numbskulls to whom California parents entrusted the minds of their children. These are so-called professionals incapable of thinking like sane adults responsible for the future of a nation. This is the mindset of the liberal utopians who think nothing of ruining the lives of millions of young people just to see if their cockeyed ideas would work. And if it didn't? Well, it was a great try.

One tragic victim of California's faulty whole-word reading programs was Kari Jorgensen, former basketball star on the Fresno State women's basketball team, who committed suicide in January 1996 at age 22 after struggling all her life with dyslexia. For Kari, the written word had become an insurmountable barrier to growth. According to the *Fresno Bee* (1/23/96):

She dreaded the world of words. She feared it. She cursed it. But too many years went by masking her secret, too many days bottling her emotions. . . . Jorgensen's fear was the ridicule of others, so she turned to her ploys, anything to avoid the shame in her eyes.

Kari's dyslexia could have been cured with lessons in systematic, intensive phonics. But no one in California's education system cared. They produce dyslexics by the million, so why should they care about one. Ms. Stewart continues:

Unfortunately, while the group pursued its ideas within this cloistered atmosphere of growing consensus, emerging research was showing that just the reverse was true about how children learn to read. . . .

In the end, the committee produced a thick document that was adopted by the state Board of Education and praised nationally on talk shows. Official textbooks were selected that were mostly literature; the book chosen by 80 percent of the school districts contained no lessons at all. Schools were expected to follow the new approach, and compliance officers began appearing in local classrooms.

Compliance officers? Sounds like something out of a police state. But it didn't take long before the horrors of whole language became apparent. A grandmother by the name of Marion Joseph, a chief policy analyst under former state Superintendent Wilson Riles, found out by happenstance that the primary schools were no longer using primers. She contacted several teachers to find out what was going on. She relates, "I got almost without exception, 'Oh my God, Marion, we are having a terrible time. The new reading method is not working.' If they tried to teach phonics or word attack skills to the kids who weren't getting it from the



storybook and the invented writings, compliance officers came in from their district office and ordered a stop to it. It was terrible stuff, virtually a new religion, a cult.”

Marion Joseph complained to Honig, and Honig began to talk to teachers and came to the conclusion that his reading framework had been “grossly misinterpreted.” In 1993, Honig was forced to resign after his conviction on conflict-of-interest charges. Ms. Steward writes:

In the end, a rudderless group of state officials were left struggling to interpret a unique and untested reading philosophy that they themselves did not understand. At the schools, deep divisions broke out as district bureaucrats began dictating bizarre orders to teachers and principals.

That was 1996. And how are California’s schools doing today? According to the *Sacramento Bee* of 8/9/13:

State schools Superintendent Tom Torlakson tried to put a positive spin on it, but the harsh reality is that academic [test scores](#) in California's public school system of 6 million students declined this year after years of apparent gains. Moreover, scores are likely to get worse when new Common Core standards are applied. . . .

Like most other states, California is moving away from its own academic standards into the multistate Common Core of what students are expected to learn at each step through the system. And when they are tested on those standards, which will kick in later this year, chances are very high that proficiency levels will plummet.

That's what happened in [New York state](#), one of the first to make the transition. When New York tested on its own standards in 2012, for example, 65 percent of its elementary students were rated as proficient in mathematics and 55 percent in English. But this year, using the tougher Common Core standards, just 31 percent were proficient in those two areas.

California students were already markedly lower in math and English than their New York counterparts, using state standards, so when California's Common Core testing kicks in, it wouldn't be surprising if proficiency drops to the 25 percent to 30 percent level. Moreover, black and Latino students have scores well below those of white and Asian American kids – what Torlakson and other educators call the "[achievement gap](#)" – so when Common Core standards become the norm, that gap may widen even more.

So why are the Common Core Standards being adopted if they are producing worse results? Apparently, the same imbeciles who implemented whole language are now in charge of implementing the Common Core Standards, all of which will cost the nation billions of dollars. And there you have the key: more money for educational bureaucrats who cannot guarantee anything but lower test scores. Increased failure is just what American children need! Ms. Stewart reported back in 1996:

Jerry Treadway, of San Diego State, recently became the most prominent whole-language proponent to publicly concede that whole-language theory was fundamentally flawed . . . . “I don’t mind saying it has been a disaster, as long as it’s clear to everyone that it was done with the best of intentions by a lot of really committed people.”

Tell that to the millions of adult Californians who can’t read. These “committed people” will now implement the Common Core Standards just for the hell of it. What a crime!

As for actual 2013 test scores, according to the *L.A. Times* (8/8/13) the percentage of students in California at grade level in English slipped to 56.4% from 57.2% and in math to 51.2% from 51.5%. But achievement in both subjects has steadily improved since 2004, when only about a third of students performed at grade level. As for minorities, fewer than half of African Americans and Latinos were at grade level in English and math, compared to three-fourths of Asians and more than two-thirds of whites. A less than mediocre academic performance at best.

# **Chapter Twenty-Four**

## **Cooperative Learning**

### **Communist Ideology in the Schools**

Several years ago, a friend of mine in Kentucky, who had been keeping me abreast of how Outcome Education was being implemented in the public schools of that state, sent me a description of Cooperative Learning, written by a high school student who had experienced it in his classroom. Here is what the student wrote, uncorrected by this writer:

I am a freshman in Highschool and recently in Spanish class our teacher introduced us to a teaching method called "cooperative learning." In cooperating learning the teacher divides you into group[s] of four or five. He holds each and every student personally responsible for their group's learning. Anytime we do work he takes one of the students assignments for each group and gives each person in that group the same grade as the person's he took up.

When we take a quiz he gives each student the average grade for their group, therefore this could easily lower the "excelled" student's grade and improve the student's who slack off. My teacher believes that we should be responsible for teaching our fellow classmates in our group. My classmates and I feel as if this is unjust, and now we have spoken with our principal about this. As of now, we have not made any more progress toward finding a solution.

An example of this would be on a Spanish quiz out of 16 possible points. I scored a 15 and the other three grades were 13, 9, and 5. This lowered my 15 to a 10.5, which is a 66%. Cooperative learning lowered my 15 (94%) to a 10.5 (66%).

For years, Charlotte Iserbyt has been warning us that public education has been taken over by small "c" communists. As a senior staff member of the U.S. Department of Education, she had access to the correspondence and grant proposals of America's top educational operatives. She

put all of that documentation in her book *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America*, published in 1991.

Cooperative learning, as described by the student, is indeed a good example of communist ideology in the classroom. The student is not judged by his individual effort but as a member of a group. According to Wikipedia, progressive social theorists such as Allport, Watson, Shaw, and Mead began advancing the idea that students working in a group was a more effective form of education than students working individually. But in actuality, group learning did not improve the work of the low achiever.

As the student pointed out, his score was 15 and the worst student's score was five. The scores were then averaged so that everyone in the group earned the same score of 10.5! If everyone is given the same grade, how can we know who is the highest achiever and who is the lowest? Why did the lowest achiever get only five points originally? If cooperative learning is valid shouldn't all the students in the group have achieved about the same score? The fact that the scores continued to vary so greatly is proof that cooperative learning didn't improve the learning of the low achievers. The average score simply camouflaged the reality of the disparate scores.

In the traditional classroom, each student is an individual responsible for his own achievement. And since each student is different in their learning abilities and the amount of effort they put into their work, the outcomes for each student would be different. But according to the socialists, individualism creates a competitive spirit which is opposed to a collectivist spirit, which is needed in a socialist society. Competition, of course, is the hallmark of a capitalist, individualistic society. Wikipedia states:

Philosophers and psychologists in the 1930s and 40s such as John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Morton Deutsch [all socialists] also influenced the cooperative learning theory practiced today. Dewey believed it was important that students develop knowledge and social skills that could be used outside of the classroom, and in the democratic society. This theory portrayed students as active recipients of knowledge by discussing information and answers in groups, engaging in the learning process together rather

than being passive receivers of information (e.g. teacher talking, students listening). Lewin's contributions to cooperative learning were based on the ideas of establishing relationships between group members in order to successfully carry out and achieve the learning goal.

Is it any wonder that socialist societies lose their economic vitality and creativity because the individual is negated in favor of the group? When we look at the 75 years of communist rule in Russia, what did the Soviet Union contribute to world economic progress? Nothing. On the other hand, capitalist America produced an endless array of goods and products that made life better for everyone. Communist Russia had to borrow from America's achievements in order to maintain a semblance of modern progress.

