

The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 7, No. 11 (Letter # 75)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

November 1992

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks.
"Without vision, the people perish."

The Upside-Down Election of 1992 Conservative Landslide - Liberal Victory The Figures Tell the Story

Although Bill Clinton won the election by winning 370 electoral votes in 34 states, he received only 43% of the popular vote. Which means that 57% of the voters did not want Clinton as President. This was clearly a massive repudiation of the Democrat Party and the liberal philosophy of government it represents. In other words, the most moderate of the Democrats could not muster more than 43% of the popular vote, even though Dukakis got 45.6% in 1988. Only a split of the conservative vote permitted the Democrats to take power in the White House.

Some will say that those who voted for Perot were not really conservatives. But they certainly were not liberal Democrats. They would have voted Republican had Bush been a true-blue conservative instead of a Jim Baker pragmatic, country-club "moderate." The problem with Bush is that he was never an ideological conservative in the Reagan mold, and he could never convincingly articulate conservative ideas because they were never part of his psyche.

The only time Bush sounded like a true conservative was when he made his famous

"read my lips" speech written for him by Peggy Noonan. Conservatives had hoped that he had undergone a conversion and really believed in what he was saying. But when he surrendered to liberal congressional pressure and agreed to raise taxes, conservatives felt betrayed and humiliated. Bush had had his chance to stand up to the tax-and-spend Congress and prove his conservatism, and he failed miserably. He preferred the advice of Darman and Baker to the advice of Buchanan, Helms, and other conservatives. The result: wholesale defection from the Republican Party.

The Buchanan candidacy in the primaries indicated the degree of anger and betrayal conservatives felt. Bush simply didn't realize how much he owed conservatives. He, Baker and Darman just assumed that conservatives would back Bush because they had nowhere else to go.

Vice President Quayle made it clear that he believed the Bush tax increase was responsible for the prolonged recession. In other words, Bush not only reneged on his pledge of "no new taxes," but helped bring

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Sources of products and services described are not necessarily endorsed by this publication. They are intended to provide our readers with information on a rapidly expanding field of educational activity. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: Post Office Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. Phone (208) 343-3790.

about the very recession that became his undoing. Bush knows now that he has no one to blame but himself, and conservatives know now that only a true conservative can win back the White House for the Republicans.

The Clinton Presidency

Bill Clinton learned back in Arkansas that if you want to stay in power you have to please those who have the power to depose you. In his first term as governor, he thought he could impose his hippy, anti-business agenda on the state. But all he did was alienate those who had the power to remove him from office. And he was thoroughly shocked when they did exactly that. He returned to power by humbly promising to do the bidding of the state's power establishment. And he remained in power because he pleased the powerful.

Bill Clinton would have never won the presidency if the opposition had not been divided. He received a majority of the popular vote in only two states: Arkansas (53%) and Maryland (50%), and the District of Columbia (85%). In Texas, for example, where he had the help of Gov. Ann Richards, he garnered a mere 37% of the vote, with 62% voting against him. In California, he got 46% while Bush/Perot got 53%. Even in Tennessee, with Gore on the ticket, Clinton got 47% of the vote, Bush/Perot 52%.

Clinton received less than 45% of the vote in 35 states: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Clinton got between 45% and 49% of the vote in only 13 states: California, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, and West Virginia.

What does all of this mean? It means that in a two-way race in 1996, the Democrats will lose unless the Republicans put up a candidate who's worse than Clinton. Therefore, Clinton will probably become more and more "conservative" as he reaches the end of his first term and wants to be re-elected. But, of course, a lot can happen between now and 1996. Will the Republicans be able to find a candidate who can win? Will the Perot people create a permanent third party? Will Clinton make some serious mistakes? Will the economy rebound? Will people be better off in 1996 than they are in 1992?

What About Education?

Who will Clinton appoint as Secretary of Education? Will it be former NEA president Mary Hatwood Futrell or one of the governors? If he chooses Futrell, it will be the first time that a private labor union is given control of a cabinet post and a multi-billion dollar federal bureaucracy. If he chooses a governor, it will probably be someone like Roy Romer of Colorado who is deeply involved in the America 2000 education reform program which Clinton favors. As for vouchers, Clinton is opposed to public funds going to private schools. Which is just as well. Conservatives ought not to want the government to get more deeply involved in education than it already is. Vouchers will open the door to government regulation of private schools, which is something we don't want or need.

