

Outcome-Based Education: The New World Order in Public Education

By Samuel L. Blumenfeld

As everyone knows, American public education has been in crisis for at least the last two decades. In fact, it was the famous *A Nation at Risk* report, issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in April 1983, that called for drastic measures to be taken if the public schools were to be saved from further deterioration. The Commission said: "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people." Then it added a comment which raised a lot of eyebrows: "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."

And so the calls for educational reform came fast and furious. Basically there were two types of reforms called for. Conservatives called for getting back to basics, for teaching reading by intensive phonics, for strengthening all of the academic subjects, for greater discipline, more homework, etc. The liberal education establishment had other ideas. Besides calling for more money, higher teacher salaries, all of which they got, their view of reform included whole language in primary reading, invented spelling, no memorization in arithmetic but lots of calculators, a breakdown of traditional subject matter into relevant topics, and, above all, a greater emphasis on the affective domain, that is, more emphasis on feelings, beliefs, values, socialization, sexuality, group learning, group therapy, peer counseling, death education, drug education, etc.

Obviously, these two views of education are not only mutually exclusive but produce totally different results. The conservative approach represents a traditional Judeo-Christian world view that sees education as a development of intellect and spirit. It sees the school as serving the parents who entrust that institution to educate their children so as to prepare them to assume the duties and responsibilities of adult life by teaching them basic academic skills and subject matter that will serve them in any field of work, in any career they may choose.

Although the conservative approach recognizes that the public school is a secular institution, it expects that institution to respect the Biblical religion that is the foundation of our society. When I was going to public school in New York City in the 1930s, it was customary for the school principal at assemblies to read a verse from the Bible. In my school the principal read the 23rd Psalm, and I remember being very much moved and influenced by that reading.

Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover summed up the traditional view when he said the following to a Congressional committee in 1962:

[A] school must accomplish three difficult tasks; First, it must transmit to the pupil a substantial body of

knowledge; second, it must develop in him the necessary intellectual skill to apply this knowledge to the problems he will encounter in adult life; and third, it must inculcate in him the habit of judging issues on the basis of verified fact and logical reasoning. . . . [The school's] principal task . . . is to develop the mind. . . .

Far too many of our teachers do not possess the intellectual and educational qualifications that would permit them to offer such a course of studies. There is an easy way out, and many of our schools are using it. They teach simpler things that are easy to teach, easy to learn, and more fun besides--how to be lovable, likable, and datable, how to be a good consumer, [and, I might inject, how to use a condom]. These aren't subjects you can grade, the way you can grade mathematics or science or languages, but they are good for hiding the ignorance of both teacher and pupil.

All of that was said in 1962, twenty years before *A Nation at Risk* was issued. Apparently the educators didn't listen to Admirable Rickover then, and they have no intention to listening to his counterparts today.

Why? Because the liberal education establishment approaches education with an entirely different world view, a humanist world view based on the notion that there is no God, that man is the product of evolution, an animal, that the purpose of education is not to create competent individuals who can stand on their own two feet and make it in the adult world, but to change society. Humanist education is basically messianic in its outlook. It not only wants to change society, but also erase from human consciousness any dependence on a higher authority, that is, God. You cannot really understand humanist education until you realize that it is at war with the God of the Bible. for humanists education is a form of spiritual warfare, not education in the sense that conservatives recognize it. That's why Admiral Rickover's common sense fell on deaf ears.

Outcome-based education, or OBE as we shall now call it, is the most radical educational reform designed to further humanist goals. First and foremost, it does away with every last vestige of traditional education, its methods, its curriculum, its objective means of assessment, its time frame, its goals. When I refer to the last vestige of traditional education what I mean is that there is not much left to traditional education to begin with. The *A Nation At Risk* report simply let us know how far we had departed from traditional educational goals. The cry for "Back to Basics" was a popular acknowledgment of the fact that the education system had long departed from its traditional curriculum.

But Outcome-Based education did not suddenly arise out of nowhere. It has been worked on and planned for by humanist psychologists and sociologists for years despite public clamor for back to basics. One must understand that these educational professionals feel that they have a mission, that they are more than just government employees, that they are in every sense of the word true revolutionaries engaged in a true revolution. That is why humanists have never had any intention of getting back to basics, and that is why so many parents have experienced frustration in dealing with school superintendents and school boards.