Or look at Cuba, which once had the third highest standard of living in the Western hemisphere. A half century of communism has turned it into an economic basket case, reducing everyone to poverty. And Obama's socialist policies are calculated to lower the American standard of living as he tries to change America from a capitalist to a socialist society. And he is succeeding because most Americans don't know the difference between socialism and capitalism, and are easily seduced by such concepts as "fairness" in income distribution, as if wealth is not earned by individuals, but distributed from the poor to the rich — as if the poor have anything to give the rich. The absurd notion that we ought to give back to the poor what they never had is a form of socialist lunacy. It is totally irrational. But who among the left cares?

Obama, the community organizer, will spend the years of his presidency convincing enough Americans that "millionaires and billionaires" must pay their fair share in taxes, even though they already pay over 40 percent of the taxes collected by the federal government. By transferring money from the productive class to the nonproductive federal government, business investment will decline, but Obama will have more money to give the "have nots." The only obstacle standing in his way is the Republican-dominated House of Representatives, which has the constitutional duty to manage the nation's money matters.

Meanwhile, our communist-controlled education system will continue to penalize the high achievers in favor of the low achievers through collectivist Cooperative Learning. *Webster's*

*New World Dictionary* defines collectivism as “the ownership and control of the means of production and distribution by the people collectively: socialism.”

That pure, unadulterated communist practice can be slipped into an American public school classroom with hardly a ripple from parents or anybody else is an indication of the depth of the public’s ignorance. Many books have already been written by critics of the public schools, but the only people who read them are conservatives who are smart enough to get their kids out. The rest of the public simply accepts the schools as they are — atheist, collectivist, and totally incompetent — but are not motivated to do anything about the kind of educational malpractice that turns millions of their children into academic failures.

As the Bible tells us, “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.” But what about the teachers? Don’t they know what’s going on? As one teacher at the Hancock County High School in Kentucky wrote in *The Hancock Clarion* of 12/30/93:

For a “dissident,” teaching in the public schools today is similar to living under a Stalinist “Reign of Terror.” Many teachers submit their horror stories and misgivings to anonymous publications or ask legislators not to quote them — for fear of repercussions.

All across America, more and more parents are opposed to what is going on in the public schools. But the education establishment has the liberal media on its side, and activist parents are labeled extremists, trouble-makers, censors, religious bigots, fanatics, fascists, etc. This is done to neutralize the vast majority of parents who don’t want to get involved, who don’t like controversy, who go along to get along.

We are finding that Americans are really no different from the Germans or Russians or Cubans who permitted their genocidal utopian leaders to take over their nations. They simply bury their heads in the sand during the transitional battles for power and batten down the hatches, preparing themselves to live through any evil imposed on them rather than fight it while there is still a chance of defeating it.

But one of the strategies the educators use to fend off the opposition is to propose educational “reform,” which requires billions of dollars to implement but never solves any of the problems that parents complain about. The teachers’ unions make sure that the legislators toe the line of phony “reform.” Indeed, in the name of “reform” the teachers’ unions have been able to get billions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayer, while delivering dross. The dross is celebrated as “improvements.”

The good news is that the homeschool movement continues to grow. Homeschooling is no longer considered an unusual and anti-social practice. It is now accepted as a legitimate and highly effective way of educating children. But lurking in the wings are those socialist educators who would like to outlaw homeschooling. They argue that the state has the right, if not the duty, to control the education of “its” children. Indeed, the socialists believe that the state owns the children and that parents are mere caretakers.

But we are still in the early stages of the socialist takeover of America. While the nanny state has been in the making since President Johnson’s ultra-liberal administration in 1965, it has reached the point where socialists in power can use it to swing Americans into a fully socialist system. ObamaCare, which barely squeezed through Congress without a single Republican vote, is the lever being used to overturn capitalism and set us firmly into socialist governance.

Meanwhile, the Achilles' heel of the Democrats is the dysfunctional public schools. That’s an arena of battle which conservatives must make the most of. For most parents — African Americans, Latinos, and Asians — still want their children to be taught to read, write, and do math, which the public schools are doing very poorly, if at all. These anxious parents should be reached by conservatives who wish to help all parents get a good education for their children in whatever form it may take. Will conservatives rise to the challenge? We’ll see.

## **Chapter Twenty-Five**

### **When Utopians Are in Power Expect Tyranny**

There are three kinds of organizations that require coercion for their successful function: governments, utopians, and criminals. Because the Founding Fathers understood the coercive power of government, they crafted a Constitution that gave our government limited powers so that Americans could exercise and enjoy a maximum of individual freedom. Thus, for most of our history Americans have considered their government to be a benign force, securing the God-given unalienable rights of the American people.

But our system has been under the assault of socialists for over a century. Socialists, by definition, are utopians. But voluntary utopianism has always failed, because human nature is incompatible with the utopian ideals which require self-abnegation to the extreme. The only utopian societies that survive for any length of time are those that are imposed by force. When people are able to escape from the utopian paradise, they flee by the millions. One third of the total population of Cuba have left the island in any way they could. Many died in the effort. In Russia, Lenin and Stalin were able to maintain their workers' paradise only by terror and dictatorship. But even that failed after 75 years of unadulterated tyranny.

What the socialist thugs in Washington are now trying to do is pass as many laws as possible, in order to impose as quickly as possible, a coercive system of government that will end individual freedom and create the infrastructure of a socialist system. This is being done as speedily as possible, so that the new system will be in place before the American people begin to understand what hit them. That is why the members of Congress didn't even have time to read the two-thousand-page health-care bill because if they actually knew what was in the bill, they would have voted against it. But that is hardly the kind of government the Founding Fathers created.



Criminals and utopians are attracted to governments because they know that that is where legal coercion lies. Criminals may kidnap one or several people in order to gain ransom money. But utopian socialists must kidnap an entire nation in order to succeed in their quest for total power. Since we know that communists and socialists cannot create a productive economy, they must deceive the electorate into believing that what they will produce is equality in paradise, such as they have in Cuba: free medical care, free education and equality of poverty and enslavement. Only a dumbed-down people would fall for that sham.

While the liberals and socialists are celebrating their power to impose crippling restrictions on free-market capitalism, the world knows that socialist societies produce economic stagnation, unemployment, and food shortages. Governments do not create wealth. They confiscate it from those who produce it. But a generation of young Americans, educated to believe that socialism is good and capitalism is evil, will be easily convinced that poverty is good and wealth immoral, just as they believe that man is causing global warming even though we are experiencing some of the coolest springs and summers on record.

This is simply mass hypnosis in action, in which people prefer to believe a celebrated authority like Al Gore rather than their own senses. And there is no doubt that the liberal mass media has succumbed to the same mass hypnosis and is on its knees worshipping the new messiah in the White House.

John Dewey knew that socialist change had to come slowly, bit by bit, piece by piece. That is why it took 100 years to bring America to its present state. Dewey knew that gradualism was the only way to deceive Americans into giving up their individual freedoms. The Fabians had stressed the need for patience while they undermined the free-market system. Fabian Tract No. 1 described that strategy in these words:

“For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did most patiently when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes, you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless.”

And that is why the Obama administration has been “striking hard,” while Obama had the power to move Congress in the direction he wanted it to go. But In 2010, he lost that precious Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, thus creating obstacles to any further socialist advance. As a result the President is resorting to the use of unconstitutional means to advance his agenda.

Meanwhile, the liberals have made it clear that they intend to use executive agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service to advance their political agenda. Utopians feel they have the moral imperative to use whatever power they have to reach their goals, even if it means corrupting the nonpolitical agencies of government.

And in case you’ve forgotten what socialists really want, in 1887 the Fabian Society openly published its credo to which every member was obliged to subscribe:

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists....It aims at the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit....The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land. The Society further works for the transfer to the Community of such Industrial Capital as can conveniently be handled socially. For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political consequent thereon.

American socialists are generally Marxists who prefer violent revolution to the gradualism of the Fabians, but they have realized over the years that such a revolution is impossible in America and thus have followed Dewey’s educational strategy which Sol Alinsky translated into a political strategy. The election of 2008 finally gave them the victory they had wanted for over 100 years.

Today, the American people are in a state of mass confusion. Economic turmoil has thrown them off-balance. Gas prices go up and down. There is confusion of apparent inflation and deflation at the same time. Credit card debt is at an all-time high. House foreclosures are taking their toll on thousands of families. Meanwhile, the Obama administration is piling up

debt in the trillions of dollars. And a sclerotic socialist system will only make things worse.  
We wonder what will be left after the socialists in Washington have done their work.

## Chapter Twenty-Six

### The Great American Math Disaster

One of the reasons why so many Americans are confused about the large numbers being tossed around by our leaders in Washington these days is because of how poorly they were taught mathematics in the public schools. They find figures in the millions, billions, and trillions almost impossible to visualize as anything more than just strings of numbers. Most Americans can barely deal with thousands, let alone trillions.

