

Public Education: The Road to Socialist Utopia

By Samuel L. Blumenfeld

James Madison, one of the wisest of our Founding Fathers and an author of our Constitution once said, **“There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations.”**

Back in 1934, when the National Socialists were consolidating their dictatorship in Germany, one of their disillusioned members, Hermann Rauschning, quit the party and left Germany. He then wrote a book, *The Revolution of Nihilism, A Warning to the West*, predicting what was in store for the world under the Nazis. In that book he described the techniques used by despots to seize total power. First, they had to be democratically elected, as Hitler was in 1933. Then they had to cripple their political opponents. Then they could freely impose brute force on everyone.

That’s what happened in Venezuela. Hugo Chavez was elected legally, and then began crippling his political opponents. Can it happen here? Last Tuesday I attended the Boston Tea Party on Boston Common. It attracted 10,000 patriots and was the most stirring political gathering I’ve ever attended. And the main theme expressed by every speaker was the need to restore Constitutional principles to our government. One of the songs we listened to was written by a comedian from Saturday Night Live with these lyrics: “There’s a communist living in the White House and we gotta get him out.” The Tea Party movement is the American-style opposition that the political class in Washington will not be able to stop. I was impressed by the understanding that each speaker had of our American capitalist, free market, Constitutional system.

We all venerate July 4, 1776, the day the Declaration of Independence was signed, and which states that the purpose of government is to secure the unalienable, God-given rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is the purpose of government. But on March 21, 2010, a day that will live in infamy, our Constitutional Republic was murdered by the Democrats in Congress and signed by the President. We are now living under a socialist form of government with unlimited powers, and the new purpose of government is to execute the orders of Barack Hussein Obama. Although all of these socialist politicians took an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, they have actually thrown it into the trash.

But this radical change did not happen overnight. For Socialists, it was the culmination

of a very slow, arduous process, which they knew would take decades to achieve. And they never for a moment lost their desire or vision for that goal, even though socialism in practice has been responsible for some of the greatest crimes against human beings in all of human history. Millions have been murdered in the name of socialism, but even hindsight teaches socialists nothing.

How did all of this begin? You may be surprised, if not shocked, to learn that Socialists began organizing their movement in this country as early as 1825, even before the word socialism was invented.

It all began when a self-appointed messiah by the name of Robert Owen, an English manufacturer, came to America to set up the first secular communist colony in New Harmony, Indiana. He believed that the new young country of America was the perfect place in which to create a new collectivist social system for the human race.

The key dogma in Owen's system was the notion that man's character had been deformed by religious brainwashing and that only "rational" education could correct it. Of course, the term brainwashing was not used in those days, but the idea was the same.

Owen's cure for all of society's ills was the reformation of mankind through a new kind of secular, scientifically oriented education. Thus, in founding New Harmony, education was to be of prime importance in creating socialist utopia. To that end, Owen assembled a distinguished group of scientists and educators ready and willing to put his ideas to the test.

That education would be at the heart of the communist experiment was made clear in the first issue of the New Harmony Gazette, which appeared on October 1, 1825. It stated clearly that "individuality detracts largely from the sum of human happiness." It then elaborated:

"It is intended to point out what we believe to be the most rational, therefore the best mode of educating human beings from infancy to manhood: knowing that any character, from the best to the worst, from the most ignorant to the most enlightened, may be given to any individual, community, or to the world at large, by different modes of education."

And from that time on, government-controlled education has always been the key to the creation of a perfect, utopian society led by the socialist elite. When after two years the Owenite experiment failed in New Harmony, the failure was blamed on the education the participants had had as children. They simply could not adapt themselves to a communist way of life. Thus, they believed that a socialist education must precede the creation of a socialist society.

(By the way, when the Bolsheviks took over Russia in 1917, they realized that the middle class bourgeoisie would never be able to adapt themselves to Communism, and that is why millions of them were sent to labor camps in Siberia or eliminated. Pol Pot did the same thing in Cambodia, killing millions of individuals educated under the old system because they were unfit for the new Communist utopia.)