Of course, the whole departure from the traditional curriculum started at the turn of the century when humanists John Dewey and his colleagues decided to use our public school system as the means of changing America from a capitalist, individualist, believing society into a socialist, collectivist, atheist society. The humanists spent the next thirty years revising the curriculum and the textbooks so that by 1930 they were ready to impose the new socialist-oriented curriculum on the public schools of America. One might call that period the first phase of the humanist reform movement. It was dominated by behaviorist, stimulus-response animal-tested psychology.

The second phase began in the early 1960s with the emergence of Third Force psychology developed by humanist psychologists Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Sidney Simon and others who tried to inject an emotional and spiritual component in the behaviorist mix. Since the goal of education was now defined as self-actualization, the emphasis was now in the development of the affective or emotional domain through such programs as values clarification, sensitivity training, situational ethics, multiculturalism, pluralism, death education, sex education, etc. Education was still viewed in its secular messianic mission of changing human behavior in order to change society. Naturally, academics, in the traditional sense, suffered, because academics now came under the rubric of the cognitive domain, programmed by cognitive psychologists who were more concerned with the affective aspect of cognition than its intellectual one.

So you can see by now the assault that traditional education has been under since the 1930s. In the meanwhile, Third Force psychology has given us a whole new educational vocabulary with such terms as change agents, facilitators, learners, critical thinking, self-esteem, cognitive dissonance, experiential learning, congruence, empathy, relationship inventory, interpersonal relationship, therapeutic change, social climate, self-actualization, clarifying values, respondent behavior, operant behavior, nonverbal cues, taxonomy, morphological creativity, behavioral objectives, group experience, group dynamics, affective learning, confluent education and many more.

All of this has been engineered mainly by psychologists who have taken over the education system lock, stock and barrel. From 1900 to about 1940 you had G. Stanley Hall, John Dewey, Charles Judd, James McKeen Cattell, Edward L. Thorndike, and their proteges Arthur Gates, William Scott Gray, William Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg, George Counts and others, all psychologists or educators trained by psychologists who transformed American education in the progressive mold. In 1933 you had the Humanist Manifesto which set the spiritual foundation for the progressive movement. In the 1940s and '50s you had the strong influence of communist social psychology through the work of Kurt Lewin at MIT and in the founding of the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine, under the sponsorship of the National Education Association. That's where sensitivity training was born.

In the '60s and '70s you had the rise of Third Force affective psychology and the

proclamation of Humanist Manifesto II, which basically outlined the curriculum for American public schools. But the beginnings of Outcome-Based Education can be traced back to the 1948 meeting in Boston of the American Psychological Association Convention where a group of behavioral scientists decided to embark on a project of classifying the goals or outcomes of the educational process since, as they said, "educational objectives provide the basis for building curricula and tests and represent the starting point for much of our educational research."

In other words, you build your curriculum on what you want your outcomes to be. For example, if you want your student to become a humanist, you start building a curriculum that will turn that student into a humanist. You teach him or her about evolution, environmentalism, feminism, reproductive rights, sexual freedom, alternative values systems, etc. And you must provide tests and assessments along the way to make sure that the outcomes are being achieved. Undoubtedly, the end product will be an All-American pagan who worships the earth goddess Gaia and becomes a Congressman.

Likewise, the curriculum of a Christian school is determined by the end goal, or desired outcome, of the educative process: a well-educated Christian steeped in the knowledge of God and His law.

