

# NEW EDUCATION

**The Radicals Are After Your Children**

*by*

**Gary Allen**

NEW EDUCATION

Reprints of this copyrighted article, *New Education* by Gary Allen, are available at the following prices: One to 99 copies, five for one dollar; 100-999 copies, sixteen cents each; 1,000 or more copies, fourteen cents each.

This article first appeared in AMERICAN OPINION magazine, a Conservative journal of opinion, in May of 1971. The subscription rate for AMERICAN OPINION, to any address in the United States, is ten dollars per year; twelve dollars to other countries. For either reprints or subscriptions, address:

**AMERICAN OPINION**  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

# NEW EDUCATION

## The Radicals Are After Your Children

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ THE great masses of Americans have traditionally looked upon formal education as an automatic escalator grinding upward to better jobs, higher income, and instant culture. The idea that formal education is the answer to all economic and social problems has been one of the popular heresies of the American creed since Colonial days. But it was not until late in the last century that this uncritical faith was exploited to persuade Americans to accept laws requiring compulsory education. It was a confidence game so brazenly burlesque as to drive a W.C. Fields to sobriety.

As the late Professor Richard LaPierre of Stanford University observed, the proponents of tax-supported schools argued that the “free” public schools:

*... would, in a generation or two, be the cure for every recognized social ill; and that the schools would, moreover, in the course of time cost the taxpayer nothing, since the educated boys would*

*grow up to be reasonable and honest men, and the need for public support of jails, prisons, poor farms, and homes for the aged indigent would thus be eliminated.*

Although there was a considerable number of congenital doubters at the time, there is no record of anyone having laughed himself to death at such wild promises. In retrospect such claims by Horace Mann and others seem totally absurd, but they were no more extravagant than those now being made by their modern counterparts. And, of course, they ignore how wrong history has regularly proved the predictions of educationists that their ever-revised programs would produce instant Nirvana. Again and again their lunatic schemes have been adopted with catastrophic results.

Yet our educationists are unwilling to accept any responsibility for the products of their great socialist school system. Instead they blame the parents — who, they say, are too stingy to pay for “quality education.” Just what “quality education” means is usually unspecified, but it is always within a cat's breath of what you are supposed to get if you approve another tax bite for increased spending on government schools.

This year, Americans will spend \$40 billion on schools, many of which are graduating “students” who can't even read. America has the costliest and most elaborate educational system in the history of civilization. With only six percent of the world's population, and between one-fourth and one-third of the developed resources, the American taxpayer

now annually invests in educational institutions almost as much as all the other nations of the world combined. Over the past twenty years the support of schools and colleges from all sources has been multiplied some eight times, while personal consumption and expenditures of business went up only about three times. Expressed in dollars of constant value, personal consumption doubled while spending for "education" grew five-fold. Over the same period the number of employees in private industry increased thirty-eight percent, while the number employed in public education mushroomed two hundred and three percent.

During the past two decades school enrollment jumped from 25 million to 47 million. Over the same period school spending escalated from \$5.4 billion to \$38.5 billion. Even so, says Stanford University's Dr. Roger Freeman:

*What did this accomplish? While enrollment grew 88 percent, the instructional staff expanded 131 percent; classroom teachers +119 percent, non-teaching professional staff such as administrators, counselors, psychologists, nurses, librarians, etc., +358 percent. The ratio of the instructional staff to pupils was reduced from 1:26.1 to 1:21.3, which means that there are now 4.8 fewer pupils per teacher in the public schools than there were in 1950.\**

And spending on the education bureaucracy by the Nixon Administration is soaring. The editors of *Barron's*, the financial weekly, noted in their issue for January 26, 1970, that "despite the weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth by professional lobbyists and liberals alike, the proposed budget for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and its affiliates happens to represent a rise of nearly 200 percent in the past five years." A syndicated column early this

year by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond cheerfully announced that the Nixon Administration "is spending \$4 billion more on education than was being spent when it took office."

During fiscal 1971, Uncle Sam will hand out to the states nearly \$12 billion in revenue for government controlled education. That comes to more than \$55 per head for every man, woman, and child in the nation, and to many times that amount at a per capita rate for taxpayers. And it totals about \$255 per pupil in just federal monies spent on education — only a small fraction of which ever gets into the classroom.

Yet our "Liberals" and educationists tell us again and again that the hippie products of our permissive public education system are the way they are because the wicked military-industrial complex eats up the bulk of government revenues which are needed for government education. The fact is, as Dr. Freeman says:

*More than half of the \$129 billion increase in Federal expenditures between 1953 and 1971 was applied to social purposes, less than one-fifth to defense. Defense meanwhile shrank from 64 percent of the Federal budget to 36 percent, from 13.6 percent of Gross National Product to about 7.2 percent.*

Dr. Freeman also reveals that the longtime argument that spending more on education for poor and "underprivileged" children would escalate their success in school has proved false. As he puts it: "Certain costly school programs introduced with great expectations a few years ago are not yielding the promised results. In fact, the entire concept of a clear-cut positive cost-quality relationship in edu-

\*"Crisis In American Education," Dr. Roger A. Freeman, Special Assistant to the President; an address to the Washington State Research Council on June 19, 1970. See *Congressional Record*, June 23, 1970, Page E5832.

cation has been called into question by recent research.”

Clearly the alleged penuriousness of the American taxpayer is not behind the failure of our public education system. And, the people know it. As Congressman John G. Schmitz, himself a former educator, has noted:

*The day of the blank check for public education in America is over. Taxpayers are no longer willing to assume that more money automatically equals higher quality in education. They have good reason for their disillusionment.*

*Never in all history has a people spent so much on public education as Americans have spent, especially in the last few years. But that top-priority educational system has produced a generation heavily influenced by the most vehement hostility to our Republic, our way of life, our traditions and heritage, and the most basic values of Western civilization.*

Instead of throwing more money at a failing school system, Americans have come more and more to look at its degenerate offspring as symptoms of a disease within the system.