Since the Owenites were atheists and very unpopular with the American people, they decided to go underground and promote the idea of a national government education system by organizing conspiratorial secret societies to do the promoting. One of the members of that conspiracy, Orestes Brownson, later converted to Catholicism and revealed the existence of the conspiracy. He wrote:

The great object was to get rid of Christianity, and to convert our churches into halls of science. The plan was ... to establish a system of state--we said *national*--schools, from which all religion was to be excluded, in which nothing was to be taught but such knowledge as is verifiable by the senses, and to which all parents were to be compelled by law to send their children....The first thing to be done was to get this system of schools established. For this purpose, a secret society was formed, and the whole country was to be organized somewhat on the plan of the carbonari of Italy....The organization was commenced in 1829, in the city of New York, and to my own knowledge was effected throughout a considerable part of New York State. How far it was extended in other states, or whether it is still kept up I know not, for I abandoned it in the latter part of the year 1830, and have since had no confidential relations with any engaged in it; but this much I can say, the plan has been successfully pursued, the views we put forth have gained great popularity, and the whole action of the country on the subject has taken the direction we sought to give it.

So there you have it. Socialists or communists began undermining our free system as early as the 1830s. And so if you've wondered why Americans adopted government education so early in our history, there's the answer. All of this had to be done by stealth so that the American people would not recognize what the true aims of the system were.

But the most important fact we learn from this is that the socialists saw **education** as the only sure way to socialism. In that way they could get around the obstacles our Constitution put in their way.

However, the movement for government education did not start with the Owenites. It actually was first promoted by the Unitarians who had taken over Harvard University in 1805 and declared war against Puritan Calvinism. They became the new liberal elite and their aim was to get the children out of Calvinist schools by creating a system of secular government schools. They took their model of government schooling from Prussia, which

Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, had visited in 1843, and came back singing the praises of centralized government control of education. He wrote in his famous Seventh Annual Report:

If Prussia can pervert the benign influences of education to the support of arbitrary power, we surely can employ them for the support and perpetuation of republican institutions. A national spirit of liberty can be cultivated more easily than a national spirit of bondage: and if it may be made one of the great prerogatives of education to perform the unnatural and unholy work of making slaves, then surely it must be one of the noblest instrumentalities for rearing a nation of freemen.

Of course, the public schools I attended in the 1930s and '40s promoted patriotism and American principles of government, but they soon became the seminaries for the indoctrination of socialism by an educational elite known as the Progressives.

Indeed, it was the rise of the Progressive movement toward the end of the 19th century that made it possible for Owen's dream of a socialist education system to be fulfilled. Who were the Progressives? They were a new breed of Protestant academics who no longer believed in the religion of their fathers. They now put their faith in science, which explained the physical world, evolution, which explained the origin of living matter, and psychology, which explained human behavior and provided the scientific means to control it.

They were also socialists. Why? Because they had to explain the origin and nature of evil. Evil was not caused by man's innate depravity as preached by John Calvin or the doctrine of Original Sin. According to the Progressives evil was caused by ignorance, poverty, and social injustice. A good secular education would get rid of ignorance, which would in turn get rid of poverty, which would also get rid of social injustice. And the cause of all of these ills was capitalism with its emphasis on private property, independent individualism, economic competition, and the accepted existence of both the rich and the poor. Under capitalism you could get rich. Under socialism equality of economic circumstance would wipe out the gulf between the rich and the poor. And so, by getting rid of capitalism, they would get rid of the basic causes of evil.

John Dewey was their philosophical leader, and in 1898 he wrote an article, *The Primary School Fetch*, in which he outlined the Progressive plan for taking over the public schools and turning them into institutions of socialist indoctrination. He stressed the importance of shifting the emphasis in primary education away from reading and literacy to socialization. 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 does not follow, however, that because this course was ~~once~~ wise it is so any longer. ... My proposition is, that conditions--social, industrial, and intellectual--have undergone such a radical change, that the time has come for a thoroughgoing examination of the emphasis put upon linguistic work in elementary instruction....

The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to me a perversion.

And because his views would be considered so radical by parents and teachers, he wrote:

Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction. What is needed in the first place, is that there should be a full and frank statement of conviction with regard to the matter from physiologists and psychologists and from those school administrators who are conscious of the evils of the present regime.

In other words, deceiving parents would become an important and implicit part of the plan for radical reform. And psychologists, of whom Dewey was one, would play an important role in creating this elaborate deception. Dewey then wrote:

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.

Indeed, Dewey himself conducted such an experimental school at the University of Chicago, and the book he wrote about that experiment, *The School and Society*, became the bible of Progressive Education and the basis of 20th century school reform.