All in all, the Clinton victory will give conservatives the incentive to work harder

to regain control of the Republican Party and the White House. Conservatives are blaming George Bush for the Republican defeat. He was responsible for creating the Buchanan defection and the Perot phenomenon. But the Baker moderates will blame conservatives for the debacle. Cal Thomas wrote in his column of 11/5/92:

"Ronald Reagan's biggest mistake was caving in to pressure from the Republican 'moderates' and selecting Bush as his running mate. . . . Conservative Republicans didn't lose on Tuesday. Moderates did. They will blame the 'far right' and their visibility at the Houston convention for torpedoing GOP political hegemony, ignoring that it was the conservative presence and their 'social issues' in the 1980s that made victory possible. It was the moderates' embarrassment with those issues that made defeat inevitable."

Columnist Don Feder offered an even more scathing evaluation of the Bush legacy. He wrote in the *Boston Herald* of 11/5/92:

Weeks before the election, Baker's White House minions put out the word: If the president lost, right-wing fanatics — who frightened suburban voters with their social extremism — were to blame.

Truth be known, it's all our fault. Back in 1990, we practically got down on our knees and pleaded with King George to raise taxes, thus demolishing his credibility, sending the economy into a tailspin and giving his enemies a set of cement lips to wrap around his neck as he sank below the waves.

And, oh yes, we implored the president to accede to the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to neutralize the quota issue.

Be sure we advised him to screw up the Gulf War — by leaving Saddam in power — to tarnish his one foreign policy triumph. And finally, we beseeched him to run a hesitant, lackluster, issueless campaign, allowing Democrats and their media cohorts to put the focus right where Republicans wanted it least — on the recession.

After winning as a conservative in 1988, Bush extended an olive branch to his enemies and his middle finger to his erstwhile allies. He signed the quota bill, and all the racial con men were for him this year, weren't they? He initialed the Clean Air Act,

and all the environmental wackos were in his corner, weren't they? He signed the Hate Crimes Bill and invited homosexual activists to the White House for the signing, and that crowd clambered aboard his reelection bandwagon, didn't they?

And what did he do for his core constituency from 1988? For evangelicals, he appointed John Frohnmayr head of the National Endowment for the Arts and stuck with him through Mapplethorpe and "Piss Christ." His first Supreme Court appointment voted to uphold *Roe vs. Wade* and declare a graduation invocation in violation of the First Amendment.

For fiscal conservatives, he raised taxes, rolled over for congressional spending, re-regulated and gave us the greatest bureaucratic expansion of all time.

[He] slashed military spending, failed to push strategic defense and coddled commies from Gorbachev to Deng. . . .

The president's defeat should once and for all signal the extinction of that freak of political nature, the liberal/moderate Republican. The electoral lessons of the recent past couldn't be clearer. Nominate a Ronald Reagan and defeat an incumbent, hold the White House for 12 years (for only the third time this century) and the Senate for six.

Go with George Bush and lose to a smarmy hustler, the quintessential hollow man.

The Perot Factor

Obviously, Perot took more votes away from Bush than from Clinton. And it is quite possible that Perot would have actually done better than Bush had he not quit in the middle of his campaign and made a fool of himself about his daughter's wedding and chosen a more credible running mate than "who am I and why am I here." Nevertheless, Perot managed to garner 20% or more of the popular vote in 30 states!: Alaska (27%), Arizona (24%), California (21%), Colorado (23%), Connecticut (22%), Delaware (20%), Florida (20%), Idaho (27%), Indiana (20%), Kansas (27%), Maine (30%), Massachusetts (23%), Minnesota (24%), Missouri (22%), Montana (26%), Nebraska (24%), Nevada (26%), New Hampshire (23%), North Dakota (23%), Ohio (21%), Oklahoma (23%), Oregon (25%), Rhode Island (23%), South Dakota (22%),

Texas (22%), Utah (27%), Vermont (22%), Washington (24%), Wisconsin (22%), and Wyoming (26%).