It is a twice-told tale, but the current malaise in public education is beyond understanding unless one reviews the thoughts and accomplishments of John Dewey, the Marxist father of modern public education. For it is the students of Dewey who are today combining the theories of their master with the concepts of behavioral scientists to create an educational system which makes the electronic totalitarianism of Big Brother seem mild by comparison.

To understand John Dewey's role, one must recognize that the international Marxist conspiracy which he served has for many years been divided into Eastern and Western divisions. The East seeks to

establish Marxism by the sword, while the Western branch pursues the same objectives with the pen. Readers will do well to remember that the pen is mightier than the sword.

The Western branch is known as Fabian Socialism. It was named for a Roman general who never *directly* engaged his enemies in all-out battle, and was founded by an odd group of radical intellectuals in London in 1884. These conspirators believed that socialism could be more effectively established through gradualism than bloody revolution. The Fabian strategy called for infiltration of education, the public media, political leadership, the clergy, and other influential bodies. The object was to establish a Marxist government by persuading the people to vote for it by degrees.

In 1905, the British Fabian Society opened an American branch known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. John Dewey was one of the founders. In 1921 the Society changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy and announced the purpose of “education for a new social order based on production for use and not for profit.” Dewey later became the organization's president.\*

John Dewey developed his theories of “progressive education” while a professor at Columbia University, and he was quickly built up by collectivists on and off the American campus as a Great Authority. He taught that there is no such thing as truth, and certainly there are no eternal truths, no fixed moral laws; that man has no mind or soul as we have always understood those words, that he is nothing more than a biological organism subject to constant change, and that he is therefore wasting his time trying to find in religion or tradition the moral and ethical concepts

---

\*In 1962, the League formed an action arm which is now better known than the parent organization. When the subsidiary, Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), later became a hot potato, the L.I.D. freed it to go its violent way.

to best guide his way on earth. "There is no God," Dewey proclaimed, "and there is no soul. Hence, there are no needs for the props of traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded then immutable truth is also dead and buried. There is no room for fixed, natural law or permanent moral absolutes."

Comrade Dewey's job was to work out ways to use the schools as a vehicle for selling the "new society" about which he and his Fabian Socialist disciples dreamed. "They [*the schools*]," he proclaimed, "take an active part in determining the social order of the future . . . according as the teachers align themselves with the newer forces making for social control of economic forces." From such a starting point it was naturally easy for Dr. Dewey to arrive at the conclusion that tradition had no meaning, that history and the lessons of the past were nonsense, that stern discipline of the mind and body was foolish, and that education had only one purpose — to enable the child to be happy in his environment.

In the early 1920s, along with fellow Fabian Socialists Bertrand Russell and Harold Laski, Dewey journeyed to Russia where the Eastern arm of the Marxist conspiracy had recently triumphed by the sword. There, for two years, John Dewey worked with the two English Fabians to help organize a Marxist educational system for the Workers' Paradise. The Dewey system produced in Russia the same sort of educational havoc that it was later to wreak on America, and in 1931 Stalin dispatched hundreds of thousands of students and their Deweyite teachers to Siberia. The Soviets went back to the

---

\*John Dewey did, however, continue to serve on the National Advisory Council for the University of Moscow, a group which sent American students to summer school sessions in the Red capital. The reader should keep in mind that educationists vehemently deny that Dewey's Marxism and virulent atheism had anything to do with his theories of education, or that they have had any lasting influence on American education.

Three R's — or whatever they call them in Russian. Progressive education, they decided, was fine for corrupting bourgeois capitalists, but was idiotic caprice once the dictatorship was fully in control.

Meanwhile, Dewey had returned to America to establish the system that had proved so destructive of educational quality in Russia.\* He saw that the traditional system of American education fostered individualism and defended our system of free enterprise, both of which he had vowed to destroy. "The mere absorbing of facts and truths," he wrote, "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 mere learning, and there is no clear social gain in success thereat." (John Dewey, *The School And Society*, University of Chicago Press, 1915, Page 15.)

Throughout the Twenties, Dewey spread his poison among his fellow college professors, but as yet the public school systems were relatively untouched. Soon, however, those who received doctorates in education at Columbia Teachers College began to occupy the chairs of education at other colleges and universities and to author textbooks extolling the virtues of "the new society." Columbia Teachers College became the most influential educational institution in the United States, and John Dewey its high guru.

One of Dewey's chief lieutenants at Columbia was Dr. George S. Counts. Like John Dewey he was very frank about what "the new society" meant. In 1931, Counts authored a book called *The Soviet Challenge*, in which he proclaimed:

*The revolutionary movement embraces much that is rich and challenging in the best sense of the word. The idea of building a new society along the lines developed by the Communists should provide a genuine stimulus to the mind and liberate the energies of millions.*

In order to bring about this revolutionary millennium, said Dr. Counts:

*[It] would seem to require fundamental changes in the economic system. Historic capitalism, with its deification of the principle of selfishness, its reliance upon the forces of competition . . . and its exaltation of the profit motive, will either have to be displaced altogether or so radically changed in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.*

To make quite clear what he was getting at, Dr. Counts emphasized that this would mean “a coordinated, planned and socialized economy.” What about liberty and freedom? Counts was not concerned. As he said:

*That under such an economy the actions of individuals in certain directions would be limited is fairly obvious. No one would be permitted to build a new factory or railroad whenever or wherever he pleased.*

Dr. George Counts soon wrote a book titled *Dare The Schools Build A New Social Order?*, in which he spelled out openly how the Dewey “progressive education” would be used to build a Marxist Utopia in America. Here are his words:

*In the collectivist society now emerging the school should be regarded, not as an agency for lifting gifted individuals out of the class into which they were born and elevating them into favored positions where they may exploit their less-favored fellows, but rather as an agency for the abolition of all artificial social distinctions and of organizing the energies of the nation for the promotion of the general welfare . . . .*

*Throughout the school program the development of the social rather than the egotistic impulses should be stressed; and the motive of personal aggrandizement should be subordinated to social ends. In promotion practices, in school activities, in the relations of pupils and teachers and administrators, the ideal of a cooperative commonwealth should prevail . . . .*

*All of this applies quite as strictly to the nursery, kindergarten, and the elementary school as to the secondary school, the college, and the university.*

That John Dewey’s “progressive education” was a scheme designed to infect students with Marxism is obliquely admitted by Dr. Counts, who explained the Dewey line as follows:

*If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence [of the upper middle class], face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare . . . .*

*You will say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative . . . .*

None of the ideas of Dewey and his educationist satraps were unique. Historians are in agreement that they were largely based on the concepts of the French Illuminist, Jean Jacques Rousseau, who contributed so much to the philosophy of chaos which precipitated the bloody French Revolution. But “Liberals” have learned that calling something “new” or “progressive” will attract flocks of empty-headed social climbers who flutter forever after the latest asinine fad. Even so, John Dewey and his col-

leagues, known as the "Frontier Thinkers," made little headway until they attracted the attention, and the financial support, of the powerful Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations. René Wormser, chief counsel for the Reece Committee, which investigated foundations for the House of Representatives in the early Fifties, writes in his book, *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*:

*A very powerful complex of foundations and allied organizations has developed over the years to exercise a high degree of control over education. Part of this complex, and ultimately responsible for it, are the Rockefeller and Carnegie groups of foundations. The largest of the foundation giants, The Ford Foundation, is a late comer. It has now joined in the complex and its impact is tremendous; but the operations of the Carnegie and Rockefeller groups start way back.*

Popular misconception has it that Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller established their foundations as a charitable device to counter adverse public opinion resulting from their predatory business dealings. While this may have motivated some of their giving, both of these men had strong ulterior motives in using their money to influence what would be taught in America's public schools.\*

Carnegie, in his book *Triumph Of Democracy*, reveals his dream of reuniting America with England.† He shared Cecil Rhodes' idea of a World Government dominated by England, and used his

\*See reprints of my monographs on "The C.F.R." and "Foundations And Tax-Free Cash" (with Harold Lord Varney), available from American Opinion at, respectively, five and two for one dollar.

†A native of Scotland, Carnegie made millions out of the steel business in America but never became an American citizen.

fortune to fund the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in order to help promote that end. After Carnegie's death, his foundations came under the control of J.P. Morgan and his partners and colleagues, who installed Morgan deputy Nicholas Murray Butler as president of Columbia where Dewey and his nest of Marxists were carefully nurtured to promote British Fabian Socialism in America.

John D. Rockefeller put his assistant Fred Gates in charge of his General Education Board. Gates tipped the Rockefeller philosophy on education in the Board's *Occasional Paper No. 1*:

*In our dreams we have limitless resources and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our moulding hands. The present educational conventions fade from our minds, and unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk.*

Later, the General Education Board expanded its horizons to take into its "moulding hands" the city folk as well. To this end the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, which often had interlocking directorates and many times acted in unison, began in the early Thirties to back Dewey and his Marxist educationists with enormous amounts of money. As René Wormser observes:

*Research and experimental stations were established at selected universities, notably Columbia, Stanford, and Chicago. Here some of the worst mischief in recent education was born. In these Rockefeller-and-Carnegie-established vineyards worked many of the principal characters in the story of the suborning of American education. Here foundations nurtured some*

*of the most ardent academic advocates of upsetting the American system and supplanting it with a Socialist state . . . .*

*Whatever its earlier origins or manifestations, there is little doubt that the radical movement in education was accelerated by an organized Socialist movement in the United States . . . .*

At the same time the National Education Association, the country's chief education lobby, was also financed largely by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations. It too threw its considerable weight behind the Dewey philosophies. As an N.E.A. report maintained in 1934:

*A dying laissez faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control.*

Traditionalist teachers, who had been strongly resisting Deweyism, were soon swamped by education propagandists backed with a flood of Rockefeller-Carnegie dollars. In 1934, the Carnegie Corporation financed to the tune of \$340,000 a study by the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association, which decreed:

*Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion, that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.*

The report concluded that boards of education must "support a school program conceived in terms of the general welfare and adjusted to the needs of an epoch marked by transition to some form of socialized economy." Professor Harold J. Laski, a close friend and colleague of

Dewey, and the chief philosopher of British Fabian Socialism, said of it: "At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America." Laski was delighted!

The study was immediately cited as an excuse to produce a flood of textbooks aimed at fulfilling the prophecy of the Carnegie-financed Commission. As René Wormser explains:

*There were plenty of teachers ready to follow the lead of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies, and their efforts extended into all aspects of education. New textbooks were required to take the place of the standard and objective works used in the schools. These new books could be used to indoctrinate the students, to give them the pathological view of their country upon which sentiment for collectivism could be built. The writer of a conservative or classic textbook has difficulty getting the funds to enable him to produce his work . . . .*

*. . . radical writers found it a simple matter to get foundation bounty. Under the influence of cliques in the world of teaching, the schools in the United States were flooded with books which disparaged the free-enterprise system and American traditions.*

It goes without saying that, by controlling the textbooks, the progressivists gained an open sesame to the minds of millions of students in the government schools. As John T. Flynn observed, it wasn't necessary to poison every glass of water coming out of every tap in a given community. It was necessary only to drop one cup of poison into the reservoir.