Incidentally, one of the new experimental schools that used the new Progressive curriculum was the Lincoln School at Teachers College, Columbia University. John D. Rockefeller Jr, endowed the school with \$3,000,000 and sent three of his five sons to be educated there. The result is that Nelson, Lawrence, and Winthrop all became dyslexic, which they complained about later in life.

By the way, Dewey did not get his socialism from Karl Marx. He got it from an American by the name of Edward Bellamy who wrote a novel about America evolving into a socialist state by the year 2000. The aim of Bellamy's socialism was equality, and since everyone would be equal in economic circumstances, envy, competition, and crime would disappear.

In order to implement John Dewey's Progressive program in the public schools, the

Progressives had to get the support of the teachers. And they did this by gaining control of the National Education Association around World War I.

After the war, the NEA began a long-range campaign to get federal aid for the public schools. Not an easy task. From 1867 to 1940--a period of 73 years--the Congress passed about 11 minor pieces of legislation related to education. The fear of federal control of schools kept most legislators from voting for federal aid to public education. But resistance was gradually broken down by such acts as the National School Lunch Act of 1946 and the School Milk Program Act of 1954. Who could possibly be against lunch and milk for children?

But it was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 passed during the Johnson administration which opened the floodgates of the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the Progressive establishment. From 1965 to 1983--18 years--there were 43 education acts passed by Congress, including the establishment in 1979 of a U.S. Department of Education with cabinet status. In the year 1994 alone, there were about 180 educational restructuring bills before Congress! The three most important bills enacted were the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and the Improving America's Schools Act, a reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965. Title One of that law was supposed to help the poor and culturally deprived kids learn to read. Forty-five years and over \$150 billion later, the kids are doing worse today than in 1965. Today it's called the No Child Left Behind Act, and it was passed by a bipartisan Kennedy-Bush love fest.

The Progressives were also behavioral psychologists who consider children to be little animals who can be trained like animals. The most outspoken of the Behaviorists was John B. Watson, who wrote in 1924 in his book, *Behaviorism*:

Human beings do not want to class themselves with other animals. They are willing to admit that they are animals but "something else in addition." It is this "something else" that causes the trouble. In this "something else" is bound up everything that is classed as religion, the life hereafter, morals, love of children, parents, country, and the like. The raw fact that you, as a psychologist, if you are to remain scientific, must describe the behavior of man in no other terms than those you would use describing the behavior of the ox you slaughter, drove and still drives many timid souls away from behaviorism.

In other words, behavioral psychology was not a career for the timid. And that is why today's behavioral psychologists will stick it to the parents. He further wrote:

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

But even as Dewey had cautioned that change must come slowly, it didn't take long before an increasing number of discerning parents began to realize what was happening. Their children were being taught to read by the new whole-word method, better known as the Dick and Jane method, that taught children to read English as if it were Chinese, an ideographic writing system. By 1955 the reading situation had become so bad that Dr. Rudolf Flesch was compelled to write his great eye-opener, *Why Johnny Can't Read*. He said,

"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....[T]oday 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."

He then explained that when you impose an ideographic teaching method on an alphabetic reading system, you get dyslexia and reading disability.

Many of you were taught to read by that method. Do you remember those great literary gems as:

Dick.
Look, Jane.
Look, look.
See Dick.
See, see.
Oh, see.
See Dick.
Oh, see Dick.
Oh, oh, oh.
Funny, funny Dick.

Of course, that kind of inane repetition does not teach a child to read. It is based on the behaviorists' animal conditioning techniques perfected in this country by Edward L. Thorndike at Columbia University and in the Soviet Union by Prof. Pavlov. Indeed, when this new method was introduced, a well-known neurophysiologist by the name of Samuel T. Orton wrote an article in the February 1929 *Journal of Educational Psychology*, warning the educators that this new teaching method would produce reading disability. But apparently that is what the educators wanted. And they got it.

You see, it's very easy to turn a child into a dyslexic. All you have to do is have the child memorize a "sight vocabulary," that is, a list of words, which is what teachers do every day in our elementary schools. Once the child has memorized several hundred words, that child will automatically develop a whole-word reflex and look at all printed words as little pictures. And if you look at a word as a picture, you won't necessarily look at it

from left to right or right to left. You will look for something in that word that will remind you of what it says. It's very easy to spot a sight reader: when they read **aloud** they leave out words that are there, they put in words that aren't there, they read words backwards, they misread words, they confuse *bs* and *ds*, and they stop cold when encountering a word they've never seen before.