The basic problem is that American children are no longer being taught arithmetic in public schools. They are taught math, which includes more than our simple counting system. Arithmetic deals with quantity. Math deals with relationships and uses complex symbols. When you submerge arithmetic in mathematics, without making sure that the children have mastered their counting skills, you get math failure. And this is nothing new. Back on June 17, 1991, *Newsweek* magazine reported:

How bad are eighth graders' math skills? So bad that half are scoring just above the proficiency level expected of fifth-grade students. Even the best students did miserably; at the top-scoring schools, the average was well below grade level. Hardly any students have the background to go beyond simple computation, most of those kids can add but they have serious trouble thinking through simple problems....

What's really frightening about these results is that the alarm has been ringing since the 1983 publication of "A Nation at Risk," the federally-sponsored study that highlighted vast problems in the public schools. Yet despite years of talk about reform — and genuine efforts of change in a few places — American students are still not making the grade and remain behind their counterparts in other industrialized nations.

All those kids who did miserably in math in 1983 and 1991 are today's voting adults in their thirties and forties. And let us not forget the disaster called "New Math" which swept through America's elementary schools like a hurricane during the 1960s and '70s, creating today's math

illiterates among Boomers in their fifties and sixties. In the New Math set theory was supposed to be the way we look at the world. Everything in the world is made up of sets. Zero is an empty set. The theory was formulated by a German mathematician who wound up in an insane asylum.

The highly entertaining Straight Dope blog has published its own take on how the teaching of math has evolved in the last few years:

The following examples may help to clarify the difference between the new and old math.

1960: A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is  $\frac{4}{5}$  of this price. What is his profit?

1970 (Traditional math): A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is \$80. What is his profit?

1975 (New Math): A logger exchanges a set L of lumber for a set M of money. The cardinality of set M is 100 and each element is worth \$1.

(a) Make 100 dots representing the elements of the set M

(b) The set C representing costs of production contains 20 fewer points than set M. Represent the set C as a subset of the set M.

(c) What is the cardinality of the set P of profits?

1990 (Dumbed-down math): A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is \$80 and his profit is \$20. Underline the number 20.

1997 (Whole Math): By cutting down a forest full of beautiful trees, a logger makes \$20.

(a) What do you think of this way of making money?

(b) How did the forest birds and squirrels feel?

(c) Draw a picture of the forest as you'd like it to look.

The educators blame students low test scores on traditional arithmetic, which hasn't been taught in years, but is a perfect scapegoat. They complain that too much time is wasted practicing adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing. The solution? More calculators and computers.

The real problem is that our educators really don't know the difference between arithmetic and mathematics, and if you don't know the difference, you will not know how to teach either.

Our arithmetic system is an ingenious method of counting, keeping track of quantity. It uses 10 symbols and place value for all of its notations and operations. As such it is one of the greatest achievements of the human intellect, an invention that permits human beings to perform any counting feat with mere pencil and paper.

But the key to its proficient use is memorization of the basic arithmetic facts. If you don't memorize the facts, then you are stuck with unit counting and you might as well learn to use an abacus. Memorization requires rote drill, which is forbidden in today's schools, even though it is the easiest way for a child to learn anything. When educators think that children can learn to compute without memorizing the arithmetic facts, they are deluding themselves and cheating the children.

Why is it important for children to memorize the arithmetic facts? Because memorization will give them mastery of the system. And once the arithmetic facts are memorized through drill and practice with pencil and paper, they will later be able to use calculators and computers with accuracy, spotting errors when they make them, always able to do the calculations on paper if necessary.

Why did eighth graders do so poorly even in wealthy suburban schools? Because of bad teaching. Obviously, when even the richest and brightest fail, one cannot blame it on rote memorization when we are told that memorization is what makes the Japanese student so

much better than the American. If teachers do not even know how to teach simple arithmetic effectively, how can we assume that they know how to teach algebra, geometry, trigonometry, or calculus effectively?

Besides, very few of us will need to use algebra, geometry, trigonometry, or calculus, but all of us will need to use arithmetic — in doing tax returns, figuring out mortgages, balancing our checking accounts, using credit cards, making change, planning our retirement. So if everyone must use arithmetic in order to survive economically, why don't they teach it?

Back in 1983, John Saxon, the celebrated author of superb mathematics textbooks used by homeschoolers and private schools, observed in the August 19 *National Review*:

For the last twenty years, these [mathematics] experts have worked unwittingly to bring matters to a point where only the brilliant can learn mathematics. They have tried to teach advanced concepts and a general overview before the student has learned the basics....In an important sense, these authors are experts neither in mathematics nor in education. They do not know which mathematics topics must be mastered at which level and have no understanding of the capabilities of the average student. Their books are visible proof that they do not know how children learn and assimilate abstractions.

Until rote learning is restored in our primary schools in the teaching of arithmetic, we can expect math failure to plague American public education for the foreseeable future. Yet, at no time in our history has knowledge of basic arithmetic been important. Tax returns are more complicated than ever. City, state, and federal budgets can only be understood if one has a good knowledge of arithmetic. Comparative shopping in supermarkets requires an ability to make sense out of different prices. Setting up a small business requires the ability to figure out costs and profits. Buying stocks, bonds, borrowing money at interest require skill with numbers.

So why don't our schools teach everyone basic arithmetic? Because the dumbing-down agenda also covers math. It's easier for government and politicians to steal from the public when they can't add things up.

## Chapter Twenty-Seven

### The Communist Origin of American Public Education

Most Americans are under the impression that Communism was invented by Karl Marx and Lenin and first practiced in the Soviet Union. The truth, however, is quite different.

Communism as an economic and political philosophy was created by Robert Owen (1771-1858), a British manufacturer, who believed that all of man's ills were caused by religion. He 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 and not by himself as the 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 wants him to have.

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

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 utopian 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 decided, 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, secular education would have to precede the creation of a socialist society. They subsequently launched a strong campaign to promote a national system of secular education. Owen's son, Robert Dale Owen, and feminist Frances Wright set up headquarters in New York City, 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.

Their anti-religious views turned so many people away from Owenism, however, 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 Socialism to Unitarianism and finally to Catholicism. Years later, describing his short experience with the Owenites, Brownson wrote (as documented in his article "The Convert" in *The Works of Orestes A Brownson*, AMS Press, Inc., vol. V, p.56):

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 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.

Thus we know that as early as 1829, the communists and socialists had adopted subversive techniques to further their ends in the United States, techniques they would continue to use right up to the present.

Public education was the result of an unholy alliance between Owenites, who wanted public schools to promote socialism, Unitarians who wanted public schools to get rid of Calvinist influence, and Protestants who wanted public schools to counter increasing Catholic immigration. The system we now have is anti-Christian, pro-socialist, and owned lock, stock, and barrel by behavioral psychologists. It is a training system designed to treat children as little animals in conformity with the educators' prevailing belief in evolution.

This is clearly not an education system for a free society, and thus it must be gotten rid of. How? American parents still have the freedom to educate their children outside this corrupt government system. The faster they exercise that freedom, the better off we all shall be.

## **Chapter Twenty-Eight**

### **Multiculturalism: the New Cultural Genocide**

The philosophy of Multiculturalism has been around since the 1970s and it now infects every aspect of American life. Its latest nefarious manifestation is in airport security, where the notion that all ethnic groups are of equal value has made ethnic profiling a no-no. Just because all of the suicide bombers have been Islamic jihadists does not mean that young Moslem men should be singled out for greater scrutiny than anyone else.

That is why everyone who wants to travel by air must be subjected to the same intensive security inspection as a would-be suicide bomber, because it would be unfair to single out young male Moslems as the only people capable of blowing themselves up in a plane. Under multiculturalism everyone is capable of doing just that.

And that's why the United States government is willing to waste billions of dollars a year scrutinizing perfectly normal people so that it can maintain its adherence to a preposterous cultural philosophy that only a small academic elite believe in.

In July 1982, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) decided that multiculturalism had to become an integral part of teacher training. Its manual states:

Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters....

Multicultural education should include, but would not be limited to experiences which:

(1) promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; (2) develop skills for values clarification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; (3) examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and (4) examine linguistic variations and diverse learning styles for the development of appropriate teaching strategies.

But what all of that gobbledygook means is that the traditional Judeo-Christian model of American values is no longer valid as the model to be held up to children in the public schools. A multicultural society is made up of many equally valid ideals that could serve as equally valid models for young Americans. No one is required any longer to conform to the once dominant Judeo-Christian patriotic ideal. That culture is to be obliterated.