Following World War II, the emphasis on creating a new economic and social

order in America was expanded to include the entire globe. This philosophy was officially adopted with the acceptance of U.N.E.S.C.O. source material by the N.E.A. As one textbook for teachers phrases it:

*Allegiance to a nation is the biggest stumbling block to creation of international government. National boundaries and the concept of sovereignty must be abolished. The quickest way to abolish . . . sovereignty is to condition the young to another and broader allegiance. Opinion favorable to international government will be developed in the social studies in the elementary school.*

All of this was just fine with the boys at the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford foundations. The idea of world government is music to the ears of the clique of super-wealthy radicals using the socialist cant for their own purposes. If you want to establish and preserve a monopoly on a national level you need to control the national government. If you want to establish and preserve a worldwide monopoly, you must establish and control a World Government. These boys think big.

But the penthouse conspirators were not the only ones pushing "progressive education." Dr. Bella Dodd, who for many years headed the New York City Teachers' Union while a high-ranking officer of the Communist Party, broke with the Communists after a religious conversion and testified before a Senate Committee:

*The Communist Party as a whole adopted a line of being for progressive education . . . [It] was eagerly seized upon and championed by the Comintern as the ideal system for limiting the ability of children in capitalist societies to read, write,*

*or to think for themselves or to act for themselves, and so to cause them to depend upon the state for a guaranteed livelihood and for the protection against the hazards caused by their inadequate training for the battle of life.*

So successful was this conspiracy that by June of 1955, the Progressive Education Association which had been founded by John Dewey officially disbanded. Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, the Association's president, explained:

*Founded in 1919, the PEA was a protest movement against traditional education, based in large part upon the philosophy of John Dewey. One reason for PEA's end is that many of the practices it has advocated have been adopted by the nation's schools.*

Even so, the term "progressive education" had by now fallen into disrepute as parents observed that their offspring, assigned by the schools to "life adjustment" classes, had neither adjusted to life nor learned to read, write, or add. It was time to change labels. While the educationists no longer praise the name of John Dewey in public, nor refer to their programs as "progressive education," both the song and the melody linger on — humming along under more "modern" aliases. As Max Rafferty, former Superintendent of Public Instruction for California, has observed:

*. . . to say that Progressive Education is dead just because it has changed its name and hidden behind various aliases is as unwarranted as it would have been for our grandparents to assume that Jesse James was dead because he had changed his name to Mr. Howard and was pretending to be a respectable family man.*

The cover-up was necessary because anti-Deweyism had risen to a crescendo following the Sputnik fiasco in 1957. For a time there was great rhetorical stress on academic excellence, particularly in the sciences. Then, using Sputnik as an excuse, America's first program of direct federal aid to education became law as the National Defense Education Act. Federal involvement had long been a goal of the National Education Association. Its proponents swore up and down that there would never be any federal strings attached to the federal monies. All they were interested in, they contended, was that the kiddies got a better education so that America could "catch up" with the Russians. Such talk proved as absurd as the earlier prediction that a compulsory public school system would permit the abolition of jails. As Congressman Noah Mason of Illinois warned at the time:

*Federal Aid for Education is not a temporary program to meet an immediate emergency. It is an effort to put our whole educational system under Federal control and to keep it there forever.*

Commenting on the bill, Representative Watkins Abbitt of Virginia declared:

*There is here demonstrated an all-out effort to federalize the schools and nationalize the lives of American citizens . . . History teaches us that when the central authority gets control of the education of our youth, it is a long step toward a totalitarian government and dictatorship . . . Federal Aid means Federal Control.*

No one should have been surprised that it turned out that way.

The next big step in the federalizing of education came with the 1965 appointment by President Lyndon Johnson of "Republican" John Gardner as Secretary

of Health, Education and Welfare. Gardner, you will not be surprised to learn, came to H.E.W. after serving for many years as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Soon the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed as part of L.B.J.'s "Great Society."\* It provided Secretary Gardner with billions of dollars each year with which to implement the wild educational schemes of his friends and colleagues at the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations. Indeed, wherever one finds radical experiments in education designed to destroy concepts of individualism and self-reliance and to promote socialism, almost inevitably one finds the names Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford.†

Today, the quest for academic excellence born in the aftermath of Sputnik has been all but abandoned. The emphasis in the journals of educational theory is now on "change." The word "change" seems to appear at least once in every sentence. The line being promoted is that technological "change" is so altering our lives that the old values of absolutes, eternal truth, traditions, and cultural standards have become obsolete. They are to be replaced by the "new morality" and "doing your own thing."

We are also told that the rapidity of technological change has "dehumanized" the individual, who can no longer function adequately in our society. In order to cope with such "change," it is necessary to develop a "relevant" curriculum. The word "relevant" now runs second only to "change" in the abracadabra of educationist incantation.

For years educationists have coded

\*A phrase coined by British Fabian Socialist Graham Wallas, and the title of a radical book he published in 1914.

†One of Richard Nixon's first acts after being elected President was to appoint the Carnegie Corporation's president, Alan Pifer, to head his committee on national goals.

their messages in a sort of pedagogic Swahili, but today they are getting braver and braver about spelling out just what they are up to. An official release of the National School Public Relations Association, dated March 23, 1970, describes the new "relevant" education:

*The major focus of the school curriculum in the 1970's is going to be a critical examination of the quality of life and society in the United States. This is the prediction of the nation's major curriculum voice, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). . . .*

*To provide a basis for a total and genuine reconstruction of the curriculum, ASCD's Board of Directors adopted a bold statement of critical concerns and commitments. It says, in essence, that educators have a responsibility to decide what aspects of a society cannot be tolerated and to do something about them. The statement commits ASCD to working, in both society and the schools, for such goals as peace, social renewal, equality, women's rights, and individuality. It charges ASCD to develop a curriculum that "identifies economic and other national problems and educates for political action on them."*

In other words, the schools are to be politicized from the ground up, and students are to be made into radical political activists as a part of the curriculum.