Incidentally, the old Dick and Jane method has evolved into something called Whole Language, in which they mix some phonics with whole-word memorization. It is called a "balanced approach." But that balanced approach is deceptive in that it does not teach intensive, systematic phonics. It merely gives the child some phonetic clues, which he must think about if he wants to use them.

What can parents do to prevent their children from becoming victims of this great teaching fraud? The best solution is to teach your child to read at home. And this can be done very simply with Alpha-Phonics, the reading program I developed to enable any parent to teach a child to read at home without having to take a course in reading instruction. Any parent can do it.

If you're curious about the philosophy behind Whole Language, here's a description of it given in a book entitled "Whole Language, What's the Difference?" written by three whole-language professors in 1991. We read on page 19:

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.

And if that doesn't convince you that these professors are nuts, read what they say 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.

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? Lev 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, just cited, 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.

In other words, whole language also entails political indoctrination. But what about phonics, you might ask? We get a very good idea of what whole language indoctrinators think of phonics in a book entitled, "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.

My response 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. Meanwhile, we the taxpayers are paying for all of it.

And so, despite the fact that this country has been fighting communist subversion since the Bolshevik takeover of Russia in 1917, and have sent our young men to fight communism on the battlefields, in 2008, we elected a communist as President. Did the thousands of Americans who died in Korea and Vietnam sacrifice their lives so that the American people could elect a communist as their president?

We can now say with utmost certainty that Barack Obama absorbed every word of his America-hating preacher in the church he and his wife attended for twenty years. He lied his way into the White House with the help of socialist Democrats who admire Fidel

Castro and Hugo Chavez more than they do George Washington.

And so, Barack Hussein Obama will go down in history as having achieved what no one believed an elected American president would ever want to achieve, the destruction of our Constitutional Republic.

And now that the Congressional wolves in sheep's clothing, have shown their true socialist colors, the American people can clearly see that their brazen, shameless, corrupt machinations will continue to be used as long as they remain in power.

And what will the American people do in response to this socialist takeover of their government? The Tea-Party Movement is just the beginning. Now that we know what the socialists have in store for us, there is no need for the freedom opposition to treat those traitors with any obsequious politeness. Let's not mince words. The idea that the only way to get people health insurance is by destroying all of our traditions of individual freedom is an idea made in hell. There are a whole lot of other legitimate ways to get people health insurance without a socialist dictatorship.

The Left has used the healthcare problem as only one of their means of destroying our way of life. Climate change is another. Energy is another. The takeover of important industries is another. And the process did not start with the election of Barack Obama, who was chosen by the left to do the job of destroying our Constitutional Republic.

Yes, Obama is highly intelligent, clever, engaging, comfortable with himself and thoroughly evil. His decision to postpone his travels in order to oversee the passage of his national healthcare bill indicated the depth of his commitment to socialist totalitarianism. In fact, the passage of that 2,700-page bill is a giant step in that direction. And I don't think that there is any doubt any longer that Mr. Obama is quite capable of becoming as ruthless a dictator as any of his socialist predecessors.

Is the American way of life that we've known and cherished all of our lives about to be permanently destroyed? The elections in November will give us a partial answer, for even though conservatives may gain control of Congress, Obama will still be sitting in the White House for a couple of more years, and he will not be twiddling his thumbs.

But it is now time for us to deal with thorny issue of government education. Parents, voters, property owners, and teachers must realize that the most important institution in a socialist state is a government owned and controlled school system wherein children can be indoctrinated to accept a socialist way of life. And the best way to end this subversive process is to return to the concept of educational freedom in which the federal government has no role in education and state governments can begin thinking the unthinkable: privatizing the schools.

Believe it or not, local public schools can easily become private institutions governed by local trustees and supported by tuition fees. This would greatly reduce the tax burden on home owners and provide more than enough resources to pay for the tuitions of poor families. The costs of education would decrease dramatically since education would once more become reality oriented wherein the fundamental academic subjects would be taught without the added costs of progressive educational malpractice. Individual intelligence and literacy would be enhanced, while collectivist group-think would be gotten rid of. But most compelling of all, the drive toward socialism would be stopped, **for you cannot have socialism without government-controlled education.**

Can this be done? It has to be done. If not, we will get more illiteracy, more failure, more student misery. Listen to what liberal Professor Anthony G. Oettinger of Harvard University told an audience of communications executives in 1982 about the future of education:

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 through 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? ...