According to Charles A. Tesconi, dean of the College of Education at the University of Vermont:

“As a descriptor, multiculturalism points to a condition of numerous life-styles, values, and belief systems. By treating diverse cultural groups and ways of life as equally legitimate, and by teaching about them in positive ways, legitimizing differences through various education policies and practices, self-understanding, self-esteem, intergroup understanding and harmony, and equal opportunity are promoted.”

Thus, multicultural education embraces much more than mere cultural pluralism or ethnic diversity. It legitimizes different lifestyles and values systems, thereby legitimizing moral diversity — which is simply moral anarchy. The concept of moral diversity directly contradicts the Biblical concept of moral absolutes based on the Ten Commandments, on which this nation was founded.

How is multicultural education taught? It is not a course which is taught separately from the rest of the subject matter. It is, in reality, a world-view which, in the words of a multicultural specialist at Emporia State University, “must permeate the total educational environment.”

Indeed, according to an associate professor at West Virginia University, multicultural education “must be carefully planned, organized, and integrated into all the subject areas. But most emphatically it must begin when children first enter school.”

The idea that there exists a common value system known as Americanism no longer prevails in American public schools. Yet we know that Americanism does exist and does constitute the basis of American consciousness: the conviction that this nation was created with God’s help and blessings to demonstrate to the world that with the true God all good things are possible, and that without Him we will be consigned to the same tyranny and misery that now afflicts the millions of people who live under paganism, atheism and communism.

During the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty that concept of Americanism was expressed over and over again in song and speech in three simple words: God Bless America. Those three words acknowledge the existence, power, and sovereignty of the God of the Bible. They express the essence of Americanism, the peculiar consciousness that makes us different from other peoples. You never hear the President of France, or Germany, or Russia calling for God’s blessings.

While that American consciousness was given to us by our Founding Fathers who, for the most part, were indeed white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants, one does not have to be white, Anglo-Saxon, or even Protestant to accept it. There are many African-Americans, Hispanics, Germans, Armenians, Russians, Catholics, and Jews who accept it.

Becoming an American does not mean aping WASPS. It means accepting the essence of what the Founding Fathers stood for and died for. That essence is founded on Biblical principles which include the concept of moral absolutes. To deprive school children of that knowledge is to rob them of their common American heritage.

Multiculturalism is also an important stepping stone to globalism, that concept of a future world government which the public schools are promoting as aggressively as ever. In an article

entitled “Multicultural Education and Global Education: A Possible Merger,” Donna J. Cole of Wittenberg University wrote:

“A multiculturalized global education would address the basic concern of where the individual fits into the mosaic of humanity and where others fit in the same mosaic....[It] would aid students in understanding that our membership in groups affects our values and attitudes....[It] would assist students in recognizing the need to be flexible and adjustable citizens in a rapidly changing world.”

The National Education Association (NEA), of course, endorses multicultural-global education as “a way of helping every student perceive the cultural diversity of the US citizenry so that children of many races may develop pride in their own cultural legacy, awaken to the ideas embodied in the cultures of their neighbors, and develop an appreciation of the common humanity shared by all people of the earth.”

That was written in 1986 before Islamist jihadists, those fanatic followers of the god of the Koran, declared war on the United States. But apparently that hasn’t changed anything. Note that the NEA recognizes no American culture that the student may take pride in. He is to appreciate the cultures of others, learn about them, at the expense of learning about his own.

The ultimate purpose of multicultural-globalist education is to prepare young Americans to accept as inevitable and desirable a world socialist government in which American national sovereignty will be surrendered for the greater good of “world peace and brotherhood.” Social studies professors have rewritten American history to play down patriotism and national pride. Patriotism leads to an ethnocentric mindset, not conducive to world government.

The only way parents can safeguard their children from such socialist brainwashing is to educate them at home or place them in private schools where traditional subject matter is taught in the traditional way. Patriotism is alive and well in the home-school movement where Biblical principles prevail. And while we must all live in a society where multiculturalism has run

amok, the greatest gift parents can give their children is the knowledge that moral sanity is far more important and necessary for our national survival than conforming to secular humanist cultural standards that reject God's law.

# **Appendix**



# **A Teacher's Testimonial**

## **The Miracle of Alpha-Phonics**

### **by Paul Lukawski**

May 19, 2008

I have been a high school English teacher for 14 years. I remember in college wanting to know how to teach children to read. I went to a teacher college established in 1910. The school had one of the oldest teacher colleges in the country. Its College of Education enjoyed an excellent reputation. I asked three different professors how do you teach reading. I received three different vague responses.

After I completed my second year of teaching, I realized that my students could not read. I taught grades nine through twelve. The second year, I had three classes of ninth graders. I assigned the novel *To Kill a Mocking Bird* for them to read. I realized that most of my students could not read the novel's literate narrative.

It was during this time that I heard Samuel Blumenfeld interviewed on shortwave radio. At this time the Rodney King verdict had come in and there was rioting in the streets of L.A. He said that the reason the people were rioting was that they did not have jobs. They did not have jobs because they were illiterate. He said you could tell they were illiterate by listening to the lyrics of the songs they listened to and by the way they talked.

I was intrigued by what he said because it verified my experience as a high school teacher. He then said the schools were at fault because of the way they taught reading. I was again intrigued because of my experience in college trying to determine how to teach children to read. I was never taught it in college.

Mr. Blumenfeld had made two provocative statements on the radio, but I knew them to be true because of my personal experience. I then decided to buy a couple of his books, including *Alpha-Phonics*. My third year of teaching, I had a class of ninth graders that consisted of the worst performing students in the school. These students were in the dropout prevention program. They were waiting until they turned sixteen to drop out of school. I teach in our state's poorest county and our district at that time had a high drop out rate. Also in the class were several students from Mexico and one from Haiti. These students were speakers of other languages (ESOL). Their only problem was that they had a limited understanding of English. Every day in the class was a struggle with disruptive behavior; and if I could finish class without a student being sent to the office for discipline problems, I considered it a success.

The students had chronic discipline problems; they had trouble with the law, every problem you could imagine. After two months of getting absolutely nowhere with the students I decided that I would try an experiment. I was going to use *Alpha-Phonics* beginning with lesson one to teach those that wanted to learn how to read. I told the class that those that wanted to learn would sit on this side of the room, and those that did not were to sit on the opposite side of the room. The only rule was a student could not interfere with the *Alpha-Phonics* lesson.

Until this time, everyone sat scattered around the back of the room, as I did not have a seating chart. Any student, when given the option, will not sit in the front of the room with the teacher. The stage being set, I began the first day by reading the directions from the "Teachers Manual" to *Alpha-Phonics* and beginning with lesson one. I wondered what response I would get.

I was shocked by the response of the students. Nothing could have prepared me for what happened. If someone had told me what would happen I would not have believed them. With the exception of a few students who sat on the other side of the room because they did not want to participate, all of the students followed along as I wrote the lessons on the board. I would write the lesson on the board, read it out loud, and then have them read. The students leaned forward in their desks and followed along.

The next day the students all sat in the front of the room. Everyone would raise their hand and want to read. Indeed, after the first few days, the students would fuss among themselves to read aloud. They fought over who could write the lessons on the board. Everyone wanted to read aloud. Everyone sat in front of the room. There were no discipline problems. The entire class had been transformed. I had discovered a disturbing truth.

We worked through the book; and about halfway through the book, we began reading *Sounder* and *The Old Man and the Sea*. One youth in the class who could not read and who had been a behavior problem told me that every night he would sit with his dad as his dad read the sports section of the papers. He said he always wanted to read the paper with his dad, but he could not because he did not know how to read. A few weeks after starting *Alpha-Phonics*, he entered the class one day and told me that as he was driving down the road he began to sound out the words on the signs. He was excited because he was never able to do that before.

We had started *Alpha-Phonics* in October and the semester ended in December. I would not be seeing the students anymore. We had completed about three fourths of the book and read the two novels. I would begin each class by doing about 15 minutes of *Alpha-Phonics* and then read from the novels. The students were eager and well behaved. The youth who began reading the signs told me that in evening he could now sit with his dad and read the sports section along with him. They would talk about what they had read. Three Spanish-speaking students learned English this way.

The following year, I tried another experiment. I had one student who was identified as having ADD/ADHD. He was notorious. He was a ninth grader. This was his first year at our school. I had another student who was in trouble with the dean's office constantly. I gave both of them Sam's *Blumenfeld Oral Reading Test* (BORAT), and they scored between the 1st and 2nd grade levels. I made an arrangement with other teachers to have both students come to my class for fifteen minutes while I did an *Alpha-Phonics* lesson with them.