Under a release date of March 23, 1970, the National School Public Relations Association condensed a talk on this same theme by Professor Theodore Roszak of California State College:

*It follows then, Roszak said, that the crisis in the schools today*

*is not caused by an inferior "educational establishment," but by the "largely worthless" culture of an industrial society. This culture is not only uninteresting to "lively and unspoiled young minds," but worse still, it degrades "all natural humanity," he said. He explained that education exists to serve national priorities . . . .*

Paul Brandwein, author of a series of textbooks for kindergarten through fourth grade which has recently been adopted in California, makes it clear that youngsters must be indoctrinated with "priorities" and beliefs which are directly opposite those they learn at home. Mr. Brandwein writes:

*As a young person grows up he comes to share most of the basic values of the society in which he lives. He brings to school some previously developed attitudes toward the major social issues confronting us. Hence he never approaches the study of social sciences with the same degree of ignorance and the same unbiased frame of mind with which he begins his study of the physical and biological universe. The important work of the social studies at the early level is necessarily directed toward aiding the student to unlearn what he already knows. This frequently involves the unsettling of his convictions, to be followed by the attempt to get him to view questions as open which he may have considered as already closed, and to guide him in acquiring a new perspective.*

Such promulgators of the "new education" are mostly behavioral scientists — sociologists, psychiatrists, psychologists. Almost without exception they are secular humanists, holding that man is his

own god, and that truth, as the essence of social good, must be manipulated to support the latest social theories. Through programs pushed by such people our schools are abandoning the teaching of "facts" and substituting instruction in human relations. No longer do the educationists rationalize, stammer, and apologize for poor performance in reading; now they claim that reading is no longer important. One junior high school principal, quoted in Mortimer Smith's *The Diminished Mind*, puts it this way:

*Through the years we've built a sort of halo around reading, writing, and arithmetic. We've said they were for everybody . . . .*

*We've made some progress in getting rid of that slogan. But every now and then some mother with a Phi Beta Kappa award or some employer who has hired a girl who can't spell stirs up a fuss about the schools . . . and ground is lost . . . .*

*When we come to the realization that not every child has to read, figure, write, and spell . . . then we shall be on the road to improving the junior high curriculum.*

*Between this day and that a lot of selling must take place. But it's coming. We shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to perform on the violin, that it is no more reasonable to require that each girl shall spell well than it is that each shall bake a good cherry pie . . . .*

Today's Frontier Innovators tell us that the printed word has served its purpose.\* Oh, it served well enough until technology gave us so many alternative forms of communication. Now, however, the printed word is increasingly *passé*. More and more schools are using

records, tapes, film strips, and movies to replace the antiquated printed word. Who knows, some day books may be as rare as stereoscopes. Or so the line goes. As part of this movement many school districts are abandoning textbooks altogether and substituting class discussion.

Under such "relevant" education the class is conducted without lectures or texts according to a new system called "inquiry," which is based on endless open-end discussions. Subject matter includes such "relevant" matters as the Vietnam War, ecology, community control, the New Left, drugs, the draft, the "peace" movement, the new morality, the pill, and abortion. These, you understand, are topics for grammar school students as well as those in junior and senior high.

In many of the "relevant" education programs the teachers prepare packets of "information" taken from a variety of periodicals on a "relevant" topic and pass them out to pupils for review and discussion. For example, students might compare treatment of a subject such as air pollution by an Establishment magazine like *Time* with the same subject as presented in a "progressive" periodical of the nature of the *New Republic* or *Village Voice* . . . so that students see "all sides" of an issue.

Just how students can be capable of reaching rational conclusions on emotionally charged political matters without a basic foundation of history, political science, economics, and morality is difficult to understand. Obviously they can't. They are being asked to accept canned "Liberal" opinions on fad subjects. The teacher guides their conclusions to what is "socially correct." Truth is redefined as a "social good." It is no wonder so many of our teenagers are

\*A recent Lou Harris poll showed that 18.5 percent of Americans aged sixteen or older are illiterate. These products of the public school system are obviously ahead of their time!

intellectually confused and emotionally distraught.

In the past, parents expected teachers to reinforce parental values and discipline. Now the child is praised for his brilliance and his courage on "social" problems while the parent is ridiculed for stubborn rigidity and old-fashioned morality. Much of what we call the Generation Gap is really a teacher-parent gap. What is happening is Marxist class warfare, based on youth versus age rather than capital versus labor.

Yet those promoting the "inquiry" system under a plethora of names and guises (the most famous of which is the Glasser System\*) claim that it teaches young people to be "problem solvers" rather than filling their heads with "useless" accumulated knowledge. The product of this type of teaching is described by Dr. Joseph Bean:

*The student, according to the "inquiry" concept, must view all knowledge as tentative rather than absolute, and "facts" are subject to continuous revision. No one is to be viewed as an authority on any subject — the student reads what he will and then "makes up his own mind" in the critical light of his teacher and peers. Not surprisingly, this system usually abolishes grading. It is also not surprising that many students are enthusiastic about it since bull sessions are substituted for hard academic work.*

*The result of instruction given our children in social studies classes is evident in rejection of family standards of morality and ethics, and in the student protests, demands, riots, destruction of property, and destruction of life which we see all about us. The process of instruction sensitizes students to drop out with*

*the hippies, turn on with the hopheads, or tear down with the revolutionaries.†*