It is the traditional idea that says certain forms of communication, such as comic books, are “bad.” But in the modern context of functionalism they may not be all that bad.

I doubt that there are any parents in America who send their children to school to learn to read comic books. If anything, they want their children to be taught to read and write in the traditional manner. They don't consider learning to read as a burden imposed on the individual. Rather, if taught properly, learning to read can be a joyful experience for children eager to explore the wonderful world of the written word as we all not so long ago witnessed in the amazing popularity of the Harry Potter books.

Widespread literacy, by the way, is not the product of 19th century forces. It was the product of the 16th century Reformation in which the need to be able to read the Bible became the imperative for universal literacy. In a Christian civilization everybody has to be literate. But of course Professor Oettinger thinks differently. He believes that literacy is only for the ruling cognitive elite. Yet we have compulsory school attendance for everyone, which Professor Oettinger does not want to abolish. Yes, he wants all of your children in the government schools, but he and his colleagues will decide who will become literate and who will not.

But if you want your child to become literate despite professor Oettinger, you can do it by getting Alpha-Phonics and teaching your children to read at home.

But the millions of parents who send their children to the government schools will soon discover that their child is learning disabled, or dyslexic because of the teaching methods used in the schools. And because many of the children who cannot learn to read become frustrated and angry and act out in the classroom, the educators offer a cure: Ritalin and other mind-altering drugs.

Even some liberals are concerned about the decline of literacy in America. In 2007, The National Endowment for the Arts issued an alarming survey, *Reading at Risk*. The Endowment chairman Dana Gioia stated: **“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.”** But of course, he did not offer the simplest solution: teach the kids to read with intensive, systematic phonics.

According to the Report, 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. Why? Because reading has become a painful, tortuous exercise that they wish to avoid.

The simple truth is that literacy is not at all difficult to achieve, provided the right teaching methods are used. Indeed, the home-school movement has already proven that parents can actually do a better job of teaching reading than our high-priced professionals.

It has also been shown that children progress better academically when taught at home, and that the cost of educating a child at home is less than \$1,000 a year.

If Americans want to once more experience what it means to be free, they must tear open the straitjacket imposed on them by the socialist education tyrants. They must get the government out of education, for educational freedom is the best antidote to the poison of socialism.

The plain, unvarnished reality is that the public schools have become a criminal

enterprise. Our educational leaders are engaged in a deliberate, well-planned **conspiracy** to dumb-down the American people. Indeed, back in 1983, the National **Commission on Excellence in Education** reported:

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.

Why aren't our educational leaders being held responsible for this "act of war" against our people? Should not the deliberate dumbing down of an entire nation be considered a crime of gigantic proportions? What about the deliberate use of teaching methods that cripple the brains of our children? Is that not also a crime?

Medical malpractice is a punishable offense, but educational malpractice is not. And the educators manage to extort more and more money from a gullible public to keep doing what they've been doing for decades. Is not extortion a crime?

Our educators have also become drug pushers, forcing six million children to take mind-altering drugs so that they won't be able to resist the harm being done to them in the classroom. Is turning a normal child into a drug addict not a crime?

What about exposing children to virtual pornographic sex education, in which they are taught that perversion is perfectly normal? Is that not a kind of child molestation that should be labeled a crime? Sex education has become a battering ram against a child's religious morality. As a result, millions of children are condemned to lives as functional illiterates, mentally stunted, spiritually empty, and morally vulnerable.

Nor do we know how many children have been led to suicide by satanic Death Education which has been marbleized into the curriculum. Writing one's obituary, visits to funeral parlors and cemeteries are part of the Death Education program.

Our government schools now produce ignorance, illiteracy, moral depravity, assaults and massacres. And most American parents still send their children to these institutions because they are free and have a great football team. But what a price many of their children will pay for the rest of their lives.

I could go on, but I know you get the message. We are where we are today because we let our guard down. As a result we are now in a fight for our lives, our freedoms, and the future for our children. It is not where we expected to be in the year 2010. But as long as we still have the vote, we may be able to reverse this situation without violence.