Because I began in August, I was able to finish the whole book with them by Christmas. I gave

both students the BORAT post-test. One boy had doubled his reading score and the other was close behind him. The boy with ADD/ADHD was never antsy or hyperactive when he was working on the lesson. He was a completely different child when he was with me. Indeed, his teacher would often allow him to stay the whole hour with me because he had many behavior problems in her class. He never had a behavior problem when working on *Alpha-Phonics*, neither did the other child who was constantly getting into fights and being suspended. When these two youngsters worked on *Alpha-Phonics* with me they were totally different children.

The following year, I worked with some other children. I had developed a system where I would set aside ten minutes each class period and do a few lessons while the rest of the class would work quietly on their own at their desks. I would use the BORAT to identify the illiterates in my class. I would then ask them if they had ever had an A in English. Invariably they would say, "No." I would ask them if they would want one. They would say, "Yes." I then would say that all they had to do was work with me for ten minutes a day on *Alpha-Phonics* until we were done with the book. When we were done with the book, I would choose several pages at random for them to read from. If they could read the pages to me, they would receive an A. I told them that that was all they had to worry about in the class. I was not interested in what they did regarding the usual coursework. That was the incentive I offered them. It was up to them.

One youth had failed the ninth grade and was taking his ninth grade English class over again with me. He was also taking his tenth grade English class. His tenth grade class met next door to mine first period. He would then come to my class second period. His tenth grade teacher was the same one he took the year before, the class which he had failed. He was working ten minutes a day on *Alpha-Phonics* for several weeks, when one day the door that communicated between my room and the neighboring room opened. It was his tenth grade teacher. She called me over to her and asked what it was I was doing with him. I told her *Alpha-Phonics*. She said, "Look!" The whole class was watching Channel One and chatting. It was during homeroom. The whole class, except this youth, who was busy reading a book I had given him. The teacher was flabbergasted. She knew he was illiterate and could not believe that he was able to read.

One day I was working with this boy at my desk when we had a new student enter the class. He had just been released from juvenile detention. He knew the youth I was working with and sat by him as we worked together. He was curious about what we were doing, and I explained it to him. He said that he could not read either. He explained that he started having trouble reading in the third grade. He said that when the time came to read aloud he would intentionally get into trouble so he would be sent to the office so that he would not have to read. He could not take the embarrassment. He did not want anyone to know that he could not read. The boy I was working with chimed in and said that he was the same way. They both recounted events when they would get into trouble on purpose so they could avoid reading. They would even start fistfights. The boy who had been in juvenile detention was sent there because he had set fire to the junior high school.

The following year I had firmly established my regular ten-minute routine in my class, and every year after that I would have students who would participate. One year I was in a staffing meeting for a boy who was labeled as a special education student with learning disabilities. The special education staffer, whom I had never met before asked me what I was doing with the boy. The reason she asked is that she was with the boy's science teacher when the science teacher had reported that the boy began volunteering to read aloud. The science teacher was astonished. We live in a small community and the teacher had known the boy ever since kindergarten and had known that he could not read, thus the placement in the special education program. Here he was volunteering to read aloud in her class. I told them what it was I was doing.

There is one case that haunts me. I had a big strapping youth who was seventeen years old. He had failed ninth and tenth grade English because he could not read. He was in my ninth grade English class. I had given him the BORAT test, and he was at about the 1-2 grade level: A typical case. We began working ten minutes a day. After a month I gave him the book *Sounder*, and he told me he was reading it at home. We were about halfway through the book when he no

longer showed up in my class. I learned that he had moved away. I do not know if he ever completely learned how to read. He was a decent well-mannered youth who would show up every day, was polite and carried a big stack of books with him. He was waiting for someone to teach him to read.

My daughter was born in 1996. I remember seeing the little girl read in the *Hooked on Phonics* commercials and wished my daughter could read like her. When she was two, I began to teach her how to read during my summer vacation. She would take naps then, and I followed the advice in the teacher's manual. I set up a routine. Every day, before she took her nap, we would sit together. Following Sam's advice, I appealed to her intellect. I said, "It is time for our lessons." I began by following the alphabet pre-reading exercises in the back of the book. Again, following Mr. Blumenfeld's advice, I did not pressure her or scold her, regardless of her behavior. Some days, she would kick at the book and giggle. I would say, "You did a good job today!" And I put the book away. We would continue tomorrow. It went on like this for several months.

When school started again she would do the lessons with me before we went to bed. She enjoyed the routine and the lessons. One evening, while my wife was in the room, she took out the book on her own and began reading from lesson two: "Am, Sam, Hear the S sound," she said. Then, - "Sam sat." - etc. My wife could not believe it. "Did she memorize those words?" She asked. "No," I replied, and then explained the method.

When she was three, we were driving down the road when she said, "Look Momma," pointing to a sign, "*Marshal's*, there is your store!" My wife could not believe it. When she was three, there was one occasion when our daughter was at Sunday school. Her teachers were arguing over whether or not she was reading the colors on the crayons. "She's memorized them," said one. "No, she is reading them," said the other. The colors she was reading were purple, fuchsia and magenta. Magenta was her favorite.

The spring before my daughter began kindergarten she could read fluently any word in front of

her. We were at a spring festival when my daughter and her friend bought soft drinks. My daughter read the inside of the cap, which told whether or not you had won a prize advertised on the side of the can. My daughter read the label effortlessly, which included the words **vacation** and **discovery**. “She is a genius!” exclaimed the father.

My daughter’s friend asked her dad to read the soft drink label to her. I told the girl’s father that his daughter could read as well if he used *Alpha-Phonics* with her. I said, “Follow the lesson manual and be patient, do not pressure your child, as Mr. Blumenfeld says, and in a year or so she will be like my daughter.”

That fall I saw the girl’s parents and asked how she was doing. He said his daughter had not really taken to the book yet. (His daughter had just started kindergarten, as mine had.). I said, “Be patient and keep going.” Meanwhile, my daughter was reading at 2nd grade level; and during kindergarten reading time, she would go to a second grade class for reading instruction. The following year I saw the girl’s dad again and asked him how she was doing in first grade. He said that his daughter was reading at a second grade level and was being tested for gifted and talented.

Meanwhile my daughter entered the first grade and soon afterwards was referred to the gifted and talented program. She won the spelling bee and Math bash just as she did in kindergarten. I used Samuel Blumenfeld’s *How-to-Tutor* to instruct her in math. In second grade, she read at the seventh grade level, won all of the reading, spelling and math prizes and was elected to the school’s hall of fame. She has had straight A’s in every class. She learned to read with *Alpha-phonics* and learned math with *How-to-Tutor*.

While my daughter was in first grade, I was asked to sit on a parent teacher committee. While on the committee, the mayor of our town complained to the principal that he had been on the committee for three years and that the committee was always talking about doing something outside of the box when it came to improving the school’s reading scores. Regardless of what the committee did to improve reading scores, they were always the same. The principal said

that he was open for suggestions outside of the box.

No one had any suggestions so I said that I was familiar with the method of reading instruction in the public schools and that was what was at fault. I said that I had a method that worked better. Indeed, I said that I drop my daughter off at school at 7:30, I could walk into any class, give a ten minute lesson and still arrive at the high school where I teach in time to sign in at 8:00 a.m. I said that if anyone doubted me, I get a paycheck every two weeks with a comma in it, let's put it on the table and keep the tourists out. I wanted to let them know my intentions were serious.

They took me up on the offer, and a first year teacher volunteered her class. I began the first Monday after spring break. I only had six weeks to work with the children. I made transparencies of the *Alpha-Phonics* lessons and followed the teacher's manual. I only did a ten-minute lesson. The teacher combined her bottom one-half students with the reading teacher's bottom one-half students. After two weeks, the mother of one of the children approached me. She said, "I am glad you are working with my daughter. A while back the school called me up to their office and told me there was something wrong with my daughter. She had a learning disability. I cried for two days." I told her not to listen to anything the schools told her, to be patient and to watch what happens.

A week after school was over, I saw the mother again and I asked her how her daughter was doing. She said that the school had called her up again and told her that they had given her daughter an end of the year reading test showing that she had a 40% improvement in her reading: and they were going to put her into an advanced class.

The following year, I was asked to do the project again with a first-grade class. I worked ten minutes each morning. I was only able to complete three-fourths of the book. The school's diagnostic test revealed that of the children who were able to complete the project successfully, not one had a reading disability. The makers of the diagnostic test said that you could expect 20% of the children to have reading disabilities.