But the behavioral scientists are not content merely to *load* the curriculum. They have introduced what can only be termed psychological brainwashing techniques in order to "change" the character and personality of students. In an article titled "Forecast For The 70's," the *N.E.A. Journal* observed in its issue for January 1969:

*The roles and responsibilities of teachers will alter throughout the next decade. Future-think suggests that between 1970 and 1980 a number of new assignments and specialties will materialize if present trends continue.*

*For one thing, the basic role of the teacher will change noticeably. Ten years hence it should be more accurate to term him a "learning clinician." This title is intended to convey the idea that schools are becoming "clinics" whose purpose is to provide individualized psychosocial "treatment" for the student, thus increasing his value both to himself and to society.*

All across the country tens of thousands of teachers are attending classes and seminars to prepare them as psychological technicians ready to go to work on the minds of your children . . . turning them into activists for the "new [socialist] society." These semi-trained amateur psychiatrists call themselves "change

---

\*This is thoroughly described in Dr. William Glasser's book *Schools Without Failure*, which might also be subtitled "Schools Without Learning."

†Dr. Bean was until recently a member of the Glendale, California, School Board. He resigned after discovering the hard way that the state and federal governments have virtually removed all local control of education from the individual communities.

agents." Dr. Jerrold Novotney, a trainer of "change agents" for our schools at U.C.L.A., explains:

*Leadership is directed towards changing the behavior of people. Changes in people's behavior are manifestations of changes in their goals, their perceptions, their understandings, insights, values, beliefs . . . . To bring about changed behavior in people, would be generally to alter one or more of these factors . . . .*

*The change agent as he deals with human beings in groups must perceive himself as a leader working with human organizations. Successful change agency starts with unfreezing the system.*

This strategy for changing society was worked out by Kurt Lewin, the father of sensitivity training, at the N.E.A.'s National Training Laboratory. It consists of "unfreezing" old beliefs and attitudes, "moving" to new socially relevant concepts, and then "freezing" these "changes" into the personality of the subject individual. All of this, to which parents are expected to surrender their children, is done in groups. Individual thinking is to be surrendered to group thinking. As "change agent" trainer Kenneth Tye explains: "Individuals have different goals. If they are to work together effectively [as a force for change in society], they must cooperatively determine the direction of their efforts."

The "inquiry" or "problem solving" type of "relevant" curriculum, previously discussed, is tailor-made to subject emotionally and intellectually unprepared youths to the experiments of the teacher clinicians. Tye tells his trainees: "The change agent who wishes to use problem-

solving as a way of entry for creating change should start with problems which are real to the group."

The man who originated the idea of turning our classrooms into psychiatric clinics for experimentations on our children calls himself Dr. Jacob Levy Moreno. Born behind the Iron Curtain as Ivan Vladimir Morenovsky, he is described by the *Los Angeles Times* of May 4, 1957, as a "New York mental expert famed as the discoverer of psychodrama, group therapy and sociometric technique in psycho-therapy."

Detailed discussion of the sociometric movement and its derivative techniques, which include sensitivity training, is beyond the scope of this article.\* Basically it involves the methods of mind manipulation used by "change agents" to alter the personalities of young people. Moreno's strategies call for the assuming of roles, group criticism, and group confessions. In his book, *Who Will Survive?*, Dr. Moreno credits John Dewey with persuading the schools to introduce his systems. In his "Forecast For The 70's," the *N.E.A. Journal* predicts that Moreno's "sociometry" system will play an increasingly important role in the coming decade.

What sort of an operator is this Dr. Jacob Moreno to whose charge millions of American children are to be delivered? Certainly he makes no attempt to hide his hatred of individualism and love for collectivism. In his book, *Who Will Survive?*, he writes: "If God would come into the world again he would not come into it as an individual, but as a group, as a collective . . . ." But here Moreno is speaking figuratively, for he obviously does not believe in God. Moreno claims, "The only way to get rid of the God syndrome is to act it out [through the sociodrama]." And he proclaims coyly:

*I have heard that a form of socio-psychodrama is used for Communist propaganda . . . to convert people to communism . . . . This is an illustra-*

\*For details see the *Sixteenth Report*, California Senate Investigating Committee On Education, Pp. 136-171.

*tion in point that highly directive sociodrama can be used for the indoctrination of any set of values, religion, communistic or fascistic.*

And the celebrated Dr. Moreno says of Communist Karl Marx:

*He raised the question as to who should govern the means of production in order to assure society from uneven and unjust distribution of income. Thus far Marx was correct.*

But, concluded Dr. Moreno, Marx looked at man as solely an economic being and overlooked the role that psychiatry could play. Moreno claims that by using sociometry he can do a better job of bringing about Communism than did Marx. "How can we avoid the errors which Marx has made on the theoretical and on the practical level of revolutionary action?" Dr. Moreno asks rhetorically. He answers:

*We can avoid the theoretical error by replacing the theory of socialism with the theory of sociometry, and the practical error by replacing the global hit or miss socioeconomic proletarian revolution with "small" sociometric revolutions . . . .*

*A scientific knowledge of economics is important but insufficient for a true change of social order . . . . Socialism is the revolution of one class, the economic proletariat; sociometric revolution is a revolution of all classes without exception . . . .*

*The sociodrama is an instrument by means of which social truth, truth about social structure and conflicts can be explored and social change transacted by means of dramatic method . . . .*

Moreno's battle cry might well be, "Psychiatrists of the world unite!" He

foresees a world empire of automatons manipulated by psychiatrists. This prophet of the "new educationists" foresees the takeover:

*As human society is ailing we can expect a psychiatric empire to emerge gradually and spread over the globe. Politicians and diplomats will move into second status. Social scientists, psychiatrists, sociatrists and sociometrically oriented socialists will move into first. The mentor in the White House, a future President of the United States, may well be a psychiatrist before another century has passed.*

It sort of gives you the creeps. Yet if you ask an educator about Dr. Jacob Levy Moreno (or Ivan Vladimir Morenovsky, if you prefer) you will doubtless be told he is a simple and kindly man who wishes only to help America's kiddies obtain the best possible education. Anyone who suspects otherwise is a wicked enemy of education and children.