The result of the scientists' deliberations has become known as Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, a behaviorist classification of outcomes produced by a new curriculum that does away with traditional subject matter and teaching methods. The central figure behind all of this is behavioral scientist Benjamin S. Bloom of the University of Chicago. His taxonomy, which is little more than a humanist-behaviorist straitjacket for public education, is contained in two handbooks, one for the cognitive domain and the other for the affective domain. Bloom writes:

Curriculum builders should find the taxonomy helps them to specify objectives so that it becomes easier to plan learning experiences and prepare evaluation devices. . . . In short, teachers and curriculum makers should find this a relatively concise model for the analysis of educational outcomes in the cognitive area of remembering, thinking, and problem solving. . . .(p. 2)

Equally important, the psychological relationships employed by the classification scheme are suggestive of psychological investigations which could further our understanding of the educational process and provide insight into the means by which the learner changes in a specified direction. (p. 3)

A second part of the taxonomy is the affective domain. It includes objectives which describe changes in interest, attitudes, and values, and the development of appreciations and adequate adjustment. . . . It is difficult to describe the behaviors appropriate to these objectives since the internal or covert feelings and emotions are as significant for this domain as are the overt behavioral manifestations. . . . Our testing procedures for the affective domain are still in the most primitive stages. (p. 7)

That was written in 1956. But by now their testing instruments have been quite perfected to do their job of monitoring affective change. Bloom continues:

Blumenfeld - 5

This taxonomy is designed to be a classification of the student behaviors which represent the intended outcomes of the educational process. . . . (p. 10)

The taxonomy is not completely neutral. This stems from the already-noted fact that it is a classification of intended behaviors. . . . (p. 15)

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. . . . It is important that the major objectives of the school or unit of instruction be clearly identified if time and effort are not to be wasted on less important things and if the work of the school is to be guided by some plan. . . .

The philosophy of education of the school serves as one guide, since the objectives to be finally included should be related to the school's view of the "good life for the individual in the good society." What are important values? What is the proper relation between man and society? What are the proper relations between man and man? (p. 27)

Note that the relationship between man and God is not included in the taxonomy.

The book then outlines the taxonomy, or classification, of the cognitive domain. Concerning knowledge, Bloom writes:

Knowledge as defined here includes those behaviors and test situations which emphasize the remembering, either by recognition or recall, of ideas, material, or phenomena. (p. 62)

A sample of the knowledge expected to be learned is given as follows:

To develop a basic knowledge of the evolutionary development of man. . . . A knowledge of the forces, past and present, which have made for the increasing interdependence of people all over the world. . . . knowledge of a relatively complete formulation of the theory of evolution. (p. 71)

These are just samples of the kind of "knowledge" the student is later expected to manifest in his behavior. As for the taxonomy of objectives in the affective domain, we read:

Affective objectives vary from simple attention to selected phenomena to complex but internally consistent qualities of character and conscience. We found a large number of such objectives in the literature expressed as interests, attitudes, appreciations, values, and emotional sets and biases. . . . (p. 7)

[T]he process of socialization, with its development of behavioral controls, is a topic with which the affective domain is much involved. (p. 38)

Bloom then points out that it is often difficult to separate the cognitive from the affective. He writes:

Many of the objectives which are classified in the cognitive domain have an implicit but unspecified affective component that could be concurrently classified in the affective domain. (p. 48)

Which means that you can easily slip in some affective outcomes with your cognitive

objectives, thus making it easier to obtain the desired behavioral changes. And, accordingly, this is better done at an earlier age. He writes:

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. . . . (p. 85)

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. We are of the opinion that this will prove to be a most fruitful area of research in connection with the affective domain. . . . (p. 88)

If you learn nothing else from this article than the fact that the psycho-educators know how to cause a major reorganization of values in the mind of a child in one single hour of classroom activity, then you've learned why it is so dangerous to put a Christian child in a public school. I know of an 8-year-old second-grader in Michigan who committed suicide because of a film he was shown in the classroom. It took only one hour in the classroom to change that child's life for good. The taxonomy continues:

[Psychologist Gordon] Allport (1954) emphasizes the basic reorganization that must take place in the individual if really new values and character traits are to be formed. . . . (p. 89)

It is not enough merely to desire a new objective or to wish others to be molded in the image that we find desirable or satisfactory. We must find ways of understanding and determining what objectives are central and significant if we are to summon the appropriate effort to achieve these more complex objectives. (p.90)

Everything in Outcome-Based Education can be found in Bloom's writings. For example, in his book *Human Characteristics and School Learning*, published in 1976, Bloom expounds on his theory of Mastery Learning, which is at the heart of the methodology in OBE. The basic idea is that most students can learn what the schools have to teach "if the problem is approached sensitively and systematically." What makes mastery learning work, says Bloom, is the feedback-corrective procedure. He writes:

The feedback procedures typically consist of brief formative tests, at the end of each learning task, which indicate what the student has learned and what he still needs to attain mastery of the task. Mastery is frequently defined as something approximating 80 to 85 percent of the items on a criterion-referenced test. (p. 125)

In mastery learning the pupil is permitted to take as much time as necessary in order to achieve mastery of whatever it is the teacher wants him or her to learn. In fact, the pupil cannot advance to the next task or learning module until the previous task or learning module has been mastered. This means that the pupil may not graduate until he or she can demonstrate that "learning" (indoctrination?) has taken place.

The problem with mastery learning is the content of material to be mastered. It is easy enough to determine whether or not a child has memorized a specific Biblical verse. But how do you master material in the affective domain, and how is that mastery

tested? By prying questionnaires.

Has mastery learning been tried anywhere? Yes, it was tried in a reading program in the public schools of Chicago back in the 1970s. The curriculum, following Bloom's taxonomy, consisted of 5,000 pages of behavioral objectives. The five-year program turned out to be a disaster with reading scores plummeting. It was obvious that learning by "behavioral objectives" does not produce true learning.

The man leading the OBE revolution today is not Professor Bloom, who is now 80 years old, but a much younger and energetic psycho-educator by the name of William G. Spady. In an interview published in *Educational Week* (Dec. 1992), Spady tells us that while as a graduate student at the University of Chicago and a member of the admissions staff, he recruited as a freshman a student by the name of Jim Block, a "bright, intense, athletic young man." During the next four years Block and Spady became fast friends. After Block got his bachelor's degree, Spady introduced him to Benjamin Bloom. Block became one of Bloom's best graduate students and did much of the basic research in Mastery Learning. Spady says that he was one of the earliest to know about Mastery Learning because he was getting the data straight from his friend as it was unfolding.

Spady then moved on to Harvard to teach social relations and education. He also got interested in organizational theory. He says:

So, when Block told me about the fundamental changes associated with mastery learning--turning time into a variable instead of time being a constant, and having what I now would call a criterion base for standards instead of comparative standards--I found the ideas theoretically compelling, and I took them immediately to the educational system level--because to me the fundamental barriers to making the mastery learning idea work were at the organizational and institutional level. So I said to Jim Block--I mean we literally made an agreement that day--"You fix the classrooms, I'll work on the total system."

And so, Outcome-Based Education was born. Note that Jim Block's mastery learning methodology would be the classroom mode of instruction, and Spady would reorganize the entire education system to make mastery learning work. In other words, the systemic barriers to mastery learning that were part and parcel of traditional education would have to be removed. The plan, obviously, was based on the assumption that the traditional school was an obstacle to learning.

So an entirely new kind of system had to be created to make behaviorist mastery learning work. If it failed in Chicago, then obviously it was the system that was at fault, not the program. Outcome-based education is the new system.

According to Spady, our present traditional instruction system (which produced the most literate nation in history until 50 years ago) is a relic of the industrial age, and therefore we need a new delivery system based on mastery learning techniques (which have no track record of success anywhere except in Jim Block's experimental

research); the present school calendar is a relic of the agricultural age, therefore we need a year-round school calendar that sweeps our traditional two-month summer vacation into the dustbin of history; and the present traditional philosophy of education is a relic of the feudal age (because it fostered intellectual development, religion and respected parental rights) and is no longer suitable for schools engaged in changing values. What we need, says Spady, is a total revolution, a paradigmatic change.

And Spady knows how to organize a revolution from the top, a revolution funded by the wealthy humanist foundations (Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller), and planned by the graduate schools of education, the state departments of education, and the federal government. The new psycho-educationist elite will destroy whatever is left of the traditional system and replace it with an expansionist, New Age, holistic system of total control under the OBE label.

What are the outcomes being planned in Outcomes-based education? How do the change agents decide what the outcomes should be? Spady says:

We are starting with what the research suggests about the future and we design down, or design back, from there. We're talking about a systematic process called Strategic Design: determining as well as we can from studying the literature and available data about future trends and conditions that our kids will be facing out there in the world.