I once was explaining to a student why children have reading problems. When I finished, a girl from the other side of the class, who I thought was not listening, said, "This is what happened to my brother. He is in the fourth grade, hates to read and gets stomach aches and headaches." I told her that his troubles were over and gave her a copy of *Alpha-Phonics*. Four months later, I asked how was her brother doing. She said he completed the book and reads just fine.

I had the same success with students in special education, who were labeled as learning disabled or educatably mentally retarded. I have 100% per cent success with every student. The only variable is the speed at which students progress. You must follow Dr. Blumenfeld's advice and be patient. Do not pressure the child.

I have many other heartbreaking stories about children who have quit school because they did not know how to read, and no one will teach them. I have had children take a copy of *Alpha-Phonics* and keep it to teach friends they know how to read. I encouraged everyone to try *Alpha-Phonics*. **The results you see in the child are truly miraculous. It must be seen to be believed.**

**P.S.** (August 17, 2013): I am currently tutoring several immigrant children from Bangladesh, including a kindergartener. I helped him complete *Alpha-Phonics* this summer. He can read all 124 lessons aloud with nary an error. I told the mother that this fall as he enters first grade the school will test him and as a result of his reading ability he will be catapulted into the gifted program as this happened to my daughter. She had completed *Alpha-Phonics* before kindergarten. Consequently, when her kindergarten class would spend their 30 minutes a day learning "reading", she was sent to a second grade class to read. She is a senior in high school this year and scored a 31 on ACT, to the amazement of everyone. Yale is attempting to recruit her and she wants to be a cardiologist. Alpha-phonics is first in line for any credit as it maximized her nascent potential and linguistic development.

## **John Dewey's Plan to Dumb-Down America**

As It Appeared in the FORUM,

Vol. XXV, May 1898, Pages 315 to 328

(Reformatted by Bob Montgomery Thomas, April 30, 2013)

### ***The Primary-Education Fetish***

It is some years since the educational world was more or less agitated by an attack upon the place occupied by Greek in the educational scheme. If, however, Greek occupies the place of a fetish, its worshippers are comparatively few in number, and its influence is relatively slight. There is, however, a false educational god whose idolaters 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. Other subjects may be taught; but they are introduced in strict subordination.

The very fact that this procedure, as part of the natural and established course of education, is assumed as inevitable,—opposition being regarded as captious and revolutionary,—indicates that, historically, there are good reasons for the position assigned to these studies. It does not follow, however, that because this course was once wise it is so any longer. On the contrary, the fact, that this mode of education was adapted to past conditions, is in itself a reason why it should no longer hold supreme sway. The present has its claims. It is in education, if anywhere, that the claims of the present should be controlling. To educate on the basis of past

surroundings is like adapting an organism to an environment which no longer exists. The individual is stultified, if not disintegrated; and the course of progress is blocked. 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 existing status was developed in a period when ability to read was practically the sole avenue to knowledge, when it was the only tool which insured control over the accumulated spiritual resources of civilization. Scientific methods of observation, experimentation, and testing were either unknown or confined to a few specialists at the upper end of the educational ladder. Because these methods were not free, were not capable of anything like general use, it was not possible to permit the pupil to begin his school career in direct contact with the materials of nature and of life. The only guarantee, the only criterion of values, was found in the ways in which the great minds of the past had assimilated and interpreted such materials. To avoid intellectual chaos and confusion, it was necessary reverently to retrace the steps of the fathers. The régime of intellectual authority and tradition, in matters of politics, morals, and culture, was a necessity, where methods of scientific investigation and verification had not been developed, or were in the hands of the few. We often fail to see that the dominant position occupied by book-learning in school education is simply a corollary and relic of this epoch of intellectual development.

Ordinary social conditions were congruent with this intellectual status. While it cannot be said that, in the formative period of our educational system in America, authority and tradition were the ultimate sources of knowledge and belief, it must be remembered that the immediate surroundings of our ancestors were crude and undeveloped. Newspapers, magazines, libraries, art-galleries, and all the daily play of intellectual intercourse and reaction which is effective to-day were non-existent. If any escape existed from the poverty of the intellectual environment, or any road to richer and wider mental life, the exit was through the gateway of books. In presenting the attainments of the past, these maintained the bonds of spiritual continuity, and kept our forefathers from falling to the crude level of their material surroundings.

When ability to read and write marked the distinction between the educated and the uneducated man, not simply in the scholastic sense, but in the sense of one who is enslaved by his environment and one who is able to take advantage of and rise above it, corresponding importance attached to acquiring these capacities. Reading and writing were obviously what they are still so often called—the open doors to learning and to success in life. All the meaning that belongs to these ends naturally transferred itself to the means through which alone they could be realized. The intensity and ardor with which our forefathers set themselves to master reading and writing, the difficulties overcome, the interest attached in the ordinary routine of school-life to what now seems barren,—the curriculum of the three R's,—all testify to the motive-power

these studies possessed. To learn to read and write was an interesting, even exciting, thing: it made such a difference in life.

It is hardly necessary to say that the conditions, intellectual as well as social, have changed. There are undoubtedly rural regions where the old state of things still persists. With reference to these, what I am saying has no particular meaning. But, upon the whole, the advent of quick and cheap mails, of easy and continuous travel and transportation, of the telegraph and telephone, the establishment of libraries, art-galleries, literary clubs, the universal diffusion of cheap reading-matter, newspapers and magazines of all kinds and grades,—all these have worked a tremendous change in the immediate intellectual environment. The values of life and of civilization, instead of being far away and correspondingly inaccessible, press upon the individual—at least in cities—with only too much urgency and stimulating force. We are more likely to be surfeited than starved: there is more congestion than lack of intellectual nutriment.

The capital handed down from past generations, and upon whose transmission the integrity of civilization depends, is no longer amassed in those banks termed books, but is in active and general circulation, at an extremely low rate of interest. It is futile to try to conceal from ourselves the fact that this great change in the intellectual atmosphere—this great change in the relation of the individual to accumulated knowledge—demands a corresponding educational readjustment. The significance attaching to reading and writing, as primary and fundamental instruments of culture, has shrunk proportionately as the immanent intellectual life of society has quickened and multiplied. The result is that these studies lose their motive and motor force. They have become mechanical and formal, and out of relation—when made dominant—to the rest of life.

They are regarded as more or less arbitrary tasks which must be submitted to because one is going to that mysterious thing called a school, or else are covered up and sugar-coated with all manner of pretty devices and tricks in order that the child may absorb them unawares. The complaint made by some, that the school curriculum of today does not have the disciplinary value of the old-fashioned three R's, has a certain validity. But this is not because the old ideal has been abandoned. It is because it has been retained in spite of the change of conditions. Instead of frankly facing the situation, and asking ourselves what studies can be organized which shall do for to-day what language-study did for former generations, we have retained that as the centre and core of our course of study, and dressed it out with a variety of pretty pictures, objects, and games, and a smattering of science.

Along with this change in the relation of intellectual material and stimulus to the individual there has been an equally great change in the method and make-up of knowledge itself. Science and art have become free. The simplest processes and methods of knowing and doing have been worked out to such a point that they are no longer the monopolistic possessions

of any class or guild. They are, in idea, and should be in deed, part of the social commonwealth. It is possible to initiate the child from the first in a direct, not abstract or symbolical, way, into the operations by which society maintains its existence, material and spiritual.

The processes of production, transportation, consumption, etc., by which society keeps up its material continuity, are conducted on such a large and public scale that they are obvious and objective. Their reproduction in embryonic form through a variety of modes of industrial training is entirely within the bounds of possibility. Moreover, methods of the discovery and communication of truth—upon which the spiritual unity of society depends—have become direct and independent, instead of remote and tied to the intervention of teacher or book. It is not simply that children can acquire a certain amount of scientific information about things organic and inorganic: if that were all, the plea for the study of the history and literature of the past, as more humanistic, would be unanswerable. No; the significant thing is that it is possible for the child at an early day to become acquainted with, and to use, in a personal and yet relatively controlled fashion, the methods by which truth is discovered and communicated, and to make his own speech a channel for the expression and communication of truth; thus putting the linguistic side where it belongs—subordinate to the appropriation and conveyance of what is genuinely and personally experienced.