As we noted earlier, one of the outgrowths of Dr. Moreno's group therapy system is sensitivity training. Masquerading under some two dozen pseudonyms, it is increasingly used in our schools; and, in some districts, successful completion of a course in sensitivity training has become a requirement for graduation. Most colleges now require sensitivity training for all students preparing to become teachers.

While it has many variations and aliases, sensitivity training nearly always includes group confessions and group criticism conducted by a "trained" leader. The technique is the same as that used by the Red Chinese on American prisoners of war in Korea. It is designed to produce "change" in a person's values and even his personality. Many become psychologically hooked on sensitivity training, caught up in the fascination it

holds for those with sado-masochistic tendencies. Others sustain severe emotional damage.

The National Training Laboratory, financed by the N.E.A., admits that sensitivity training "includes coercive persuasion in the form of thought reforms or brainwashing as well as a multitude of less coercive, informal patterns." Which is *why* the socialist N.E.A. promotes it for the schools. Sensitivity training is designed to strip a person of his psychological defenses so that he has no private thoughts which are kept from the group. The group collectively decides what is right or wrong for the individual. Sensitivity programs have been financed by the Ford Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

From here the plot sickens. Using elements from Dr. Moreno's program and advanced techniques in sensitivity training, Dr. Benjamin Bloom has produced a program known as Taxonomy — a nightmare which would have turned the characters of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* green with envy. Taxonomy, which means classifying according to a system, is a term applied to a systematic measuring by psychological testing of how a student acts, thinks, or feels on a wide variety of subjects. The student would be tested several times each year from kindergarten through grade twelve and results would then be fed into computers in one of thirteen regional data banks already established around the nation by the Defense Department.

The state would thus have a complete psychological profile covering in minute detail every facet of every student's life, thoughts, and personality — thus allowing behavioral scientists to predict how he would react in any given situation. These tests have been so designed that, if the student does not meet the behavioral objectives established, he is re-cycled through the same material and given more sensitivity training until he is a "right thinker."

He would not be graduated from high school until he had the proper social outlook. No one would be allowed to escape this Orwellian brainwash, and the result would be a nation of robots programmed to think and do what they are told.

It sounds like madness, of course. But this Taxonomy system *has already been started* in fifteen California school districts, and all school districts in the state are scheduled to adopt the program by 1973. Plans for a similar program are now in an advanced stage in Florida.

The plan in California has been hidden in a program known as P.P.B.S. — Planning, Programming, Budget System. It is sold to the public as an automated accounting system which also makes certain that teachers are reaching specified educational goals with their students. On the surface it seems designed to promote efficiency, but built into it is a vast program for administering and recording psychological tests for students. The results will go into data banks at Palo Alto, California.

At the present time, the proponents of the P.P.B.S. program are still denying publicly that it has anything to do with Taxonomy, but in seminars with their own people they admit what the program really is. And certainly a nationwide Taxonomy system is on the planning boards. On April 15, 1970, the *Washington Star* reported:

*U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen Jr. has outlined a plan for restructuring local schools that would include computerized data systems designed to help professionals "prescribe" programs for helping pupils and their families. . . .*

*Allen suggested each local school system should have a central diagnostic center "to find out everything possible about the child and his background. . . ."*

*After tests and home visits, Allen said, the center "would know*

*just about everything there is to know about the child . . . .”*

*The information would be fed into a computer for use by a team of trained professionals who would write a “prescription” for the child “and if necessary, for his home and family as well,” Allen said.*

The next step is to feed test results from the local data bank into the regional computers. Doubtless the Taxonomy program is to be set up one step at a time to prevent the identification and isolation of whatever opposition to it might develop. Meanwhile, the Carnegie Corporation and the U.S. Office of Education have bankrolled a group known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (N.A.P.E.) to work on the establishment of a *national* computer evaluation program.

That is simply catastrophic. But consider *this*. In its “Forecast For The 70’s,” the *N.E.A. Journal* predicts:

*Biochemical and psychological mediation of learning is likely to increase. New drama will play on the educational stage as drugs are introduced experimentally to improve in the learner such qualities as personality, concentration, and memory. The application of biochemical research findings, heretofore centered in infra-human subjects, such as fish, could be a source of conspicuous controversy when children become the objects of experimentation.*

According to Paul Beach in the *Congressional Record* of September 17, 1970:

*Such programs are no longer speculative. School systems using “behavior modification” drugs on elementary pupils have surfaced in*

*districts across the nation — in Anaheim, California; Omaha, Nebraska; and Montgomery County, Maryland, schools. Most so far use amphetamines, like Ritalin or Dexedrine, on so-called hyperkinetic (overactive) children. Among addicts, such drugs are known as “speed.” According to press sources, school officials admit having put “tens of thousands” of youngsters on these or similar drugs, or as much as 10 to 20% of elementary students in particular districts.*

While the drugs work as stimulants on adults, they have the opposite effect on youngsters. Nobody knows why, and nobody knows what the long-term effects will be, but that has not stopped the educationist experimenters from requiring their ingestion by certain active children — mostly fidgety boys. In one California elementary district, one-third of the student body is already on these drugs; ten times the number that could reasonably be expected to be hyperkinetic.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare supports this program and speculates that these drugs, which are highly addictive to adults, are not addictive to children. But already many doctors and school personnel are grumbling privately that educational policy-makers must never have been boys, and that the only effect of drugging children will be to raise “a generation of junkies and speed freaks.” One of the problems which has already evolved is that kids on the playground are now engaged in pill swapping. At the very least, it will be impossible when these youngsters are teenagers to tell them that drugs are dangerous. How do you get them off “speed” when they’ve been popping pills since kindergarten?