Lenin once said, "The way to crush the bourgeoisie is to grind them between the millstones of taxation and inflation." Which reminds us that it was unjust taxation that

was the catalyst for the first American Revolution. True to his communist beliefs, Obama and his socialist cronies are using the Leninist model to grind us down. But of course socialists don't create wealth, they simply redistribute the wealth of others. Indeed, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher put it very bluntly by noting that the socialists **"always run out of other people's money."** Which, of course, ends in national bankruptcy.

Ronald Reagan described the challenge facing us: **"There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right. ... You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we will sentence them to take the last step into a thousand years of darkness."**

The Founding Fathers dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to achieve the freedom they gave us. Can we do any less?

Yesterday, on Face the Nation, Bob Shieffer interviewed Scott Brown, the newly elected Republican Senator from Massachusetts. After asking a lot of questions about the Tea Party Movement, he asked Scott if he believed that the country was headed toward socialism. Scott managed to circumvent the question, refusing to say the word socialism. Why? Because socialism has become the “s” word, and like the “c” word, communism, is not mentioned in polite political circles in Washington. That is why all of these Sunday news shows are so empty of any substance. There is no debate going on between socialism and capitalism among the media pundits, although the s and c words are frequently used by Rush Limbaugh, John Hannity, Glenn Beck, Joseph Farah, Andrew Breitbart, and other conservative columnists and talk show folks.

But it took the Russian newspaper Pravda to tell Americans exactly what is happening to their supposedly capitalist country. Pravda is the Russian equivalent of the New York Times or the Washington Post.

Back in Soviet times, it was the official mouthpiece of the Communist government and quite critical of American capitalism. But now it seems to have as much freedom as any publication in the West, and what it now writes about events in America is quite ironic. A year ago, in its issue of April 29, 2009, Stanislav Mishin wrote:

“It must be said, that like the breaking of a great dam, the American descent into Marxism is happening with breathtaking speed, against the back drop of a passive, hapless sheeple, excuse me dear reader, I meant people.

“True, the situation has been well prepared on and off for the past century, especially the last twenty years. The initial testing ground was conducted upon our Holy Russia and a bloody test it was. But we Russians would not just roll over and give up our freedoms and souls, no matter how much money Wall Street poured into the fists of the Marxists.”

If you’ve read Antony C. Sutton’s book, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, you would understand what Mr. Mishin is referring to. Western money financed the Russian revolution, and millions of Russians died resisting the communist takeover of their country. But Marxists have learned from that experience and know how to impose their dictatorship “democratically.” Mr. Mishin goes on:

“Those lessons were taken and used to properly prepare the American populace for the surrender of their freedoms and souls, to the whims of their elites and betters.

“First, the population was dumbed down through a politicized and substandard education system based on pop culture, rather than the classics. . . . Then their faith in God was destroyed. . . . The final collapse has come with the election of Barack Obama. His speed in the past three months has been truly impressive. His spending and money printing has been record setting, not just in America’s short history but in the world. If this keeps up for more than another year, and there is no sign that it will not, America at best will resemble the Weimar Republic and at worst Zimbabwe.”

“These past two weeks have been the most breathtaking of all. First came the announcement of a planned redesign of the American Byzantine tax system, by the very thieves who used it to bankroll their thefts, losses, and swindles of hundreds of billions of dollars. These make our Russian oligarchs look like little more than ordinary street thugs in comparison. Yes, the Americans have beat our own thieves in sheer volume.”

“Then came Barack Obama’s command that GM’s president step down from leadership of his company. That is correct, dear reader, in the land of ‘pure’ free markets, the American president now has the power, the self-given power, to fire CEOs, and we can assume other employees of private companies at will.”

“So, should it be any surprise to discover that the Democratically controlled Congress of America is working on passing a new regulation that would give the American Treasury department the power to set ‘fair’ maximum salaries, evaluate performance, and control how private companies give out pay raises and bonuses?...

“Prime Minister Putin, less than two months ago, warned Obama and UK’s Blair, not to follow the path to Marxism, it only leads to disaster. Apparently, even though we suffered 70 years of this Western sponsored horror show, we know nothing, as foolish, drunken Russians, so let our ‘wise’ Anglo-Saxon fools find out the folly of their own pride.”