A similar modification, almost revolution, has taken place in the relation which the intellectual activities bear to the ordinary practical occupations of life. While the child of bygone days was getting an intellectual discipline whose significance he appreciated in the school, in his home life he was securing acquaintance in a direct fashion with the chief lines of social and industrial activity. Life was the main rural. The child came into contact with the scenes of nature, and was familiarized with the care of domestic animals, the cultivation of the soil, and the raising of crops. The factory system being undeveloped, the home was the centre of industry. Spinning, weaving, the making of clothes, etc., were all carried on there. As there was little accumulation of wealth, the child had to take part in these, as well as to participate in the usual rounds of household occupations. Only those who have passed through such training, and, later on, have seen children reared in city environments, can adequately realize the amount of training, mental and moral, involved in this extra-school life. That our successful men have come so largely from the country, is an indication of the educational value bound up with such participation in this practical life. It was not only an adequate substitute for what we now term manual training, in the development of the hand and eye, in the acquisition skill and deftness; but it was initiation into self-reliance, independence of judgment and action, and was the best stimulus to habits of regular and continuous work.

In the urban and suburban life of a child to-day this is simply a memory. The invention of machinery; the institution of the factory system; the division of labor; have changed the home from a workshop into a simple dwelling-place. The crowding into cities and the increase in

servants have deprived the child of an opportunity to take part in those occupations which still remain. Just at the time when a child is subjected to a great increase in stimulus and pressure from his environment, he loses the practical and motor training necessary to balance his intellectual development. Facility in acquiring information is gained: the power of using it is lost. While need of the more formal intellectual training in the school has decreased, there arises an urgent demand for the introduction of methods of manual and industrial discipline which shall give the child what he formerly obtained in his home and social life.

Here we have at least a *prima facie* case for reconsideration of the whole question of the relative importance of learning to read and write in primary education. Hence the necessity of meeting the question at closer quarters. What can be said against giving up the greater portion of the first two years of school life to the mastery of linguistic form? In the first place, physiologists are coming to believe that the sense organs and connected nerve and motor apparatus of the child are not at this period best adapted to the confining and analytic work of learning to read and write. There is an order in which sensory and motor centres develop,—an order expressed, in a general way, by saying that the line of progress is from the larger, coarser adjustments having to do with the bodily system as a whole (those nearest the trunk of the body) to the finer and accurate adjustments having to do with the periphery and extremities of the organism. The oculist tells us that the vision of the child is essentially that of the savage; being adapted to seeing large and somewhat remote objects in the mass—not near-by objects in detail. To violate this law means undue nervous strain: it means putting the greatest tension upon the centres least able to do the work. At the same time, the lines of activity which are hungering and thirsting for action are left, unused, to atrophy. The act of writing— especially in the barbarous fashion, long current in the school, of compelling the child to write on ruled lines in a small hand and with the utmost attainable degree of accuracy—involves a nicety and complexity of adjustments of muscular activity which can only be appreciated by the specialist. As the principal of a Chicago school has wittily remarked in this connection, “The pen is literally mightier than the sword.” Forcing children at a premature age to devote their entire attention to theses refined and cramped adjustments has left behind a sad record of injured nervous systems and of muscular disorders and distortions. While there are undoubted exceptions, present physiological knowledge points to the age of about eight years as early enough for anything more than an incidental attention to visual and written language-form.

We must not forget that these forms are symbols. I am far from depreciating the value of symbols in our intellectual life. It is hardly too much to say that all progress in civilization upon the intellectual side has depended upon increasing invention and control of symbols of one sort or another. Nor do I join in the indiscriminating cry of those who condemn the study of language as having to do with mere words, not with realities. Such a position is one-sided, and is as crude as the view against which it is a reaction. But there is an important question here: Is the child of six or seven years ready for symbols to such an extent that the stress of educational life can be

thrown upon them? If we were to look at the question independently of the existing school system, in the light of the child's natural needs and interests at this period, I doubt if there could be found anyone who would say that the urgent call of the child of six and seven is for this sort of nutriment, instead of for more direct introduction into the wealth of natural and social forms that surrounds him. No doubt the skilful teacher often succeeds in awakening an interest in these matters; but the interest has to be excited in a more or less artificial way, and, when excited, is somewhat factitious, and independent of other-interests of child-life. At this point the wedge is introduced and driven in, which marks the growing divorce between school and outside interests and occupations.

We cannot recur too often in educational matters to the conception of John Fiske, that advance in civilization is an accompaniment of the prolongation of infancy. Anything which, at this period, develops to a high degree any set of organs and centres at the expense of others means premature specialization, and the arrest of an equable and all-around development. Many educators are already convinced that premature facility and glibness in the matter of numerical combinations tend toward an arrested development of certain higher spiritual capacities. The same thing is true in the matter of verbal symbols. Only the trained psychologist is aware of the amount of analysis and abstraction demanded by the visual recognition of a verbal form. Many suppose that abstraction is found only where more or less complex reasoning exists. But as a matter of fact the essence of abstraction is found in compelling attention to rest upon elements which are more or less cut off from direct channels of interest and action. To require a child to turn away from the rich material which is all about him, to which he spontaneously attends, and which is his natural, unconscious food, is to compel the premature use of analytic and abstract powers. It is willfully to deprive the child of that synthetic life, that unconscious union with his environment, which is his birthright and privilege. There is every reason to suppose that a premature demand upon the abstract intellectual capacity stands in its own way. It cripples rather than furthers later intellectual development. We are not yet in a position to know how much of the inertia and seeming paralysis of mental powers in later periods is the direct outcome of excessive and too early to appeal to isolated intellectual capacity. We must trust to the development of physiology and psychology to make these matters so clear that school authorities and the public opinion which controls them shall have no option. Only then can we hope to escape that deadening of the childish activities which led Jowett to call education "the grave of the mind."

Were the matter not so serious it would be ludicrous, when we reflect all this time and effort to reach the end to which they are specially consecrated. It is a common saying among intelligent educators that they can go into a schoolroom and select the children who picked up reading at home: they read so much more naturally and intelligently. The stilted, mechanical, droning, and sing-song ways of reading which prevail in many of our schools are simply the reflex of the lack of motive. Reading is made an isolated accomplishment. There are no aims in

the child's mind which he feels he can serve by reading; there is no mental hunger to be satisfied; there are no conscious problems with reference to which he uses books. The book is a reading-lesson. He learns to read not for the sake of what he reads, but for the mere sake of reading. When the bare process of reading is thus made an end in itself, it is a psychological impossibility for reading to be other than lifeless.

It is quite true that all better teachers now claim that the formal act of reading should be made subordinate to the sense of what is read, that the child has first to grasp the idea, and then to express his mental realization. But, under present conditions, this profession cannot be carried out. The following paragraph from the report of the Committee of Fifteen on elementary education states clearly enough the reason why; though, as it seems to me, without any consciousness of the real inference which should be drawn from the facts set forth:-

"The first three years' work of the child is occupied mainly with the mastery of the printed and written forms of the words of his colloquial vocabulary,—words that he is already familiar enough with as sounds addressed to the ear. He has to become familiar with the new forms addressed to the eye; and it would be an unwise method to require him to learn many new words at the same time that he is learning to recognize his old words in their new shape. But as soon as he has acquired (before three years) some facility in reading what is printed in the colloquial style, he may go on to selections from standard authors."

The material of the reading-lesson is thus found wholly in the region of familiar words and ideas. It is out of the question for the child to find anything in the ideas themselves to arouse and hold attention. His mind is fixed upon the mere recognition and utterance of the forms. Thus begins that fatal divorce between the substance and the form of expression, which, fatal to reading as an art, reduces it to a mechanical action. The utter triviality of the contents of our school "Primers" and "First Readers," shows the inevitable outcome of forcing the mastery of external language-forms upon the child at a premature period. Take up the first half-dozen or dozen such books you meet with, and ask yourself how much there is in the ideas presented worthy of respect from any intelligent child of six years.

Methods for learning to read come and go across the educational arena, like the march of supernumeraries upon the stage. Each is heralded as the final solution of the problem of learning to read; but each in turn gives way to some later discovery. The simple fact is—that they all lack the essential of any well-grounded method, namely, relevancy to the child's mental needs. No scheme for learning to read can supply this want. Only a new motive--putting the child into a vital relation to the materials to be read—can be of service here. It is evident that this condition cannot be met, unless learning to read be postponed to a period when the child's intellectual appetite is more consciously active, and when he is mature enough to deal more rapidly and effectively with the formal and mechanical difficulties.