Apparently, Spady and friends are quite confident that they can predict the future and they are willing to gamble that the future they predict will be there when the kids get out of school. But to base an entire education system on visionary assumptions about the future is not only foolish but dangerous. What students should be taught are basic academic skills as well as the timeless spiritual and moral values of the Bible that they will be able to use under any circumstances. The Bible has endured for over 2,000 years as the unchanging standard and guide to a moral, healthy, and productive life regardless of the different forms civilization has taken. Isn't it obvious that a Bible-based Christian education can serve children in the future better than any secular education based on predictions of the future?

But the visionaries of OBE have a different view. In Spady's seminar guide entitled Transformational Outcome-Based Restructuring, we read:

The visionary purpose reflects the rapidly changing social, economic, political, cultural, and environmental context in which our current students will live. As a result, Transformational OBE is inherently future-oriented and focuses on students' life-long adaptive capacities. It requires a fundamental shift in the prevailing paradigm of educational leadership, policy-making, priority setting, outcome defining, curriculum design, instructional delivery, assessment and credentialing, decision making, and implementation strategies.

The key word is "visionary," and success in the OBE school is measured in terms of how well the student achieves the "visionary higher-order exit outcomes."

What is an "outcome"? According to Spady, an outcome is "a culminating demonstration of learning." The emphasis is on performance, not content, on behavior, not knowledge. A "high-level culminating outcome" is a "complex role performance." Curriculum and instruction are geared to "what we want the kids to demonstrate successfully at the end."

Will the traditional subject-based curriculum be abandoned? Yes, says Spady, "But content itself can't disappear; we just develop a fundamentally different rationale for organizing and using it; one that is linked much more to the significant spheres of successful living rather than to separate disciplines and subjects."

In that case, how will history be taught? Spady's view is that there should not be a separate course called history "that starts at some ancient time and moves forward to the present." The students should "thoroughly examine current problems, issues, and phenomena in depth and ask why, why, why, about their origins and relationships."

And so if history is not to be taught in chronological order for what it tells us about our past, how will American youth understand the origins and foundations of America? The Bible is our model of history because it tells the story in chronological sequence. If young Americans are not given the story of America in chronological sequence, then what America is at present will seem like some sort of incomprehensible puzzle.

OBE is also strong on the affective domain. Spady's seminar guide states:

Transformational Outcome-Based Education exists to equip all students with the knowledge, competence, and orientations needed for them to successfully meet the challenges and opportunities they will face in their career and family lives after graduating.

What are "orientations"? They are "the affective and attitudinal dimensions of learning" that deal with the student's emotions, motivation, "attitudes," and relationships. The wrong attitudes--the spiritually and politically incorrect attitudes--will no doubt be subject to Bloom's feedback-corrective procedures.

A key premise of OBE is that, under mastery learning, all students can learn and succeed and that the school can control the conditions of success. In other words, time constraints will no longer decide how long a student remains in school. He will remain there as long as he has to in order to be able to demonstrate in an "authentic context the outcomes of significance." As the OBE policymakers in Minnesota said when Spady told them that not every student would be in school for the same length of time or take the same courses, "If they can't demonstrate the outcomes of significance, then we shouldn't be letting them out of school."

That may mean changing the compulsory attendance laws to accommodate this feature of OBE. Incidentally, the OBE people are also interested in taking control of the

children as early as possible. In an OBE program called Odyssey Project being used in Gaston County, North Carolina, we read:

The Odyssey Project describes a formal system of basic schooling for students ages 3 to 18 with a developmental prenatal to age 3 component. The project will use an outcome-based education model that focuses on the knowledge, skill, and attitudes that students should possess when they graduate from Odyssey learning centers.