These voters are sick of hypocritical politicians who lie to get elected and tax and spend when in power. They wanted a leader who would express their frustration and disgust and throw the bums out. They thought they had him in Perot. But come 1996, who will these voters vote for? It is up to the conservative movement to win these basically conservative voters back to the Republican Party. We have four years in which to do it. In the meantime, Clinton will do all he can to win them over.

Other Interesting Votes

In Tampa, Florida, voters repealed a gay-rights ordinance by a 58% majority.

In Colorado, voters repealed gay-rights ordinances in Denver, Aspen and Boulder. They also voted down an education voucher plan that would have paid parents half per pupil costs of education.

In Portland, Maine, an attempt to repeal a gay-rights ordinance was defeated by 57% of the voters.

In Georgia, Republicans led by Newt Gingrich captured 3 new seats in Congress. Gingrich himself was re-elected.

In Iowa, an equal rights amendment to the state constitution was soundly defeated by 52% of the voters. Republicans also captured the state House.

In Michigan, Republicans swept into control of the state House for the first time since 1968. They held 50 seats before the election; now they hold 56. The state House plurality is viewed as a coup for Republican Gov. John Engler. Republicans already control the state Senate 38 seats to 20. As for the top of the ticket, Bush got only 37% of the vote, Perot 19%, Clinton 44%.

Oregonians voted 66% against a state

constitution amendment condemning homosexuality.

In Arkansas, Republicans gained 2 seats in the state House and 2 seats in the state Senate.

In California, voters rejected an income tax increase on business, and Republicans picked up 3 seats in the state Senate despite the fact that Bush only got 32% of the vote. In fact, Bush got a higher percentage of the vote in Arkansas (35%) than he got in California.

In Montana, Republicans won the governor's seat and took control of the state House.

In New Hampshire, Republicans won the governor's mansion by 56% of the vote; Republican Gov. Judd Gregg won the race for the U.S. Senate; and the Libertarian Party won 3 seats in the state legislature.

In Illinois, Republicans won control of the state Senate.

Term limits were approved by voters in 14 states: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming.

In Massachusetts, gay Democrats Barney Franks and Gerry Studds were re-elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. But also 2 Republicans were elected to the U.S. House.

Early-Childhood Assessment Plan Approved

The National Education Goals Panel has approved a resolution to move forward in developing a comprehensive early-childhood assessment system to help gauge children's readiness for school.

The assessment system, which would highlight children's social and emotional maturity and physical and mental well-being

as well as their intellectual skills, would be used to chart the nation's progress in meeting the first of the six goals set by the President and the nation's governors. That goal states that all children will enter school ready to learn by the year 2000.

Acknowledging that the assessment system could take several years to develop, the panel also agreed to explore "interim measures" to help monitor children's progress through such means as teacher observations. The resolution, adopted in March 1992, also "encourages the creation" of educational materials and programs to help parents foster their children's school readiness.

The panel's meeting March 27 was its first since it was reconfigured to provide greater political balance and give Congressional representatives voting power. At that meeting, the goals panel backed a strategy-planning subgroup studying Goal 1 assessment issues. The group advanced a conception of readiness encompassing, in addition to cognition and general knowledge, physical well-being and motor development, social and emotional maturity, approaches to learning, and language use. The assessment would gauge children's progress in each of those areas at several points in the kindergarten year, using data from multiple sources such as teachers, parents, child profiles, and portfolios of student work. The system would also gather data on children's family and preschool experiences before they entered school.

A major barrier to Goal 1, experts point out, is the lack of an "infrastructure" for reaching children from birth to age 5. "There is no one institution or set of institutions that has access to all of those families, so it's a hit-or-miss proposition," said Douglas R. Powell, the head of the department of child development and family studies at Purdue University.

"We need an attitudinal change . . . in the national Zeitgeist of thinking that accords priority to very young children," said Sharon Lynn Kagan, a senior associate at Yale University's Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy. "I would like to see a society that recognizes that readiness is everyone's business."

Multidimensional Readiness

In a presentation at the March meeting, Ernest L. Boyer, the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and head of the panel's Goal 1 resource group, called the resolution "historically important" in embracing a multidimensional view of readiness.