The endless drill, with its continual repetitions, is another instance of the same evil. Even when the attempt is made to select material with some literary or historic worth of its own, the practical outcome is much like making *Paradise Lost* the basis of parsing-lessons, or Caesar's *Gallic Wars* an introduction to Latin syntax. So much attention has to be given to the formal side that the spiritual value evanesces. No one can estimate the benumbing and hardening effect of this continued drill upon mere form. Another even more serious evil is the consequent emptiness of mind induced. The mental room is swept and garnished--and that is all. The moral result is even more deplorable than the intellectual. At this plastic period, when images which take hold of the mind exercise such suggestive motor force, nothing but husks are provided. Under the circumstances, our schools are doing great things for the moral education of children; but all efforts in this direction must necessarily be hampered and discounted until the school-teacher shall be perfectly free to find the bulk of the material of instruction for the early school-years in something which has intrinsic value,—something whose introduction into consciousness is so vital as to be personal and reconstructive.

It should be obvious that what I have in mind is not a Philistine attack upon books and reading. The question is not how to get rid of them, but how to get their value,—how to use them to their capacity as servants of the intellectual and moral life. 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. Just because literature is so important, it is desirable to postpone the child's introduction to printed speech until he is capable of appreciating and dealing with its genuine meaning. Now, the child learns to read as a mechanical tool, and gets very little conception of what is worth reading. The result is, that, after he has mastered the art and wishes to use it; he has no standard by which to direct it. He is about as likely to use it in one way as in another. It would be ungrateful not to recognize the faithfulness and relative success with which teachers, for the last ten or fifteen years, have devoted themselves to raising the general tone of reading with their pupils. But, after all, they are working against great odds. Our ideal should be that the child should have a personal interest in what is read, a personal hunger for it, and a personal power of satisfying this appetite. The adequate realization of this ideal is impossible until the child comes to the reading-material with a certain background of experience which makes him appreciate the difference between the trivial, the merely amusing and exciting, and that which has permanent and serious meaning. This is impossible so long as the child has not been trained in the habit of dealing with material outside of books, and has formed, through contact with the realities of experience, habits of recognizing and dealing with problems in the direct personal way. The isolation of material found in books from the material which the child experiences in life itself—the forcing of the former upon the child before he has well-organized powers of dealing with the latter—is an unnatural divorce which cannot have any other result than defective standards of appreciation, and a tendency to elevate the sensational and transiently interesting above the valuable and the permanent.

Two results of our wrong methods are so apparent in higher education that they are worth special mention. They are exhibited in the paradox of the combination of slavish dependence upon books with real inability to use them effectively. The famous complaint of Agassiz—that students could not see for themselves—is still repeated by every teacher of science in our high schools and colleges. How many teachers of science will tell you, for example, that, when their students are instructed to find out something about an object, their first demand is for a book in which they can read about it; their first reaction, one of helplessness, when they are told that they must go to the object itself and let it tell its own story? It is not exaggerating to say that the book habit is so firmly fixed that very many pupils, otherwise intelligent, have a positive aversion to directing their attention to things themselves,—it seems so much simpler to occupy the mind with what someone else has said about these things. While it is mere stupidity not to make judicious use of the discoveries and attainments of others, the substitution of the seeing of others for the use of one's own eyes is such a self-contradictory principle as to require criticism. We only need recognize the extent to which it actually obtains.

On the other hand, we have the relative incapacity of students to use easily and economically these very tools—books—to which most of their energies have been directed. It is a common experience with, I will not say only the teachers of undergraduate students, but of graduate students,—candidates for advanced degrees,—to find that in every special subject a large amount of time and energy has to be spent in learning how to use the books. To take a book and present an adequate condensed synopsis of its points of view and course of argument is an exercise, not merely in reading; but in thinking. To know how to turn quickly to a number of books bearing upon a given topic, to choose what is needed, and to find what is characteristic of the author and important in the subject, are matters which the majority of even graduate students have to learn over again for themselves. If such be the case,—and yet attention to books has been the dominant note of all previous education,—we are surely within bounds in asking if there is not something radically wrong in the way in which books have been used. It is a truism to say that the value of books consists in their relation to life, in the keenness and range which they impart to powers of penetration and interpretation. It is no truism to say that the premature and unrelated use of books stands in the way. Our means defeat the very end to which they are used.

Just a word about the corresponding evils: We have to take into account not simply the results produced by forcing language-work unduly, but also the defects in development due to the crowding out of other objects. 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, tragic. This epoch is also the budding-time for the formation of efficient and orderly habits on the motor side: it is pre-

eminently the time when the child wishes to do things, and when his interest in doing can be turned to educative account. 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 present curriculum is psychologically impossible. It is simply a superstition: it is a remnant of an outgrown period of history.

All this might be true, and yet there might be no subject-matter sufficiently organized for introduction into the school curriculum, since this demands, above all things, a certain definiteness of presentation and of development. But we are not in this unfortunate plight. There are subjects which are as well fitted to meet the child's dominant needs as they are to prepare him for the civilization in which he has to play his part. There is art in a variety of modes---music, drawing, painting, modeling, etc. These *media* not only afford a regulated outlet in which the child may project his inner impulses and feelings in outward form, and come to consciousness of himself, but are necessities in existing social life. The child must be protected against some of the hard and over-utilitarian aspect of modern civilization: positively, they are needed, because some degree of artistic and creative power is necessary to take the future worker out of the ranks of unskilled labor, and to feed his consciousness in his hours of contact with purely mechanical things.

Those modes of simple scientific observation and experiment which go under the name of "nature-study" are calculated to appeal to and keep active the keenness of the child's interest in the world about him, and to introduce him gradually to those methods of discovery and verification which are the essential characteristics of modern intellectual life. On the social side, they give the child an acquaintance with his environment,—an acquaintance more and more necessary, under existing conditions, for the maintenance of personal and social health, for understanding and conducting business pursuits, and for the administration of civic affairs. What is crudely termed manual training—the variety of constructive activities, which, begun in the Kindergarten, ought never to be given up—is equally adapted to the characteristic needs of the child and to the present demands of associated life. These activities afford discipline in continuous and orderly application of powers, strengthen habits of attention and industry, and beget self-reliant and ingenious judgment. As preparation for future social life, they furnish insight into the mechanical and industrial occupations upon which our civilization depends, and keep alive that sense of the dignity of work essential to democracy. History and literature, once more, provide food for the eager imagination of the child. While giving it worthy material, they may check its morbid and chaotic exercise. They present to the child typical conditions of social life, they exhibit the struggles which have brought it into being, and picture the spiritual which it has culminated. Due place cannot be given to and history until the teacher is free to select them for their intrinsic value, and not from the standpoint of the child's ability to recognize written and printed verbal symbols.

Here we have the controlling factors in the primary curriculum of the future,—manual training, science nature-study, art, and history. These keep alive the child's positive and creative impulses, and direct them in such ways as to discipline them into the habits of thought and action required for effective participation in community life.

Were the attempt suddenly made to throw out, or reduce to a minimum, language-work in the early grades, the last state of our schools would undoubtedly be worse than the first. Not immediate substitution is what is required, but consideration of the whole situation, and organization of the materials and methods of science, history, and the arts to make them adequate educational agencies. Many of our present evils are due to compromise and inconsistency. We have neither one thing nor the other,—neither the systematic, all-pervasive discipline of the three R's, nor a coherent training in constructive work, history, and nature-study. We have a mixture of the two. The former is supposed to furnish the element of discipline and to constitute the standard of success; while the latter supplies the factor of interest. What is needed is a thoroughgoing reconciliation of the ideals of thoroughness, definiteness, and order, summed up in the notion of discipline, with those of appeal to individual capacities and demands, summed up in the word "interest." This is the Educational Problem, as it relates to the elementary school.

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 régime. Educators should also frankly face the fact that the New Education, as it exists to-day, is a compromise and a transition: it employs new methods; but its controlling ideals are virtually those of the Old Education. Wherever movements looking to a solution of the problem are intelligently undertaken, they should receive encouragement, moral and financial, from the intellectual leaders of the community. There are already in existence a considerable number of educational "experiment 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. There will be clear standards, well-arranged material, and coherent methods upon which to proceed. To build up and equip such schools is, therefore, the wisest and most economic policy, in avoiding the friction and waste consequent upon casual and spasmodic attempts at educational reform.

All this amounts to saying that school reform is dependent upon a collateral wider change in the public opinion which controls school board, superintendent, and teachers. There are certain minor changes; reforms in detail, which can be effected directly within the school system itself. But the school is not an isolated institution: it is one of an organism of social forces. To secure more scientific principles of work in the school, means, accordingly, clearer vision and wiser standards of thought and action in the community at large. The Educational Problem is ultimately, that society shall see clearly its own conditions and needs, and set resolutely about meeting them. If the recognition be once secured, we need have no doubts about the consequent action. Let the community once realize that it is educating upon the basis of a life which it has left behind, and it will turn, with adequate intellectual and material resources, to meet the needs of the present hour.