Other radical educators are not so much concerned about pumping amphetamines into their charges as they are about the fact that they do not get their

hands on your child until age five. In its "Forecast For The 70's" the N.E.A. declares: "As nonschool, pre-school programs begin to operate, educators *will assume a formal responsibility for children when they reach the age of two.*" What worries these certified government child molesters is that too many parental values are transmitted to the child during the early years.

But, of course, the child doesn't belong to the state! Really? Then why did President Nixon tell the recent convention of governors at Colorado Springs that "We have declared the first five years of a child's life to be a period of special and specific Federal concern"?

When the White House Conference on Children and Youth met in Washington last December, one of the most important matters to come before the session was that of establishing a vast grid of federally funded child care centers, a system which will probably be established this year. It would cost some \$10 billion per year to operate these federally controlled centers, *plus* construction costs. The White House Conference even recommended that the federal government provide an "advocate" for our children who would serve as a "protector" between parent and child.

The Master Planners are also discussing other charming ideas in this field. One of them is compulsory national service at age eighteen for both males and females. Those who do not choose the military would be required to do social work as federal bureaucrats. Someone wants to make awfully sure your child has no chance for independent thinking between the ages of two and twenty-one.

Among other schemes being contemplated by the illumined educationists are mandatory foster homes for children removed en masse from the influence of socially or politically unacceptable parents. Serious discussion of billeting children from poverty areas to affluent neighborhoods is already underway. There is also discussion of establishing

kibbutzim where children would live in a commune, learning to be "socially acceptable." Elizabeth Koontz, president of the National Educational Association in 1968, and named head of the new network of child care centers by President Nixon, is already pushing for the establishment of this sort of arrangement for children.

These "innovative" ideas are emanating from hundreds of so-called P.A.C.E. (Programs to Advance Creativity in Education) Centers, established by Congress as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Centers, scattered over the nation, have been funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Ford Foundation, and are staffed by the usual radical psychiatrists, sociologists, and educators. Their job is to design experimental programs for the various school districts in their area.

In order to make sure that the "new education" juggernaut is not derailed, the National Education Association operates as one of the most potent lobbies in the country. It is a very cute operation indeed. On January 29, 1970, N.E.A. President George Fischer proclaimed: "We plan to make it political suicide to vote against [*what we think is good for*] the kids and education." In July of 1970, Fischer told an N.E.A. convention in San Francisco: "The world has never seen an organization of this magnitude." Mr. Fischer said that by the end of the Seventies "the President of the United States will consult with the officers of the united teaching profession on all issues of national importance." He did not say *or else*, but he added that teachers would reach their goals by strikes, contract negotiations, and political action.

And the N.E.A. is well prepared with counter measures should parents try to protect their schools from the attacking waves of behavioral scientists. Along with other "educational" groups the National Education Association is now conducting

seminars in how to sell the new programs and head off opposition. The first tactic is always to accuse those who oppose letting teacher play psychiatrist of being some sort of extremists or religious fanatics.

Okay, what *can* parents do to protect their offspring from the Orwellian people planners? It is customary here to urge parents to become "involved," to join the P.T.A., to discuss the situation with teacher, to protest at the local school board. More often than not, these are merely exercises in frustration.

In some cases it still may be possible to head off the "new education" programs if local citizens can mobilize enough pressure on the local school board. But more and more these programs are being taken out of the jurisdiction of local boards and mandated by state law or federal guidelines. Within a few years, local school boards will have no power at all and we will have a Federal School System. Even in cases where local pressure can be brought to bear, unless the pressure is constant, "Liberal" school boards will tend to sneak faddish programs in the back door as soon as the furor out front calms down.

It is vital for a totalitarian state to control the education and indoctrination of youth. Knowing this, the collectivist social engineers are working constantly to destroy independent private schools. They scream that it is "un-Democratic" for you to try to keep your child out of their clutches. As social engineer James B. Conant, the former president of Harvard, expressed it:

*I do believe there is some reason to fear, lest a dual system (public and private) of secondary education may, in some states, come to threaten the democratic unity provided by*

\*This is not to contend that all private schools are good schools. Many are more futuristic than the public schools. But when you are paying the bill *privately* you can pick and choose.

*our public schools. I refer to the desire of some people to increase the scope and number of private schools. Our schools should serve all creeds. The greater the proportion of our youth who attend independent schools, the greater threat to our democratic unity.*

Those who would socialize America will do anything to keep their education monopoly from being broken. They see private schools as a serious threat to their power. But so bad are the public schools that more and more parents are now willing to make the financial sacrifices necessary to keep their children out of the hands of the certified government child molesters.\* After all, how much is it worth to keep your son or daughter from being turned into a hippie, a revolutionary, or an obedient little Marxist?

Private schools, unfortunately, cannot be a panacea. Many of us simply cannot afford them, and others live in areas so sparsely populated that maintenance of both public and private schools is not practical. Parents in these situations must run their own schools at home after regular school hours. If they are not to see their children destroyed they have no other choice.

What were once community schools, organized for the convenience of parents and supported by them, have now become government indoctrination centers, increasingly financed and controlled by Washington. Their products are the Spock-marked generation of delinquents, drop-outs, and drug freaks we see all around us. Their tools are no longer those of Socrates or Christ, but of Dewey, Moreno, and the behavioral scientists. As Dr. Joseph Bean has observed: "When you consider that the ultimate goal of warfare is the control of the behavior of the vanquished by the victor, you realize that we are now in the greatest conflict in the history of mankind. Welcome to World War III." ■ ■