The approach endorsed by the panel reflects "a growing understanding of the complexities associated with this whole readiness goal," said Ms. Kagan who chaired the technical subgroup.

However, citing concern that the system would not provide information soon enough or help parents gauge their own children's readiness for school, some goals-panel members urged that surveys of teachers or progress reports by parents be used to provide data in the interim.

Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado suggested, for example, that within a year, all parents of children under age 6 be given a form to fill in to help monitor their own children. "This would begin to communicate what we think is important" to help influence parents, he said.

Mr. Boyer and Ms. Kagan were receptive to exploring interim strategies to monitor progress and aid parents, as long as they do not "derail" the long-term goals of a broader assessment.

In its resolution, the panel agreed to encourage the use of "existing interim measures" such as teacher judgments and to

support the creation of "developmentally appropriate educational tools" to help both parents and teachers address school-readiness issues.

One approach offered by panelists was to promote programs like Missouri's "Parents as Teachers," which offers home visits, parenting education, and other services to help parents spur young children's learning. According to Gordon M. Ambach, executive director of the Council of Chief State School Officers, the schools' role must be redefined and facilities revamped to make them the "primary contact point" for the referral or delivery of a wide range of services to families. For such efforts to succeed, parents must play a pivotal role.

Rather than focusing on "counting to 10 or knowing the alphabet," said Dorothy Rich, the president of the Home and School Institute, Inc., interventions should help parents bolster children's social and organizational skills and zeal for learning. (*Education Week*, 2/12/92, 4/8/92)

Comment:

Assessment is a euphemism for control, and early-childhood assessment will merely make it possible for the government to control every individual in the United States from birth onward. The fact that the federal government is so deeply involved in this project and is financing studies by so many universities and nonprofit educational organizations all under the direction of Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that the purpose of this control is to serve the interests of the New World Order. All of the components of a humanist, totalitarian system are being quietly put into place without the public having the faintest idea what is happening. According to Bev Eakman's

book, *Educating for the New World Order*, the monster data-storing computers are already in place. Eakman writes (p. 215):

"Any way you look at it, the non-secure, cross-referenceability of large numbers of federal and state computer banks portends a massive government dossier-building capability. With the addition of attitudinal and psychological data, any political, religious, social, racial, or geographical group can be targeted for change — for psychological manipulation — under the present system, just as it stands. Once the requirement for a social security number is lowered to newborns — an event that appears imminent — behaviorists will be able to single out ("target") individuals of any age for psychological exploitation."

Whom Clinton chooses for Secretary of Education will reveal to what extent the new President will be committed to the New World Order. He spoke a great deal during the campaign about being an "agent of change." And now that a "change agent" has won the Presidency, it will be possible to finally see what exactly that means.

Workers Lack Basic Skills Say Employers

More American businesses say workers need to improve their writing and talking, but few offer training programs to help things along, a survey revealed. Until the economy improves, Miriam Shubin, a New York workplace literacy specialist, said few companies will be motivated to tackle the problems. She explained that many firms are now able to temporarily hire overqualified jobless people for entry level positions.

Shubin is a consultant to The Olsten Corp., a nationwide temporary personnel firm based in Westbury, N.Y. that surveyed

402 companies in July 1992. The firms identified writing as the most valued skill but said 80 percent of their employees at all levels need to improve. Last year, 65 percent listed writing as a problem. But only 21 percent of the firms offer training in writing skills, such as putting together memos and business letters.

Seventy-five percent of the companies identified as a key problem interpersonal skills, such as speaking, listening and talking with customers as well as other workers.

Reading comprehension was listed as a needed skill by 41 percent of the businesses, while 40 percent named basic math skills. The business officials said the most common method of identifying workplace literacy needs is through informal, day-to-day observation of employees' skills by their supervisors. (*The Lima [Ohio] News*, 9/21/92)

Britain Dumps Progressive Ed In Teaching English

The long battle over how English should be taught ended Sept. 9, 92 with a decisive victory for the traditionalists. Mr. Patten, Education Secretary, accepted proposals from the National Curriculum Council to abandon the "progressive" approach which has dominated the subject for nearly 30 years and introduce greater rigor into the teaching of the basic skills of reading, writing and speaking. He agreed the law should be changed to ensure that children are taught:

* To write correct English by learning the rules of grammar.