Why this interest in preschoolers? You have to go back to Bloom to find the rationale. In his book *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, published in 1964, he wrote:

We can learn very little about human growth, development, or even about specific human characteristics unless we make full use of the time dimension. Efforts to control or change human behavior by therapy, by education, or by other means will be inadequate and poorly understood until we can follow behavior over a longer period. (p. 5)

The absolute scale of vocabulary development and the longitudinal studies of educational achievement indicate that approximately 50% of general achievement at grade 12 (age 18) has been reached by the end of grade 3 (age 9). This suggests the great importance of the first few years of school as well as the preschool period in the development of learning patterns and general achievement. . . . The implications for more powerful and effective school environments in the primary school grades are obvious. . . . (p. 127)

We believe that the early environment is of crucial importance for three reasons. The first is based on the very rapid growth of selected characteristics in the early years and conceives of the variations in the early environment as so important because they shape these characteristics in their most rapid periods of formation.

Secondly, each characteristic is built on a base of that same characteristic at an earlier time or on the base of other characteristics which precede it in development. . . .

A third reason . . . stems from learning theory. It is much easier to learn something new than it is to stamp out one set of learned behaviors and replace them by a new set. (p. 215)

And that is why the OBE people want to get at the children as early as possible, to indoctrinate them before anybody else can get to them. Bloom also worked on ways of applying testing procedures to measure affective components in education and to keep track of the student's development over a long period of time. All of this has been incorporated into OBE data collection by computer, so that each student's data file will be available to anyone who has access to the data bank.

And what happens after the student has jumped through all the hoops and can demonstrate a "higher order competency in a complex role performance"? According to Hillary Clinton and Ira Magaziner in an article in *Educational Leadership* (Mar. '92, p. 12):

Students passing a series of performance-based assessments that incorporate this new standard would be awarded a Certificate of Initial Mastery. Possession of the certificate would qualify the student to choose among going to work, entering a college preparatory program, or studying for a Technological and

Professional Certificate. . . Through new local employment and training boards, states, with federal assistance, should create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in regular schools.

There you see the makings of a three-tier society tailor-made for the New World Order: a university elite at the top, born to rule; a body of technicians and professionals to keep the wheels of government, industry and the service economy working smoothly; and the "workers" who will be at the bottom of the new caste system. Maybe that's why the OBE people have packaged their program so deceptively. Spady says:

In January of 1980 we convened a meeting of 42 people to form the Network for Outcome-Based Schools. Most of the people who were there--Jim Block, John Champlin--had a strong background in mastery learning, since it was what OBE was called at the time. But I pleaded with the group not to use the name "mastery learning" in the network's new name because the word "mastery" has already been destroyed through poor implementation.

Of course he was referring to the fiasco in Chicago. And since we have found nothing but whole language in the OBE programs now being used, there is no reason to believe that mastery learning disguised as OBE will do any better. And so the deception goes on, and millions of children will be subjected to more insane experimentation because a group of psycho-educator control freaks are determined to have their way regardless of what parents think or want. And that is why it is more imperative than ever for parents to keep their children out of the public schools.

And because the psycho-educators know that a large number of children will not be able to learn to read under mastery-learning whole language, they are already preparing American industry to accept that reality. It was Prof. Anthony Oettinger of Harvard University's Division of Applied Science who told an audience of executives in 1981:

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 really want to teach people to do a lot of sums or write in "a fine round hand" when they have a five-dollar handheld calculator or a word processor to work with? Or do we really have to have everybody literate--writing and reading in the traditional sense--when we have the means through our technology to achieve a new flowering of oral communication? It is the traditional idea that says certain forms of communication, such as comic books, and "bad." But in the modern context of functionalism they may not be all that bad.

Now I wonder how many parents send their children to school to learn to read comic books. And I wonder how many parents ask themselves "do we really have to have everybody literate?" Of course, we do. That's why we have compulsory school attendance from age 6 to 18. That's why parents can be sent to jail if they fail to send their children to school. And why force children to sit in school for 12 years if you're not going to make them literate "in the traditional sense"? What other kind of literacy makes any sense at all?

But the key to Prof. Oettinger's view is in the very question he asks: "Do we really want to teach, etc." What he really means is that the educators really don't want to teach children to read and write in the traditional sense, and even if they don't want to do the job that parents want them to do, they have no intention of letting anyone else who wants to do the job come in and take their place. That's the kind of situation we are dealing with, one in which parents have no say in how their children are to be educated, one in which parents are being outrageously deceived by self-appointed planners of the new world order, one which no thinking, rational American can accept.