* To learn to read by a method that includes a significant element of phonics which involves sounding out words instead of trying to remember their shapes.

* To spell by methods that include learning lists of words off by heart.

* To appreciate the great works of English literature by being introduced to the standard literary canon.

Over the past five years, each proposal has been fiercely resisted by the progressive educationists who were largely responsible for the various reports on which national curriculum English is currently based. Mr. David Pascall, chairman of the 15-strong National Curriculum Council, said detailed recommendations would be submitted to Mr. Patten by the end of February with the intention that the new order should come into effect in September 1994 for pupils aged five to 14 and in September 1995 for those aged 14-16.

In blunt advice to Mr. Patten, the NCC said its predecessors, including committees chaired by Sir John Kingman, Vice-Chancellor of Bristol University, and Prof. Brian Cox, Professor of English at Manchester University, had failed to define essential knowledge and skills with sufficient clarity. The NCC said every child should be taught to speak Standard English — the "grammatically correct language used in formal communication throughout the world" — clearly, accurately and confidently.

By contrast, the Cox committee said non-Standard English, including such formulations as "we was", "he ain't done it" and "she come here yesterday" were "rarely more than a social irritant to some people" — a view scathingly attacked by the Prince of Wales.

Back to Phonics

In the strongest official endorsement of phonics as a vital element in the teaching of reading, the NCC said children needed to be taught the links between sounds and written forms. It complained that the existing statutory order made only a passing reference to phonics and none at all to reading schemes,

which, by repetition, helped children acquire basic skills.

By contrast, the Cox committee said children would "draw meaning from the printed page" when they were enjoying themselves. It said that "simple endorsements of one or another nostrum are of no service to the teaching of reading."

The NCC said that learning to spell was another essential skill, yet the existing order made no reference to the ways in which competence in spelling could be developed. By contrast, the Cox committee said too much attention was paid to the "secretarial" aspects of writing. A child could be a poor speller but write interesting stories, or be a good speller but write boring stories.

Mr. Pascall said he realized the proposals were likely to be controversial and could undermine the morale of teachers who liked things as they were. However, English lay at the heart of the national curriculum and the case for changing it was overwhelming.

Mr. Nigel de Gruchy, general secretary of the National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers, said: "The national curriculum has become a political football being booted up and down by the Conservative Right Wing." (*The Daily Telegraph*, London, 9/10/92)

Comment:

After our trip to Australia in August 1991 we became convinced that progressive educators throughout the English-speaking world were working in concert to dumb down the people in these countries in order to bring about a world socialist, pagan or atheist system. The Christian believers in the English-speaking countries pose the most serious opposition to a world pagan system. But since most Christians in these countries put their children in the government schools, the aim of the education system has been to

paganize the children and thereby, over a period of time, reduce the Christian opposition to virtual impotence.

By destroying literacy among Christian children, and selecting the gifted and talented for special humanist instruction and indoctrination, the vast majority of Christian children will be denied access to God's word in the Bible. By sexualizing the children as early as possible through explicit sex education, the children will start engaging in experimental premarital sex in violation of Biblical restraints. This will cause what the psychologists call "cognitive dissonance," an internal conflict which can only be resolved by a change in belief systems. Most children will adopt the humanist belief system because it will permit them to continue their sexual activities without feeling guilty. When you add to this the strong pagan influences throughout our culture, particularly in music and television, it is easy to see why so many children are being led into self-destructive behavior. And that is why we are warning parents to keep their children out of the government schools.

There is little possibility that the American education establishment will follow the British lead. The establishment's commitment and dedication to a world pagan system precludes their turning back to a traditional philosophy of education. The progressives have spent 90 years getting to where we are today, and they are too close to their goal to stop now. The only force that can thwart their utopian dream is the homeschool movement, which denies them access to a growing number of Christian children. And therefore we can expect increased efforts on the part of progressives and their statist allies to lobby for legislation curtailing and regulating homeschooling. It is up to the homeschoolers to organize an effective opposition.